

Special Board of Stewards meeting:

January 3, 2007

1:00 PM, Delta VISION HCP Office

Stewards in attendance: Barb Hulet, Sharon Peterson, Trona Denny, Don Pyle, Denise Claire Laverty. Richard Nunamaker arrived late.

Directors: Caryn Brady, Anjula Julian, Sara Sharer

DO Personnel: Mike McMillan, John Jones

Others: Dolly Hill, Rex Stucker, Eric Ellis

Denise Claire is nominated to facilitate in the absence of both co-Directors.

Dolly Hill from the Delta VISION nominating committee presents board nominees for the Delta Program. They are Rex Stucker and Eric Ellis, (Eric has numerous questions about board responsibilities and will have further discussion with Caryn Braddy before accepting the nomination). Don Pyle states that Surface Creek has one possible nominee: Jim Wood. Rex Stucker accepts the nomination for Delta. Anjula reports that North Fork will have a parent representative at the regular Board meeting on the 10th of January as a possible nominee for their program. The new Board is in process and could possibly have a transition period of 6 to 12 months.

Charter Appeal: Discussion of Eric Hall's review of the Charter denial will be reserved for Executive session as it is documented attorney-client privilege.

Discussion with District personnel in regard to the Board of Stewards letter from December is that they feel the timeline for response is unrealistic for the district administration to address. The intent of the letter was to see if the school board is willing to negotiate with the VHCP. It is stated that the waivers will be requested in a routine fashion. The Board of Stewards would like a written response to their concerns and would like confirmation of who the school board will be willing to negotiate with. The Board feels that the support should be a public response; it is felt that the Board of Education will defer those negotiations to the superintendent. The district administration needs clarification on what the contract for the VHCP would be and has serious concerns regarding the current MOU. Both sides agree that there needs to be negotiation and a clearer contract. District personnel again state that their biggest concern is that VHCP is a home based program. It is reaffirmed that VHCP is a community based program guided by parental choice. It is stated that we have families who still use the term "Home Schooling" on a regular basis and that needs to change. It is felt that it is only an issue of changing terminology and that the program is understood and recognized state wide as a viable school model.

District personnel disagree and feel that “Home School” is a very dangerous scenario for both sides. District personnel feel that the required 90 outside hours are not being taught by “Highly Qualified” instructors. They feel that the Resource Consultant is at the head of the VHCP structure with families and learners and that person should therefore be “Highly Qualified”. It has been requested by the Board of Education that we have “Highly Qualified” in our structure.

The VHCP needs questions of intent from the Board of Education and District Administration answered and they need to address and clarify those issues in a public setting.

The Board of Education also needs to recognize who the nine member of the Board of Stewards are.

There is concern from members of the VHCP over the language changes in the resolution passed by the Board of Education to renew the waivers which allow the Vision collation to operate. District personnel state that there will be an open discussion on pursuing the waivers as routinely as possible and they do not feel there concerns with the resolution that was passed by the Board of Education. It is felt by members of VHCP that the current resolution puts the entire coalition in jeopardy. It is questioned whether the waivers are on the agenda for the January School Board meeting. It is also asked if the resolution that was passed was already sent to State Board of Education. District personnel affirm that the resolution was adopted by the school board and is the resolution that will be presented to the state. There is concern that the resolution language stating that the waivers would be presented to “certain schools” and that it is a viable concern to the VHCP. Is the intention of the resolution to divide the coalition and grant waivers to certain schools or is the coalition considered one entity by the School Board?

District personnel responds that the granting of waivers is a local decision and is based on separate contracts negotiated with each school in the coalition. It is those separate contracts that enable each school to be granted waivers by the Delta County Board of Education. It is asked if the Board of Education is willing to contract with the VHCP. District response is that the Board of Education wants a non conflicted Board of Stewards by January 2007. They feel the VHCP Directors provide the Board of Stewards with all vital information and seating an entirely new board is not a problem. VHCP feels that to rush on seating an entirely new board in the middle of numerous negotiations and conflicts is a dangerous proposal and VHCP has been advised by two attorneys (including Aaron Clay, attorney for the school district) not to seat a completely new board at once. It would best serve VHCP to have experienced board members remain in place until conflicts are resolved and negotiations are complete. The district disagrees with Mr. Clay and feels we need a totally new board in place by the end of January. The District feels the new board should be the ones signing a new contract with the Board of Education. VHCP states that the Board of Stewards will not be the ones directly negotiating the new contract they will only be signing the agreement once the terms are agreed upon by the VHCP and the school district. The only reason the process is being rushed is because it was a request made by the Board of Education. District now states it

will have further discussion in May about creating a new contract, and confirms that the current MOU is ethically binding until the end of the fiscal school year 2008. The Board of Education can make a resolution to begin that process sooner if both sides agree to abandon the current MOU and adopt a new contract. The VHCP agrees and wants to move forward on developing a more concrete contract.

The question is again asked of “What the School District and Board of Education sees as the positives of VHCP. We are trying to find a starting place to know what the District and school board consider the strengths of the program.

District responds that it can be easily done if the VHCP addresses the 5 points of improvement request by the school board.

VHCP asks structurally what the safe areas of the program are. We have our ideas of what the program strengths are but don’t know if they correspond to what the board of education considers.

District again states they want a new non-conflicted Board of Stewards and it is that board they will negotiate with. VHCP wants clarity on what the programs strengths are.

It is decided to move the conversation along and call for executive session CRS 24-6-402 (4) (b). Attorney – Client privilege.

Executive session concludes @ 2:45 PM.

There is a proposal not to appeal the Charter decision to the State Board of Education. It is felt that funds could be raised for the appeal, but might not be the responsible thing to do.

There is a block on the vote, and further discussion.

There is a proposal to deliver the letter of intent to appeal the charter decision to the school district, the deadline for the intent is today @ 5:00 PM and the letter will need to be hand delivered to the District Office.

There is a block on the proposal and further discussion.

There is a second vote with the same result. The proposal moves forward by majority vote.

The next Board of Stewards meeting will be at the North Fork office on January 10th and there will be further discussion on the appeal process.

Meeting adjourns at 3:26 PM