

**MINUTES OF MEETING OF BOARD OF TRUSTEES
OF
CLAY COMMUNITY SCHOOLS**

A Regular Session of the Clay Community Schools Board of Trustees was held at North Clay Middle School, Media Center, 3450 W State Road 340, Brazil, IN 47834, on Thursday, June 14, 2012. Tammy Beasley, Jennifer Kaelber, Tina Heffner, Forrest Buell, Rob Miller, Ron Scherb and Amy Burke Adams were present.

I. Call to Order

Mr. Miller, president of the board, called the meeting to order at 7:33 p.m. He then led those in attendance in the Pledge of Allegiance and offered the prayer.

II. Consent Agenda

A. Claims

B. Board Meetings

Regular Session Minutes for May 17, 2012

Executive Session Certification for May 17, 2012

Special Session Minutes for June 12, 2012

C. Field Trips

Northview High School Choir members who wish to participate to Walt Disney World, Orlando, Florida, March 23-March 28, 2013, for a performance and workshop led by Disney professionals.

D. Personnel

A. LEAVES OF ABSENCE

- | | |
|------------------|------|
| 1. Certified | None |
| 2. Non-Certified | None |

B. RETIREMENTS

- | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--------|-------------------|
| 1. Certified | None | |
| 2. Non-Certified | | |
| a. Maintenance Tech (June 29, 2012) | MAINT. | Richard Haughee |
| 3. Place on Retirement Index | | |
| a. Teacher (beginning 2012-13) | ESE | Pamela Fulk |
| b. Teacher (beginning 2012-13) | SE | Renee Watts |
| c. Teacher (beginning 2012-13) | NCMS | Kaylynn Sanders |
| d. Teacher (beginning 2012-13) | NCMS | Gregory L. Mogan |
| e. Teacher (beginning 2012-13) | NCMS | Richard M. Rosner |

C. RESIGNATIONS

- | | | |
|--|-------|----------------|
| 1. Certified | | |
| a. Teacher – Elementary | ESE | Pamela Fischer |
| 2. Non-Certified | | |
| a. Head Mechanic | TRANS | Chris McVay |
| 3. ECA Resignations | | |
| a. Spell Bowl Coach | NHS | Debbie Allen |
| b. Fine Arts Academic Super Bowl Coach | NHS | Rayna White |

| | | |
|---|------|--------------|
| c. Football – 7 th Grade Coach | NCMS | John Russell |
| 4. ECA Lay Coaches | None | |

D. TRANSFERS

| | | |
|---------------------|------------------|--------------|
| 1. Certified | | |
| a. Special Services | From NCMS to FPE | Sarah Goda |
| b. Special Services | From CCHS to VBE | Sarah DeLong |
| 2. Non-Certified | None | |

E. EMPLOYMENT

| | | |
|---------------------------------|------|-----------------|
| 1. Certified | | |
| a. Additional 1 section Spanish | CCHS | Lynn Gugino |
| b. Additional 3.5 sections Math | CCHS | Rachel McCleary |
| 2. Non-Certified | | |
| a. Physical Therapist (PT) | CORP | Tara Foulke |
| b. Insurance Coordinator | CORP | Michael Fowler |

F. EXTRA-CURRICULAR

| | | |
|--|------|---------------|
| 1. Extra-Curricular Certified | | |
| a. Student Council Sponsor | NHS | Nikki Osborn |
| b. Excalibur Sponsor | NHS | Dianna Knox |
| 2. Extra-Curricular Non-Certified | None | |
| 3. Extra-Curricular (Lay Coach) | | |
| a. Summer Drill Team Dir. | CCHS | Chelsea Bryan |
| b. Percussion Specialist (Summer & Fall) | CCHS | Joe Diko |
| c. Asst. Summer Band Director | CCHS | Becky Ziegler |

G. CHANGES

| | | |
|--|------|--|
| 1. Certified | None | |
| 2. Non-Certified | | |
| a. John W. Boyce – Change from Network Specialist to Senior Network Specialist | | |
| b. Steven Hazard – Additional Certifications resulting in pay change | | |
| 3. ECA-Lay Coaches | None | |

H. TERMINATION

| | | |
|---|------|--|
| 1. Certified | None | |
| 2. Non-Certified | None | |
| 3. Coaching | | |
| a. Due to the lack of participants in the Volleyball program, there will not be a C-Team and the position of Volleyball C-Team will be eliminated. Jennifer Smith has been informed by Mr. Romas. | | |

I. CONTRACTED SERVICES

None

J. VOLUNTEERS

- | | |
|--------------------------------------|------|
| 1. Athletic Volunteers for 2012-2013 | None |
| 2. Classroom | None |

Mrs. Heffner moved to accept the consent agenda items. Mr. Scherb seconded, and the motion was approved by a 7-0 vote.

