



VISION
To be a world-class school system

THE SCHOOL BOARD OF LEE COUNTY, FLORIDA
School Board Retreat – M I N U T E S
Friday—October 27, 2006 /10:00 a.m. (Approved 12/5/06)

Participants: Mr. Steven K. Teuber, J.D., Chairman
Mr. Robert D. Chilmonik, Board Member
Dr. Jane E. Kuckel, Board Member
Dr. James W. Browder, Secretary & District Superintendent
Mrs. Martha Crotty, Coordinator—Superintendent’s Office
Dr. Elinor C. Scricca, Vice Chair
Mrs. Jeanne S. Dozier, Board Member
Mr. Keith Martin, Board Attorney
Mrs. Julie Nieminski, Board Auditor
Mrs. Denise Mangus, Recording Secretary

1. **WELCOMING/OPENING COMMENTS:** The School Board of Lee County met October 26, 2006 at 10:09 a.m. at Riverside Community Center for a retreat; Chairman Teuber presided. He commented the 10/23/06 Advisory Committee Workshop went well. Dr. Browder noted the many important topics today which will bring all closer to an understanding for the next year; he looks forward to positive discussion.

2. **BOARD OFFICE (Board Member Needs for Upcoming Year and Board Office Budget):** Mrs. Dozier noted, re office budget/move, using an old student side desk/table; she doesn’t mind old furniture but would request some newer/nicer. Her current office/set-up is not satisfactory. Mrs. Dozier questioned who’s moving first and what’s going to occur. Dr. Browder noted that a former employee experienced with this kind of business move; after pricing received, it was determined to handle internally with current staff. Dr. Browder noted a review of each Board Member’s office. General discussion ensued on the Board’s separate offices—though some operate from the house, there’s not filing room at home; offices are needed at work for constituent meetings and professional individuals. A timeline will be brought of who’s moving first (department relocations will take up to six months). Separate Board Member offices help alleviate re sunshine (two people in same area could hear something possibly coming forward for a vote). Mr. Chilmonik noted he was talking about swing offices to help reduce costs. Per Mr. Teuber’s inquiry, budget projections are taken into account (process—high gear in February; there’ll be due dates’ timeline). Ms. Roberts will provide a monthly Office expenditures’ copy to the Board.

Dr. Scricca commented, re mileage expenditures, some functions may be okay with just one Board Member present. Mr. Teuber clarified some Boards can opt or not for in-county mileage; Mrs. Dozier noted most do, especially with large geographical areas. Dr. Kuckel noted, in some instances, one Board representative may be good. Mrs. Dozier wouldn’t want to limit Board Members attending events. Dr. Scricca suggested prioritizing. Dr. Kuckel wouldn’t want limitations where students are honored; she turns in mileage only for required meetings of the Board. Mr. Teuber thinks this is a good idea; Dr. Scricca concurred. Mr. Chilmonik has studied travel costs, noting the areas of airlines and rental cars. It was suggested to rotate attendance for national events (e.g., NSBA); training and state conferences would be different. Dr. Browder suggested sending two Board Members yearly to national (one can’t cover all things; even at the state, 3-4 try to cover all meetings). Mrs. Dozier noted the Office Budget divided six ways, one of which is for legislative (though latter not abused—necessary meetings); she noted sometimes it’s easier to drive to Tallahassee. Mr. Chilmonik noted the comments weren’t about abusing policy but do a study of spending; he wants to see reports of what each Board Member’s doing. It was noted the office is operating with two assistants though things continue to increase. Re in-county travel, there was consensus to submit the required meetings only; on national conferences, a limit of two Board Members to attend, with encouragement to all for state functions.

3. **BOARD MEETING ISSUES (Board Meeting Times, Reorganization, Rotations, Public Comment):** Mr. Teuber noted time lags between Briefings and the Action meetings; he suggested Briefings have a 5:00 time certain, with Regular Meetings starting at 5:30 p.m. Mrs. Dozier asked about other districts; Dr. Browder noted yesterday pulling this information and it’s varied—Collier at 2:00, Palm Beach—8:00 p.m. (once monthly); Manatee—8:00 p.m. (twice monthly); Pinellas—5:00; Volusia—4:00; Broward—10:00 a.m. or 2:00 p.m.; Charlotte—5:30 p.m.; Sarasota—6:30 p.m.; Board of County Commissioners—9:00 a.m. Most larger districts start in the afternoon with a time certain to end; 5:30 would be well within the parameters. Briefings are effective and memos provide

additional information. Dr. Kuckel noted agreeing with 5:30 for Action; not many attend unless there's an issue. She suggested Briefing could start at 2:30 p.m. and student hearings at 2:00 p.m. Mr. Chilmonik noted a problem with a 5:30 start time though not with 6:00 p.m. Dr. Scricca agrees with a 6:00 start time with Briefings to begin at 3:30 p.m. and time certain of 5:30. Mrs. Dozier noted that if there's an important matter someone wishes to comment to the Board, they'll make arrangements; the Board is accessible by phone (home and work), e-mail, etc.; she agrees with Dr. Kuckel on the lag time and to be mindful of staff. Dr. Kuckel noted, re a 5:30 start time, that recognitions/resolutions take 20+ minutes (people could still attend and be home by 6:30 for family dining) and public comments would not occur until about 6:00. Mr. Teuber likes the meetings moved in closer together on time; he can agree with Dr. Scricca and Mr. Chilmonik—the public's used to 6:30 p.m. and 6:00 may be less shocking. Mr. Teuber wants people to see positive teacher and student recognitions. Mrs. Dozier noted she'll go along with everyone. Dr. Kuckel noted 5-0 is not needed but she'll be there and continue to work through this.

