

GARFIELD SCHOOL DISTRICT #302
REGULAR BOARD MEETING

Thursday, August 25, 2022
Held in the Garfield Library

OPENING OF MEETING:

The Garfield School Board meeting was called to order at 7:01 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:

Wil Edwards: Why did the Garfield Board want complete autonomy for their own students in the Garfield School but give up autonomy for the high school Garfield students, and specifically why did the citizens of Garfield feel the same way. I did not get that answered so I am here to ask this again.

Jessie Honcoop: In regard to that question, I think for it to be a true cooperative district, as a Garfield member I would need to vote for a Palouse Board member as well and same with the Palouse community would vote for a Garfield Board member.

Wil Edwards: I completely agree with that, but the second question talked about complete autonomy.

Jessie Honcoop: Because it is complete autonomy right now. We vote for the Garfield Board to do what we want them to do and Palouse votes for their board members for what they want them to do. So, if it to be a true joint district it needs to be joint voting.

Matt Bofenkamp: From a board member position I look at Washington State law and yes, we are a cooperative which means we agree to work together on matters that are cooperative, which is a lot of stuff, and I think that 999/1000 we are going to agree on these items. From a board member position, fundamentally I respect the idea that local communities elect their boards to run their school districts. We have a cooperative agreement that says that we have autonomy, that is what the law provides, but we are going to put something on paper for the benefit of cooperative operations to work together on issues because from an administration standpoint it works well. My answer to you, as a single board member, from an autonomy standpoint both our boards do have some autonomy. Our local communities elect those boards to make decisions for their district. A lot of those decisions if they are cooperative in nature will be made at the joint board level together, but the law says that locally elected boards have authority over their buildings. It is less about students to me and more about policy, administration, and finances.

Wil Edwards: So, if you allow that 1%, let's take topic -gender neutral bathrooms – is the Garfield School Board and citizens going to allow the Palouse Board to allow the gender-neutral bathrooms in the Palouse School? You will have no control over that if that is what they really want to do. How do you fix that and how do you feel about that. I just picked this as a hot topic in the news.

Justin Honcoop: That is Palouse prerogative as that is their building. I have the choice not to send them, I chose to homeschool as I did not agree with what was going on in the Garfield School. There have been changes here and it is a hot bed subject to me because it was a mess. The board chose to do something to protect the health and safety, but it was the parent's choice in this building. We are not saying that Palouse could not do anything different, I am not saying that we couldn't decide on curriculum or joint activities together, but in the Garfield Building that was the parents' choice to choose. So, in Palouse, as Sean said last meeting, if Palouse had elected at that time to say, as a Palouse school board we feel the need to require masks for our students at this building, that is the Palouse's directive to their building, and they can do that. And me as a parent I will have to decide if I am going to allow that, causing the damage that it will do.

Wil Edwards: You have ability to make that choice but do other parents have that luxury to pull their kids and do homeschooling.

Justin Honcoop: That comes down to each individual parent to make that decision and I am not going to speak for them, but I am on the school board, and I am talking for the parents who have talked with me directly saying this is important and this needs to be done for our school and we respected our constituents and did what they asked.

Wil Edwards: You talked with your constituents from your community, was that a majority of the community or was it 5, 10, 15, etc?

Justin Honcoop: I don't know how to answer that as we have a large number of parents in our community and there are a large amount that don't have kids in our school. But the vast majority of parents that spoke with me, and I would say about 80% plus, said that this is important and that we need to choose for the safety of our kids whether or not they wear a mask. So, to answer your question, if Palouse decided that they are going to reinstate masks then that is their choice as Palouse Board members, that is their ability as a board. We are not taking away our autonomy from our students; that was on a health and safety decision within the school building that Garfield School Board #302 controlled. Education, athletics, busing are all joint issues that we are working on, but the health and safety of this building is under the school boards prerogative, and that is my opinion.

CHANGES TO THE AGENDA: None.

CONSENT AGENDA:

A. Payroll:

1. Payroll-Warrant

August -30210039-30210051, 30210091-30210092, 30210126-30210129

For a total of \$75,609.51

2. Payroll Electronic Transfer

August - \$115,369.24

3. Payroll Electronic Transfer Fed W/H & SS

August - \$35,124.24

B. Accounts Payable

1. General Fund

August - 30210093-30210110, 30210112-30210121, 30210123-30210125

For a total of \$52,939.52

2. Capital Projects:

August – 30210111 - \$26,323.10

B. Approval of Minutes

1. July 21, 2022

C. 2022/2023 Staff Hires/Moves

1. Debbie Anderson – Move to confidential exempt status

2. Jennifer Bonifas – Hire – Garfield Food Service Cook

3. Jennifer Roetcisoender – Hire – Garfield Para-Teacher

4. Anais Mills – Hire – Para-Teacher

MOTION: A motion to accept the Consent Agenda was made by Justin Honcoop and seconded by Paula Adams. The motion passed with the following roll call vote:

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

NEW BUSINESS:

A. Oath of Office Superintendent:

Sean Neal read the oath of superintendent with Brett Agenbroad who repeated the oath.

B. Approve payment of Apollo Solutions Group Invoice.

MOTION: A motion to approve the payment to Apollo Solutions Group Invoice was made by Ryan Pfaff and seconded by Matt Bofenkamp. The motion passed with the following roll call vote:

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

REPORTS:

A. Superintendent Report:

1. The Boiler is 70 years old and was put in service in 1952. We don't know when it was built. There should be a plate that shows when it was built but it was not a law to put this on the boiler and this has never been found. I did have a conversation with Apollo about how they got paid with Mr. Jones and Mr. Loe and Apollo. After all their payment questions were answered I stayed on to ask about a Plan B for the boiler should it fail since it has been repaired several times and after I have seen the actual nickel sized hole in the boiler. One of the members on the Apollo team addressed the need to get a hold of William Boyle, Mid Mountain Boiler out of Texas. So, I called him myself and have had a number of conversations with him and he has a very quick fix solution, this boiler out and new boilers in by the end of October. When we met this week on Plan B, Apollo wasn't real warm to that plan and they weren't interested in discussing Mr. Boyle's recommendation for a quick fix. They told me that they would have a viable plan by last Friday and this came and went. I asked them again what the plan was and they wanted to look at ESD 101, Michael Black, emergency school funder, to identify more money that in case we had a catastrophic failure we could have more money. My point is, we could be sitting on a stack of money that has no value to me if we can't have a boiler within 24 hours or less. So, they need a month to do some research. So, what we are going to do is take internal measurements of the wall thickness of the boiler once we get the instrument that has been

recommended to us and then they will run a series of calculations on the projected life of that boiler. As soon as we have these figures, I will have a stronger position to talk with Mr. Black with. I don't want to sit around in the dark and hope that we make it through the winter, we need solid information that we can understand on boiler wall thickness and the projection of life for that 70-year-old boiler.