III. Comments from Patrons

Ginger Maesch, a former employee, noted that she had spoken to the board at the meeting in May and had given board members a packet of information and she wondered what the board members thought about her situation. Mrs. Adams pointed out that, if it is a personnel matter, it would need to be discussed in private, to which Mrs. Maesch replied that she had been told if law enforcement would not do anything about it, she was to bring it to the school board. In reply to Mrs. Adams' question as to whether Mrs. Maesch had the right, as a former employee, to meet with the board, Superintendent Tucker stated that due process is always accorded to individuals in employment; however, one of the other issues is with regard to Mrs. Maesch's child's safety. She added that she would be happy to meet with Mrs. Maesch when school starts.

Cheyenne Monfort, a student at East Side Elementary, shared her feelings about how much she enjoyed having Mary Ray as principal at East Side and her wish that Mrs. Ray would come back.

Jennifer Clark began her comments speaking on behalf of the children and the parents at East Side Elementary regarding the actions taken and the way the situations were handled over Principal Mary Ray. Mrs. Clark was informed that details regarding personnel issues could not be discussed in a public meeting, only in executive session. Mrs. Clark then asked why the principal position was not posted before being filled, to which Superintendent Tucker replied that, due to the timeline, the administration felt there were past candidates who had been interviewed that could be looked at, and a recommendation for that position would be made later in the meeting. Mrs. Heffner remarked that she found the support for Mary Ray very commendable.

Kristi Cundiff, a parent of students at East Side for the past 17 years, noted that she had substitute-taught and volunteered in classrooms at East Side. She shared information about her children, both biological and adopted, who had all attended East Side. Mrs. Cundiff commented that everyone needed to look and see what could be done to make East Side better and help children learn. Mrs. Cundiff questioned the board members' decision to not post the principal position and look outside of this school corporation for candidates. She can't fathom that the board doesn't believe there are people in the community and the corporation who are capable of running East Side. Mrs. Cundiff referred to the Indiana School Boards Association Code of Ethics. She pointed out that the very first point it makes is that school board members should honor the highest responsibility that membership demands by thinking in terms of children first. As she sees it, she is not sure that has happened. To close her comments, Mrs. Cundiff asked that the board not accept the resignation of the former principal and bring her back so the children at East Side could have appropriate closure with the relationship they once had.

Scott Fosdick, also a parent of a student at East Side, noted that he and his wife had moved into the area 13 years ago from St. Louis. He has a deep concern, which is probably the flip side of the opinions that had been expressed at this meeting. He is of the opinion that looking at outside sources for employees that are eligible is a very good thing as long as protocol is followed. Mr. Fosdick has not researched whether or not there is a hiring protocol for the position of principal at East Side; however, he is aware that there is one person who is being suggested for that position. He does not know this person's qualifications or what basis the decision is being based upon. He asked that the board not make a decision without first going through protocol and giving the opportunity to other qualified applicants, if there are some. He commented that Mrs. Ray had done a good job, but they have to move on because a decision has been made. He asked that the board do their due diligence. Superintendent Tucker responded to Mr. Fosdick's comments by noting that she had requested to expedite the hiring process because there had been extensive interviews for previous administrative positions. It was felt that there was a field of candidates that could be considered, which would allow the expediency of getting someone on board quickly, and it was determined that the position would not be posted statewide. Mrs. Adams added that the board did the same thing last year with the assistant superintendent position. To conclude his comments, Mr. Fosdick asked if parents of students at East Side could be provided with the qualifications of the new principal candidate so that they could feel comfortable with the board's decision. He also asked if the board had thought about an interim process to allow a thorough hiring process to begin.