Re zone Board Meetings, Mrs. Dozier surveyed FSBA; many meet outside/other places. The \$3,000 cost (and staff) was mentioned. Dr. Browder suggested 3-4/yearly. Possible interns may help. Mr. Teuber suggested strategic listening to see if beneficial; if there's a hot topic, people come downtown. Dr. Kuckel suggested raising the question at DAC and put the cost with it so the decision can be weighed. Re rotation of chairing Briefings and Student Hearings, Mrs. Dozier noted a chart which could have the Chair at Actions, the Vice Chair for Briefings, one Board Member for student hearings, one Board Member for recognitions/resolutions, one Board Member for Pledge and JROTC, etc. The invocation/moment of silence would rotate (Mr. Martin noted clergy non-rotation challenges). Mrs. Dozier noted the meeting assignments/roles would be best practices, providing consistency; we do more resolutions than recognitions. Mr. Chilmonik disagrees with Vice Chair doing the Briefings; he feels experience is provided. It was noted committee liaisons rotate; Mrs. Dozier's suggestion would be similar. Mr. Chilmonik feels if things are working, why change. Dr. Kuckel sees both sides, noting the Vice Chair used to do all recognitions/resolutions and the Chair did all meetings (changed under Pat Riley). Mr. Chilmonik disagrees but doesn't want to stall progress—wants rotation, giving all a chance. Mr. Teuber concurs with Mrs. Dozier to standardize; it helps staff know who's doing what. He further commented Briefings and Action have different structures. Dr. Kuckel noted the Board Vice Chair given a role—chairing Briefings. Re Board re-organization, Mr. Teuber led into this; he noted the meeting schedule had already been discuss prior. The discussion was opened up (none immediately ensued). Dr. Scricca noted Dr. Kuckel not holding a position of any kind the last four years (latter declined a nomination last year). Mr. Chilmonik noted discussing this decision more November 21st. Re the committee liaisons, keep as they currently are and bring for discussion next month as well as Mrs. Dozier's suggested chart for rotation. Mr. Teuber noted Smart Growth is a worthwhile County activity needing the District continuing to play a roll. In the past, it had been the call of the chair (who made all assignments, consulting with each) who sits on this as well as the legislative representative.

Re the Board Meeting agenda and splitting public comment, Mr. Teuber noted speakers comment and the Board hasn't been able to address until later (sometimes up to two hours); the public doesn't always stay or continue watching the TV to hear the responses. Board Member comments could be moved to enable responses to the public. There is discussion prior to items being voted on. Dr. Scricca noted a concern (since some speakers/issues emotional) about parameters of how much to respond back and forth—sometimes a little time allows calming down. Mrs. Dozier understands Dr. Scricca's comments on touchy subjects but the elected Board's supposed to be professional. Dr. Scricca agreed with not waiting until the end of the meeting. Mr. Chilmonik noted without Board acknowledgment, it may appear like stonewalling; he cited Mr. Goetz's comments asking to get together and no one addressed him or the ACLU. Perhaps each speaker could be addressed by all, with each having a turn to speak. Mrs. Dozier understands splitting public comment, noting Board direction to Dr. Browder for public comment items. Parents can be nervous to speak (not hearing Mr. Martin). Principals and teachers have immediate feedback; others depart a Board Meeting, not hearing the Board. Mr. Teuber noted, per Mrs. Dozier, responding after each speaker with direction given to the Superintendent. Mrs. Dozier noted the Board is listening. Dr. Kuckel suggested the Board Chair say a few words after each speaker, thanking them for sharing their thoughts and note the Superintendent or designee will make contact as applicable. Mr. Chilmonik noted this is so much to digest—major change and more workshopping may be needed; he likes Dr. Kuckel's suggestion to simply acknowledge parent or speaker. Dr. Scricca also likes Dr. Kuckel's suggestion; Dr. Scricca

noted that when she speaks as a Board Member, she has picked/chosen what she'll address as important or not (thereby leaving message). Her own feeling, if a volatile issue, some things may not need to be discussed or the Superintendent would've handled it anyway. If there's not discipline/established parameters, those things Board Members wish to expound on can become volatile. [Recess taken 11:23-11:28 a.m.).

Re some kind of filter, Mr. Chilmonik feels a response is deserved even if something is spoken that's totally off the wall (avoid public animosity). Most Board Members comments are fairly straightforward. Mr. Teuber agrees with Mr. Chilmonik re filters and what Board Members say—they're elected to do—and that everyone speaking gets an acknowledgment; the Board Chair can gather/raise/add a few more things to get consensus and items can go to a vote if needed. There was Board consensus for the Chair to thank each individual and then go to the next person, with Board comments right after that and ending with the Chair to bring closure/consensus for Superintendent direction as specified by policy/law. Then it would be the comments of the Board Attorney, Board Auditor, and Superintendent, with the business part of the meeting next. Mrs. Dozier noted that part of parliamentary procedures is to make sure business order's maintained; today's suggestions have merit as once business is gotten into, it's taken care of. Some boards have policy talking about business portion of meeting. Dr. Scricca noted when Board Members speak, it's matter of minutes (re filtering) and to remember they're professionals so as to not reduce a meeting to something. Dr. Browder noted appreciation for going through this; Mr. Teuber noted it being made more square in the mind about sensitivity to speakers' needs and finds this positive. The Board Chair will respond immediately (acknowledgment) and after public speakers conclude, Members comment, with the Chair directing appropriately to Superintendent (effective in December).

Mr. Teuber asked, re Chair protocol/procedures, Mrs. Dozier to consider Board Chair if not too busy with FSBA; she thinks it's good procedures/practice to have chair discussions as most boards do (though not decisions made). Dr. Kuckel agreed with not waiting until that time; she was asked about her being Vice Chair. Mr. Teuber feels comfortable with inquiring of Mrs. Dozier as the Board does different changes, she and Dr. Kuckel's experienced vs. the remaining three; though not meaning to insult Mr. Chilmonik or Dr. Scricca—both of the aforementioned two would be a great chair. Dr. Scricca noted again Dr. Kuckel not having position in the last four years. Mr. Chilmonik stated the decision's that evening though nothing personal with Mrs. Dozier; he noted with turbulent times coming up due to growth this year, it's very difficult for all and wants discussion in public that night and everyone should throw in the hat or not. Mr. Chilmonik noted this is a very important decision and this year has been horrific; it needs to thought about it with all on the same page; he feels it's crucial this year the significant liabilities to be faced and ways the Board conducts at the table is very important. Mrs. Dozier noted she could juggle and certainly do all in her power to bring everyone together.

