

Several teachers have revealed that administrators have put false and misleading information into their teacher files (even agreeing that it was false but “didn’t matter.”) What does the board do to gather evidence outside that given them by the administrators — especially since they refuse to hear from the teachers themselves on the issue?

The Board has reviewed and investigated the reports that false and/or misleading information was placed in teacher files. The reports have also been investigated by independent, outside agencies. Additionally, the district’s legal counsel, whose duty is to the district and the Board as whole, not to the administration or any individual administrator, has reviewed the allegations and the records, and has consulted with the administration and the Board on more than one occasion. In each case, the allegations that false and/or misleading information was placed in a teacher’s file were not substantiated. The information in each file was objective, accurate, and in many cases, required by law. Additionally, although the Board is not required to and does not conduct “hearings” that are not contemplated by law or Board Policy, it has received written communications from teachers who objected to the content of their personnel files, and those submissions were considered during the Board’s review of the complaints. The Board values its employees, and the vast majority are exemplary educators and staff members. We subscribe to the tenets of fairness, objectivity, and integrity. Although the Board cannot provide the details regarding those few employees who do not meet the standards that this community has the right to expect, we can promise you that every decision made by the Board is rooted in doing what is right and good for students, and our commitment to that standard will not waiver.

Board Policy [KL](#) lays out the proper procedure for a district patron to address the board regarding school personnel. Prior to and including the February meeting, that procedure was even referenced on board meeting agendas. Now, however, that policy-prescribed procedure has been eliminated in practice and on the agendas. Additionally, the school board has stated members will not respond to emails about personnel, so what forum does the public have in which to ask questions and share their perspective so the school board can accurately represent their constituents?

Addressing the board over an issue - Board Policy [KL](#) is in place as referenced. The board by law cannot discuss personnel matters. Personnel matters are confidential. If the public wants to address the board they would follow Board Policy [KL](#). If the matter cannot be settled satisfactorily by the superintendent or designee, a member of the public may request that the issue be put on the Board agenda, using the process outlined in Board Policy. In addition, written comments submitted to the superintendent or the secretary of the Board that are directed to the Board will be provided to the entire Board. The Board is not obligated to address a complaint. If the Board decides to hear the issue, the Board's decision is final. Otherwise, the superintendent's decision on the issue is final.

How the public requests an agenda item - If the public wants to address the board they would follow pBoard Policy [BDDDB-2](#). Any patron or group of patrons desiring to be included on the agenda for the purpose of addressing the Board shall make a request to the superintendent five (5) days prior to the regular Board meeting. The request shall be submitted in writing, and shall provide sufficient detail to explain fully the issue(s) to be discussed. The Board reserves the right to limit the number of and speaking time of spokespersons appearing before the Board. Unless unusual circumstances dictate otherwise, the Board will not make a decision on an issue(s) presented by an individual or group during that particular meeting. The Board reserves the right to waive formalities in emergency situations, within the limitations of state statutes.

If the Board learned that no semblance of due process was provided a targeted teacher, what action would the Board take towards the responsible administrators and on behalf of the targeted teacher?

The Board always has the ability to address concerns regarding administrator performance, if those concerns exist. Additionally, Board Policy provides several avenues for an employee to address concerns through the chain of command, and ultimately to the Board. For example, Board Policy [GBM](#) provides a procedure for filing grievances concerning alleged violation of Board Policy or regulations or the provisions of a collective bargaining agreement. However, it does not include grievances regarding evaluations or remedial documents because those processes are intended to support teachers and assist them in improving their performance. Another avenue in Board Policy [AC](#), which permits teachers (and other employees) who believe they have been discriminated against on the basis of a protected category to file a grievance.

It is important to remember, however, that not every complaint or objection is a matter of due process as defined by law. Due process is required before an employee under contract can be dismissed or demoted. Due process is not required simply because an employee requests to appear before the Board to air a complaint. Nevertheless, as described above, there are various avenues for presenting complaints to the Board under Board Policy, or by simply writing a letter or email to the Board.

Several board policies have been violated by district administrators. What specific means does the school board use to hold those administrators accountable to following the written policy, and what can be done when they don't?

As explained above, there is no evidence that any district administrators violated board policies. In contrast, the review and investigation of the complaints confirms that the administration adhered to both law and policy in every respect. However, if an administrator violates board policy, the administrator is subject to the same remedial, disciplinary, and termination procedures applicable to all other contract employees of the district under board policy and procedure and applicable state and federal law. See, for example, Board Policy [GCPE](#).