David Wise, of 10026 N Knightsville Clay Street, Brazil, IN, stated that it was with his deepest regrets that he came to this board meeting. He added that when he left the board in 1996 he made a personal vow that he would never be critical or speak publicly about the actions of the board of school trustees of Clay Community Schools. However, he feels he has been left no choice. He shared that his first encounter with this board was when the board appointed someone to serve the remainder of Dr. Dottie King's District III term. He asserted that he could have taken the board members to task for the manner in which they made that appointment. As he sees it, the board members clearly violated the Indiana Open Door law. This law states that a board can have an executive session and there are three things that can be done when considering the appointment of a public official. However, he pointed out that the board cannot reduce the number of applicants to fewer than three. Mr. Wise stated that he was called the morning following the interview process and was told that someone else had been chosen. He emphasized that a board can never make a final decision in executive session. In addition, he believes that it is quite clear in the minutes that the decision was made prior to the vote on Mrs. Beasley.

The reason Mr. Wise was in attendance at this meeting was because he believes the board has violated Title 36 of the Indiana Code. He had provided board members with a copy of an official opinion by the Attorney General of the State of Indiana, and this opinion states that school corporations must comply with Title 36. Indiana courts have held that "the purpose of competitive bidding statutes is to safeguard the public against fraud, favoritism, graft, extravagance, providence and corruption and to ensure honest competition for the best worker supplies at the lowest reasonable cost." Indiana statutes further state "Statutes that provide for free and open bidding on public work

projects are designed to protect the rights of the public by ensuring that the process be competitive.” Mr. Wise stated that he has watched as the board has moved forward with the project on South Forest Avenue and, although he had many questions, he remained silent. He had presented an official request for documents, which will hopefully answer his questions. He has many questions about the purchase of the Williams property and he is hopeful they will be answered by the furnishing of those requested documents. Mr. Wise referred to the proverbial “straw that broke the camel’s back” as his reason for attending this meeting, which was this board’s action to accept quotes on renovations on the Williams property. He had noticed in a Brazil Times article published following the May 17 school board meeting that Superintendent Tucker had recommended accepting a quote from Sycamore Engineering for \$450,000. His first reaction was, “How can they do that? Any project over \$150,000 must be bid.” Mr. Wise stated that it then became obvious to him that the project had been split into many separate parts to avoid competitive bidding. He urged the board members to check into Indiana Code 36-1-12-19 (b) (c) and (d). He then read that portion of the Indiana Code: “Dividing costs of a single public works project into two or more projects; prohibition; penalty, Section 19 (a): For purposes of this section, the cost of a public work project includes the cost of materials, labor, equipment rental, and all other expenses incidental to the performance of the project. (b) The cost of a single public work project may not be divided into two or more projects for the purpose of avoiding the requirement to solicit bids. (c) A bidder or quoter or a person who is a party to a public work contract who knowingly violates this section commits a Class A infraction and may not be a party to or benefit from any contract under this chapter for two years from the date of the conviction. (d) Any board member or officer of a political subdivision or agency who knowingly violates this section commits a Class A infraction.” Mr. Wise asserted that if he were Sycamore Engineering, he would want to know whether this is one project or if it has been divided. If he were a member of the board, he would definitely want an opinion from the state as to whether they are going to consider this to be one public work project. As he sees it, if the project is being divided so that there doesn’t have to be competitive bidding, somebody will take the school corporation to task on that. Mr. Wise doesn’t have any doubt that what is being done on the Williams project is a public works project. Mr. Wise referred to the past system used by the state of issuing project numbers and in his opinion the state certainly would not have issued multiple project numbers for one building and one site; there would have been one project number. Mr. Wise noted that he is a firm believer in following the law, and he has a lot of questions about things the board has done. As an example, Mr. Wise noted the roof project on the Forest Avenue facility and declaring it an emergency. He stated that the board had to pass a resolution and it must be included in the minutes along with the names of the two people who were asked for quotes (Note: the minutes on file in central office from December 8, 2011, include the emergency resolution). To conclude, Mr. Wise pointed out that any contract that is not in accordance with Indiana Code is void. He urged the board to be very careful.

IV. Old Business

A. Policy 1320 – Method of Selection – REVISION: Second Reading

Superintendent Tucker stated that this is a second reading, but in the interim between the first and second reading, it was discovered that there had been an amendment in

the law having to do with signatures for board member candidates. The old law required twenty-five (25) signatures on petitions, but in the new law the number has been reduced to ten (10). This was the second reading, so with that amendment, approval was recommended.

Mrs. Adams moved to approve the revision to Board Policy 1320 – Method of Selection. Mrs. Kaelber seconded, and the motion was approved by a 6-1 vote with Dr. Buell opposed.

