CALL TO ORDER  
The regular meeting of the Pleasant Hill School Board was called to order by Chair Oldham at 1:00 p.m. Other board members in attendance were Vice Chair Kevin Parrish, Wylda Cafferata, Curt Offenbacher and Barbara Orre. Staff in attendance were Tony Scurto, Superintendent; Caroline Passerotti, Business Manager; Randy Fisher, High School Principal; Thad Holub, High School Assistant Principal; Devery Stoneberg, Elementary Principal; Jennifer Robbins, Accounts Payable Specialist.

Curt Offenbacher read the Mission Statement aloud.

INTRODUCTION OF AUDIENCE  
Bill Hirsh, consultant, and Doug Stowell, community member, introduced themselves.

ADDITIONS OR DELETIONS TO THE AGENDA  
Superintendent Scurto provided copies of a revised agenda.

CM/GC EXEMPTION HEARING  
The exemption hearing was conducted. There was no public comment.

PUBLIC FORUM  
There was no public comment.

CONSENT AGENDA  
6.1 Personnel (Exhibits 1415-1 and 1415-2)  
6.101 Approve Hiring of Karen Van Sickle, High School Biology Teacher  
6.102 Approve Hiring of Nicole Sharr, High School Interventionist  
6.103 Approve Hiring of Katelyn Hamilton, Temporary Social Studies Teacher  
6.104 Approve Hiring of Ashley Oliver, HS Cheer Co-Coach  
6.105 Accept Resignation of Heather Holte, Softball Coach

Mr. Scurto presented personnel actions for Board approval. Mr. Offenbacher asked for clarification on the duties of a High School Interventionist. Mr. Scurto and Mr. Fisher stated that this position arose from the Positive Behavior Intervention and Support (PBIS) structure to help identify students not meeting standards. Our district created this position when we were receiving federal stimulus (ARRA) funding and chose to
continue it once funding was expended to assist with state testing, record discipline data, and perform other clerical and attendance-related duties. In response to a question from Mr. Parrish, Mr. Fisher said we expect to see a difference from this position in the next year or two.

Wylda Cafferata moved to accept the Consent Agenda. Kevin Parrish seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

7.0 BOARD ACTION ITEMS

7.1 New Business

7.101 Policy DJC—Bidding Requirements (Exhibit 1415-3). Superintendent Scurto handed out a correct version of the board policy with language revisions recommended by consultant Bill Hirsh. Mr. Scurto discussed the nature and importance of the proposed policy changes, which were being recommended to make sure our policies lined up with current statute and regulations, eliminated redundancies, and allowed us to do what we need to do. He explained that some of the changes were being recommended in advance of OSBA language because of laws which went into effect this past July.

Mr. Hirsh referenced changing trends in board policy through his experience serving on the Attorney General’s Model Rules Committee, and provided explanations for each of the policy revisions being proposed.

Mr. Scurto clarified that the Board needed to act on this now to come into compliance with current statute and also permit the district to keep open the option to elect a contract manager/general contractor (CM/GC) construction method.

Kevin Parrish moved to adopt revisions to Board Policy DJC as drafted. Barbara Orre seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

7.102 Appoint Project Manager

Superintendent Scurto reviewed the process for selecting the project management firms and indicated the district had interviewed the two proposers: Cornerstone Management Group and DAY CPM. He asked that the Board affirm Cornerstone Management Group as project manager, as recommended by an interview committee made up of community member Doug Stowell, maintenance of lead Bruce Patterson, administrators Devery Stoneberg and Randy Fisher and himself.

In response to a question from Mr. Parrish about selection criteria, Mr. Scurto identified experience, fee structure, and the ability to inspire confidence that they would look out for the district’s and community’s interests as the district’s “owner’s rep.” Mr. Scurto also noted that the price was a not to exceed amount of $125,000, per the budget. He indicated that Cornerstone provided the committee with concrete tools and reporting mechanisms for keeping us on schedule and within budget. Mr. Fisher and Ms. Stoneberg, who participated in the selection process, affirmed this and added that Cornerstone’s presentation was direct and that its approach seemed to be more collaborative in nature. Mr. Offenbacher inquired as to how scoring compared between the two firms, and Mr. Scurto responded that Cornerstone had been ahead in the scoring of proposals and became more ahead after the interviews. Mr. Hirsh added that he had worked with Rick Rainone from Cornerstone over the last 25 years and that Mr.
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Rainone was very knowledgeable, had lots of school district experience, and had a solid track record of successes. Mr. Scurto noted that Cornerstone also had solid references and a reputation for successfully remedying mistakes. Mr. Stowell added Cornerstone’s emphasis on regular conversations and solid dispute resolution plans.