2. Out of the elementary gymnasium we have laid a fresh cement pad for the elementary playground area and it is beautiful, as well as the new sidewalk.
3. Simply Wired was contracted to do the work on the installation of the cameras to monitor every door, hallways, and entrance. They plan on having them operational by Thursday so they are very close. These cameras will monitor any door and we can set the timer on any door camera to alert us in minutes to let us know if that door has been propped open. We will be passing a video camera policy in the joint board meeting tonight.
4. We will be getting a magnetic lock on the front door so we can buzz them in so that people can just not walk in without anyone noticing them.
5. I have asked for a local quote on getting the weeds and the grass by the fence lines taken care of.
6. Skyward training has kept our staff busy days on end and they are working hard to figure all of this out.
7. Regarding food service, we have hired a new cook which I am very thankful for. In talking with Stevie Pfaff on some of the training she has recently received, the food service will be going through a procurement audit. We do have a policy in place but what the auditor told us is that there has been a revision in 2020-2021 and that if that revision isn't adopted by the end of the audit, we will receive a fine. So that policy will be asked to be adopted at the joint board meeting tonight.
8. Cross Country practices started on 8-22, Middle school football practices started on 8/24, and Girls Middle School Basketball practice will start on the first day of school.
9. Facility in-service training will be on 8-29 and 8-30 and Mike Jones has graciously combined our district employees.
10. On Monday 8-29 we will be having an open house.
11. I would really like to thank Trish Gorence and Craig Cochran for getting this building squared away. The building looks awesome. The office staff works tirelessly to make things as seamless as possible for us.
12. Psychological services have been contracted with ESD in the past but they do not have a physical psychologist to provide us on-site this year. Mike Jones went out and found someone and I don't have one as of yet. Bailey Pfaff has some people she would like to contact but until then we will contract this remotely with ESD 101 until we can have someone in-person.
13. We did receive a Farm-To-School grant of \$19,000 for the Garfield School and that will provide 5 hours of prep services a week in the kitchen so we can have someone come in and help Jennifer prep that. Included in that grant is also fuel cost for someone to pick up and deliver the food to the schools.

ADJOURN: There being no further business the Garfield Board adjourned at 7:27 p.m.

Board Chairman: _____

Superintendent: _____

**PALOUSE SCHOOL DISTRICT #301
REGULAR BOARD MEETING**

Thursday, August 25, 2022

Held in the Garfield School Library

OPEN: The Palouse School Board meeting was called to order at 7:28 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 Debbie Anderson

Guests: Community Members

REQUESTS TO ADDRESS THE BOARD: None.

CHANGES TO THE AGENDA: We will be striking Brian Bell, AG Sciences.

CONSENT AGENDA:

A. Accounts Payable:

1. General Fund:

August – 30111185-30111189, 30111191-30111192, 30111194-301111201,
30111123-301111205, 301111207, 301111209-301111212,
30111213-20111215, 20111217-20111219
For a total General fund of: \$25,207.80

2. Capital Projects:

August – 30111190, 30111202, 30111206, 3011208, 30111212 - \$96,996.60

2. Payroll-Warrants

August – 30111132-30111147, 30111220-30111224 - \$79,116.58

3. Payroll Electronic Transfer

August – \$91,277.24

4. Payroll Electronic Transfer Fed W/H & SS

August - \$33,790.12

B. Approval of Minutes:

July 21, 2022

C. 2022/2023 Staff Hires/Moves:

HIRES:

1. ~~Brian Bell~~—Ag Science
2. Joan Allen – Para Professional
3. CJ Clark – 2nd FFA Position
4. Chris Hallan – Assistant High School Volleyball
5. Robert Lopez – Robotics Advisor

MOVES:

1. Mark Sawyer – Back to full-time (moved to 0.7 end of last school year)
Interim FFA Advisor

MOTION: A motion to accept the Consent Agenda was made by Shealyn Holbrook and seconded by Heidi Evans. The motion passed with the following roll call vote:

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

OLD BUSINESS: None.

NEW BUSINESS:

A. Superintendent/Principal Report:

- 1) Welcome to Brett Agenbroad. He and I have had a couple of different meetings together.
- 2) We were just awarded \$190,000 to install solar panels with HVAC systems that will be going in next fall. We have had a couple of issues already with the roof and we are looking to recoat that. Looking also at the walk-in cooler and there should be a bid on that next week.
- 3) Farm-To-Table Grant has come through at \$19,000. There are several different pieces to that and Stevie Pfaff is working through those. Lindsay Brown has been instrumental in some of those pieces. She has graciously volunteered in transporting food. She is working with WSU Creamery, the bakery and such.
- 4) Working on academic pieces and Brett and I will be talking about some of these in the morning, and I am pretty excited about some of the conversations we have already had about extending some of what we are doing into the middle school particularly around HiCAP and CTE learning and maybe utilizing some of the shop space in the middle school.
- 5) Please be sure to let Brian Lentz know what a great job he has been doing around the school.
- 6) In working on the football field we found out today that they cut the electrical to the scoreboard so now we have to retrench and lay new wire.
- 7) Mr. John Bofenkamp is here tonight and he has been working diligently on the outdoor classroom and things are coming together on that.
- 8) Staff in-services are on the 29th and 30th.
- 9) We are looking at upgrading our cameras, closing campus with fences, etc.
- 10) Jenny Marshall will be working with our K3 teachers and para educators.
- 11) Open house on 8-29.
- 12) We are the only school on the eastside of the state that is doing the NC-C Class.
- 13) Football has about 17 students, volleyball 15, Cross Country 13, and 4 girls are swimming in Pullman. We have about 2/3rds of our students in these events and that doesn't include those students that involved with fair and FFA. So, our kids are busy and we haven't even started school yet.
- 14) I want to be sure to recognize those community members who have stepped up and helped our students during this time we were looking for an FFA teacher. Kirk and Melissa Dugger helped with beef, Wil and Andi Edwards with swine, Noel and Libby Akin with the sheep. CJ Clark volunteered last year for different parts in the year and this summer he has worked with some of the leadership team consistently taking them and I want to keep him involved and that is why we have added him to the pay list and he is going to be at the U of I working towards his AG Certification and so if we can support him I want to try and work that way.