B. Policy 1410 – Annual Reorganization – REVISION: Second Reading

This policy regarding the annual reorganization needed to be revised because of statute that moved the election of school board members from the spring primary election to the fall general election. This was a second reading, and approval was recommended.

Mr. Scherb moved to approve the reorganization policy. Mrs. Beasley seconded, and the motion was approved by a 6-0-1 vote with Dr. Buell abstaining.

V. Superintendent's Report

Superintendent Tucker noted the following:

- Regarding the remodeling that is taking place at what will be the new central office, Superintendent Tucker pointed out that the project is a design/build construction project being overseen by the architect. Hannig is the firm that was selected to complete the project. They have started to take pretty dramatic strides in finishing the building. There are some alternate bids that will be brought back to the board for approval. Mr. Milner determined that some items could be done cheaper and he will be bringing back a recommendation for another company to do work with infrastructure such as computers and camera security. It is looking good and if they continue to work at this pace, Superintendent Tucker is hopeful to be moved in by August and hold the August regular session board meeting at that location.
- The administrative retreat was held last Thursday and it went very well. The newly-adopted Goals and Strategies for the district was revisited and a guest speaker who had done a Best Practices survey in all of the buildings came in and gave the administrators a review of those results as it existed in each building as well as throughout the district. There was also additional R.I.S.E. training in order to be prepared to conduct appropriate and relevant evaluations moving forward in the fall.
- Kathy Knust was commended for facilitating staff development all summer. The teachers were also commended for coming in on their time to give extensive participation in curriculum revision and assessment development.
- Summer cleaning is going well, and is maybe even a little ahead of schedule. An additional update will be provided before school starts.

VI. New Business

A. Recommendation to Award Bids for Milk & Dairy, Bread & Bun Products

The bids for milk & dairy and bread & bun products were opened prior to the May 17 2012, regular session school board meeting. After review, Patty Dyer, Assistant Food Service Director, recommended accepting the bid of Aunt Millie's Bakery for bread & bun products and Prairie Farms for milk & dairy products. Approval was recommended.

Mr. Scherb moved to approve the milk & dairy and bread & bun products bids. Mrs. Adams seconded, and the motion was approved by a 7-0 vote.

B. Textbook Adoption

The miscellaneous textbook adoption recommendations were presented and approval was recommended. Mrs. Heffner noted that some of the classes had e-text available but it will be up to the discretion of the teachers, and she believes that is good. Superintendent Tucker added that it will open up the possibility of being able to access curriculum seven days a week from anywhere.

Mrs. Heffner moved to adopt the textbooks as presented. Mrs. Kaelber seconded, and the motion was approved by a 7-0 vote.

C. Capital Projects Loan

Superintendent Tucker explained that after the school corporation had its 2012 approved budget that went through the public process and the hearings, the budget was submitted to the Department of Local Government Finance (DLGF). After the DLGF has considered the budget, they send back the 1782 notice, and typically that notice is received sometime near the beginning of the second semester. When that notice was received this year, the Department of Local Government Finance had reduced the Capital Projects Levy and the amount that was being asked for. The DLGF had indicated it was due to a calculation they had used. When Superintendent Tucker had questioned that with a couple of other business managers, they indicated that their understanding was they were not allowed to use a negative number calculation. After complaints to the state about this issue, the legislature put in effect an amended law, H.B. 1072, which said DLGF could not use negative numbers in their calculation. In doing that, money that had originally been requested became available to the school corporation again and permission was given to request to have capital projects monies put back into the corporation's 2012 budget, the difference being only slight in terms of the overall size of the capital projects budget. Originally, the corporation was only eligible for a levy of .03050. Because of their error and failure to follow the law, the DLGF had to allow the school corporation to increase that levy to .03134, which is an increase of .0084 per \$100 of assessed valuation. To the school corporation, it would mean an additional \$291,188. In order to get this adjustment back into the capital projects fund, the state has allowed school corporations to adopt a resolution at a board meeting, with the request to be sent back to DLGF for their consideration. If approved, it would be an interest-free loan coming from the state's General Fund. In return, the school corporation would post that difference and it would appear on debt service for next year in the 2013 budget. This would, in fact, increase debt service by about eight-tenths of one penny on \$100 of assessed valuation. Among Superintendent Tucker's

reasons for doing this—she has heard rumors that DLGF may permanently lock in school corporations' CPF tax levies using the present benchmarks. Superintendent Tucker's feeling is that if there was ever a year to go to actual monies that the school corporation originally had coming to it, she doesn't want to bypass a year wherein the corporation may be locked in to a previous levy and not have a higher levy as a permanent benchmark. She explained that it doesn't mean in years forward the higher levy amount would have to be requested; it would just provide a cushion to know that the corporation could go up to that level. She asked the board to consider approval of requesting the capital projects loan from the state General Fund and to sign the resolution if they approve the request.