4. **PROCESS/BOARD POLICY/ADMINISTRATIVE REGULATION (AR)/RULE DISCUSSION:** *Strategic Plan Review* – Mr. Teuber noted, re strategic plan versus costs, looking through the plan and departments but get Board direction. When going through department plans, things like small class size amendment smacked without costs hardly asked for; costs were conceivable in the conceptual stages but steps can be taken back with quantifying data put in. Dr. Browder noted different items and their cost are questioned each year for the beneficial and best; what is in front of this year's strategic plan items, the budget process has been gone through to attain this year's goals within the plan. For a quick timeline re development of strategic plan and costs for a next year, it's a budget item of how it's laid out (we're in year 3 of 5, with it laid out to accomplish; another year added annually). Within this budget, \$36 million's to accomplish the strategic plan. Dr. Kuckel wants to hear what Mr. Teuber has to say as she's wrestled with this a long time. A lot of community members were involved. She doesn't regard this plan as the "be all" and wants the title changed to Strategic Plan for Continuous Improvement since seeing this in a different position; Dr. Kuckel sees staff trying to improve. It's unsure whether the plan is seen to help the Board get better or what leads them; it's felt the Board needs to get together for next year's goal development. People who developed plan have a lot of peripheral information; there's a feeling to make decisions based on cost of investment and look at all five areas and getting all five—this is about quality and continuous improvement. When looking at mission and vision, the Board may be at a different level of where they want to go in leading the District, support, technology, etc. Dr. Kuckel has a problem that in the beginning of not saying where we are and where we're going; strategic plan should be for continuous improvement (process instead of

metrics); there are caveats around this plan for her to be a guiding light. Mrs. Dozier noted her committee met several months. Dr. Kuckel noted eight goals coming out of meetings lasting 2-3 days; she sees needs as a Board to add on to this or separate for Board to do visioning around the District in where we want to go, primary goals to move us to world-class system, growth, etc. Dr. Scricca understands the plan to be community based; she agrees with Board responsibility of being driven and the need to identify goals (e.g., measurable ones) but considers it very fortunate/diplomatic that it was done on community-based direction. When talking strategic plan, the nucleus takes charge first and the process is laid out later. Dr. Scricca is unhappy re measurable objectives. Dr. Kuckel noted plan completion based on goals but not feeling we didn't have where we start and where we go.

Dr. Browder noted having a metric, anticipating discussion. We separated from a vacuum (one before was developed in a vacuum with three goals); this strategic plan was community-based. He noted one thing done now is to integrate; School Improvement was moved to Dr. Itzen's area (Testing and Evaluation), which is one of the major focuses we should be about—inside the area of doing research and development, and Mr. Legutko was involved in this. The timeline may have needed to be relayed better; this is determined by a variety of things and based on student and continuous improvement. Development can be done any way. Dr. Kuckel doesn't feel it's based on student improvement (where are kids now, where we were, etc.) Dr. Browder noted it's been moved and aligned there now versus the beginning; Dr. Itzen, Linda Boyle, and that group work with academic focus (our baseline is 99; all within assessment folder talks about baseline and how we move forward). We talked about this being a business strategic plan versus what was there before. Ours has eight areas; majority went away because we didn't move forward with sales tax. Dr. Browder likes the idea of the Board having a set of goals; start there and organize and go in the directions desired. School Improvement Plans and department ones are getting more scripted than before due to state requirements.

Mrs. Dozier provided a reminder the Board developed a series of goals after Dr. Browder came on Board. She noted evaluations are usually done to see if goals met (continuous improvement and quality); she feels she should've put on a calendar to evaluate goals as to where they were in order satisfy their needs. It was questioned if the Board needed to develop policy to tighten expectations for themselves as a Board; re the Strategic Plan, there would be evaluation, adjustment, and deployment. Dr. Kuckel feels frustration; measurable goals talked about but has the conversation really taken place. There needs to be buy-in and a look to see if Board goals met. Mr. Teuber noted this isn't what he was talking about; he noted looking at all departments and review/analyze (the Board would get plans). He asks, re computer technology as an example, where are resources coming from. Dr. Browder looks at the Strategic Plan (a superintendent's focus is different from a school board's). Are there ways to end something or if whether they're right? Is a particular plan viable/worth it to the District or taxpayers. Dr. Browder is not to blame; he's doing what the Board says, with the latter not wanting to micromanage. Mr. Teuber noted a step may have been missed—taking a look at themselves and ask (re something) if this is really what the Board wants. Dr. Scricca suggested this be tasks of Finance or Compliance Committees; they could be asked to look over and report back to the Board (thus filtering through a community-based committee). Dr. Browder noted an umbrella re the strategic plan and setting of goals; he sees a Board workshop to take developed goals, integrate into the current plan or start again. Dr. Browder noted we can look at it but can't do it right now—a lot of folks have laid out their plan for the year. Mr. Teuber noted feeling 80-90% is good. There was consensus for a goal-setting workshop to be set.

Policy 1.51, School Board Internal Auditor Function – Dr. Browder requested the School Board Internal Auditor Function be covered next (Mrs. Nieminski is present for this today). Mr. Chilmonik noted, re her responsibilities, a general question which won't take long. He inquired about the organization of the internal auditor to the Board function and separateness from the Audit Department; he reads everything handled by the Internal Auditor to the Board. The policy is just about Mrs. Nieminski, Internal Auditor to the Board and maybe line 27 should read School Board Internal Audit function. She deals with her audit function (there's a separate District audit function). The Internal Auditing Department reports to Dr. Browder; they do school activities' funds. Ms. Nieminski isn't linked to Bob Brown; they're different functions though she checks with the latter for all information access (they have two-way communication). Mr. Chilmonik was worried about duplication of efforts. Mrs. Nieminski noted knowing Mr. Brown and it's real comfortable (he lets her know on things and they

coordinate; there's no direct reporting relationship). Out of courtesy, she is copied by Mr. Brown on items. They have difference functions; Mrs. Nieminski checks with Mr. Brown to make sure she can access information he has if needed. In some things she reviewed in a report, he's looking into. She feels as responsible auditor, it's important to peruse and make sure things are good before the Board approves; Mrs. Nieminski noted instinctively looking through audit reports no matter who puts them out. She noted being external versus (Mr. Brown) internal. Her position is new; it's important everyone talks to her, with communication publicly/formally. She's copied on all superintendent correspondence. Mr. Chilmonik noted her last memo was very good (her matrix).