- 15) Mark Sawyer, even though his passion is robotics, he also knows that he is the only one with FFA experience and so he graciously has moved into that role while we are in that transitional period. Robert Lopez will take on the robotics piece.
- 16) Thank you to all the folks, parents, boosters, for their efforts this year.
- 17) Picture day will be the 9/13 in Palouse and 9/15 in Garfield. Our AV students do the pictures and this helps support our program.
- 18) We worked really hard on after school programing before Covid, and so we are going to be bringing this back in the middle of September.
- 19) Vitalant Blood Drive will be on September 16 the night of a home football game. The money generated for this goes towards robotics.
- 20) Newsletter information went out today on Blackboard to put out important dates, ect.

ADJOURN: There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 7:43 p.m.

Board Chairman: _____

Superintendent: _____

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

Thursday, August 25, 2022
Held in the Garfield Library

OPEN: The Joint Board meeting was called to order at 7:43 p.m. by Garfield Chair Sean Neal.

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: Community Members

REQUESTS TO ADDRESS THE BOARD: None.

CHANGES TO THE AGENDA: We will add board retreat to New Business.

CONSENT AGENDA:

- A. Approval of Minutes
July minutes are not complete at this time.

NEW BUSINESS:

- A. Discussion – Board Retreat:
After discussion, Sean, Jess, Mike and Brett will set up a date and place for this.
- B. Discussion – Approve first reading of policy 3245, 6610, and 5011:
 - 1) Policy 3245- Students & Telecommunication Devices
In Garfield we will be having a no-phone in the classroom policy and the handbooks pre-covid had that procedure/practice going on. So the administration recommends to approve the Washington State School Directors Association (WASSA) Model Board A model policy 3245.
 - 2) Policy 6610 – Video Surveillance
Now that we have cameras in place we need to approve Policy 6610. This is also a WASSA Model policy.
 - 3) Policy 5011 – Sexual Harassment of District Staff Prohibited.
This was not in our current policy so this just needs to be cleaned up.

Board Discussion: Board discussion followed with questions about “fill in the blanks” and Section E regarding Policy 3245 – searching devices, and both of these will be revised. Brett and Mike will work on the modifications and get this back out to the boards. Videos will be held for 30 days and then they can be taped over.

Community Discussion: A community member asked about the smart watches in the classroom.

Mike and Brett said this is something they will have to look into.

MOTION: Paula Adams moved to approve for first reading policy 3345, 6610, and 5011, seconded by Jessica Smith. The motion passed with the following roll call vote:

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

NEW BUSINESS: Continued

C. Adopt on first reading, Revised B.P. 6220 – Bid or Request for Proposal Requirements

Board Discussion: Brett reported that this will not be brought back to the board, this will be approved first and final – we have the policy in place, it is just a revision and if we do not get this in our books we will have a finding on the procurement audit that we will be having.

Community Discussion: None.

MOTION: Ryan Pfaff moved to approve the Revised B.P. 6220 – Bid or Request for Proposal Requirements, moved by Jessica Smith. The motion passed with the following roll call vote:

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

D. Joint Board Discussion/Action: Possible revision(s) to current Cooperative Agreement.

Board Discussion: Handouts were given to the board members regarding Lind-Ritzville cooperative agreement as well as St. John/Endicott. Board discussion followed.

Jessica Smith: These are both identical. Which one copied from the other one?

Justin Honcoop: Lind-Ritzville copied from St. John/Endicott.

Ryan Pfaff: They both copied from our original agreement.

Justin Honcoop: The thing I took away from these is Section I, regarding the staff, is that each district would maintain their own staff. It is simple and straightforward. My approach to this is that Garfield and Palouse should maintain their own employees. If we send them to another district for work we can agree upon a payment plan or cost share, which they identify here, and it is just much simpler than trying to go through the convoluted plans that were written up in our previous one.

Jessie Twigg-Harris: Which one are you looking at, the one that we are working on specifically.

Justin Honcoop: I was specifically looking under 4, and then 4G, talking about hiring new employees. Especially 4G, iii, Single District Employees who teach students in both districts in a cooperative program will be discussed in the joint board meeting and individual votes will be taken by both boards. That is a single district employee and why are we discussing a single district employee in a joint board session and then taking votes on this. It is just much simpler if we just stayed with something like our adjacent districts have and what we had.

Heidi Evans: I do agree that that would be much more clearer but we also need to be mindful again that our union agreements are between the three of us so that reopens negotiations with your unions because then you are going to have to break apart our union contracts, which would be like Garfield and the union and Palouse and the union. Which I don't think is impossible.

Justin Honcoop: Isn't that what we are currently doing?

Heidi Evans: No, right now our collective agreement is between the three parties. It is very unusual in this case. Most of the other ones do have two separate collective agreements and it would be cleaner in that respect.

Justin Honcoop: We just went through negotiations is that something that we can just redo?

Heidi Evans: If you reopen your contract it reopens all negotiations.

Justin Honcoop: What if we stay with our current cooperative agreement.