What reason does the board offer for defying MO State law that suspensions lasting for more than 60 days must have hearings? So far, the board's responses to requests by at least one employee for his legally required hearing have ranged from "we're not done investigating" to "well, he resigned." The MO State law does not remove the requirement for this hearing once the teacher's employment has ended. The people's elected representatives wrote a law requiring a hearing – and we all recognize that a hearing happens DURING a suspension in order to gather evidence for use in later arriving at an honest conclusion and a determination if the charges were brought forth fairly. The hearing is not to decide whether the employee should be retained, but rather to decide if the information gathered during the investigation is complete and accurate. The hearing does not happen after the verdict is issued. A hearing is not an autopsy, to be done after the investigation is finished. It looks as though the administration is concerned that wrongdoing will be exposed in a public hearing. What other reason can be provided for the refusal to hold a hearing?

The district has unerringly complied with Board Policy [GCPD](#), which is derived directly from state law. Law and policy provide exceptions to the hearing deadline requirement – both temporarily and permanently.

Board Policy GCPD, paragraph 3 - "If an employee is not removed from administrative leave within 30 days of being placed on leave, the district will hold a hearing within 60 days of the date the employee was first placed on leave. The hearing and determination may be continued for good cause but may not continue more than 180 days past the date the employee was placed on administrative leave. This hearing requirement does not apply to an employee who is put on paid administrative leave due to misconduct, or an investigation of misconduct, when the district refers such misconduct to a law enforcement agency or another state or federal agency or when the law enforcement agency or other state or federal agency has commenced its own investigation of the misconduct for which the employee was placed on administrative leave."

The district cannot disclose the specific exceptions that apply in a particular case because such information is closed under the Missouri Open Meetings Act and Missouri common law privacy rights. Additionally, the requirement for a hearing, when it does apply, unequivocally expires once the employee has resigned or is otherwise no longer with the district. Furthermore, the original and continuing purpose of the statute was NOT to expose allegations that the administration unfairly placed an employee on leave without adequate reason based on misconduct or unsatisfactory performance. The underlying motivation for the statute and related policy was to prevent sweetheart deals between boards of education and favored employees whereby the employees were placed on unlimited leave with pay and benefits instead of being terminated.

Board members have claimed several times that they are prohibited from hearing concerns from teachers under investigation because they are required to remain neutral, given the prospect that they might later serve as jury for a District hearing on that teacher's case. This is highly implausible, given that 1) Board policy requires that the superintendent update the Board monthly on the employee's case, eroding any possibility of the Board members' truly being neutral, 2) hearing from the targeted employee could only make the Board more sympathetic to his/her case, and the targeted employee would never contest a hearing outcome on the grounds that the Board was too sympathetic to him/her, and 3) the Board is responsible for evaluating the superintendent – and hearing evidence of his dishonesty is critical to the Board's evaluating him. Are there any remaining reasons, more plausible than those previously proffered, that would explain the Board's absolute refusal to hear from successful veteran teachers when they allege that the superintendent's allegations of them are highly dishonest? What does the Board stand to lose in hearing from veteran teachers who are alleging dishonest and abusive treatment from District administrators?

There are numerous avenues by which teachers may express their concerns. There is no "absolute refusal" to hear from veteran teachers. Indeed, the Board has received numerous, lengthy communications from a few teachers and, as also explained above, those complaints have been reviewed and investigated by different agencies and individuals. To the extent the Board has denied individual, intermediate-level "hearings," those decisions have been based on law, policy, and best practices. The Board is the ultimate decision-maker regarding terminations and is required by law to avoid unalterable predispositions regarding the outcome of potential hearings. Additionally, the Board cannot and should not hold individual "hearing" regarding every employee complaint. And as discussed in detail above, grievance procedures are available to employees when the complaint falls within the parameters of a specific policy.

Multiple board members have told a concerned community member that they implicitly trust an administrator, and that they were unwilling to doubt anything he told them. Do you believe that if a District administrator was lying to you that he would be so clumsy about it that you would be able to spot the lie without considering any evidence from the targeted teacher - that is, that you would just automatically recognize that he was lying and that his alleged evidence was fabricated?

Throughout this entire process, including internal and external review and investigations, there has not been a single indication that any member of the administration has lied, misrepresented, exaggerated, or otherwise deceived the Board, any employee, or the public. Instead, the concerns expressed regarding employee performance have been substantiated internally and externally. The concerns are rooted in fact, evidence, and duty to students. The Board does not come to any situation with a blind loyalty to any individual or particular point of view. Trust is a foundation for a working relationship, it is not a wall to hide the truth. The Board has the intelligence and resources to determine if the information it has received is fabricated, and it has carefully and thoroughly determined that the information provided by the administration regarding personnel matters is objective, truthful, and corroborated.

If a person has absolute proof that an administrator is not acting with integrity, what is the proper protocol for them to be heard?

Board Policy [GBM](#) and [AC](#) apply. Contact the Compliance Officer, Jeff Simpson, for forms and information.