Mrs. Nieminski's beautiful/very well done memo/document was noted by Mrs. Dozier though the latter questioned if she was responsible for this and the understanding of given Board direction. She later had a conversation with Mrs. Nieminski re the latter's timeclock, as Mrs. Dozier felt embarrassed if an employee felt such was needed. Mrs. Nieminski noted doing this anyway for her records; she understood someone said it would be helpful for them re taking time out of auditing practices to put together documents (audit hours out of her department). Mrs. Dozier thought Board Members would have feedback like Mr. Martin giving information on Board cases. Mrs. Nieminski, re a construction audit, would periodically give the Board information (as an example but not to have documents likes this periodically). Mr. Chilmonik thought he had heard at the Board table about two meetings ago that this was asked for of Mrs. Nieminski to account. Mrs. Dozier noted that if that was her communication at the time, she apologizes—this isn't what she meant. The Superintendent gives updates on academic programs put in place, technology plans put in place, updates, etc. Dr. Scricca noted Mrs. Nieminski doing this as a way for her to do her performance measures. Mrs. Nieminski noted she'll put an annual report together (she asks did she meet her goals, have her recommendations been implemented—something within the 90% range is reasonable though 100% wanted). She noted this time accounting doesn't take much time; she punches it in and it rolls in with her monthly and annual (done this way at the Cape and Collier). Dr. Scricca noted this business way; Mrs. Nieminski is setting measurable goals for herself. Mrs. Nieminski noted being used to working with performance measures. Mrs. Nieminski noted concern about updates and bringing a finding during the Board during an audit—it's confidential and should be shared with the department and Dr. Browder while still in progress; not public record until audit is final with action plan included and shared with the Board. Anywhere worked before, she doesn't publicly comment until the final report (unless not related to an audit being brought forward). Mrs. Nieminski can't think of anything she's doing outside of her audit scope; she's clarified to Dr. Browder her work progress and what it's based on. She noted the narrative takes a couple of hours.

Safety – Dr. Browder distributed a school safety binder to the Board to glance at (subsequently retrieved); they're put together, and schools follow. The binders (what we're doing) are protected under sunshine. Re a public comment speaker, there's a section in the safety manual on lockdown. Dr. Kuckel inquired as to the infectious disease plan being in line with the County's; Dr. Browder noted the county had input including things to do for avoiding spread/pandemic. Mr. Martin noted the Code of Conduct is married with the info in the safety manual; every school has their own plan that merges with this. Re Mr. Chilmonik's inquiry, Mr. McNerney and the Safety & Security Department are fast response team (and handle evacuation). In lockdown situation, Dr. Browder and the Sheriff, with the latter—having sent two deputies to each zone site—being on-ground at the scene (District folks there also). Anytime there's sheriff/police present, those persons on-site. Any emergency (e.g., bomb threat), we send a person. Mr. Chilmonik asked, in studying situations, if there's a system set up to notify parents automatically; Dr. Browder responded absolutely—Parentlink (every parent notified within three hours) which is used for a variety of things. As things could be life and death on-site, we work through issues in addition to lockdowns. There's a designated person at each school to do an outbound message (with examples of what to say). Dr. Browder noted we're not perfect but getting substantially better. General discussion ensued (not one child killed in a fire in past 100 years) about drills for violence (32 children killed last year in school violence). He has no problem with practices (one during a class change). Maybe one practice (re school violence) per semester is a good number; lobby legislators for this (decreasing 10 fire drills).

AR 1.151 (Complaint Procedures for Sexual Harassment by Students) – Mr. Chilmonik noted doing a little research re sexual contact incidents between staff and students. He asks specific language be put in to prohibit sexual contact with students (protect/like zero tolerance). Mr. Martin noted there's been work on this; he'll check

with Mr. Dodig to see status. It had gone to Dr. Adkins for work with labor management on it. Dr. Browder noted this is a SPALC issue (TALC's very specific re state rules).

AR 1.152 (Complaint Procedures for Harassment and Discrimination Based on Race, Color, National or Ethnic Origin, Disability, Age, Sexual Orientation, Religion and Marital Status by Employees) – Mr. Chilmonik noted having general question about ADA facilities' compliance: does it have to be mentioned (other areas address requirement for facilities to do); it's not required in policy. Dr. Browder provided a reminder re four years ago the fire code issue. There was extensive work done to comply with ADA (completed and submitted) and what was on the report was finished. Mrs. Dozier provided a little history of the District years back and some laxness re ADA; she worked closely with a gentleman (having multiple disabilities), staff, etc. Previous administrators (Gail Williams and Denise Luster) helped get things up to speed; it was taken on, and we forged ahead.

AR 2.6 (Complaint Procedures for Sexual Harassment by Employees) and AR 2.261 (Complaint Procedures for Harassment and Discrimination Based on Race, Color, National or Ethnic Origin, Disability, Age, Sexual Orientation, Religion, and Marital Status by Employees) – Mr. Chilmonik noted these two are probably together, under Title 7; he inquired about someone in a superior position if to date an employee or not a consensual relationship. Mr. Chilmonik looked at both policies and asked about protection for School Board Members or senior district administrators. He further asked/provided an example if a Board Member has an affair with an employee or superintendent (Mr. Chilmonik stated to Dr. Browder not him), is the Board protected under policy for any actions that could be expensive to the taxpayers/Board. Mr. Martin will research such; certain limit on activities can be in place while on duty but placing restrictions on social life/outside could prove a problem.