In response to a comment made by Mr. Hirsh about Cornerstone’s lower hourly rates, Mr. Offenbacher asked whether the $125,000 budget for project management was adequate. Mr. Scurto said that Cornerstone thought it would be adequate although it was a little low. There was discussion about ways to track costs over the life of the bond program.

The Superintendent handed out draft award language (yellow sheet) and explained that a five-day protest period would expire the following Tuesday. Board action would hold pending no protest, and DAY CPM was not expected to lodge a protest.

Mr. Stowell and Mr. Hirsh discussed the necessity and timing of soil tests and agreed that master planning needed to be completed first. Mr. Hirsh stated that he thinks the existing schedule is reasonable and noted that if the district elected to go with CM/GC, the CM/GC would be part of the team and help work out the solution.

*Curt Offenbacher moved that the Board approve the rankings for bond project manager, subject to no successful protests of the intent to award, and authorize the superintendent to negotiate and execute a contract with the top ranked firm. Barbara Orre seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.*

7.103 Appoint Architect Firm
The Superintendent reviewed selection process for architectural firms reported that the District had received proposal from four firms. He asked that the Board affirm the ranking of these firms based on the recommendation of the selection committee:

1. Robertson-Sherwood/Mahlum
2. gLAs
3. DLR Group
4. Soderstrom

The selection committee included Board members Curt Offenbacher and Kevin Parrish; community members Scott Chambers and Doug Stowell; administrators Randy Fisher and Devery Stoneberg; and himself Mr. Scurto stated that the intent to award had been sent out, and he provided the Board with draft award language (blue sheet).

Board members discussed their positive and negative impressions of various building designs after visiting buildings designed by the different architects. They noted the benefits of the site visits and reference checks and observed that all the proposals were good, with the top two very close. The District’s positive planning experience with DLR Group was noted. The Board also discussed the concerns about the adequacy of budgets and the importance of diligent budget management, keeping an eye on costs (construction costs and related operating costs) as well as what we want from our buildings.
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Mr. Hirsh recommended that the board share with the chosen firm what they liked and did not like about the schools visited, both in relation to interior and exterior, and in specific detail. He reiterated that we should be able to get we what want within the total budget allotted.

**Kevin Parrish moved that the Board approve the rankings for architect proposed by the selection committee and authorize the superintendent to negotiate and execute a contract with the top ranked firm, subject to parameters established by the Board in executive session. Curt Offenbacher seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.**

Chair John Oldham thanked the selection committees for their work. Mr. Offenbacher emphasized the importance of involving staff in the design process.

**7.104 CM/GC vs. Design-Bid-Build**

Mr. Scurto presented the need to determine the building process for the construction program and distinguished between the construction manager/general contractor (CM/GC) method and the design-bid-build method. He explained that the Board must approve a resolution exempting a project from competitive bidding requirements to utilize CM/GC services. A copy of a draft resolution was included in the board packet.

Mr. Hirsh explained that a major benefit of the CM/GC method was the ability to involve the construction manager early in the design process, bringing practical considerations in areas such as scheduling, constructability and value engineering into the conversation. Mr. Hirsh offered further detail about the specific stages of the design process and how the guaranteed maximum price was determined and approved by the Board. He explained that the CM/GC is responsible for meeting the budget and any savings go to the owner.

Mr. Scurto stated that it is in the best interest of the district to do this and distributed copies of findings developed by the district.

Mr. Hirsh explained that Oregon Revised Statutes require that the exemption have two keep elements: 1) It cannot encourage favoritism and competition will not be diminished, and 2) It must likely result in substantial cost savings to the District and other substantial savings. He stated that our projects are not all that complex, and while budget is not too tight and timeline not too short, the combined effect is a complex program. He indicated we have contingency but not a lot, so we must be thoughtful in how we manage our funds. He believed our chances of achieving all of the District’s needs were improved by using the CM/GC method. Otherwise, he considered it likely that the construction schedule would need to be extended, which would require additional dollars to pay the project manager and architect. Mr. Hirsh added that the District must have expertise on staff or hired to in order to use CM/GC services. He commented on the expertise in this area held by both Rick Rainone from Cornerstone and Roberson-Sherwood.

Mr. Scurto noted that in the project manager interviews, both firms recommended the CM/GC method to do this program.