Leaders such as those elected to positions of decision-making for a school set an example for those under their care, including students. As such, they should be definitely held to a much higher standard of behavior. However, even a minimal standard should certainly disqualify them if they commit a crime. One board member's criminal actions at the felony level have raised quite a commotion in the community as they've recently become public. Is the board planning any type of public reprimand or censure for that member, including calling for his resignation?

Under Missouri law, a Board member must be convicted of a felony to be rendered ineligible to serve. That has not occurred. The Board of Education does not have the authority to remove a member from the Board, and Missouri has no recall mechanism for school boards. The voters of the district determine who is elected and/or re-elected to the Board. The Board is not permitted to formulate a "plan" outside a Board meeting to take action at a future Board meeting. Board actions can occur only during a properly-called meeting, pursuant to motions and votes taken during the meeting.

Is the Board aware of the superintendent's having ranted at the city council a couple of years ago that if the city didn't pass a mask ordinance then he would shut down the school at the first case of COVID in the school? Does this seem to you consistent with how city government should operate? If you are aware of this, how do you feel about it? If you are not aware of it, are you interested in the details?

Click on this [link](#) to view the city council meeting. Dr. Bauman addressed the city council beginning at 1:14:57 to 1:56:51. The date of the meeting was August 10, 2020.

The Missouri chapter of the National Education Association has published a document calling for Missouri legislators to strengthen the Missouri Teacher Tenure Act (https://www.mnea.org/sites/default/files/publications/Legal_Advocacy/dueprocesstenure.pdf), given that it offers only procedural protection but not substantive protection. In other words, they note that this act offers no protection for a teacher who is falsely accused. There is no opportunity to challenge a dismissal on the basis of the substance of the allegations against a teacher. The Missouri Teacher Tenure Act only offers protection for a teacher if the district violates the prescribed procedure for firing him/her (in terms of timeliness, notifications, etc.). Given this, do you believe it is possible that an administrator could – EVEN IF YOU THINK THEY WOULD NOT – fabricate allegations against a teacher to drive him/her from the District?

What should due process look like for a teacher accused of misconduct? Specifically:

- Is a teacher under investigation entitled to know what board policy governs the investigation?
- Should the accused be given opportunity to know and answer concerns before those concerns emerge as formal accusations in a Professional Improvement Plan or notice of deficiency?
- Is it appropriate that a teacher be informed he is being investigated for one specific reason only to subsequently be charged with a lengthy list of fabricated concerns never before presented to him?
- If the superintendent developed a personal vendetta against a teacher and the superintendent's best friend was charged to conduct an investigation into that teacher, would the investigator's friendship with the superintendent threaten the integrity of the investigation?

All teachers are required to read the employee handbook. This document details the issues referenced above and refers to the policies involved: [GBM](#), Staff Grievances, [GCPE](#), Termination of Professional Staff Members, [GCPD](#), Suspension of Professional Staff Members and [AC](#). Prohibition against illegal discrimination, harassment and retaliation apply.

The Board has reviewed and investigated the reports that false and/or misleading information was placed in teacher files. The reports have also been investigated by independent, outside agencies. Additionally, the district's legal counsel, whose duty is to the district and the Board as whole, not to the administration or any individual administrator, has reviewed the allegations and the records, and has consulted with the administration and the Board on more than one occasion. In each case, the allegations that false and/or misleading information was placed in a teacher's file were not substantiated. The information in each file was objective, accurate, and in many cases, required by law. Additionally, although the Board is not required to and does not conduct "hearings" that are not contemplated by law or board policy, it has received written

communications from teachers who objected to the content of their personnel files, and those submissions were considered during the Board's review of the complaints. The Board values its employees, and the vast majority are exemplary educators and staff members. We subscribe to the tenets of fairness, objectivity, and integrity. Although the Board cannot provide the details regarding those few employees who do not meet the standards that this community has the right to expect, we can promise you that every decision made by the Board is rooted in doing what is right and good for students, and our commitment to that standard will not waiver.

If District administrators provided the Board derogatory information about a teacher within the District and the teacher thereafter formally requested in writing to be provided a copy of this derogatory information, can you think of any reason why the District would refuse to provide this information?

Teachers see all evaluations, letters of concern and/or reprimand, performance improvement plans, notices of deficiencies, statements of charges, and other remedial or disciplinary documents. They have access to their personnel files for purposes of review pursuant to Board Policy [GBL](#). The only circumstances under which an employee might not be able to directly review a document pertaining to “derogatory” information would be confidential information in an investigation file concerning a complaint filed against the employee by another party or information protected from disclosure by attorney-client privilege. However, in all cases, the employees is advised of the “derogatory” information – including the allegations against the employee and the documents (if any) that underlie those allegations.