Heidi Evans: I think you guys have made it pretty clear that you want that real definite separation, which I can respect, but then if we are going to do it then we need to sever that umbilical cord and have it that way because I think we are opening ourselves to an interesting situation. Case in point, some action that was taken earlier tonight, which I don't believe passes some Fair Labors Standards Act with the Department of Labor.

Justin Honcoop: What is that?

Heidi Evans: That is making your secretary an exempt status person, and I warned you guys on this last time, and if you look at a lot of secretaries they are not salaried individuals and the FSLA has very strict standards on who can be exempt and who cannot be exempt. We talked about that a little bit last time. That is your board's decision to make that as that is your staff, so moving forward I think it would be really wise that we do separate those because you are in the interest of protecting your legal interest and we are in the interest of protecting our legal interest as well. But just certain ramifications when we really start wanting to make that definite separation, which I think makes sense that even goes with our comparators here with their school arrangements and taking a little bit deeper dive like I mentioned they do have their own separate union agreements even if they are very identical for the most part to one another.

Matt Bofenkamp: I like the idea of making progress while we are talking about all this. Since we have the draft that Jessica sent out to everybody two weeks ago, I think in order to make good progress to the boards we reference that when we are talking about this so we can start making some concrete changes or at least modifying the draft so we have time as board members to chew on that and then hopefully come to an agreement. So, Section IV in our current draft, is the broad support for getting rid of all those sections and simplifying it to "each district will maintain responsibility and authority in all matters relating to the staff and employees for which they serve. (With Modifications)

Jessica Smith: My question is how many staff members do we have in this role, and what will this look like for them.

Mike Jones: Jeremy Loe supplied us with a spreadsheet of employees but they weren't separated out by any district so we do not have that, and we do not want to put names out there.

Jessie Twigg-Harris: From your perspective, what are the effects on the staff? So if there is no shared staff do we have separate contracts then?

Brett Agenbroad: I don't see anything changing. The way I would think of it is contracting services. We agree that we have a specialist, if you want those services we would agree on which day a week, just like we are doing now and cost share those out. Just like Mike and I have been talking about having someone come over and use our shop, we talked with Jeremy, and he said he would just quarterly bill them or cost share that out.

Heidi Evans: I think the cost share is easy to figure out. I would be most interested to see what the agreement of these shared staff members look like.

Justin Honcoop: What do you think of Section VII C. Complaints or concerns will be resolved in the following manner. It spells it pretty straight forward.

Board discussion followed on this topic regarding grievance.

Justin Honcoop: Do we have any staff members that are coming to Palouse to Garfield that are spending a large portion of their days.

Mike Jones: Yes, and vice versa.

Justin Honcoop: Who are they and what do they do?

Brett Agenbroad: There is an AG teacher is our employee but he spends all his time at the high school.

Justin Honcoop: But he is at the high school full time so why is he a Garfield employee.

Mike Jones: Part of that has to do with the cost share with the CTE.

Matt Bofenkamp: So this doesn't really change the way the board handles things because this is the way it has been done for many years. We did that tonight with several of our new hires.

Mike Jones: But this has been done differently at different times as administration changes. We go to add an AG position and I don't just have Palouse employees and Palouse communities on that board hiring that position, they are impacting Garfield students. So, in my mind that should be a joint approval, not just a Palouse approval, and then I get told to put it on the Palouse agenda and that bothers me. We could bring up a couple of other names that we are sharing under a global contract, and we have a relationship with those individuals and a commitment to those across the board in both districts. Again, Brett and I have talked a little bit about some of this, but we only talked once about this briefly. I was a little disheartened that some of this was in the agendas tonight. Some of those things are joint and need to be joint if we are going to be a cooperative. If we are going to be separate but equal type of concept that is going to take a whole lot of separation and I think just the word separate is a slippery slope.

Matt Bofenkamp: But from an administrative issue do you worry about an situation where an employee that could be considered a joint employee but works full time in your building that there is an administrative issue that occurs, but in order to take any action with that employee would then require action by both board (as it is worded now).

Mike Jones: But that is also when you are talking about an employee side, that is also why a single superintendent is in both of those districts because then there is a chain of command that happens, they oversee that individual employee, they then go to the principal that has the issue and then the superintendent who oversees is then final authority.

Justin Honcoop: But then case in point to that is when the superintendent lies to one board then we have massive issues.

Mike Jones: But you are talking about past president. I also think that in that case, to be quite honest, that if you go to a single superintendent, which again I will just say that none of this ever came up prior to hiring Brett, and this has zero to do with Brett and we have talked about this, that when you look at a single superintendent, and you are hiring a single superintendent, all 10 hire that individual and if one board is upset with him that's done. It is just like any of the policy that we talked about previously, if one side of the board didn't like it because it is a joint issue and it dies, same thing with the superintendent. I know this is a slippery slope and there is more conversation with that but I am simplifying part of that, but this is part of the issue. When this was built it was two principals, single superintendent so that you had that piece.

Justin Honcoop: But it failed drastically.

Mike Jones: I disagree on the fail. There is a lot to it and there is a lot of history in the pieces, but I would think that the Garfield five and the Palouse five learn from past president and learn from those pieces, and that is what disheartened me a little bit. Again, I don't mean to misspeak and I don't mean to put it out there in this way, and I want to make it very clear that I am committed to working with Brett, and it has zero to do with Brett.

Justin Honcoop: This is a done issue.

Mike Jones: I know. But I am telling you that now it is showing up in all of our policy pieces and when he and I talk about even hiring and moving people on there – even an employee that we share between district, that has full flow between districts, so now that we are going to time slip an employee to ensure that they are a 0.5 on both sides.

Justin Honcoop: No, it is a cost share, you figure it out and work through it. It doesn't have to be where we have gotten the budget down to \$3,000 at the end of the year to pay one district back and forth.

