

20/20+

EnVision

A Community Discussion on the Future of Education in Brownsburg

Steering Committee Meeting No. 2

December 1, 2009

6:30 p.m.

Meeting Notes

- 1) The Steering Committee Membership roster contact and demographic information was reviewed. Members were encouraged to submit Commission nominations so information may be issued in early January at the latest. The Steering Committee requested the Contact Information sheet be forwarded by e-mail for use in tracking potential Commission Members.
- 2) Potential Facilitator contacts were reviewed and discussed, including the three responses that had been received to date.
 - a) All three current facilitators appear to be well qualified, each with experience in efforts similar to the EnVision 20/20+ project.
 - b) Several Steering Committee members expressed concern that additional candidates were not available in order to insure the short-listed candidates truly represented the result of a due diligence process that brought the best candidates to the interview table. Additional facilitator candidates will be sought and brought to the Steering Committee for consideration.
 - c) The Steering Committee expressed concern regarding the potential cost of facilitators, specifically:
 - i) Identification of available funds to support the Facilitator Professional Services Agreement (funds not to exceed \$75,000 are expected to be available, drawing from a number of sources; if possible, cost should be maintained below \$50,000);
 - ii) Definition of an “acceptable” amount of funds to expend on a Facilitator (after much discussion, it was confirmed that for such an effort a fee range of \$25,000 to \$75,000 [and preferably below \$50,000] was “reasonable”, given the nature of the work, the scope of services expected, and the “tolerance” of the community for such an expenditure).
 - iii) Confirmation of alignment between the available funds and the expectations of the facilitator candidates (after discussion, it was determined the fee expectations of the current three candidates are probably aligned with available funds, but John Voigt will contact each group to confirm the general fee expectation to insure any misalignments are quickly identified and resolved).

- 3) The interview process was discussed at length, including the following key issues:
 - a) Development of objective selection criteria:
 - i) A number of criteria and objectives were discussed at length. These items will be further developed into a rubric or scoring form for use by the Interview Committee.
 - ii) Criteria revolved around the following issues and concepts:
 - (1) Ability and method of producing deliverables (ranging from *unable to produce*, to *produces on own*, to *facilitates Commission members to produce final report*);
 - (2) Community facilitation skills (working with large groups on public issues, including but not limited to public education);
 - (3) Knowledge and experience with public education issues (varying opinions as to the need for pre-existing knowledge of school issues, versus “business” perspective);
 - (4) Facilitation skills trump knowledge skills, within reason;
 - (5) Knowledge of school finance was considered by some on the Steering Committee as “important”;
 - (6) Knowledge of school facilities was deemed by the Steering Committee as less important, since the focus of the Envision effort is not facilities.
 - b) Other questions and issues raised in the course of this discussion:
 - i) The issue of referendum experience as a selection criterion was raised by the Steering Committee. The Steering Committee’s consensus is the goal of the EnVision process is not referendum, therefore the selection of facilitator should not hinge upon referendum experience. A facilitator candidate who has referendum experience should only be selected on the basis of their facilitation skills and experience.
 - ii) Likewise, the issue of the neutrality of a facilitator was discussed at some length. Facilitator candidates with school experience, and the fact that the facilitator will ultimately be paid by the school district, could be construed as compromising the neutrality of the facilitator. No clear resolution to this issue was arrived at in the discussion.
 - iii) In answer to a Steering Committee question, Miss Corbin noted that cost reductions will be continuing within the district during the EnVision process, with upwards of \$1 million in cost reductions expected to be needed in calendar year 2010. It is hoped that early results from the EnVision Commission will prioritize expectations to assist in these cost reductions and any additional reductions that are required in subsequent years.

- iv) In answer to a Steering Committee question, Miss Corbin noted that the numbers of students leaving BCSC is known but not the specific reasons for their leaving (exit interviews are not conducted – in most cases, BCSC is not aware of a student having left the district until well after they are gone).
 - c) After discussion of criteria and candidates, the Steering Committee agreed to push the interview date back to January 5, 2010 to allow time for the procurement of additional candidates as well as development of interview criteria. This will impact overall schedule, with the full Commission not meeting until early February, 2010.
- 4) The Interview Committee structure was established:
- a) A “front row” team was identified to serve as the interview team, comprised of the following Steering Committee members:
 - i) Tracy Sullivan;
 - ii) Allan Bolante (nominated in absentia);
 - iii) Jim Waggoner;
 - iv) Larry Hartley
 - v) Tom Garrison;
 - vi) John Voigt (serving as moderator).
 - b) All other members of the Steering Committee will participate as “back row” participants of the interview process.
- 5) Activities moving forward (note the schedule has been adjusted to reflect the change in interview dates):
- i) December 15, 2009 – Continued work on:
 - (1) Commission Membership;
 - (2) Facilitator short-listing;
 - (3) Facilitator interview planning.
 - ii) January 5, 2009 – Interview of Facilitators, formulation of recommendation, if possible.
 - iii) *January 11, 2009 – Board of School Trustees Meeting.*
 - iv) January 19, 2009 – Steering Committee Meeting – Planning for Commission (if possible).
 - v) *January 25, 2009 – Board of School Trustees Meeting.*
 - vi) January 26, 2009 – Steering Committee Meeting – Planning for Commission (if possible).
 - vii) February ??, 2010 – EnVision 20/20+ Commission Meeting No. 1 – TBD.
- 6) The meeting adjourned after 8:30 p.m.