

KINGMAN UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT #20
SPECIAL BOARD MEETING
JUNE 25, 2024

Meeting was called to order at 4:30 pm.

Procedural

The Pledge of Allegiance was said

Procedural

Roll Call; Mrs. Toni Henry, Ms. Starr Jensen, and Mr. Boyd Hardy were present. Roger Cox and Lori Grant were not in attendance.

Procedural

Call to the Audience (The Board will listen to any comment from the public but will not respond except as permitted by A.R.S. § 38-431.01(G). The Board may refer the item to the administration or request to have it placed on a future agenda.)

Procedural

Eve Garlyn – My name is Eve Garlyn and I am a member of the Literacy Committee that volunteers here to help kids read and a grandmother of six. Thank you Mr. IT person for your diligence about the AI that the students are going to have access to such as how babies are made or something similar. I heard last time I was here I'm still more confident that you said it was a purely biological answer. But I would also like to implore you to ask the AI more questions with the hope that the answers will also be biological, scientific in nature. The four questions are: What is a man? What is a boy? What is a girl? I am generally quiet in these meetings, in fact it's a very first time in my 25 years here in Kingman and attending city council meeting almost every time during that time, and then I started coming here recently, I don't talk in these kinds of meetings. But this morning I had a conversation with my 13 and granddaughter and in the course of the conversation, she said people can choose their genders. So I would like to know what AI, that our students have access to says on that subject. I hope it's biological and scientific, XX and XY.

Consent Agenda

Action - Passed

A. Fundraisers (From June 11th Meeting)

Mrs. Toni Henry – For this meeting we just have fundraisers on there. I think we've had a chance to look over them.

The motion to approve the Consent Agenda Fundraisers was made by Ms. Jensen

The motion was seconded by Mr. Hardy.

The motion to approve the Consent Agenda Fundraisers passed in favor 3-0.

Possible action to approve KUSD #20 Gifted Education Scope and Sequence

Action-Passed

Mrs. Liz Albin - The Advanced Learning Program (ALPs) at KUSD provides an advanced and/or accelerated pathway for our high achieving students in elementary, middle and high school. Our pathways consist of gifted and accelerated education (K-5), Cambridge International (6-12), and dual enrollment (10-12). As part of our strategic plan: 1) to create equitable and accessible learning environments; and 2) to provide effective and transparent transitions, national and local norms are used to identify students who would qualify for services through our KUSD gifted and accelerated program which is detailed in the KUSD Gifted Scope and Sequence included in the board packet. This Scope and Sequence which provides the details of our Gifted and Accelerated program (K-12) as required by state statute was developed through committee meetings, collaboration with accelerated learning teachers(ALT) and site principals over the last several years. As required by the state law, our elementary schools provide screening windows three times a year. For the last three years, we have also participated in the Arizona GR 2 Universal Screening which has helped us to systematically screen ALL second graders in the district and identify students with the designated giftedness. We will participate in the Arizona GR 2 Universal Screening again next year. With Total School Cluster Grouping we are also using local norms to identify the top, high achieving students at each elementary school, so as to provide enriching learning opportunities for all our students regardless of the location of the elementary school. All schools have high achievers within local norms, and we are committed to providing students, with a learning need to be challenged, the services to advance their learning wherever they are in the district. Our district Gifted and Cambridge web pages provide community with information regarding our gifted screening placement protocol, program information and other resources for our families. According to Arizona Revised Statutes 15-779.02 KUSD Gifted Scope and Sequence is required by law to be board approved and submitted to the state by July 1st.

Mrs. Henry - Well, I did receive some questions by email. The person didn't think we were going to be having a call to the public. So I'm just going to read some of their statements and potentially their question and it would be stuff that we wouldn't necessarily know. I can read about it, but I wouldn't necessarily be able to say that it's accurate or not. So that's just one reason I'm bringing it up. It mentions on page seven of the Scope and Sequence in the middle column, second to the last row states that the District uses AP, IB and CIE coursework for differentiating instruction for 9 through 12. Our district has neither AP nor IB for years. I know my daughter took AP classes way back when but that's been a while. In addition, the district description mentions CIE exams but does not mention that students at all 9 through 12 levels do not have to take those exams for evaluation of our programs, that they're strictly voluntary. CIE is the Cambridge

program?