Mike Jones: I agree, that has to be worked out. I am just saying that some of the challenges that start cropping up when you start going through that, and I agree with you it is a done issue and that is why I say it has zero to do with it, we are moving forward as we are, but I think when you start looking at those things, if you are going to be committed to having two bosses, then you are committing yourself to two contracts and I personally don't know if that is in the best interest of cooperatives. With that being said, there is more to it.

Brett Agenbroad: You have been doing this for 15 years – Zane was here for 15 years.

Matt Bofenkamp: I appreciate all of the input but for the input of this we have two superintendents for the foreseeable future. For the interest of this document, we need to stick with that because that is where we are. By October we need to finish this document.

Jessica Twigg-Harris: This brings up 7c, in terms of how grievance would be resolved, in the St. John/Endicott agreement, that this version simplifies the issue, but I don't think it does given that both of these are built entirely on a single superintendent structure.

Matt Bofenkamp: I believe the intent of 7c is when a community member brings forth an issue, how it should be handled. If you flip back to the wording at the very beginning where they simply state, "staff employed by one district, but assigned in the other will be bound by all negotiated agreements covering their employment within their contracted districts." That would cover a grievance situation, that gives the clarity on what which district would handle a grievance situation.

Heidi Evans: Unfortunately, it doesn't. Collective bargaining agreement with the union is separate from this but I am willing to bet is outlined in the collective bargaining agreement a dispute resolution. If you want to apply this to the teachers and staff, then you have to get the union contract.

Matt Bofenkamp: Then we may need to simplify this by saying that any disputes will be handled on the already agreed upon contract.

Heidi Evans: If we make these statements like "we have no control over you", or "you have no control over us", then what happens if a staff member feels that basically their building has violated the contract that our building serves over, that is outlined in the grievance procedure, then there is nothing that Brett or Mike could do at the end of the day, that either one could say "this is my building and this is the way of it", and if I was a staff member that is scary.

Justin Honcoop: Couldn't they go bring that up with their boss. The employee and employer could come together and have a resolution with that grievance.

Heidi Evans: They could then file an unfair labor practice complaint with the public employee relations commissions, and they could say they violated the contract.

Jessica Smith: So, this is an opposite issue. What if masks come back again and Garfield chooses to vote no masks and we have a cooperative employee or a shared employee that gets cost shared down to us in our building, do they have to wear a mask.

Justin Honcoop: Just to be clear, we elected for parents to make the choice, we didn't say no mask, we said that the parents have the right to choose what they do with their child's medical health, not no mask.

Jessica Smith: So you stated that the staff member can choose whether or not they can wear masks, then if they come into the Palouse School building are they bound by the option or are they bound by the Palouse rule which said they shall not?

Matt Bofenkamp: I would like to suggest this, our community turned out and said put your differences aside, move forward, strengthen the cooperative and keep it together. I am ready to do that but part of that is moving past these past votes and moving on and I would really like to do this. We are always going to disagree on this and rehashing this every single time we come to the school board it is not helping. I would like to do what the community asked which is put our differences aside and let's really try to work

on the draft that Jess put out, really try to come to a consensus. As I am doing this, I am trying to write stuff down and I don't know if anyone is doing this, and I don't know if anyone wants to do this, but I will volunteer, I would like to come out of this with modifications to this draft that we can redistribute to the group so that we can still work on moving forward with this. Obviously, the staff piece is one part of it, I am just trying to put a format together here. Are you okay if I take that and type all of this up and resubmit it to the group, a revision 1 and a revision 2, a moving document that we can work on.

Jessica Twigg-Harris: Why, isn't Jess doing that generally.

Matt Bofenkamp: I guess I didn't realize that so if Jess was doing that.

Paula Adams: However, respectively, that is a very moving sentiment, but the Garfield Board is not doing that when we keep saying "but the past problem with the superintendent", so if we are going to ask our colleagues to do that, we need to do the same.

Jessie Twigg-Harris: In the document that we are working on, is there a specific change or reason that section 4G, 1, 2 and 3 need to be changed.

Jessica Smith: This is not going to change anything for this school year because that would not be totally unfair to our staff. Would it be acceptable to work through this and table specifically the issue of how we want to do the joint staff until after we get the cooperative agreement and then we can go back and amend it as we see fit next March if we need to, if not we move forward. We will not leave it out but just leave it as written with the intention that the board will go back and redo this once we get through all of this.

Paula Adams: I have a question about what is currently written in G2. It talks about cooperative employees or dual district employees, and it sounds like there is some disagreement about how those are identified. So how are they identified?

Jessie Twigg-Harris: Are there cooperative employees who are paid by both districts working in both districts?

Discussion followed on dual/cost shared employees.

Justin Honcoop: I have a problem with iii below that. "Single district employees who teach student from both districts in cooperative programs will be discussed at the joint board meeting and individual votes will be taken by both boards." I would move to strike that whole line. Either you are a single district employee or you are a cooperative employee.

Mike Jones: How do you feel about a Palouse employee who is then teaching Garfield students that you have extreme concerns about, and vice versa.

Matt Bofenkamp: I think if they are employed by Palouse it is a Palouse employee, if they are employed by Garfield it is a Garfield employee. I don't think the geographical location of the student should matter from a personal administration standpoint. If they are a true cooperative employee and they are a true cost share then it is outlined here.

Jessica Smith: That kind of goes back to what Wil Edwards was asking about, how can Garfield make sure its board and its community have a say on what goes on in the high school or vice versa, so if we get rid of that we lose that ability for us to give back feedback on what we are seeing and vice versa.

Mike Jones: We have a lot of parents here and not one of them have had a problem getting a hold of me, but at the same time it becomes fundamental. I don't see the students as Garfield or Palouse students, I see them as Gar-Pal students and that is the way it needs to be across the board. If the Garfield Board has an issue, I answer in part to you as well. You may not have the authority to nix my contract at this point, but I do answer, and I do feel a sense of responsibility to Garfield and the Garfield Board to be able to meet the needs of the Garfield students within my building, even though I don't sparse that out. So in that respect I think you should have some say if there is concern and your parents are coming with you with those concerns.