Are you aware that RSMo § 105.55 not only prohibits the District from imposing comprehensive gag orders on teachers, as they have repeatedly done, but also requires that the District “prominently post a copy of this section [of this law] in locations where it can reasonably be expected to come to the attention of all employees of the public employer”? What is your plan for ensuring that this notice is put in front of District employees, so that they can know when a District gag order exceeds its legal authority? Do you believe that embedding this disclosure within the mountain of mandatory readings teachers face at the beginning of each school year, embedding it within a voluminous employee handbook, or inserting it into an encyclopedic list of District policies satisfies the requirement that it be reasonably expected to come to the attention of all employees?

The district is required to provide notice of a myriad of laws and regulations at the beginning of each year and to post notice of most of them in prominent locations. The district complies fully with the law in meeting these obligations. Additionally, the district has not imposed prohibited “gag orders.” Section 105.055.4(4) specifically permits a public employer to restrict or take disciplinary action against an employee if an employee knows that information is false, the information is closed or confidential under the open meetings law or any other law, the information relates to the employee’s own violations, abuse of authority, or endangerment of the public health or safety.

Board Policy [GBM](#) and [AC](#) apply. Contact the Compliance Officer, Jeff Simpson, for forms and information.

If you became convinced that the superintendent has been consistently lying to you about the evidence against teachers he wants gone, with the full complicity of other district administrators, what would you do to him/them? Are you willing to consider that evidence?

There is no evidence that this is occurring. However Board Policy [GBM](#) and [AC](#) apply. Contact the Compliance Officer, Jeff Simpson, for forms and information.

At this evening's Town Hall, at least one school board member insisted that despite the lack of any substantive protection within the Missouri Teacher Tenure Act, there were still multiple layers of recourse available to a targeted teacher up to and including filing a lawsuit against the school district. Since a lawsuit is prohibitively expensive for most teachers, would the Board please explain what the additional layers of protection and recourse are which exist beyond the Teacher Tenure Act and appealing to the school board but short of a lawsuit?

Board Policy [GBM](#), [GCPD](#) and [AC](#) apply. Contact the Compliance Officer, Jeff Simpson, for forms and information.

The school district hired a specialized director of communications that has no teaching degree, whose sole focus is to oversee the communication technology with the schools and the community. However, the budget of millions and millions of dollars of real estate that Ozark taxpayers finance is overseen by a history teacher with no engineering degree or background in construction, Curtis Chessic. Please explain why you have not hired a specialized construction engineer for this multi-million \$\$ budget position who the architects and contractors have to report to, to avoid wasting taxpayers \$\$s?

In any building project, we rely on experts. This includes architects, engineers, construction managers, etc. A focus area in the coursework within the superintendent degree program is organizational management. Below are the requirements for a [superintendent certification](#).

An applicant for a Missouri Initial Administrator Certificate (Superintendent, Kindergarten-Grade 12) who possesses good moral character may be granted an Initial Administrator Certificate (Superintendent, Kindergarten-Grade 12) subject to the certification requirements found in 5 CSR 20-400.500 and the following additional certification requirements specific to Superintendents:

(A) Professional Requirements. An Initial Administrator certificate, valid for a period of four (4) years from the date of issuance, will be issued to applicants meeting the following requirements:

1. A permanent or professional Missouri certificate of license to teach;
2. A minimum of three (3) years of experience as a building- or district-level administrator at a public or accredited nonpublic school;
3. The applicant must achieve a score equal to or in excess of the qualifying score on the required exit assessment(s) as defined in 5 CSR 20-400.310 and 5 CSR 20-400.440. The official score shall be submitted to the department;
4. Completion of a course in Psychology/Education of the Exceptional Child;
5. Completion of an educational specialist or advanced degree program in educational leadership and recommendation from the designated official of a regionally accredited college or university or other education leadership program approved by the department which shall include:
 - A. Specific courses (must be separate graduate courses of at least two (2) semester hours)-
 - (I) Foundations of Educational Administration, including components of Career and Special Education;
 - (II) School Supervision; and
 - (III) School Law;
 - B. Knowledge and/or competency in each of the following areas:
 - (I) Vision, Mission, and Goals-
 - (a) Developing and articulating a vision; and
 - (b) Implementing and stewarding a vision;
 - (II) Teaching and Learning-
 - (a) Promoting positive school culture;

- (b) Promoting effective instructional programs;
 - (c) Ensuring comprehensive professional growth plans; and
 - (d) Data and assessment;
 - (III) Management of Organizational Systems-
 - (a) Managing the organizational structure;
 - (b) Leading personnel;
 - (c) Managing resources; and
 - (d) Processes of effective evaluation of educators;
 - (IV) Collaboration with Families and Stakeholders-
 - (a) Collaborating with families and other community members;
 - (b) Responding to community interests and needs; and
 - (c) Mobilizing community resources;
 - (V) Ethics and Integrity-
 - (a) Personal and professional responsibilities;
 - (VI) The Education System-
 - (a) Understanding the larger context;
 - (b) Responding to the larger context; and
 - (c) Influencing the larger context;
 - (VII) Professional Development-
 - (a) Increasing knowledge and skills based on best practices; and
- C. Directed field experiences in superintendency of at least three (3) semester hours.