Mrs. Albin – Correct, yes.

Mrs. Henry – It says the 6-8 indicators state that the National History Day is used, yet the program is only KMS. The same for the Building Project and the Seeds of Change is only at White Cliffs Middle School. The question is asked if we're going to use this particular document; shouldn't it be correct as to what we use and require? Not necessarily programs that we no longer use or evaluations that the students don't actually have to participate in as part of our scope and sequence or as part of our evaluation process.

Mrs. Albin - So I'm looking at page seven, the middle column, the reference to the AP, IB or CIE coursework, that column is actually provided by the state as possible indicators. So what we actually do on the district is the third column over, so that example column, not all of it applies to KUSD. Yes, we do use just the Cambridge International exams, and students that qualify for gifted have the opportunity to opt out if they choose not to be in it and that was made through discussion. with parents. As far as the exams go, students are not required to sit for them, partly because there are exams in June and also on Fridays. If students aren't required to be in school that day, it's very difficult to require them to come, especially in June to come back and take exams. However, even though they may not be sitting for those exams, they are prepared for them all year long as if they were going to sit for them. So they're learning the same content as if they had been going to take the exam at the end of the course. As far as the 6-8 programs, we can add that notation on here that those programs are specifically at those schools. So National History Day is Kingman Middle School, and The Building Design Project is at Kingman Middle School and the Seeds of Change is at White Cliffs Middle School.

Mrs. Henry – Ok, thank you.

The motion to approve KUSD#20 Gifted Education Scope and Sequence was made by Mr. Hardy.

The motion was seconded by Ms. Jensen.

The motion to approve KUSD#20 Gifted Education Scope and Sequence passed in favor 3-0.

Possible action to approve BoardBook proposal for the 2024-25 school year

Action-Passed

Mrs. Valerie Portillo - If approved, this proposal for BoardBook Premier, will begin for the August 2024 Board meeting. Boardbook requires at least 2 weeks to a month of working with our IT department to get the system integrated. In your packet, includes everything that BoardBook Premier includes on their platform. The recurring cost will be \$3,250 per year. This price will include maintenance/support, installation, training, and implementation. I did include a graph to show what BoardDocs included versus what BoardBook includes just because that was the one brought up for us to look into. It is pretty much very similar and just a few differences in BoardBook Premier versus BoardDocs. It is a yearly contract and it will be \$3,250 per year. If for whatever reason we didn't like it or it wasn't meeting our needs, we could cancel at any time but we do not get refunded for the \$3,250 and will still have access to it for the full year. At the end of the year if we feel it is not meeting our needs we can always look into BoardDocs. BoardBook is not affiliated with ASBA but they do offer pretty much everything that we are looking for in BoardDocs and at a fraction of the cost.

Mrs. Henry – So we are able to put things online, access, and back up documents for the public to see such as this graph and those kinds of things?

Mrs. Portillo – Yes. They also have the follow along features so that if you're managing the board meeting and you're going to item seven, anybody else who's following along, can also get pushed down to item seven so they know exactly where the meeting is in case they got lost. You guys can vote in real time as well. So you can each put your votes and it will show that online to show who's voting yes, and who's voting no and if it passes or not. You can make notes on there for your own personal self instead of writing it down. I'm excited to try it. I think it'd be great for the public to view instead of having to come in and see it in the paper form.

Mr. Hardy - You said installation. Like maintenance installation? What is the actual installation portion? Is it a hard device sitting somewhere?

Mrs. Portillo – No, they will work with IT to get it installed through our website and that way we upload everything through them to publish on our website.

Mrs. Henry – At a fraction of the cost, I like that one.

Mrs. Portillo – Yes, it's a big difference in price.