Before a motion was made, Mr. Scherb clarified that the change in the rate would be eight-tenths of a penny. Mrs. Heffner added that she had contacted Mary Jo Alumbaugh, the Clay County Auditor, and Mrs. Alumbaugh was very clear that this is not going to be a situation where it increases taxes.

Mrs. Heffner moved to accept the capital projects loan that was presented as well as the resolution. Mrs. Beasley seconded, and the motion was approved by a 7-0 vote.

D. Rainy Day Fund Transfer for Pre-School Special Education

Superintendent Tucker pointed out that a few years ago pre-school special education transportation used to be a line item as a levied amount within the local budget. However, the Department of Education took that out as one of the line items, so the money that was already in that fund was set aside in the Rainy Day Fund. At the conclusion of the school year when expenses for special education pre-school transportation are known, a resolution is made to take that money from the Rainy Day Fund and put it into the General Fund for the excess of transportation costs. The amount this year is \$26,592.28. Mrs. Heffner noted that it is approximately the same each year. Approval was recommended.

Mr. Scherb moved to approve the Rainy Day transfer for pre-school special education. Mrs. Heffner seconded, and the motion was approved by a 7-0 vote.

E. Summer Central Office Work Schedule

The past summer the board allowed central office staff to operate on a 40-hour week based on four days. A lot of area corporations do this practice as well. She asked the board's permission and approval to set central office hours at 7:00 a.m. through 5 p.m. for the remainder of June and a portion of July. It is strictly for non-certified staff. Administrators are working portions of those Fridays or taking vacation time.

Mrs. Adams moved to approve the summer central office work schedule for non-certified staff. Dr. Buell seconded, and the motion was approved by a 7-0 vote.

F. Consideration to Appoint New Principal for East Side Elementary

Superintendent Tucker noted that there had been an interview committee that had been working through the process of conducting interviews for the middle school and high school administrative personnel. At the point the resignation of the East Side

Elementary principal had been received, it was determined because of the time constraints to pull that same committee together, which included three board members, the personnel director, and Superintendent Tucker. The committee had previously interviewed both of the candidates, one for an administrative position and another who had interviewed and had been contracted as a consultant for curriculum and instruction and also had an administrative licensure. She noted it was a very hard decision on the part of the committee and the final determination was to go with the candidate who had previous administrative experience and who had come from a demographic that was better suited to East Side in terms of the challenges and also the rewards that would be available for that type of position. The recommendation was to appoint Elizabeth Wernz as the new principal at East Side Elementary, and approval was recommended.

Mrs. Kaelber moved to accept the recommendation and Mrs. Beasley seconded. The motion was approved with a 5-0-2 vote with Mr. Scherb and Dr. Buell abstaining.

G. Renovation Recommendations for 410 W. Pinckley Street Facility

Superintendent Tucker explained that when the Williams property had been purchased, it was at one point under consideration as to whether to go through the same design/build process that had been used for the new central office property at 1013 S Forest Avenue. Sycamore Engineering, who had done projects for the school corporation in the past, was contacted in order to get a ballpark estimate on what the potential costs would be. She noted that Sycamore was gracious enough to not charge for their estimates but they broke down some costs as they saw that would be in the ballpark for some of the separate improvements to the facility. She believes the board was a little overwhelmed at the potential cost, so a work session was held on June 12 to walk through the facility with Tom Reberger, Frank Misner, Chris McVay, who has worked as the corporation's chief mechanic, and Wade Hood of Sycamore Engineering to answer questions about making some of those improvements and why they are necessary. A determination was made to not go with a design/build bid as was done with the American Legion property; rather, it was decided to get into the costs of what had to be done to be able to move over operations. Superintendent Tucker noted that the transportation department would probably not be moved in fully when school starts. She proposed breaking some of the costs down, noting that the board had already approved the final quote on the perimeter fencing. Also, the board had already approved using Mershon/Knust to do the trenching work in the building for the drainage and oil separators.