Maintained real estates - Who is the supervisor of all the maintenance departments to whom the building maintenance personnel report to. Please explain the tasks of the building maintenance personnel and the tasks of the supervisor of all maintenance

The Maintenance Director is responsible for overseeing the maintenance workers assigned to the buildings. We have three levels of maintenance workers. Their job descriptions can be found below. In summary, they are responsible for maintaining electrical, plumbing, HVAC, and general maintenance. They are also responsible for ensuring the proper contractors are called when items exceed their knowledge or skill level.

- Director of Maintenance
- Maintenance Supervisor
- Maintenance 3
- Maintenance 2
- Maintenance 1

The minutes of the October board meeting showed the approval of the Change Orders for Tiger Paw #9 and the OIC #19. This means that the construction plans had changed 9 times during the remodel of Tiger Paw and 19 times during the remodel of the OIC. Changing the construction plans 19 times seems particularly excessive given that a change order generally means more money will be spent to cover the change. How does the district ensure that taxpayer money is being spent wisely and prudently for all of the construction that is going on?

"Change order" is just the industry term for an amendment to a construction contract that changes the contractor's scope of work. Most change orders modify the work required by contract documents (which, in turn, usually increases the contract price) or adjust the amount of time the contractor has to complete the work, or both. For there to be a valid change order, the District and contractor must both agree on all terms.

The district has a Board Policy on change orders, [FEF-1](#), Construction Contracts Bidding and Awards. We are managing our change orders according to policy. Examples of change orders include the District's desire to move the location of a wall to accommodate some other design element, adding a window where there was none in the original plans, or changing the finish of the floors from tile to terrazzo. These types of change orders are known as additive change orders, but there are also change orders which delete portions of the work; these are known as deductive change orders and typically result in a decrease in the contract price. We ensure that money is being spent wisely because all change orders are sent to the board for review and approval.

The changes were said to be made in the name of safety but this is incredibly dangerous and my children were terrified at the thought. Since we were not able to remedy this situation with the transportation department, we have had to switch our children to car riders. With our children all being in the same school for this year, and this year only, concerns arise for the future, and wondering how we will be able to shuttle our children to all the different schools on time. Do our taxes not pay for safe transportation to and from schools?

We safely transport all of our students to and from schools. Board Policy [EEA](#) and [EEAB](#) govern our decisions on transportation. If a community member believes there is a safety issue that has not been addressed at the level of inquiry, we encourage you to pursue this issue at the next level.

South Elementary just had a water main break severe enough that a second grade class had to evacuate out the windows and the OIC has had several recent water intrusions. What are the plans to keep mold from developing in these buildings? We don't want another massive mishandling of a mold situation like is currently happening at the Ozark Middle School.

There is no mold problem at the Middle School. The Ozark Middle School has had its air quality tested 11 times in the past four years. As part of the inspection, a licensed inspector checks the room, including cabinets on top of and behind furniture. On November 6, 2019, every room in the building was inspected, and air quality tests were performed. The district encouraged two teachers, selected by Middle School teachers, to walk around with the inspector and verify their process and thoroughness.

During the November 6, 2019 test, 37 rooms tested below detectable levels, and 25 rooms tested below 200 ppm of common airborne molds (*Penicillium* /*Aspergillus* and *Cladosporium*) with an outside sample of 1,546. The purple hut and room 106 tested slightly higher than the outside sample. The purple hut is an open-air common space and would have near equilibrium with the outside air. Room 106 scored 1,974 PPM, which was higher than the outside sample. The inspector found no visible mold growth. Out of an abundance of caution, the district contracted a remediation company to come in and clean the entire space, from the trusses to the floor tile. The cleaners found several items leading to the higher count. Mainly a teacher-provided portable whiteboard from Walmart that was overused and became moldy on the cork backing, along with several personal cooking utensils. The whiteboard was removed, and utensils were cleaned.