Mrs. Henry - Well, I'm glad you were required to look into it.

Motion to approve BoardBook proposal for the 2024-25 school year was made by Mr. Hardy

Motion was seconded by Ms. Jensen.

Motion to approve BoardBook proposal for the 2024-25 school year passed in favor 3-0.

Approve Instructional Improvement Fund Compensation Proposal through FY26

Action-Passed

Dr. Dorner - I mentioned in the workshop, this is the stipends that will be paid to all certified eligible teachers using the Instructional Improvement Fund based on their longevity. Staff that are here 0-3 years will receive \$300, 4-6 years \$600, and 7 or more years \$1,000 stipend payment. Finance would pay out a stipend that represents the end of this FY24 year in the coming weeks. Then in May or early June of next year, they would receive another, and the following year after that. At which time we'll assess the funds and continue from there.

Mrs. Henry - We kind of discussed it already.

The motion to approve Instructional Improvement Fund Compensation was made by Ms. Jensen.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Hardy.

The motion to approve Instructional Improvement Fund Compensation passed in favor 3-0.

Possible action to approve the proposed FY25 M&O and Capital Expenditure Budgets

Action-Passed

Mrs. Jones - If approved, the FY25 Proposed Budget as discussed in the public hearing will be adopted with a final M&O budget capacity of \$63,652,348 including the \$11 million carryover from FY24. With the reduction of about \$1 million for our energy water savings fund and \$1.7 million for a 3% non-compliance. Final unrestricted capital capacity of \$8,340,075 with more than \$4.5 million slated for spending in the rest saved as cash reserved. Our primary and secondary tax rates have not been calculated yet and the state has not released the FY25 forms yet. Our proposed budget is estimated with FY24 rates. Any inflation adjustments have not been approved by the state yet and are not included in this budget. Our first budget revision will have these adjustments included.

Mrs. Henry - Well, again, we thank you for the budget workshop earlier.

Motion to approve the proposed FY25 M&O and Capital Expenditure Budgets was made by Ms. Jensen

Motion was seconded by Mr. Hardy

Motion to approve the proposed FY25 M&O and Capital Expenditure Budgets passed in favor 3-0.

Sole Source determination for Radio Engineering Industries (REI) software, Armor Software Suite, for HD series camera system installed on bus fleet

Action-Passed

Mrs. Jones – The district requests the board to approve Radio Engineering Industries as a sole source vendor for its offering of Armor Software Suite. Based on the REI ISO manufacturing and proprietary standards no other Armor Software Suite will function with the HD series camera system. The district asks the board to continue with REI to support the updated camera system on our current bus fleet. Armor Software Suite will allow dispatchers to look at video coverage at any given time. No more waiting for the bus to return to the yard so the video coverage can be downloaded. Children that don't arrive home in a timely manner can be reviewed on video footage and provide information as to the stop the child exited on the bus. Annual spending shall not exceed \$25,000. The camera systems were installed July 2023 on the current bus fleet and continue the services required for the cameras to work as the district needs. No other company provides this armor software suite.

Mr. Hardy - The Armor Software Suite, is that like a proprietary name brand of this company? Or is that just kind of like saying fire wire?

Mrs. Jones - I'm not as familiar with this, but that's my understanding

Mr. Tim Gardner - The armor suite is just what they call it. It's all the different tools they have insight which tells you more about where the bus is, and what they have been doing. If they're speeding, GPS location, that's their insight package. Their autopilot is where you do all of the bus recordings. So when they're dispatched gets a request from a site to pull a video that's in their autopilot section. So all these different tools are just part of their Armor Suite which is basically just the dashboard that you use to access the system.

Mr. Hardy - This is the only company that does that? This Radio Engineering Industry?

Mr. Gardner – REI, I believe they're specifically a bus video camera solution. So they specifically only do the bus cameras bus specific technology. I have not heard of any other bus specific cameras solutions. I know in the past that we have thought about putting some of our school type cameras on the buses, but they're not specifically made for buses. Then they all the other software they provide is specific to buses. I'm sure there are other companies that exist but this one is quite adept at what they do.