Matt Bofenkamp: And from a staff concern perspective, as a parent I would trust the superintendent of that school and their board to make sure they have the right people, and that is my trust in the other board. My big concern, and I am only speaking as an individual, is a situation where we trust our administrators to operate our schools, the boards don't get involved in the day-to-day operations and that is not what we should do or what we are expected to do, but if we put ourselves in a situation where if we try to somehow make a cooperative employee based on geographically the kids they are teaching and where they are coming from we all of the sudden we put our superintendents in a position where they now have no control over that employee and I don't think that is right.

Mike Jones: I don't know if I am a 100% following you. The way you phrased that, I don't know that I necessarily agree with that but I don't fully understand what you said, you lost me somewhere along the line. I think somewhere in the framework of what we are really talking about is that both districts are trying to do what is best for both kids involved, and I think we are all in agreement with that and that is the primary concern. With that being said, if there is a concern on any level, regardless of your geographic location, it has no absolutely no bearing on that, it is a matter of who you are contacting and who is working with you, and then if a Palouse parent comes to me with a significant concern about a Garfield employee, in our current arrangement my first call is with the Garfield superintendent and saying "this is the problem that we have, where are we at, and then we try to operate from that point. If it reaches the board level on that and now we are in a situation where one side says they are absolutely great and the other side says they are absolutely horrible, how do we resolve that.

Matt Bofenkamp: So that is what I am saying, we shouldn't even put ourselves in that position. You made my point for me. If a Palouse parent calls about a Garfield employee and you relay that concern to Brett, then Brett brings this to his board and says this is what is going on. So you made my exact point, regardless of where the child is from we already have that in place and we are just looking to make sure that, from an actual operation standpoint, we actually do that.

Mike Jones: And in my mind there is, whether you are firing or keeping an employee, and in the extreme case that that happens we are really talking about the progression of checks and balances if you will of what that is going to look like on the disciplinary side and having some resolution there that is amendable to everyone involved and that is the piece is the part that is broken.

Brett Agenbroad: That is just due process. If there is an employee of Garfield that has a complaint against them, then I investigate, take appropriate action, if it is termination I bring it to the board, but there is that due process that I would do on any employee that serves under me and I know that you would do likewise.

Mike Jones: And to be quite honest, and we may have some of those parents in the room, the first question I would ask is have you talked with Brett and if the answer is "no" then I would tell them that they have to start there. That is the due process component that we are really talking about, what are the structured lines that to be able to get us to that point that everything has been done by both sides, that trust/not trust take all that out the window, that everyone can feel comfortable that it has been followed and processed to a distinct resolution.

Justin Honcoop: But we can get hung-up on that distinct resolution, as it is currently written.

Mike Jones: As it is currently written that is why it needs to be somewhat revised. I don't have the answer.

Justin Honcoop: I would say strike it. So if they are a single employee and it has come to Garfield, and Brett says this individual is not working, this is what they have done wrong, there is no hung jury here, they are fired. We can't have a majority of one board and not a majority in the other board and now we can't do anything now and the only step then is arbitration.

Jessie Twigg-Harris: If they are employed by one school but they work in both, and it is not working in one of the schools, can their contract then be honored in the other school if they are taken out of one school.

Brett Agenbroad: They can be reassigned in the other school.

Mike Jones: But the follow up to part of that, for example, let’s take the music department, all of the sudden we have a problem with one of them and we say we are no longer going to use your employee in the district. Now we are going to hire that employee and so we are incurring an additional cost which is no longer cost shared, and we have made that decision and that kind of defeats the whole purpose of what we are trying to do. So there has to be some cooperation in some capacity.

Justin Honcoop: But we could have that cooperation simply by having cooperative employees and single district employees, if they work in both they are a cooperative employee and they fall under this category, if they are a single district employee, they are a single district employee, they may work at another district but they are a Garfield or Palouse employee. Then it is a very simple chain of command, that if any parent has a problem with them, regardless of their school, can talk with their boss and then it flows down.

Jessie Twigg-Harris: But that is not currently how it is, currently they are employed by one or the other and then shared. That is an idea that we can go for that but that is not how it is right now. So our agreement to some extent needs to match what we have going on right now in order to protect our employees right now. We can’t change the system, unless we rearrange how they are employed.

Matt Bofenkamp: I don’t think we are looking at doing that. If what we are doing right now is acceptable can we just maintain that but just change the wording to match what the status quo is now. Because right now, but maybe I heard wrong, that we don’t have any cooperative employees like it reads now. So, if we don’t then what we can do is strike that session and come back to it in March, maybe we look at this again, but if what we have in the wording is what we have now then maybe I am fine with that.

Jessica Smith: I am looking back at my old drafts and then it got slightly shrunk.

Matt Bofenkamp: Does G3 match what our existing cooperative agreement says?

Jessica Smith: It collapses cooperative employees and dual district employees into one, and the actions under them both were the same, so I shrunk that down. Single district employees is also word for word.

Discussion followed about dual employees on whether or not we have them.

MOTION: Heidi Evans moved that we accept or ratify the preamble in Section I, assumptions A, B, C and D as presented, seconded by Andi Edwards. The motion passed with the following roll call vote:

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

MOTION: Heidi Evans moved that we strike all of Section A as currently presented, and for it to be replaced with the mission and goals from the March 2020-2021 cooperative plan as presented in that document, seconded by Jessie Twigg-Harris.

Board Discussion:

Jessica Smith: I think we need to tweak it long-term but for right now let it stand.

Heidi Evans: I will read it out loud. “The mission is to preserve the cooperative for the purpose of enhancing and facilitating the educational objectives of the Garfield and Palouse School Districts advocating for public education and allowing all stakeholders, board members, staff, parents, students, and community members to have a voice. In this way we will ensure that we put the interest of the children first. So the goals are:

- A) Preserve the cooperative,
- B) Adopt board operating procedures and set an annual date to review the procedures,
- C) Work on hiring procedures for certificated and non-certificated employees,
- D) Work on hiring procedures for supplemental and athletic contracts,
- E) Work on a procedure to designate the job descriptions for cooperative employees.