During an air quality test on October 25, 2019, it was determined that the art room had *Stachybotrys*, commonly referred to as "black mold." This is not a commonly occurring airborne spore, so the district required a remediation company to come in to mitigate it. During this process, the source was determined to be several old printer paper boxes that were used to store wet clay student projects as they waited to go into the kiln. The mitigation process was completed, and the air was retested. No signs of *Stachybotrys* were present on the retest. The district tested art rooms across the district to ensure there were no *Stachybotrys* in any art classrooms. The results came back clean for all buildings. The district held a district-wide meeting for all art teachers to ensure they knew not to store clay in or on cardboard in the future. Parents of students at the middle school were informed of the findings and results.

Multiple indoor air quality tests have been conducted by multiple licensed have been completed since November 2019. The tests continue to come back clear.

South Elementary's water supply line for the heating system broke, and water entered the hallway and one classroom. The water was extracted from the floor using three water extractors. Fans were put in place to continue the drying process for the floor. The district decided to change out the existing 30-plus-year-old supply and return lines with a licensed HVAC company. This required the suspended ceiling tiles to be removed. The hall tiles were scheduled to be replaced in the summer of 2023. The district decided to replace the 3rd and 2nd-grade hall while they were out. The district continues to utilize mold-resistant ceiling tiles.

The OIC has had the following performed at the expense of the contractor's and subcontractor's insurance by a licensed water intrusion contractor.

- Entry Way – 2 Ft Drywall cut on all wall
- Office 1 – 2 Ft Drywall cut on all wall
- Office 2 – 2 Ft Drywall cut on all wall
- Classroom 6 – 2 Ft Drywall cut on East, West and South wall
- Classroom 7 – 2 Ft Drywall cut on East & South Walls
- Office 4 – Tear out & replace all Drywall
- Office 3 – Tear out & replace all Drywall
- Storage Area 1 – 2 Ft Drywall cut on all wall
- Hallway 1 – Tear out & replace all Drywall
- Classroom 4 – Tear out & replace all Drywall on East wall
- 2 Ft Drywall cut on North, South and West
- Classroom 5 – 2 Ft Drywall cut on all walls
- Hallway 2 – 2 Ft Drywall cut on all walls
- Classroom 3A – 2 Ft Drywall cut on West wall
- Classroom 3 – Detach & Reset Lower Cabinets
- 2 Ft Drywall cut on West wall and 45 Ft on North wall
- West Hall 1 – 2 Ft Drywall cut on South wall 24 Ft
- East Hallway 2 – 2 Ft Drywall cut on South wall 17 Ft

Every building in which my child has attended school has leaked on them when it rains, including the new OIC, which leaked before the interior construction even began. Students in the district report this as a common occurrence. Why do we have the budget to put brand new turf on the football field but not repair the roofs of the schools?

The district has multiple policies that cover facilities, construction and maintenance. Board Policy [FB](#) states the board will review the long-range facility plan. Board Policy [ECB](#) refers to preventive maintenance to protect and improve the district's facilities. The facilities improvement plan reviews the hundreds of thousands of square feet of roof each year. As with any building, roofs will leak as they age and are repaired as needed when the leaks appear.

The Turf was replaced for safety reasons. The wearing down of the artificial blades and the normal deterioration of the playing service required a change to ensure player safety. It also needed to be replaced to meet impact and concussion testing standards due to normal deterioration of the surface. The cost of the installation is offset by the advertising on the field and sidelines.

The process of replacing the High School Roof has begun. During the summer of 2022, three large sections of the High School roof were replaced. During the summer of 2018 and 2019, the Middle School roof was torn off and replaced. North Elementary roof was torn off and replaced in 2012. West Elementary was new in 2008. The South Elementary roof was coated in 2018. The OIC has gone through a complete tear-off and replacement. Tiger Paw and Junior high have multiple install dates on their roofs.

The District is seeking requests for proposals for performance contracts. Included in the contract is the replacement of the High School, East Elementary, South Elementary, and Junior High School roofs. The district continues to use multiple contractors to repair leaks as they occur.

Are you aware the new OIC has no handicap accessible entrance to the main east doors nor the district office doors on the north? What is the plan to remedy that situation, who is responsible for it, and how much extra money is it going to cost to redo that?

The 2018 city code does not require push button handicapped door access. However, this can be reviewed under our facility improvement plan that would include funding. The accessibility was addressed in the following way. The east doors and entry sidewalk to the OIC are designed to be accessible sidewalks. DeWitt can provide as-built spot elevations confirming they installed it per our plans to say 100% they are accessible.

The Admin space on the north was not modified or changed during that project. It already had accessible parking spaces and an access ramp on the front of that building. We did not modify the building and therefore we did not change or modify parking as it was existing. That being said, the accessible spaces need to be re-stripped and updated signage added.