Mr. Hardy – We talked about recycling buses are coming in and getting new buses. What is the cost to upgrade the new buses with this suite of camera work? Do they take it out of the old bus?

Mr. Gardner – I do not know the exact cost because I wasn't a part of that project. My assumption is that whenever they have a bus, retiring or being out of production that they use that money to outfit new buses or purchasing buses with that agreement. The Transportation Manager and the previous Assistant Superintendent were the two that were heading that project so there would be more information with them.

Ms. Jensen - Aare they training you guys to work on these? Or do the bus driver comes in in the morning and has to sit down, do we have to wait till somebody from the company comes in or....?

Mr. Gardner - Everybody I have in my department, Information Technology, was trained on how to use these. Myself especially, so I know the ins and outs of the entire program. Transportation handle the programs on the day to day. If they run into any issues we're informed immediately to assist. But they do have a 24/7 support with REI that if there is any issues they will send out an engineer or technician to fix whatever the issue is.

Ms. Jensen – Will we have a couple extra cameras or hardware without having to wait?

Mr. Gardner - I believe so but I believe we can get them overnighted from Phoenix. We've had this since summer of 2022, or last year?

Mrs. Jones – Since July of 2023, just barely a year.

Ms. Jensen - And what's been the maintenance requirements for that last year?

Mr. Gardner - Teaching new dispatch people how to use them and showing them all they have to do.

Ms. Jensen - I know they take a beating on some of these roads too.

Mr. Gardner – We have not had any of them break. We haven't had any of the DVR systems within the buses which also router, we haven't had any of those break. Seems like pretty resilient system. We do have a couple cameras on the outside of the buses. Those seem to be doing fine as well for weather proofing. Not that I had been aware but if any of buses have gotten too close to trees or anything like that, it seems like they've been pulling up pretty clearly.

Dr. Dorner – Can you explain how principals can use them remotely?

Mr. Gardner - It all is cloud based, so a principle could use them from home to request a video without having to come all the way back to their site. Their work computer connects to this computer and allows access to the site. They can access it from their phone, from home, or from vacation if they need to. The system itself is always at your fingertips. You can use it wherever you want.

The motion to approve sole source determination for REI camera system installed on bus fleet was made by Ms. Jensen. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hardy.

The motion to approve sole source determination for REI camera system installed on bus fleet passed in favor 3-0

Possible action to select Superintendent evaluation tool for the 2024-25 school year

Action-Passed

Mrs. Angela Moreschi - In collaboration with the Superintendent, may choose one or two tools to use in the evaluation of the superintendent for FY24-25. The evaluation tools to choose from, including in your packet. A discussion I included on the May Governing Board agenda, you which board members and the superintendent were able to discuss the evaluation tools. Staff now brings this back as an action item for the Board's decision as to which tool to use in the evaluation of the Superintendent for FY2024-25.

Mrs. Henry - Do you guys have a preference?

Mr. Hardy - I don't really have a preference. It seems to cover the same idea.

Mrs. Henry – It is the same basic information. One was four pages and one was 18 pages.

Mr. Hardy - I can tell you why I chose the four page one. It had nothing to do with content.

Mrs. Henry – Dr. Dorner was there one that you felt highlighted your strengths?

Dr. Dorner – Well I respect your four-page comment. They both have the same indicators and areas. I feel like part of what we talked about in my evaluation conversation can be shown through either one. So either one. I do plan to come with supporting documents as in the performance pay piece we've sort of outlined in the 18 pages. If you want to collect the data on the four page, either one.

Mrs. Henry - From an educator background was there, either of those that if you were doing evaluations on? Employees would have been...?

Ms. Jensen - No, because you can say the same thing with those four pages as you can with the 18.

Mrs. Henry - We have to select one.

Mr. Hardy - With a four page one, is this something this is for the 24-25 school year? The question seem to resonate with a lot of the same ideas, different words. When we approached the next year is that something that is going to be pretty much the same system or is it something that drastically alters from year to year depending on the what happened? Has this been kind of a universal, or history kind of thing?