Superintendent Tucker's first proposal was to go with Sycamore Engineering to provide three-phase 600 amp electrical service to the building at a cost of \$23,255. The existing electrical panels will also need to be replaced at an additional cost of \$2,114. The various wiring and additional electrical materials come at a cost of \$15,855. The energy efficiency of the lighting was also considered and the cost to replace the lighting fixtures would be \$7,401. The total for all of these items through Sycamore Engineering would be \$48,625.

An additional cost for which Superintendent Tucker recommended approval was for a concrete slab on the exterior of the building for a wash bay with a basin and a drain connection for \$5,200 through Mershon/Knust.

Superintendent Tucker's third recommendation was for the above-ground fuel tanks. Chris McVay located only two companies in proximity to Indiana that would make it reasonable to quote the tanks. It was decided to recommend going with a company named W. W. Barnhart, and their quote for the cost and the installation of two above-ground fuel tanks and the necessary equipment was \$124,174.88.

Superintendent Tucker recommended approval of the three separate recommendations: the recommendation for Sycamore Engineering; the recommendation for Mershon/Knust; and, the recommendation for W. W. Barnhart.

Under discussion, Mrs. Adams asked if Barnhart's quote provided for transportation of the tanks to the site. Mr. Misner replied that the quote was for everything.

Mr. Scherb refuted a comment that he had heard earlier in the meeting by stating that the corporation was not going to spend \$450,000 renovating this bus garage. He believes it is not necessary, it is too much money, and the board is going to take its time and do things piece by piece if necessary. The Barnhart quote includes \$56,000 for installation of the tanks, which he believes is too much money and he will not approve it.

Mr. Scherb then offered his thanks to previous boards and previous administrations for putting Rainy Day money aside for the bus garage and central office. Everything being done will be paid for as it is done without any new taxes or levies. However, he doesn't believe there is any reason to get in a hurry and spend big money renovating this building. He is very upset that he allowed the approval last month of the floor drains in this building. After talking to about a dozen people in the last 48 hours, he shares their concern that putting drains on the flat surface in the building will only ruin a perfectly good floor and a lot of money will be spent doing it.

At this point, Mr. Scherb moved to withdraw the approval to install the drains inside the building. Dr. Buell seconded.

Discussion of this motion ensued, with Mrs. Heffner stating that she felt really bad for patrons who had left early because during Board Comments she wanted to address the East Side issue. Regarding the situation with the gentleman who spoke about the law, Mrs. Heffner pointed out that the board has taken direction from the buildings and grounds director and superintendent, and they were asked to look at the transportation facility and make it the most reasonable financially as they could. Speaking as one board member, she wanted to do this incrementally to save money, which may be why it appears to have been pieced out. Mrs. Heffner also wants things to be above-board and transparent and she likes for them to be bid on as well, which is why the board made it policy that bids are to be opened at a public meeting and not before a bid committee. She believes that the board has approached this in a legal manner, and if it has not, then she wants to be corrected. Having said that, she is not sure anything can

be withdrawn except by the person who makes the motion. It was determined that Mrs. Beasley had moved to approve the installation of floor drains at the May school board regular session meeting.

Mrs. Heffner returned to the topic of the East Side principal and noted that she, as a board member, takes into consideration the recommendations given to the board by the committees that take the time to do the interviews. She also noted the time constraints in this particular instance, which is why she felt comfortable with the decision, especially after receiving the resignation from East Side and pursuing filling the vacancy with applicants that had already been received. She totally understands why things sometimes don't seem transparent. Mrs. Heffner responded to a question from the audience asking if there were only three board members who chose the new principal by stating that there were three board members who participated as part of the interview committee. Mrs. Kaelber joined the conversation and noted that her son is a student at East Side. She added that she was a member of the interview committee and she chose that person too.

Discussion was refocused on the issue of rescinding the motion to approve the installation of floor drains. Mr. Scherb's motion was declared void because he was not eligible to make the motion. It was then explained to Mrs. Beasley that since she had moved to approve the drains, she would have to be the person to make a motion to rescind the approval of those floor drains from the last meeting. If she makes the motion and a member of the board seconds it, the board would then vote on whether or not to rescind.

