

Board of Governors
Sobriety High School
Wednesday, April 29, 2009
4:00 – 6:30 P.M.
Minutes

Members Present: Larry Schmidt, Chad Benesh, Paul McGlynn, Sarah May,
Chet Johnson, Bob Doffing, Stan Hacker, Bruce Santerre, Alan Braun, Lee Wignall
Staff: Barb Wornson, Debbie Bolton, Julie Wettstein, Crystal McAninch, Deb Thompson, Hannah Cushing,
Judi Hanson, Dan Ondich, Katie Gruchalla, Mary Popelka, Matt Nupen
Guests: Alumni students, Parents

4:00 Call to Order
Introductions

Stan Hacker
Stan Hacker

Staffing

Stan Hacker

- Barb will speak with people once the model is approved.

Process for Model Decision

Stan Hacker

- Is Stan planning to recuse himself from voting on the models since it is creating a position that he's interested in; there's a conflict of interest with Stan wanting a position and being on the board because Stan is proposing the plan to create positions that don't exist. Board should take a look at whether they think he should be allowed to vote or not.
 - We opened it up for anybody to create a model and there wasn't a decision to make it to exclude the board from creating a plan so board members will be voting on the plan.
 - Decision was made to go ahead as is.
- Robert's rule of order is that the chair would vote if there is a tie.
- First a summary of the financials and summary from the finance meeting will be brought to the board; recommendation for a model will not be brought from the finance committee.

Summary of Models

Bruce Santerre

- Bruce created a matrix showing the breakdown of the models.
- Assumptions: there may be an increase to 20% holdback, which will create a cashflow issue. We have implemented a process for loans to get us through should that happen. We've already looked at the budget thoroughly. We are looking at a 180 ADM for the revenue with students not being bussed. The variance would be removing the student fees that were in some models. Board's goal is \$185,000 fund balance. We need to decide if staff will be traveling or if it would be internet assisted. 3% increase in contracted services. The lease and expenses includes lease aid.
- Stan's Model
 - Two Executive Director's would be responsible for two sites each
 - MSW (social worker) and 1.0 para should be added to Stan's and Hannah's plan because its special ed money.
 - West Model = Edina, Burnsville; East = Arona, North Summit; Executive Director, Recovery Director, and Clerical would rotate every day, 3 core teachers at each campus
 - Do we rotate teachers every quarter for the core that's lacking and use computer assistance?
 - How does it lighten the load from recovery director – they'd be doing recovery for 2 sites.
 - Leases & Fixed cost - \$546,000

- B3
 - Fund balance jumps about \$30,000
 - Move from 4 sites to 3 sites – can get out of Edina site and can be purchased for \$30,000 and is reflected in these numbers already – if we decide this we need to move on this because need to decide by June 30
 - Wages are frozen
 - Leases & Fixed cost - \$489,000
 - 4th special ed would be a transitions/work coordinator and assigned to all 3 sites
 - 3 fully staffed campuses with recovery director at each site
 - MSW – covered by special ed and would be able to do home visits, work with mentally ill kids, work with psychiatrists/social workers, IEP managers
 - Student enrollment – how do parents/students/teachers feel about transferring to another campus – if we don't get the students carried over, we have made new connections, kids would transfer if we provide transportation from Edina to Burnsville
 - Before we do away with Edina since it is our history, we should make sure we aren't losing something very important
 - We spend \$233,000 for lease at Maplewood, B3 is 226,000, Edina = \$283,000, Burnsville = \$230,000 to \$280,000, Coon rapids = \$185,000 to \$195,000; Net savings = \$140,000
 - Stimulus would cover the social worker – MSW would increase special ed revenue
- B4
 - Keeping 4 campuses and is essentially the same
 - Reduction from 4 recovery directors to 3 with addition of MSW
 - Expenses are from the lease and expenses from the 4th site
 - Would still need online interactive curriculum – no change from this year
 - Teachers could do variances – like english and math
- Hannah's model
 - Doubling the executive director position isn't the vision, it would be a completely separate role, teachers would switch by quarter, still supplementing online, project based learning, similar to Stan's model with recovery director at each campus
 - Stan's or Hannah's plan would drop 10% lead teacher salary
- Our salary schedule is lower than other districts, lead teachers are on current salary schedule with 10% stipend, recovery director on administrative salaries - should be looked at and put on same salary schedule.
- These plans were costed out at most expensive salaries.
- Q-comp is being worked on to be used across all models - \$40,000 and is not factored in.