MAIN MOTION: It was moved that we strike all of Section A as currently presented, and for it to be replaced with the mission and goals from the March 2020-2021 cooperative plan as presented in that document. The motion passed with the following roll call vote:

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

MOTION: Jessie Twigg-Harris moved to ratify Section 3, A, B, C and D of the Duration and Termination from the draft revised document, seconded by Jessica Smith.

Board Discussion:

Justin Honcoop: I would look at Section D on that and I think we should probably have that in writing how we are going to break the distribution of property out.

Matt Bofenkamp: So, the point being, the last sentence there says, “the parties will agree in writing how to distribute any real and personal property jointly acquired by the Parties.” Should that just be set out now because at that point it may be hostile, and you would have people arguing over things. So, would there be an easy and concise way for us to even simply say, at this point, that the superintendents would work together on any shared property and come to a mutual value-based agreement that splits cost between both districts, or something to that effect.

Jessica Smith: Do we have shared cost property at this time?

Mike Jones: Transportation. It is run through Garfield but because it is split on that they use all of our numbers to supplement that piece, so there would be some shared cost in that.

Jessie Twigg-Harris: I don't think it makes sense to actually list things as that can say, and I don't think that that is what you were saying, but it does say that both parties will agree.

Matt Bofenkamp: So, reading from St. John/Endicott- maybe this would be better wording – “In case of termination, a monetary value will be placed on all jointly purchased supplies, materials, and equipment. The supplies, materials and equipment will then be divided between the districts according to the share of the purchase cost borne by each district.” I don't care if we have that last sentence in there about ESD 101 superintendent, I don't mind that it is there, but I think that this lays it out clearly. Could we have that language as Section D, and that way it is already set there we don't have to ask our superintendents to then come up with a written agreement after a termination has already been done.

Heidi Evans: They are still saying that a monetary value will be placed at that time because it does make more sense because of depreciation of assets. To that effect I did put on my notes that I would really love to add “the ESD 101 Superintendent shall serve as mediator.”

AMENDED MOTION: Matt Bofenkamp moved that Section 3 D, is modified to only include the first sentence, and that Section 3 E, will be created with the wording from the St. John/Endicott agreement, seconded by Justin Honcoop.

Board Discussion:

Heidi Evans: I just want to read this back, just to make sure I understand it correctly. So D will now read, “Upon termination of the Agreement, all real and personal property acquired by either party shall remain with the Party who acquired it.” The new E will read, “In case of termination, a monetary value will be placed on all jointly purchased supplies, materials and equipment. The supplies, materials and equipment will then be divided between the districts according to the share of the purchase cost borne by each district. The ESD 101 Superintendent shall serve as mediator.”

MAIN MOTION: It was moved to approve Section 3, A-D, Section 3 D, as modified to only include the first sentence, and that Section 3 E, will be created with the wording from the St. John/Endicott agreement. The motion passed with the following roll call vote:

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

Heidi Evans: Since operational responsibilities seem under dispute, should we jump ahead to 5?

Jessica Smith: Since we have kind of tentatively agreed that we are going to leave things as they are, pulling from the old cooperative agreement for now, I have a list of things we have to discuss over the next couple of months, I am sure you will be thrilled with that, but do we want to go ahead and approve for this version for this draft, Section 4, and just go ahead and bite the bullet.

After discussion it was decided not to go with Section 4.

MOTION: Justin Honcoop moved to approve Section 5, General Administrative Procedures, seconded by Heidi Evans. The motion passed with the following roll call vote:

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

Heidi Evans: I think that Section 6 may be a little sticky so we should jump to Section 7, Dispute Resolution.

Discussion followed regarding adding ESD 101 as mediator.

MOTION: Jessie Twigg-Harris moved that we ratify Section 7, Parts A, B, and C as is, except with one addition, in Step 2, specifying the mediator as ESD 101. This was seconded by Matt Bofenkamp.

Board Discussion: Discussion followed regarding the wording of ESD 101 mediator language. It was decided that Jessica Smith would take this and revise it as follows: “...the Parties will proceed to resolve their issue by requesting the ESD 101 Superintendent for assistance and to facilitate a resolution process.”

Matt Bofenkamp: How do we feel about striking Section C under this premise? As a good gesture, I as a board member, do not necessarily really want to have wording that says, “board go to the court if you don’t like it or don’t like anything”, because the reality of the situation is that any board member can do that anyway. So is it a good faith gesture from the board to not just include the language to say, “if none of this works let’s go to the Superior Court.”

Jessie Twigg-Harris: I would argue that it is good faith to keep it in, only because it is accountability for everybody and it specifies what that accountability is, and I don’t think that it deems us to go down that path but do feel like it is accountability.

MAIN MOTION: Motion made to ratify Section 7, A, B, C, with modifications to specify a mediator assistance by ESD 101 as read by Jessica Smith. The motion passed with the following roll call vote:

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

MOTION: Justin Honcoop moved to approve Section 8, Revision, Amendment, Supplementation, as written, seconded by Heidi Evans. The motion passed with the following roll call vote:

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

MOTION: Jessica Smith moved to approve Section 9, Miscellaneous, as it stands, seconded by Justin Honcoop: The motion passed with the following roll call vote:

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

Heidi Evans: In the area of “IN WITNESS WHEREOF”, I think all board of directors must sign.

Jessica Smith: Do all need to vote on that.

Sean Neal: Let’s do it this way - are there any objections to having all board members required to sign in the “IN WITNESS WHEREOF” section? Seeing no objections, this is approved.

d
Justin Honcoop: Do we want to hash out 4 or 6?

Jessica Smith: I have 6 A as having been approved at the last meeting so there is at least one subsection down.