Mr. Stowell noted that the overall project could cost less using CM/GC because of the collaborative approach to problem solving.
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Mr. Offenbacher indicated he was not sure we could get our work done under design-bid-build. Mr. Parrish agreed CM/GC gives the District the most flexibility and best value in addition to lower risk.

Mr. Hirsh clarified that the CM/GC manages the construction, subcontractors, layout of design, scheduling, budget etc. The project manager is the owner’s representative who makes sure elements of the construction program are appropriately bid, manages the overall budget, and oversees additional activities including haz-mat abatement, surveying, mandatory testing, interacting with the county building department, surveying, overseeing contracts with the architect and CM/GC, managing the close-out process, coordinating with district staff before move-in, and procurement of furniture, fixtures and equipment and technology. He added that statute prohibits a public agency from hiring the same firm to be CM/GC and project manager or architect.

Mr. Parrish asked that we create an organizational chart explaining the roles of the various parties.

*Curt Offenbacher moved that the Board adopt the resolution for a public contracting exemption from the competitive bidding process and utilizing the CM/GC process, as presented. Wylda Cafferata seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.*

7.105 Appoint U.S. Bank as Bond Paying Agent.
Mr. Scurto requested that the Board approve the appointment of U.S. Bank as bond paying agent, replacing BNY Mellon. He reminded the Board of problems the District had with BNY Mellon in the past and that problems were continuing. Ms. Passerotti indicated her interest in using U.S. Bank as paying agent for the District’s existing bonds as well as the new ones.

*Kevin Parrish moved that the Board appoint U.S. Bank as Paying Agent for new and existing bonds. Barbara Orre seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.*

7.2 Old Business
Board members expressed their appreciation to Bill Hirsh for his valuable contributions.

Chair Oldham called for a ten minute recess as of 2:55 p.m. The Board meeting resumed at 3:08 p.m.

8.0 BOARD CHARGE
8.1 Review Board Self-Evaluation

Mr. Oldham said he had read the evaluation and was not happy with the tool. He found it very difficult to identify Board consensus on items needing improvement. Many statements included in the evaluation tool did not apply, and Board members’ interpretations of what the statements meant were a not necessarily in agreement. Mr. Parrish and Mr. Scurto suggested identifying common strengths and weaknesses. Mr. Oldham responded that he had tried numerous approaches and was unable to draw conclusions. He stated his preference for the old tool, as it contained fewer items that could be discussed.

Ms. Cafferata said she did not like this evaluation tool either and suggested creating a subcommittee to develop a better tool for next year.
Mr. Oldham indicated that the outcome of the evaluations as prepared would conclude that the PHSD was a “C” board, while he thinks they are a “B+/A-” board. Mr. Offenbacher indicated that he would have assigned a “C” grade to the Board given the criteria in this tool. He also took exception to some of the questions.

A discussion of the evaluation tool followed, with general consensus that the scoring tool skewed results and impacted the usefulness of data. Mr. Scuro observed that the Board has worked through difficult situations and taken hard stands and that anecdotal information could also be useful in an evaluation.

Ms. Cafferata and Ms. Orre volunteered to work on an evaluation tool for next year, to be ready for Board review by December.

8.2 Review 2013-14 Charge (Exhibit 1415-6)

Board members reviewed the 2013-14 charge document to see how they had performed:

1) Achievement: Goal to monitor/improve student achievement.

The Board discussed ways to effectively measure student achievement. The Superintendent indicated he had worked with the two principals to determine areas that were measureable, and he referenced the presentation by OSBA staff on student achievement earlier in the year. He suggested beginning with a work session on state report card results and allowing the Board and admin. team to discuss where we need to do our work (i.e., math scores). He thought it might be best to review results together, allowing the board to set new goals and and allowing staff to come up with ways to respond. He also indicated that state assessment scores would be coming out in October. He would want to examine the data and focus on specific areas to work on.

Mr. Parrish suggested using the Iowa Test of Basic Skills which compares students to other students. Mr. Offenbacher questioned whether students were aware of our school scores and how they might be involved. Ms. Cafferata asked to receive quarterly achievement reports with an overall view of achievement.

Mr. Oldham stated that achievement should still be a Board project for the purpose of the Charge document. After some discussion, it was agreed that a board work session would be scheduled for the second board meeting in October, as state assessment scores are scheduled to be released by October 9. It was requested that Board members receive a copy of the scores in their packets. It was also suggested that the work session begin an hour earlier than usual to also accommodate an update on facilities projects.