Mr. Chilmonik asked about nepotism. Mrs. Dozier noted concern several years ago on another situation; but Mr. Martin noted school districts are exempt. Mr. Martin noted he could do a memo to explain the law and school boards. Dr. Kuckel asked about language for complaint procedures and how we handle them; nothing mentions School Board Members. It was noted that there may always be a governmental risk for liability—not every act, but some can; the courts look to see if the entity's liable (steps the entity has in place to deal with it; that's why District has policy and subordinates can make a complaint). Timeframes are dealt with, and potential discipline. Courts look to see if there's a process followed. Mr. Chilmonik noticed the Superintendent is the final say. Dr. Kuckel asked what is thought that the Board would be liable for; Mr. Chilmonik wants to make sure we're buttoned down with the Board not being liable and that we're covered/protected as a Board and district. He's not comfortable and doesn't know why but wants to ensure protection against eventuality; Mr. Chilmonik noted the sub situation with the comment on student breasts. Mrs. Dozier is glad he brought this up; she commented that maybe we do need to a policy of response. When the allegation of sexual misconduct is employee to student, put in policy what the response is; when a threat to an employee, we know what do but it's in policy (backing the Board up). Mr. Martin will review again. Certain emergency situations need immediate action (e.g., one student on another); Mr. Martin noted you can put into policy immediate. The courts look at, re potential lawsuits, those implementing/knowing policy and what it says; do employees know where to go and know what the policy says. Mr. Chilmonik noted guidance counselors were referred to; Mr. Martin noted the Equity Coordinator. There is training for administrators for what they're supposed to do and for equity coordinators per Dr. Browder; all called down and given documents on sexual harassment, bullying, etc. [Break was taken for lunch from 12:45-1:15p.]

Policy 4.231, Campaigning on School District Grounds – Mrs. Dozier requests a refresher from Mr. Martin on obligations for Board and others. Mr. Martin noted this policy went through steps in the past. He made mention of campaigning for public office on the grounds of any district facility in addition to statutory positions to influence a vote further a campaign as a government official. Mrs. Dozier asked if it's something that needs adjustment or just review. Mr. Martin noted the policy and its form in the past have always been open to interpretation, as language can be very broad. In the last revision, language limited campaigning activities but things can mean different things to different people; he's tried to think about this some prior. Re violation of policy, he's asked to give interpretations and read broadly; unsure if this what's wanted (maybe more broad and more limited). He does have some material if the Board wants to start discussion. Mr. Chilmonik noted sorry to Mr. Teuber but this is on agenda; he's read through campaign literature (when running for office) and one can't

do anything in official capacity—phone calls, e-mails. Mr. Chilmonik turned in his cell phone (paranoid), concerned about accusations re fax machine, if you respond back to e-mails—he noted running scared of what’s appropriate or not. It was noted the policy was changed for vehicle signs. Mr. Chilmonik thinks policy needs to be clearer on what we do or don’t; there may be confusion re how the Board policy dictates and Florida Statutes (Board policy can’t reduce F.S., who’s higher authority). Mr. Chilmonik questioned if all parties can participate; if open to all, it’s okay. Dr. Kuckel noted this is not a role for partisan politics. Re Mr. Teuber’s e-mail (his noting to try to be civic minded), the League of Women Voters should’ve probably been used; he asked re getting teachers, parents, kids active. In trying to solidify citizenry, we talk about patriotism/veterans but some others don’t vote. Government teachers in same situation (not to cross the line) though Board Members are constitutional officials. Getting the word out to vote—not for a particular person—is part of the democratic process Dr. Kuckel noted. Dr. Browder noted principals are communicated with re getting all out to vote who are eligible (there’s been an annual competition between high schools). Dr. Browder noted, for students to learn, the national government course every high schooler has to take covers such and work within the course (voting also included within American History). Dr. Browder said that always additional things could be done to encourage students to take this seriously (more will be looked at); inside some high schools, there are voting booths brought over for student government elections with kids voting as adults do. Dr. Kuckel would like to see Mr. Martin’s drafts (one narrower than other) and talk about at an upcoming workshop or meeting.

Process for Use of District Credit Cards – Mr. Chilmonik noted his questions pretty much answered with information provided (re Cherry Holland and Maintenance’s use prior to 2005). Credit cards aren’t for individual truck inventory but needed items (without paper process on front side); the work order is taken with the employee and a receipt brought back. There’s a process in place; Maintenance is getting used to it. There are 101 cards. Dr. Browder noted we’re going down the road that Board brought forward and its initiative put into place. Mr. Chilmonik inquired about Board Members receiving one for travel; Mr. Teuber noted in other business offices, the secretary having one that the business traveler would use and return. Mr. Chilmonik mentioned a Board Member getting in trouble some place. Dr. Browder noted all are treated the same re training; Mrs. Greta Campbell will not allow any messing around with this. Dr., Browder would suggest two cards for the Board Office since two agreed to travel nationally. Mr. Teuber noted having to provide a district ID along with the credit card to use.

Policy 1.30, Responsibilities and Authority of the School Board – Dr. Browder noted policy, work flow, Board Members’ information requests, and trying to tie all together so all use. He noted the second page is everything new (and Policy 1.32). The 60 minutes of time arrived at comes from public information requests. Mr. Teuber noted that if it’s an individual Board Member, it’s like a citizen. Dr. Browder noted it’s essentially putting into writing what we currently do though timeframe with requests. Per Dr. Scricca’s question, there’s been only a handful in the past 3-1/2 years of requests exceeding 60 minutes. What’s said and talked about together needs to be clear on what’s directed, per Dr. Browder. Dr. Scricca concurs with requests exceeding 60 minutes to come to the Board; Dr. Browder noted he could handle if a request exceeded an hour by five minutes, as an example. Mr. Martin noted, re the drafted language, it giving the Superintendent some discretion. Mr. Martin is looking at other districts’ policies, significant or excessive. Mr. Teuber noted that if there are nebulous words, no one knows—like campaigning—where we’re at. Mr. Teuber noted the reason for the 60 minutes—as a single Board Member, one is a county citizen and gets same deference (more than 60, requires the Board). Mr. Chilmonik feels, re Policy 1.30/line 27 (action by individual Board Member), Mr. Teuber said this many public times about him; Mr. Chilmonik commented other Members doing it at meetings. Mr. Chilmonik noted concern on the policy language re asking questions and doing his job. Dr. Browder noted most call on him for anything. Mr. Chilmonik feels we’re boxing ourselves in. Mr. Teuber noted that per Statutes, Board Members can’t broaden the powers the state gives; Board Members have zero power among themselves. Dr. Browder noted no issues re Board Members directing staff (Board has been good); he noted there may be times when a Board Member asked and staff felt it was more as direction, and Dr. Browder would get a call or something in writing. Talked about here is Dr. Browder’s direction; all agree the Board comes to him, and he directs staff. Mr. Teuber noted when Mr. Chilmonik writes a letter to Dr. Browder with a timeframe and he has to drop everything else; all authority comes as a Board and not a Member, per Mr. Martin. Mr. Chilmonik feels this is amazing; if he asks for information that’s over 60 minutes, he has to go to the Board and feels it’s restricting his ability to do his job. Mr. Martin

noted that F.S. say only the Board has responsibility; no where does it say individual school board members over individual matters. If a board member brings up issues and wants research, it's appropriate for the Board to note their interest or not. Mr. Chilmonik noted it was not his intent to give direction; he feels free public interchange stifled, feels it will look like we're trying to hide something, and it will look bad in the newspaper. Mr. Chilmonik has asked unpopular questions and didn't feel clear info received back; if this is to be cut off (e.g., 60+ minutes), he wants an attorney general opinion on this proposed policy. Mr. Chilmonik isn't happy or feels this is in the best interest of the taxpayer, and he will have an individual editorial.

