

**Meeting:** LEAP Committee

**Date:** April 9, 2019

**Time:** 4:00 – 5:30 pm

**Location:** Administration Building, Room 137

**Attendees:**

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Amy Al-Hashlamoun	<input type="checkbox"/> Jessica Behrens	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Melissa Greer	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Gail Halmstad	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Aaron Harder
<input type="checkbox"/> Justin Jablonske	<input type="checkbox"/> Sarah Jackson	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Todd Johnson**	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Laurie Klinkhammer*	<input type="checkbox"/> Mike Kohls
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Kim Koller	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Jason Rehbein	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Pete Riley**	<input type="checkbox"/> Crystal Ruzicka	<input type="checkbox"/> Breana Stanley
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Amy Traynor	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Jonathan Wheeler	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

\*Committee Chair

\*\*Co-Facilitator

**Guest(s):** Jim Schmitt, Executive Director of Teaching and Learning

**Notes:** Meta Miske

Laurie Klinkhammer called the meeting to order at 4:02 pm.

**1. Public Comment**

- None

**2. Approval of minutes from 3.12.19**

- Motion from Amy Traynor to accept minutes; seconded by Aaron Harder. Minutes were approved by unanimous vote of the committee.

**3. Report from Arctic Zone – Jonny Wheeler**

- Jonny and Justin Jablonske have researched and talked with families and teachers. There is increasing enrollment in the program, indicating the program is well-liked. PBL (project-based learning) students do as well or better in standardized testing than students in a traditional setting.
- To help the program be more successful, the Arctic Zone would like to see more staff, more collaboration/prep time, and better communication. A new performance agreement is suggested to help with these problems.
- Questions from Jonny:
  - Can the committee determine that the teachers be excused from traditional PD?
  - Can the committee approve a new performance agreement?
  - Can we push the EauZone along in the zone approval process before LEAP has all of the new process established?
- Discussion:
  - Regarding Professional Development the committee agreed that the details must be clearly defined in the new performance agreement include what PD will occur in place of specific District of Building directed PD to avoid disagreement over what PD each party feels the teachers need
  - Regarding giving ArcticZone a temporary plan until their performance agreement is rewritten, it was agreed that from the perspective of a principal, he/she may not appreciate the LEAP Committee having the authority to require/excuse teachers from specific PD
  - Topic was temporarily placed on hold to discuss Policy and Process Finalization which could have impacts on this discussion

- Upon return to this discussion the following was agreed upon in answer to Jonny's questions:
  - PD will need to be clearly addressed in the performance agreement; LEAP does not have the authority to excuse the teachers from PD at this time as a result of the current performance agreement
  - ArcticZone's original performance agreement will be reviewed and evaluated against the new Process to determine what needs to be updated in order for the Zone to be supported
  - P&G want the Policy and Process finalized before LEAP moves forward with any new or in-progress proposals including the EauZone and EauZone will need to go through the new process