While Mrs. Beasley pondered the issue of the floor drains, Mr. Miller stated that most of the time in a shop setting, it has been his experience that a squeegee would be used to push water into a drain anyway, regardless of whether it has been sloped for that drain or not. He doesn't feel like the garage can do without a floor drain in the building. Mr. Scherb responded by thanking Superintendent Tucker for being concerned about safety. He noted that a slick floor could get someone hurt. However, he feels this drain would not solve that problem. He suggested using materials that could be put down on the floor that would keep it from being slick. Mr. Scherb then stated that he had talked to a lot of contractors who work with concrete. He had been told that floor drains had been installed in the old Quonset hut with less than satisfactory results. Mr. Misner responded by saying that was not true; rather, the drains had helped tremendously. A suggestion from Mr. Scherb was to take the money for the drains and invest it in a wash bay that could be added on to the building. Buses could then be washed 365 days a year in any weather and it could be heated, if desired. The buses could then be put in a bay for service and there would be no water dripping on the floor. Mr. Scherb also suggested heating the floor with radiant heat. Mr. Misner did not disagree with Mr. Scherb, but he pointed out that it would cost a ton of money to build such a wash bay.

Mrs. Beasley asked if there had been two quotes on the drain installation. Superintendent Tucker replied that at the last meeting the board approved to break this out by approving the fence, and she had asked them to seriously consider the installing the drains, which was also approved. In addition, the fiber optic line installation was

approved. Double Bee is the fencing company that was selected, and Mershon/Knust were approved to install the floor drains at a cost of about \$14,500. In addition to what had already been approved, they offered to lay the concrete and install the drain for a wash bay for an additional \$5,200 while they were there to work on the floor drains. Superintendent Tucker asked the board for an initial \$5,200 to Mershon/Knust to do that piece. She pointed out that she had seriously reduced a lot of the costs. She also noted that she had read the same thing that the patron had alluded to in Indiana code and commented that when looking at other school corporations or other building projects within this corporation or normal operations within a school, there are a lot of times that improvements are made to facilities. She believes the contention by the patron was to suggest that something was being done to pad the costs when in fact the intent was to avoid getting into a situation with a huge expenditure that might have resulted with a design/build project.

Mrs. Adams pointed out that she didn't believe anyone considered the board was trying to circumvent anything by breaking these down. She added that when it is broken down, it provides more opportunity for local vendors to be competitive. While acknowledging that some may criticize that approach, she believes the bottom line is that this is our community and the board needs to try its best to keep the community as economically healthy as possible.

Mrs. Beasley shared her decision to not move to rescind her motion to approve the floor drains. Mr. Scherb then moved to approve the \$48,625 in improvements: the three-phase electrical service, electrical panels, wiring and electrical materials, and light fixtures. In addition he moved to approve the \$5,200 concrete wash bay. The motion would exclude the fuel tanks. Mrs. Heffner seconded the motion knowing that the fuel tank costs will be further investigated. Mr. Miller pointed out that the fuel tanks are not needed right away; the existing fuel tanks are functioning and only three blocks away. The motion was approved by a 6-0-1 vote with Dr. Buell abstaining.

H. Northview Athletic Handbook Changes: First Reading

I. Northview Coach's Handbook Changes: First Reading

J. North Clay Middle School Athletic Handbook Changes: First Reading

K. North Clay Middle School Coach's Handbook Changes: First Reading

This was a first reading, so no vote was required for Items VI. H., I., J., and K. These items will be brought back to the July meeting for approval.

L. Cheerleading Program Information

Mrs. Kaelber had requested information relating to the cheerleading program at Northview High School. Board members were provided with that information. Mrs. Ruth Ann Medworth, cheerleader sponsor, was in attendance to answer board members' questions.

Mrs. Kaelber's biggest concern was the demerit system. She noted that use of cigarettes, alcohol or other drugs resulted in only 10 demerits, and she suggested that Mrs. Medworth look at that. Mrs. Kaelber asserted that a teenager would read that to mean that showing up drunk twice would mean she could still be on the squad because

it would only result in 20 demerits. Mrs. Medworth responded by noting that the athletic handbook policy would also kick in to that and she believes the demerits would be in addition to whatever the handbook stated. She would be open to taking a look at that.

Mrs. Heffner asked why there was a separate policy for cheerleaders in addition to the athletic handbook. She personally does not like the separation. Jan Gambill, girls athletic director for Northview and North Clay, stated that the athletic handbook encompasses the whole athletic department and each coach may have rules in addition to the handbook. Mrs. Heffner asked for a copy of each coach's rules.

Mrs. Adams asked if a parent had ever expressed concern over the fact that cheerleaders are required to wear make-up. Mrs. Medworth replied that the make-up was part of their attire. They are also asked to wear their hair the same way. It is part of the performance persona. No one has ever said anything to Mrs. Medworth about make-up. Mrs. Adams noted that she had not had any complaints; it was just a question.