Mrs. Dozier noted Mrs. Nieminski's memo; Mrs. Dozier looked within/questioned if she caused this to happen, as we're not critical enough of ourselves/looking at actions we're responsible for. Mrs. Dozier noted this is nothing more than policy, adhering with F.S. which govern the Board as elected officials. She, before running for office, read codes that dealt with school board members and asked herself if she could live by/be governed by such, of which the answer was yes. There have been times when direction was given to the Superintendent and micromanaging—e.g., when he's told a task, told how to do it, and not allowing him to be the administrator we've hired him to be. Mrs. Dozier noted the Board might workshop a document several times to make sure what Board Members want; one thing to understand is that she, for example, has no power (can cut ribbons, speeches) but zero authority—only when working with her board. In pulling together, she has to be able to work with her colleagues and reach out to them, olive branch to get someone to work with her. One has to get and give cooperation; she noted hearing an issue with this policy though she's heard Mr. Chilmonik say "tightening things down." She noted Mr. Chilmonik does an excellent job in looking at numbers/budget; this is tightening down language re state statute. In requesting the attorney general, one of the Board's own employees is being undermined; she would hope that Mr. Martin did his homework but she's certainly willing for it to go to the attorney general.

Mr. Teuber noted policy is no more than explanation of what's in Florida law, the power given board members and what we've operated under. News media shouldn't have hard time understanding—this is based on law; all school boards operate in Florida (whether 9 members or not) to have consensus to direct the superintendent. If Dr. Browder is needed to give a report (e.g., 35 buses late), it doesn't mean questions can't be asked. At the time the answer requires data to go forward or a lot of data, the Board Member needs to go back to Board (to get all heads bobbing, not just theirs). The demands for the under \$25,000 report was contrary to policy and law; months of all the data, spending taxpayers' money with nothing coming but enough publicity. Mrs. Nieminski found a few things and waited until she did (without six months negative publicity). Mr. Teuber asked to look where we're going, if viable to the public or Mr. Chilmonik's constituents, working with other Board Members and coming forward. Writing an editorial is not the way professionals and adults handle the issues. Re swearing-ins, inferring on ceremonies, going to media wasn't right way. He'd caution against editorials; the time to bring up items is public forum (the Board's meetings). Mr. Teuber is okay with sending to the attorney general.

Dr. Kuckel noted to Mr. Chilmonik that he's the one with the issue; there have been a number of staff hours (at a cost) but there needs to be substance of where he has issues and wrongdoing. Staff works many hours and don't need to be chasing tails in the newspaper on what may or may not be wrong. If trying to bury the hatchet, doesn't think there'll be a move forward with an editorial; Dr. Kuckel noted it's up to Mr. Chilmonik. He noted concerns of public money and how it's being spent/allocated to the classroom (he paid for the \$12 disk he felt needed to do his job, as the Board denied); there may be 30 pounds of paper and feels he did find things (Cafferata issue not over and cost; he'll follow that trail until he's comfortable). With new computer systems, there should be simple spreadsheets and numbers, not requiring all staff time to do. He feels he does have ability to ask questions, noted this Board stepping back and the public's best interests. Mr. Chilmonik feels more negative publicity to restrict him doing his job; he feels they're the laughing stock of the county and could be of the state and why is there so much paranoia and fear. He noted just trying to earn his \$38,000/year.

Mrs. Dozier noted it's not paranoia and fear on her part; one thing the Board continually talks about is as many resources to go into classroom as possible (not taking staff time away from providing services to the classroom); part of the ability is for the Board to grow—professionally and look at where our requests are. There's been a couple of times in talking with the Superintendent, she realizes not needing info and works it through. It was

mentioned by a public comment speaker of employees feeling threatened; there's intimidation at the Board table as well. Mrs. Dozier explained to Mr. Chilmonik that she felt he was within her space at a recent meeting and he mocked her (e.g., noise disruptions—slamming papers which were loud in the microphone as well as the microphone being hit); he acknowledged he was tapping. This is a large organization to govern and all need to work together; this doesn't mean we get our way on every issue but work together as a Board and with other individuals. Sometimes individuals may not see her point of view; she goes home and thinks about her point of view at home instead of always making threats to the Board. These are not skills even in the workplace people use. It's a give and take situation. Retreats are part of what this is all about. Retreats used to be multiple days; maybe more needed. Maybe more discussions needed like today to put feelings and airs out here today. If we've things bothering us, it's learned in leadership and she's sure he learned in corporate leadership; work together to get most productivity. Remainder of the Board may not be as efficient with underlying issues; master board training gets groups to work together to be high performing team. She's not saying questions can't be asked, but are we looking for something or have a gotcha mentality. In trying to show something wrong with the system, am I a part of the problem needs to be asked. Mrs. Dozier further thinks all consider and talk as a group; are we willing to try to do that. No negative affects on the schools are desired.