#### 4. Policy and Process Finalization - Kim

- Review Policy 332 - in handout LEAP's language remains with P&G's recommendations in red
  - P&G changed "teacher" to "ECASD Certified staff member" to include counselors, instructional/literacy coaches, etc., and to ensure that a Zone is internal and run by an ECASD staff member
  - P&G changed from LEAP committee overseeing operational parameters to the Principal overseeing
  - P&G change that LEAP Zones shall serve to "provide an additional avenue to" since there are other ways to have innovative programs
  - Change from "developing" to "implementing" so the expectation isn't that teachers are experimenting but rather finding programs that work for children
  - Change in last sentence for consistency.
  - Kim asked to attend the next P&G meeting, so she hopes she has something to take back to them from this meeting today.
  - Discussion:
    - Policy 185 provides the rationale for Policy 332
    - Kim read Policy 185 which includes the charge of the LEAP committee; however, the policy does not include a definition of the ongoing involvement LEAP can or should have with a Zone.
- Review of Process
  - P&G asked Kim to strike the LEAP ambassador throughout the entire process indicating that this is a partnership between the staff and the principal
  - Discussion:
    - Concerns raised about the involvement of LEAP; committee is involved throughout Phase 1 and then not again until 3.3
    - Discussion of LEAP remaining involved or perhaps a governance board to help ensure the performance agreement is honored and avoid challenges similar to what ArcticZone has faced
    - In Phase 3 the staff member and principal are partnered; what recourse is there if the principal fails to support the Zone as agreed upon in the performance agreement?
    - When does LEAP give their opinion to the Board regarding the success of a Zone?
    - Laurie and Aaron each volunteered to go to a P&G meeting to share information about the LEAP ambassador's role and why LEAP feels so strongly that the ambassador is needed
    - LEAP agreed to keep the LEAP Ambassador in the Process draft but to place the ambassador after the Principal to stress the connection between the staff member and the principal
    - If the Process is a Rule, then P&G's approval is not needed, but if the Process is an Exhibit, then P&G's support is needed as an Exhibit needs Board approval
      - Since LEAP wants P&G to support the Policy, it would be appreciated if P&G would support the Process as well
  - Agreed upon changes:
    - Agreement to add to the Policy as the last sentence of the first paragraph: **The LEAP Committee will review each Zone annually and provide a report to the Board.**
    - Agreement to add to Process "LEAP Ambassador as needed."
    - First bullet point in policy (Solve an identified issue...) will be removed

- Procedural question: when the Board has two committees who are disagreeing, how is a decision determined; currently LEAP and P&G continue to go back and forth on the same issues? The Board can vote.
- Kim will update the policy by accepting P&G's changes and making the updates noted above. Kim will send out to LEAP for final approval. Kim, Laurie, and Aaron will also let P&G know that this is the language LEAP wants and that LEAP wants to keep the LEAP ambassador in the process.

## 5. INDE Update

- **Anna Rolbycki – parent/community member**

- Review of work in the past to have an outdoor-focused secondary school called Little Red Nature Campus (LRNC.) INDE would like to take an update back to the Board regarding INDE's progress toward the proposal and they need LEAP's approval to do so.
  - INDE feels this is the appropriate time to provide the Board with an update because:
    - There is a Federal grant available; they've missed the first 2 of 5 grant cycles and it's first-come, first served.
    - INDE's completed a financial planning review and feel they have a more complete picture on how the school will support itself and generate revenue for ECASD
    - There have been discussions of other unique learning environments such as a virtual charter school that have gone straight to the board without the involvement of LEAP, so INDE wants the opportunity to share with the Board
    - INDE believes this is a great opportunity for staff and students, and the longer we wait, the more students miss out on this opportunity
  - Melissa Greer made a motion to support INDE providing the Board with a progress update. Amy Traynor seconded the motion.
    - Discussion:
      - To get on the agenda, does LEAP need to support the program or just support an update of the project?
        - LEAP need only support an update of the project, not the project itself
      - LEAP agreed that the deadlines warrant a timely update to the Board.
      - What is INDE seeking from the Board?
      - INDE currently wants to provide a progress update as the Board previously gave them the authority to further develop the proposal and they feel ready to provide more information. INDE hasn't decided to ask anything from the Board at this time, although INDE will discuss that further.
    - Motion passes by unanimous vote of the committee.

## 6. Other

- Laurie Klinkhammer thanked to Ali McMahon and Andy Brown who agreed to move their proposal for EauZone from this meeting to the next meeting to allow LEAP time to discuss the policy changes from P&G. Andy Brown asked Laurie if there's anything that LEAP is looking for special for them to work on:
  - Andy and Ali will summarize general project-based learning at the request of Laurie.
  - Please also succinctly describe their research into PBL.
  - How do they plan to grow their knowledge in this field (PD plans)?
  - Will there be a lottery system for the EauZones or will the growth be in staff so all students are welcome?

## 7. Future Agenda Items

- None discussed

Laurie Klinkhammer made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Andrew Harder seconded the motion. The meeting was adjourned at 5:31 pm.