M. Waiver of Retirement Date

The board was asked to consider waiving the retirement date for Regina Paullus who was previously secretary/treasurer of East Side Elementary. Approval was recommended.

Mrs. Heffner moved to accept the waiver of retirement date. Mrs. Kaelber seconded, and the motion was approved by a 7-0 vote.

Prior to the board member comments, Mr. Scott Fosdick once again addressed the board. He commented that he believes the East Side parents who attended the meeting did not understand that there were two applicants interviewed for the principal position; they assumed one person was chosen. He believes it would be great if the board could communicate that to them so that they understand the process. In response, Mrs. Kaelber noted that the board approved a resignation: Someone made a decision that was brought to the board, and the board could not force that person to stay in a position. She added that she had moved her son from another school to East Side last year because it was the better place for him and she cares very much about the other students in that building.

VII. Board Member Comments

Rob Miller stated that one of the things this board had said was that it wanted to be more open, and he believes the board proved that tonight. He noted that a board meeting is not an open forum, by law, and a lot of what can and cannot be done at a board meeting is limited by law. On another topic, Mr. Miller commented that he went to all three graduations and he enjoyed all of those. He deemed this one of the highlights of his year.

Amy Burke Adams stated that, although she wishes she had the kind of influence that was insinuated during patron comments, she was but one of five individuals on the interview committee and she is one of seven board members. She does not have that

kind of influence. She agreed with Mr. Miller that graduations are the highlight of the year and the most joyous and rewarding time of being a school board member.

Forrest Buell read a prepared statement: "I requested an agenda item for the regular June board meeting to discuss and take action on the item I presented at the May board meeting to elect board members to serve only the schools within their individual school district. It is an urgent item to accept or reject. Also, I would like to know how much taxation is being paid by Clay City taxpayers and the total cost of the renovations for the seven current elementary schools. What is the percentage of this amount in the total cost and how much of the total cost of this project is being used for Clay City's elementary school." Superintendent Tucker responded to his comments, noting that at the time he requested that as an agenda item, the board packet had gone out and she was past the time of where it could have been advertised for the June meeting. Dr. Buell requested that this item be added to the July agenda.

Dr. Buell read another prepared statement, as follows: "I wish to inform the general public of Clay City's schools. In 1982, when state approval of Northview High School construction was requested, the state departments who gave approval or disapproval gave that school board a choice. If Clay City schools were left as they were in 1982 and not undermined in any manner, state department approvals for Northview would be given. If Clay City schools were undermined in any manner, no state approvals for Northview would be given. That Clay Community School Corporation board pondered a few days then agreed to not undermine Clay City schools. On this agreement, Northview High School was constructed. However, today Clay City schools have been undermined since this construction. Clay City schools' education is not being delivered as strongly as it was in 1982. The operation of the schools has been weaker. Money in the millions that's paid by Clay City taxpayers has been used outside Clay City's school district. Problems involving staffing have been weakened. The 1982 state department's option for approving Northview was permanent. After the construction phase of Northview, our local school boards have not complied with the state department's request. They said when they gave their approval to leave Clay City schools alone. And I have a feeling, I wasn't on that board I don't think and I don't have that report that came back, the state departments felt that Clay City would have their own school board. The only way they approved Northview was to leave Clay City completely alone, I can't say that extent. Now this is Clay City school patrons: If Clay City schools continue to be undermined, Clay City patrons need to consult with our state departments. If I am still here, I will go with you. If I am not here, take this document and consult with our state departments that approved construction operation of our Clay schools in this 1982 approval of Northview High School. Request separation from Clay Community School Corporation. Clay City schools can survive better in another setting."

Tina Heffner stated that she appreciates all the hard work that is put into the corporation and also, all of the input by the community. As a parent of two Clay City graduates, she stated that sometimes it is what you make it.

Tammy Beasley offered her condolences to the families of the four Northview students and two Northview graduates who have passed away in the last three weeks. She asked to keep their families in our thoughts and prayers.

VIII. Future Agenda Items

Forrest Buell's future agenda item was presented during Item VII. Board Member Comments.

IX. Adjournment

Having exhausted all agenda items, the meeting was adjourned at 9:29 p.m.

The meeting was audio recorded and copies may be requested by contacting the Central Administration Office.