Mr. Fisher and Ms. Stoneberg provided information on tests that our students are currently taking, including a new Smarter Balance Assessment. They acknowledged that students may need to time to acclimate to the new test. Ms. Stoneberg indicated that ESD superintendents are engaged in an effort to buy formative assessments as well.

Board members discussed various concerns about standardized testing. Mr. Oldham expressed his concern with the inability to get consistent measures from the state with data that is useful on a consistent basis. Ms. Stoneberg explained that student mobility prevents having a consistent measure, as that would require the ability to measure the progress of an intact cohort. Other board members voiced concerns about adding.
another standardized test and spending time testing for limited benefit. Mr. Scurto suggested trying to isolate an intact group and measure their progress in an effort to develop a meaningful tool.

Mr. Oldham suggested that future action steps include a report on academic enhancement. He also noted that block activities are still considered controversial. He indicated the board would still like to know what is being offered to kids who do not need help in the form of academic enhancement. Mr. Fisher handed out a synopsis of what was offered last year and the percentage of students participating in each area. He supported using the block period to focus on math and reading as well as senior projects. Mr. Oldham confirmed this is the type of information the board wants to hear on a quarterly basis. In response to a question posed by Mr. Parrish about the cost of adding teacher time outside the school day to provide assistance to students, Mr. Scurto suggested that after-school sessions would not necessarily attract the kids who need help or tie to academics being taught in the classroom. He also explained that extra preps for teachers are also a problem. He thought the district might investigate on-line options that would not impose a burden on existing staff and suggested using Beyond High School Connections funds for this purpose. Mr. Scurto also noted that a number of kids are being served with the current instructional model.

Ms. Cafferata requested that actions steps include encouraging student ownership of academic achievement, with quarterly reporting to the board. It was agreed that the Board still wants to receive monthly reports from the building principals.

Ms. Cafferata said she was not satisfied with TAG reporting and would like to receive quarterly reports from both schools.

It was agreed that the item on art education could be removed as a goal for 2014-15 but would be looked into again before budgeting for 2015-16.

2) Communication: Goal to improve communication among the community, staff, students and Board.

It was agreed that a shorter, more concise mission statement had been adopted and could be removed from actions steps.

Board members agreed to retain the action step on improving communication with auxiliary/fundraising groups and discussed inviting them to present at board meetings, one time each. They also discussed having a board member attend each of the fundraiser group meetings at least once.

They also wanted to continue receiving written reports on Workshop Wednesday and discussed various ways staff could provide meaningful information. Ms. Cafferata would like to see notes once a quarter and stated she was willing to come to the office to review them. Mr. Scurto indicated he retained that information in his office.

The Board agreed to retain the superintendent and board evaluation items as stated, and expressed their interest in student council representation on the board.
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They want to continue the quarterly newsletter and to drop the item about contacting Open Enrollment families.

Ms. Cafferata requested that the staff hiring recommendation form be revised to include the number of applicants as well as the number of applicants who are interviewed.

3) Finances
Board members agreed to drop the action step about PERS rates. They asked to be informed about PERS rates through the budget process and for staff to continue forwarding information as it became available.

The Board still wants to learn more about Health Care Reform and its impact on district finances and employee groups. They also want to continue receiving a mid-year cost-benefit report on Open Enrollment.

The Board asked that regular reporting by the project manager on the status of bond projects be added.

4) Facilities
The Board agreed on a revised Goal of “Implement capital improvement program.”

They requested monthly reports and more if needed. They also agreed to add an update of board policies on bidding and procurement.

Board members agreed to create an action item for pursuing grant opportunities in conjunction with facilities development.

9.0 FUTURE BOARD MEETINGS
Chair Oldham stated that the next two board meetings are scheduled for September 15 (regular meeting) and September 29 (work session) at 7:00 p.m. in the Community Center.

10.0 ANNOUNCEMENTS/OTHER
An update on the progress of the par course was requested by Ms. Cafferata. She also asked about plans for senior projects.

11.0 RECESS TO EXECUTIVE SESSION: Negotiations with Architect Firm, ORS 192.660(2)(f). The Board recessed into executive session at 4:58 p.m.

12.0 RETURN TO PUBLIC SESSION at 5:14 p.m.

13.0 ADJOURNMENT at 5:14 p.m.

Signed: ________________ , this __ day of ____________, 2014.

John Oldham, Board Chair
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