Others Views

- The students are our number one focus. Don't pick just one plan but look at creative ways to incorporate all of them. There was a 5th model that came up 2 weeks ago – hire another executive director – SBS wouldn't even cost it out. If we stay as we are in 2009, our fund balance would be a zero fund balance.

Board Views

- We have a good model now and we should move forward with the same director and give her a chance to fix what wasn't working. Keep 4 campuses.
- Could go along with 3 schools if we need to do that to survive, but it would be a different school. Like the 5th model, our models are systemic, it would increase accountability. More local leadership that could respond effectively to changes.
- Don't see closing down a campus and going to 3 is feasible; we would need every campus to have more kids than they ever had. 2 director model would give an administrator to help out with discipline, setting, knowing the personality of all teachers, etc. Hannah's model has 4 recovery directors.

- If we continue doing the same things we are doing we are ultimately doomed, we need to make changes. B3 or Stan is appealing because its different, don't know if it will work but we need to try something different because this isn't working. I don't want to vote for status quo.
- A lot of strength in 3 campus model, we haven't talked to those that we are impacting enough. We need more site management.
- 3 campus model makes us manage more kids, Stan's plan looks good with 2 directors on site to manage the staff and kids. Important to keep admin staff. We need to look at how to hire, who to hire, these are the positions that are open and please apply. More difficult decisions to be made in the future.
- I need to see fund balance of \$100,000-120,000. Every school is in this dilemma, don't like additional money spent administratively, not in favor of three campus structural , going back and forth between a few models.
- Student's have had the runaround their whole lives so we need to look at something that's stable, 3 sites with 60 students is crazy, not enough space and not a healthy environment. Concern of 2 executive directors, someone needs to be at the top and there should only be one superintendent. We need 4 core teachers at each campus. Look at getting variances for some of our teachers.
- Another change will not work because we've done it too many times. B4 with amendments, with some adjustments with salaries, another major change would be too taxing because we've been trying constantly to make changes. There could be conflict across campuses with 2 directors, we need recovery directors across all campuses.

Bob motions to do a paper ballot to rank the four plans using 1-4, one is the highest and is a tally for starting discussion. Seconded by Paul.

Lee motions to make it a verbal vote to rank the plans to see where everyone is at. Paul seconded.

ACTION: ADOPTED

Eliminate One Model

Stan – 2, 3, 3, 3, 1, 1, 2, 1 (16)

B3 – 3, 1, 1, 2, 3, 2, 4, 2 (18)

B4 – 1, 2, 2, 1, 2, 3, 3, 3 (17)

Hannah – 4, 4, 4, 4, 4, 4, 4, 4 (32)

Motion to remove Hannah's model for consideration by Bruce. Seconded.

ACTION: ADOPTED

Motion by Paul to eliminate B3 because it is next lowest. Seconded.

ACTION: ADOPTED

- Legislative is trying to change sponsors of charter schools to be authorizers. This would give sponsors more power.
- We can't afford to lose a recovery director. To judge their effectiveness is not fair when they are new. Two executive directors could cause a war between the two campuses. The director won't be able to build the bonds because that's what's happening with our traveling math. With staff moving it won't make an affiliation and connections between staff and staff and students and staff.
- Increase recovery director to 3.6 and knock a few thousand of the fund balance of B4 will increase the expenditures and would bring down the fund balance.
- B4 is a bridge to transition to a model that will allow us appropriate serious planning.

Motion by Paul to vote on Stan's model and if approved we move forward. Chet seconded.

ACTION: ADOPTED

Lee suggests that we move to vote and implement the plan. The implementations would take place July 1.

Chad amends motion so prior to actual vote we do a straw vote and tally and move forward with the original motion. Seconded by Paul.

ACTION: ADOPTED

- 4 votes for Stan's plan, 4 votes for B4.
- Discussion: majority of staff may not agree with this plan. Stan's model isn't a cure all and like direction it takes us and the flaws are fixable. More play in this model and like the systemic change. We are Sobriety High and the government doesn't give us one penny for recovery. There are other money sources we need to look at. The only reason for this model is for people on-site to have interaction with staff and students daily.
- Vote for Stan's Plan to move forward raise hands, 4 votes for Stan and 4 votes for B4. Stan is tiebreaker. Stan will vote for his plan and will not apply for a position with Sobriety High.

Meeting Dates All meetings are 4:00-6:30 at the Central Office unless other wise noted.
May 20, June 17, August 19

Adjournment