Mr. Chilmonik mentioned detracting from schools and actions taken. There's something daily in the paper; if doing job right way, not going to make the media. He writes editorials so the public understands what's being done. Public will read story and could make impressions. Mr. Chilmonik feels each Board Member should write as public communication is a responsibility. He takes his responsibility very seriously. His plan is to do politely and respectfully. Mrs. Dozier noted that in what Mr. Chilmonik just said about something false or troubles him, he'll continue to dig; she said when digging, you're digging for dirt. In some language he's used, it's been cover-up, conspiracy; she doesn't understand the use of those words. Nobody is guilt of cover-up; she said harassment's been mentioned. Mrs. Dozier tapped on the table, noting maybe some of Mr. Chilmonik's fellow Board Members feel bullied by him and his actions. Each have to look within and be critical of themselves; am I part of the solution or part of the problem (Mrs. Dozier regularly asks herself). What purpose is there in writing a newspaper editorial; does that help move the Board forward. Mr. Chilmonik feels it's his responsibility to communicate his feelings and things he feels not shared by him; the public has right to know how it's run, monies spent. He said the 60+ minute language restricts his ability to do the job. Other boards have an inordinate amount of time and have specific policy; Mrs. Dozier note, re an opinion out there, that part of it is not working with your board. Try to hash out and get to a compromise; there's a difference of my way or highway. If going to media, that's threatening or either you comply with me or I'll hold over your head.

Mr. Teuber noted guilt (re media—but not anymore) but it's unfair position Mr. Chilmonik forces the other four into (vs. cooperative Board spirit arrangement). It's not good to operate business in the newspaper instead of at the table. Media will communicate here (attending today). Dr. Scricca noted that this whole discussion is about public officials and Board Members—elected to a board. When elected to a board, state statute gives enumerable examples of how a board is to act; there's too much emphasis, in respect to Mr. Chilmonik, that I'm an elected official and have right to do anything I want. It's an elected official to a board with four other members; F.S. are very clear about now power/authority unless at a board meeting with everyone. Power is taken when going to media—that kind of power impinges upon 80,000 kids and it hurts. Talking about this policy as elected official to a school board, ask for info; Mr. Martin confirmed only actions as a school board. We support constitution made up from statutes (statutes supersede any policy); Dr. Scricca doesn't understand why we're having discussion. Mr. Chilmonik mentioned abuse of power and understanding his responsibility. There are ways to communicate with the public and they've the right to know what's going on. He feels there have been public slanderous/libelous statements made about him. He will defend his good name (starting up again with his good name); he came with open heart to work with people. He'll work with the best of his ability. He feels a good board is not a Board always in lock step with each other.

The process document would be used if policy adopted. Mr. Martin noted not advocating language/posing; he drafted for the purpose. He looked at other districts, providing info of how we got to this point (many districts). Language developed is from those with some adjustments; he contacted colleagues and asked them if this inhibits

an individual's right to get info to perform duties—the answer was no, consistently with recognition that the action taken is by the Board. Re staff spending time researching information, if F.S. looked at, not individual Board Members direct staff (language absent describing individual board member authority); a lot of language describing a school board. He appreciates Mrs. Dozier's comment re his research; his work and opinion consistent with F.S. He's worked 15 years with school boards; he won't be insulted if Board's desire to send to attorney general. [Break taken 2:31-2:36 p.m.] Mr. Teuber noted an attorney general opinion may take up to six months; he inquired about approving this and then rescinding. Mrs. Dozier noted to help and work with Mr. Chilmonik, she concurred to use the attorney general but she regrets Mr. Martin being questioned; consensus was reached. Dr. Browder suggested to workshop it then.

5. **SCHOOL BOARD ATTORNEY**: Mr. Martin went over the chart (copy on file in retreat book of costs). There's a substantial difference in real property acquisition services; Ms. Hawkins' position has paid for itself. Re worker's compensation, there's a substantial increase (talked about before). Mr. Martin's not at point of suggesting additional staff in-house but an eye will be kept on it. A little time will should be given to make sure about Ms. Hawkins' position and additional positions; down the road, worker's comp, discrimination, and personal injury cases will be reviewed again (and look over all numbers). Total professional fees decreased the last couple of years. The increase this year was workers' comp (one very large case). Comparable districts will be looked at for settlement costs as well as consulting fees (to be brought back for next year's report). Mr. Teuber noted the cost of picking another attorney had intangible benefits; she sits in with Mr. Kitson, other contracts, etc.
6. **COMMUNITY RELATIONS**: *Community Roundtable and Celebrations* – Dr. Scricca applauds Dr. Browder meeting with business leaders. Her feeling, as a Board, is to meet with community—business owners, service clubs, scouts, and provide agenda of things we're doing and challenges facing us and things we could do better for community/district relations. We're celebrating our causes also and we recognize the fact that we're not resolving every problem but we do have challenges to meet; the community could be provided with a timetable, expectation table and how we start working towards these challenges. Show the community challenges, balance of what we've done well and are doing, etc. It may be possible to community roundtable the whole board, inviting reps from service clubs with the place to be determined (the first roundtable could be business people, the second—service clubs, the third—other organizations). Sponsors could be sought for a breakfast or lunch. This would provide opportunity to sit at ease and speak in civilized manner. The newspaper's interested in what we're doing—perhaps they could sponsor. Mr. Teuber likes the idea but we haven't got the town hall meetings yet; Dr. Scricca noted this is different (cross section of community). Mr. Chilmonik hasn't brought up the town hall meetings (though awaiting). Re the celebrations, some could be intertwined with the community and roundtables. It comes down the community and that is what's being talked about—offering a venue. Dr. Scricca talked with Dr. Browder (not criticism or micromanaging) about concerns of his meetings where the Board wasn't invited or simply to observe. Dr. Kuckel noted that recognitions have been changed to occur all along; if we've an interactive celebration, positive parts could be brought out. It requires a great deal of work/discussion. Re challenges, it may reduce the necessity for an opposing view to be highlighted at a particular time.