A Board member told a concerned community member that the School Board will not hear complaints from teachers because the teachers don't work for the School Board, only the Superintendent works for the School Board. This same position was shared with another community member by a different board member. Is it really the Board's position that:

- 1) the Board is not responsible for teachers' working conditions**
- 2) the Board is not willing to hear concerns from teachers, and if that is true**
- 3) How does a teacher who has a concern with their supervisor or administrator properly go about making that concern known.**

In accordance with state law, specifically Section 162.301(3), no person may be employed unless approved by vote of a majority of the whole Board. That requires four affirmative votes, regardless the number of members present. So, procedurally, the Board does hire more than one employee. Indeed, it hires all school employees. However, the Board hires only one employee whose responsibility is to report directly to the Board. That person is the superintendent of schools. The superintendent supervises the next level of administrators, who in turn supervise those who report to them, and so forth.

Under Missouri law, only the Board can dismiss an employee under contract during the term of the contract (e.g., tenured teachers or employees whose contracts have not expired). This requires a statement of charges and a hearing, if the employee chooses not to resign. The Board also has the sole authority to renew or non-renew employees who are under contract for a specific term upon the expiration of that kind of contract (e.g., probationary teachers, administrators on one- or two-year contracts, etc.).

As permitted by Missouri law, and in accordance with Board Policy [GDPE](#), the superintendent may terminate employees who are not under contract (“at-will” employees). The termination must be reported to the Board of Education. The superintendent’s decision will stand unless reversed by the Board.

Therefore, the Board does hire only one superintendent whose duty is to report directly to the Board. But the Board also hires all other employees of the district, and each of those employees is an essential link in the chain of command.

Board Policy [GBM](#) and [AC](#) apply. Contact the Compliance Officer, Jeff Simpson, for forms and information.

Why is there a dedicated Weight Training II class for high school students that specifically excludes “non-athletes”? Weight training is a sport, and competitions exist worldwide for those who chose to train, regardless of age. Sports are supposed to be extracurricular activities, so why is there a dedicated class only offered to athletes during school hours that our tax dollars are paying for? I would imagine that every student should be able to take all classes offered as long as prerequisites are met and frankly, being in an extracurricular activity should never be a qualifying prerequisite for any class offered during the regular school day. Students are not required to be in the math league to take Algebra II after they have taken Algebra I, and this is no different.

Is it possible for a non-athlete to take a Weights II class? The short answer is yes. However, they would most likely be enrolled in Weights I.

The Weights I course is open to all students. The Weights II course requires a coach's signature to enroll. Regarding the curriculum, the core lifting program is the same in both Weights I and II. The rationale of Weights II requiring teacher permission is instructional planning and application tailored to ensure safety for student athletes whether in season, out of season, or on game day. If non-athlete students wish to take weights, they are enrolled in Weights I. If non-athlete students wish to take weights and there are irreconcilable conflicts within their schedule and the class size allows, they could take Weights II.

Course descriptions from the handbook:

Boys Weights I

HS0406

(.5 credit, Gr. 10-12, can be taken only one block per semester)

PE credit

Prerequisite: Doctor's physical is required before class begins

A class designed to teach basic weight lifting techniques which will improve strength, endurance, flexibility and conditioning. May be repeated for credit.

Boys Weights II

HS0406A

(.5 credit, Gr. 10-12, can be taken only one block per semester)

PE credit

Prerequisite: Coach's signature, doctor's physical is required before class begins

A class designed to teach basic weight lifting techniques which will improve strength, endurance, flexibility and conditioning. May be repeated for credit.

If you have any concerns or questions regarding class schedules or courses contact the building administrator or counselor.

Why are mandatory absences directly related to a student being quarantined due to COVID being counted against a student? This is a circumstance that is out of our control as students and parents, and should not negatively impact our students. If the CDC requires the absence, and therefore the school, it should be excused and not count as time missed when the work is being made up.

Absentees are all counted the same at this point. We follow Board Policy JED.

COVID absences for this school year are treated like any other absence that a parent reports to the school or nurse. CDC guidance is still to isolate for 5 days for a positive case; however, it is difficult to monitor those in any capacity. In regard to the last two years, we did our best to provide students opportunities to make up work, join classes synchronously when possible, and collaborate with teachers, students, and parents to ensure students could access materials and make up the assignments. Absences for COVID and quarantines were coded differently with the guidance from DESE. As such, that process has ceased. OHS Student Handbook Attendance p. 14 - “Attendance procedures are in place but the goal is to encourage attendance not create punitive measures for absences. Our goal is to ensure that students have opportunities to achieve their potential which includes attending class, completing assignments and performance on assessments.” Parents can contact the school office if they have specific questions.