Mrs. Moreschi - The one evaluation tool, the four page one, has been in existence, if I understand your question correctly, for quite some time. It was just through a collaborative effort that they develop the new tool to provide a choice.

Mr. Hardy - Did anybody talk about what the benefit of the extended one was? Was there a benefit to it that I missed?

Mrs. Moreschi – I think it was a collaborative effort of different school superintendents that got together and looked at it. What are the responsibilities of the position? I think they just detailed down more about all the different functional areas the superintendent has oversight over.

Dr. Dorner - It seems more like a portfolio versus a summit. I would come in with portfolio information for a summit gathering.

Mrs. Moreschi – I think the longer one, and Dr. Dorner, I don't know if you would agree but it seems to be more data based perhaps? A diverse view that is not as specific as the other.

Mr. Hardy – Okay, I was just curious. I'm still going to go from the four page one. I just wanted some clarification. There was a discussion about why it was even looked at the larger one versus smaller because I want to give the best information for her, about her or whoever it is at the time. If those other superintendents got together and they actually sat down said this is a better option, was ever expressed like that? Or was it always just like, here's another option, throw it out there.

Mrs. Moreschi – I am sorry. I don't know. I know it was at least intended to be a choice. If the board was looking for something a little bit more expansive with the details, but I don't recall seeing anything whether they recommend one or the other. So they are both in policy as an option.

Ms. Jensen - I could see that the larger one with more content for a superintendent of a bigger district is the way I looked at it.

Mrs. Henry – We have a pretty large district.

Ms. Jensen - Yeah, but I'm thinking compared to Mesa.

Mrs. Henry - It's my understanding from ASBA that when enough districts request something, then that's one of the things they try to provide. So if over us being a fairly new board, we wouldn't have been in those particular conversations. But if enough school boards had said, "Hey, we would like this", then that's why they would have put

together something more like this for us to have. Like she said, to have a choice, but it would have been because users School Board's would have asked for it.

Mr. Hardy – I don't know, I like the conciseness.

Mrs. Moreschi – I do have something I can just throw out there as well. Just this was the information part. The Arizona School Administrators and the Arizona School Boards Association, introduced this comprehensive reverse superintendent evaluation tool for governing boards and superintendents. The evaluation tool and handbook were developed collaboratively with superintendents and board members from across Arizona, and they are reflective of the collective diverse voice of both groups. Data and feedback collected from the 10 districts that piloted the tool in 2021-22 school year also imported the final product. There is a section on making the most of the responsibility. So it says while an evaluation is required, a few other things about it are prescribed: the process to evaluate the superintendent is not defined by statute, nor is the use of a specific evaluation tool. They are local decisions that the governing board and superintendent teams must make together. So I think it kind of goes back to that wanting to give the board a choice.

Mrs. Henry - I know that it's already been in a past meeting and then we're bringing these two tools back now, but we are missing two board members. So would it be out of line to get their input before an actual vote was taken? This going to take a unanimous vote here but it's potential that they might have insight into them. I don't know if they have response to that?

Mrs. Portillo – I did not receive any.

Mrs. Moreschi – There is a timeline associated with this.

Mrs. Henry - I guess that there would be.

Mrs. Moreschi – It does talk about the decision should be made collaboratively before school year or the fiscal year so keep us in alignment with the timeline.

Motion to approve Superintendent evaluation tool CBI-E for the 2024-25 school year was made by Ms. Jensen

Motion was seconded by Mr. Hardy

Motion to approve Superintendent evaluation tool CBI-E for the 2024-25 school year passed in favor 3-0.

Adjourned

Action-Passed

Motion to adjourn was made by Ms. Jensen

The motion was seconded by Mr. Hardy

The motion to adjourn passed in favor 3-0

Adjourned at 5:02 pm

Mrs. Tonya 'Toni' Henry, President

Mrs. Lori Grant, Vice President