Dr. Kuckel noted the above having merit. She's talked with Dr. Browder about using our TV channel re vignettes on our successes, performances and parents tuning in. Dr. Kuckel asked if the roundtables are accomplished with the advisory committees; Dr. Scricca responded no. Representatives from each organization would feel they've a part. Mrs. Dozier noted, re community roundtables, superintendent roundtable discussions at the Consortium. A lot of planning is needed (may be like Points of Light). Maybe have (instead of community roundtable) a state of the organization/foundation meeting (this could be a workshop all by itself). Re town hall meetings, all agreed this positive (but not to hammer staff with these, legislative delegation, community roundtables, etc.). Mr. Chilmonik noted trying to eliminate staff time by having at a school in a zone (e.g., media center—parents questions could be taken), staff set up mikes/monitor, no refreshments; Dr. Browder attending is not very time consuming. Strategic listening could be used. Dr. Kuckel asked about consolidating board meetings out and about—put in agenda/have combination town hall meeting in zones with equipment already set up, with a meet-and-greet before. Another thought, per Dr. Kuckel, with the roundtable set aside larger dinner time between Briefing and a community meeting; folks could be invited to eat with the Board and talk. Dr. Browder noted eight

groups he'll meet with in the next eight months; he'll be describing things (10) he's most proud of and challenges (10) also presented. The Superintendent will be asking them what they see as challenges and would encourage the Board to attend (his are community business leaders); he'll do a search and get all the condo associations (with a mailer sent out inviting someone in that association to have a discussion with him). Safety providers, religious leaders, etc. will also be looked at. Dr. Browder is bringing in the 15 largest businesses (identified from Regina Smith, the Horizon Council, and Steve Shimp); this is a real good reach-out (Mrs. Smith brought the list and brainstormed the types of groups; it was their suggestion to present challenges and things most proud of). It will be a two-hour opportunity and won't impose on the business person's day. Mr. Teuber asked for calendars at next Briefing for town hall meeting dates.

Resolution/Industry Week — Mrs. Dozier noted, re the Industry Appreciation Lunch, perhaps the District should proclaim an industry appreciation week re the Horizon Council and the close work with our comprehensive high schools. She has on her calendar how much is policy making, recognitions (more of latter needed). Reaching out and joining with the community's successes helps ours. Dr. Scricca noted (from her other life) the resolutions/recognitions for particular business partnerships.

7. **GOOD OF THE ORDER**: Mr. Chilmonik questioned security and procedures for someone on do not call list. There's a process document to follow in relationship to this; it's been practiced for years (put in document about two years ago). He noted the items listed were collection of examples of inappropriate things said re the individual (noted one issue more than a year ago); Mr. Chilmonik noted being curious but disturbed when he read this re earlier reporting of such (e.g., national security). Dr. Browder noted it was investigated right away and discussed; there was review and felt no immediate (decided by school/Assistant Principal) threat. Dr. Browder noted speaking again to the Secret Service last night. Mr. Chilmonik noted the allegation if it wasn't exactly what happened (e.g., fake bomb threat), he has worry for Board liability and if any federal statutes broken (is there federal standpoint liability). Mr. Chilmonik would like to speak to the Secret Service if the Board desired. Mr. Martin noted, re isolating the question, if potential liability for failure to report an accusation—he's not aware of legal entitlement to report threat but he'll investigate. Secondly, in this review of the reasons principals took action they did rather than investigate all evidence they have to support their decision, the Board has entrusted to the Superintendent and by F.S. what reasons to use and are those appropriate reasons. In that context, what is provided is nothing more than a list (Mr. Martin wouldn't term it to be accusations) but a list used by a principal for that purpose. A caution he'd give—there's no legal requirement to give any reason to make a decision. It's generally not best to make public (per the direction of the Board). Mr. Martin may be wrong for review of what are the reasons vs. causes (and proof)—there's not legal requirement to have cause. Mr. Chilmonik noted this is a serious allegation that goes with someone; he took this personnel issue as a national security threat.

Dr. Kuckel broached a topic she doesn't have detail on regarding some districts passing sales/proper tax for teacher salaries; we could have for a limited amount of time. There could be extended school (paid staff development in summer/paid curriculum work to give teachers opportunity to earn more money). She's talked with Dr. Browder and thinks we owe teachers obligation to at least try to get salary scale beefed up, with the opportunity to earn a decent living. The majority of housing for teachers was applied for. Dr. Kuckel is unsure of the discussion needed right now but we need to look at what districts have done but feels it's owed to teachers and staff to put them in a competitive salary situation without jeopardizing; maybe we could be creative re earnings. Mrs. Dozier thanked Mr. Teuber for the good meeting today. She noted calling Dr. Browder re the threatening statement about the President and asked about tightening up policy re national security/life or limb threats decided at school levels. The new administrators do have a lot of training (when it comes to liability). She noted a question such as who it says you have to notify; when she talked about communication in the past, how is it that you let people know this happens (individuals talk with media but there's a public information office to call). Re the statements of Dr. Kuckel to brainstorm teacher salaries and Dr. Scricca's roundtables—ways surface out of meetings like this (maybe more than once a year needed). Mrs. Dozier thanked the Board for their contributions and suggestions today, leaving healthy with ways to start/trail/get on to forward mission of District; she thanked Dr. Browder and staff for this meeting as well as fellow colleagues for getting down to nitty gritty.

Dr. Scricca echoes Mrs. Dozier. Some things resolved today. She feels Dr. Blanton (FSBA) may need to come down again re Board Member roles and responsibility at a Board Meeting. Board Members receive phone calls and e-mails but get an understanding again of the limits of power and authority of what they can do (the public may not realize what the Board's doing). Dr. Blanton's training could take place at the beginning of a Board Meeting (live/televised). Mr. Teuber doesn't feel this will change things necessarily. He noted, re Board Member salaries, that the state legislature should just set it (has concern with being the only elected officials who vote on their own salary); there's been a formula for years (FSBA's based on what the statutory recommendation was). Dr. Browder suggested making this a discussion topic for legislative work but would suggest not getting out of sync and use amount suggested. Dr. Browder noted, re different potential graduation arrangements—one, two, three, and four day scenarios. Another thing he noted was the student assignment plan committee; he wanted to update that Lee Middle be middle and Michigan a primary (expanding to South Zone at Lexington Middle with middle years' program and Heights as a primary years' program). The West Zone is the next step. He will bring high school graduations' discussion later, and he'll send a document of what everyone's doing around the state re such. The Retreat was then adjourned at 3:50 p.m.

/dwm

MINUTES BOOK NO. 41 - FY07

Steven K. Teuber, J.D., Chairman

ATTEST:

James W. Browder, Ed.D., Secretary and District Superintendent

<p><i>An audio/visual tape of this meeting has been produced to provide a verbatim record of the proceedings. Members of the public may obtain a copy of the tape of any meeting by making a request for such through the Communications Department and paying the actual cost of copying the tape. Members of the public may view any Board meeting tape at the Communications Department at no cost. Anyone wishing to view a Board meeting tape should contact the Communications Department at 337-8327 to make such a request.</i></p>