Matt Bofenkamp: I don’t know if this is the right way to do this, but we have done a lot here, three-fourths of the document is done. We still need to talk about 4 and 6. I have some mark-ups that I would really like to share with everyone, and I meant to send it out to you but I just ran out of time and I apologize for that. I had the opportunity over the past two weeks to talk to several previous board members, and actually the founding board member that was on the Garfield Board when the cooperative was formed and received some interesting input and points of view that I didn’t consider. Based on that, I have made some mark-ups here. There is not a ton, but one is striking a portion of Section 6 B and rewording it a little bit and then there are a couple items under 6 D that I would add for clarification. If I took that as an action item and put that out there – here is our current draft and here is a requested modification for us to then discuss at the next meeting – is that acceptable? Or do you want me to spell those out now so we can talk about them.

Shealynn Holbrook: I think an email would be good and we can talk about it next month.

Matt Bofenkamp: If you are okay with that Jessica, I will do a revision 2 within yours, highlight it in a different color, and then send it out to everybody.

Jessica Smith: I have no problem with that. I would request that there are a couple more easy hitters if you can bear with me, Section 4.

Heidi Evans: For D, I think it should spell out what month we do our cost sharing agreement?

Discussion was made that this is usually done in May.

Jessica Smith: Does anyone have anyone have any problem with Section 4, A, B, C, D or E, the first half of four, with the share cost in May.

MOTION: Jessica Smith moved that we approve Section 4, Parts A, B, C, D or E with the modification that we will do the cost share agreement in May. This was seconded by Justin Honcoop. The motion passed with the following roll call vote:

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

MOTION: Jessica Smith moved that accept Section 6, sub bullet point F and F alone, seconded by Jessie Twigg-Harris.

Board Discussion:

Justin Honcoop: I personally have a problem with it. I feel like it locks us in this bad decision if we can't ratify what the cooperative matters are. We are saying we are going to follow something that we haven't even set the boundaries to so how can we do that. Like 6 B, I have some pretty big red lines through 6 B and so I don't know if I can approve 6 F if we don't know what the cooperative matters are.

Jessica Smith: We haven't ratified any of the rest of Section 6 so none of that applies. It is the original wording.

Ryan Pfaff: It is in the original document, the very original document.

Justin Honcoop: I just have a problem with approving something on the very bottom when we haven't gone through the nuts and bolts of it.

Jessica Smith: We have already approved the Dispute Resolution part though which to me is the bottom bit. This is just saying that – if this doesn't work out we go to what we have already approved.

Jessie Twigg-Harris: I think that ultimately what this is saying, we are saying that there is a system in place and in leaving B, C, D and E still on the table we are recognizing that we still have work to do, but that this is merely acknowledging that when those decisions are made, if we have a disagreement then we will follow what we agreed upon.

Justin Honcoop: I get that but for me I would want to set the top ones before we jump to the bottom.

MAIN MOTION: It was moved to accept Section 6, sub bullet point F and F alone. The motion passed with the following roll call vote:

Jessica Smith – Aye	Paula Adams – Aye
Heidi Evans – Aye	Justin Honcoop – No
Andi Edwards – Aye	Matt Bofenkamp - Aye
Shealynn Holbrook – Aye	Ryan Pfaff – Aye
Jessie Twigg-Harris – Aye	Sean Neal – Aye

Superintendent Report:

3245 P – Students & Telecommunications Devices, 5010P – Sexual Harassment of District Staff Prohibited, 6220P Procedure – Bid or Request for Proposal Requirements.

Sean Neal: Are there anything else that needs to be added there?

Brett Agenbroad: Just for the board to know what the administrative action will be to fulfill the policy that you have approved or most likely to approve in the near future.

Community Discussion:

Jacob Turner asked to speak to the board. I am new to the area, and I come from somewhere that had a charter school which had four members who would volunteer and the board would approve, and had a district for the public that everyone was voted in. I am wondering how you are selected.

Jessica Smith: We are elected officials by our specific city.

Jacob Turner: The way that I see it, the parents want to have a say in their kids’ lives at school. The way that parents can have that say is by selection of the board, you are the representative of the public, and then from there the superintendent answers to the board, and then all the employees of the school answers to the superintendent, so there is a chain of command there. So, in order for the parents to have a say in how their kids are handled, I think the way that I am hearing you guys discuss whose employee someone is, based on the building, doesn’t work. It needs to be whose employee is based on the students that they are teaching. And so, by that, all of your employees who do anything with junior high or high school must be cooperative employees, they must be answerable to both boards. Otherwise, if a parent in Palouse has a problem with the policy in the junior high, or a parent in Garfield has a problem with the policy in the high school, they don’t have any way to resolve that. They can mention something, the superintendents can talk it through with each other, but if the parent is saying, “this is how my kid is being treated and I don’t agree with that”, and it raises to the level of going to the board, and the board for that city says, “No, we are following exactly what the policy is, we are fine.” Then the method of resolution for the parent at that point is to replace the board, but they can’t because they can’t vote in that other city. That is why it feels wrong that you are defining whose employee they are based on just the building when there is no option for their kids to get educated except to send them over to the other city during that point and time, or, paying a bunch of money to send them out of district somewhere. So, I am sorry that this saying, “Hey go back to the drawing board on a bunch of this stuff you have argued over, but I really do think that you have to shift the way that you are defining those things in order to resolve some of the arguments in a way that respects the idea that you are supposed to be representing all of the parents. And the problem is that each of you only have half of that chunk of parents that are your bosses, and you are taking care of the kids for the other side. So, it needs to be this whole room or some of these parents are not represented. As far as the mediator you may need to define in your definition section what the mediator is so that within policy you can say a mediator will be grabbed and you can say ESD superintendent and if they are not available you may need a decision right away you, so making sure your definition is more than just that one guy will help.

Shishona Turner: Jacob was on the board for the Charter School in Moscow and went through a lot of training, and he has a wealth of knowledge with him how to work a coop. There is value in trying to find case studies and case studies as your background because we keep falling back to the what if and the masks and we don’t want to hash that out again, but there is a lot of what ifs that need to be discussed. We need to have protections in place for staff when they don’t agree with the policy that is passed in one building.

ADJOURN: With there being no further business to discuss, the joint board meeting adjourned at 9:37p.m.

Board Chairman: _____

Superintendent: _____

Board Chairman: _____

Superintendent: _____