What do we need to do to effectively change the grading policy? Currently, our students' grades are so heavily weighted by test scores alone that even if our students are scoring perfectly on all class work/homework, yet buckling under the pressure of test taking, they are failing. For example, Biology is 100% test and lab scores. Zero points are obtained by classwork or homework. In math courses, 95% of their grades are from test performances, while a meager 5% is from classwork and homework. A test can be only 16 questions and worth 100 points, while homework is 20-25 problems (give or take) and only worth 4 points. This is not how colleges grade performance, or even how our jobs reflect our performances, so it's setting very unrealistic expectations for our students and just not giving them a fair shake at being graded for what they are actually capable of. So to reiterate my question, how do we initiate change effectively?

One of the goals for the learning division this year is better assessment literacy. Teams from each building, pK - 12, are attending a 6 day assessment coaching academy spaced throughout the school year. The teams use the understanding gained to apply within each building and to disseminate through professional learning (PLC) team meetings and professional development during the year and within our PLC Academy in August of each year. The District Curriculum Council (DCC) submits a Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment Plan (2022) to the board each spring. Parents serve on the DCC along with teachers, administrators, support personnel, community members, and board members. If someone is interested in serving on the DCC, please contact Dr. Carson's office.

We intend for grades to measure individual student achievement in mastering the learning objectives while not factoring in student behaviors. According to O'Connor (2011) there are three purposes for assessment: 1) diagnostic, 2) formative, and 3) summative. It would be unfair for a student to receive a grade from diagnostic assessments such as a pretest since the assessment takes place prior to instruction. Formatives, such as quizzes and homework, would also be unfair to assign a grade as they are used by both the teacher and student to diagnose areas targeted for improvement and growth toward mastery of the standards. Thus, only summative assessments such as tests, projects, performances, or similar assignments can accurately be used to judge a student's achievement following a sequence of instruction. This aligns with Board Policy IK Academic Achievement which requires teaching staff to meet the following obligation as it pertains to student evaluation: Insofar as is possible, distinctions will be made between a student's attitude and academic performance.

The expectation of all teachers is that if they assign value (a grade) to an assignment in the gradebook, then that grade must be recoverable and the student be given an opportunity to relearn the material and make the corrections necessary to demonstrate they have learned the material on the assessment. The student and teacher must determine what caused the student's inability to display mastery of the objectives/standards, and create a plan to reteach, relearn, and

reassess. This does not mean simply retaking the assessment. There must be a diagnosis of growth needed for mastery and why the student struggled prior to the reassessment being given.

In regard to Biology classes, they are in compliance with this expectation. See below from Biology Syllabus:

Practice activities will not be penalized with grades. This practice is essential to learning and therefore grades will only be determined through labs, projects, and tests. The final each semester can account for up to 10% of your final grade. There will be an EOC (End of Course) exam at the conclusion of second semester. **This exam may be worth a portion of your grade.**

If you miss class, need help, or want to retake an assessment, students will need to schedule a time with me. TIGER time and/or after school tutoring can be used for this and needs to be discussed with me so that we can get you scheduled for a time to come in.

Assignments and Summative exams can be redone or retaken. However, the student needs to come in for at least one tutoring session PRIOR to the redo/ retake. This can be done during Tiger Time or after school.

I have addressed each of these questions within the school and have either been ignored completely or told that it is regulated at the state level. I called the MO State Board of Education to inquire further and they insist that these three things are out of line with what the state believes is fair, and are rules in place on the local level only. The finger pointing continues to go back and forth, and I only want to know: How do we initiate change to include all students in classes that are being funded by ALL tax-paying families (not just athletes), and how do we ensure that our students are able to be fairly represented by their grades and attendance? Test grades should never exceed more than 15-20% of a student's overall grade for any class.

Parent voice is welcomed and needed. If any parent would like to volunteer to serve on open committees, please contact Dr. Carson's office to become involved. If a parent would like to attend a meeting while not serving on the committee, that is allowed as well. The wellness committee dates are published [here](#). For other committees, please contact the office for more information.

With the influx of new housing in the area, there seems to be a pressing need for an additional elementary school in the district. It's my understanding this is a part of the long range plan. Are there any updates on the plans of this additional elementary school?

In the [current plan](#) we would be looking at a new elementary school in four years. According to the demographic study, we are on track.

If you look on page 25 of the [demographic study](#), it shows the projected growth of the buildings. The numbers in yellow tell us the student population is at the level we need to make adjustments.

How do you respond to the information out in social media, that our school board abuses its power and doesn't hold administration accountable for their actions?

These claims are false and defamatory and the individuals who post such allegations are well aware that they are not true. Nevertheless, they post them anyway. The Board is committed to providing the best education possible for district students in a positive and supportive working environment. All Board decisions are focused on that goal, and the Board would not tolerate anything other than that from the administration. Administrators are held accountable through the evaluation, remediation, and termination process, just like all other employees of the district.