

Cooperative School Boards Work Session  
RCW 43.30.080

Monday, May 15, 2017  
St John-Endicott High School HFL Room 6:00-8:00 PM

St. John School Board Vice Chair Jim Rogers and Endicott School Board Chair Marvin Schmick called their respective boards to order and jointly opened the work session at 6:00 PM.

Attendance:

Endicott School Board

Marv Schmick  
Nancy Anderson  
Jamie Misner  
Greta White  
Debbie Schlomer

St. John School Board

Jim Rogers  
Alan Blumenshein  
Val Brewer  
ShantyI McGuire

Others In Attendance: Suzanne Schmick, Mark Purvine, Bruce Porubek, Dana Crider, Darrell Miller, Billy Ray, Michelle Stach, Linda Greenhalgh, Lori Loomis, Amanda Webb, Kelli Melhus, Rod & Jessica Mills, Mac & Karen Mills, Christy Thrasher, Shani Hergert, Travis & Rachell Anderson, Rick & Tammy Fox, Heidi Hough, Laura Jones, Michelle Welch, Tia Langston, Gary & Janet Luft, Bill & Cathy Parrish.

By the request of St John board member Valerie Brewer, Superintendent Schmick announced that director Brewer would be making a recording of this work session.

Superintendent Schmick reviewed the agenda for the meeting. She explained that Public Comment will be heard for 30 minutes. It is not intended to be a debate session but rather a great opportunity to hear your thoughts. She further explained that there will be no public comment at the SJE and LaCrosse work session tomorrow night as she feels the public comment belongs in the SJE meeting to answer questions and concerns raised in the St John and Endicott communities over the last two weeks.

Superintendent Schmick reviewed for the group where St John and Endicott schools are in the process of possibly forming a sports coop with LaCrosse. Two public forums have been held and the two main items that came from the public forums were 1.) Continue work with LaCrosse and 2.) Conduct a self-study of SJE/ESJ athletic programs. Superintendent Schmick stated that a committee was formed to assess and make recommendations for SJE/ESJ athletics. The committee was formed with members from both communities that represent elementary, middle school and high school. Members of the committee include: St John Principal Mark Purvine, Endicott Principal Bruce Porubek, SJE Athletic Director Darrell Miller, ESJ Athletic Director Billy Ray Jr. along with St John community members Bill Parrish, Dr. Lundberg, Heidi Hough and Endicott community members Tia Langston,

Linda Greenhalgh and Steve Selk. The formal report from the self-study will be presented at the regular board meeting on Monday, May 22<sup>nd</sup>.

At the last work session with LaCrosse, their board members presented their proposal. Superintendent Schmick reiterated that the 6-points are not demands but rather ideas. She asked the group gathered to keep in mind that the St John and Endicott boards have not convened to discuss the 6-points on the proposal since they received it during the April 26 work session. They plan to discuss tonight after public comment.

The St John and Endicott boards directed Superintendent Schmick to prepare a mailer asking for input from patrons regarding the “ALL Sports” clause that was listed in the boards’ original proposal with LaCrosse made at the public forums. The mailer asked patrons and families: Would the public be in favor of moving forward with high school athletics in 2017-18 without volleyball or should we wait until 2018-19 when all sports will be combined with LaCrosse. The results of the survey are as follows:

- 221** Yes, please go ahead and start the SJEL High School Sports Cooperative in 2017-18 without Volleyball.  
130 = St John  
91 = Endicott
  
- 81** No, please wait until 2018-19 to start the SJEL High School Sports Cooperative with Volleyball included.  
68 = St John  
13 = Endicott
  
- 5** No decision = St John

Superintendent Schmick then opened the floor to public comment at 6:18 pm. Summary of questions and comments is as follows:

- Appreciation was shown for the boards’ continued hard work
- Disappointed that another public forum has not been scheduled for the public to provide input regarding LaCrosse’s proposal. Also, doesn’t feel enough information has been given to the public to be able to make an informed decision on the survey that was mailed out in early May. We should be able to play sports with LaCrosse without giving them voting and decision-making rights. They are joining our sports programs. Does not want to help a dying town.
- Are we going to gain many students by joining with LaCrosse? Why haven’t we spent time fixing what is broken instead of so much time on LaCrosse discussions?
- LaCrosse kids have had great attitudes, they’re coachable and they’re positive examples to our kids.
- There has been plenty of information due to the fact this has been discussed at board meetings and work sessions for a year. No need for another public forum. If people want more information then they need to attend board meetings/work sessions or visit with administration at the school.

- LaCrosse is very aggressive about getting their athletes to places where they can play. For example, a LaCrosse senior is playing baseball at Colfax this spring since SJE did not have a team. Concerned that our districts don't do the same for our kids. We need to do what's best for our kids.
- Applauds St John community for keeping the town alive but would like to see St John have a more welcoming hand. Put the shoe on the other foot; LaCrosse is giving up quite a bit to find a place for their kids to participate in sports. Do what's best for kids.
- No one is saying we do not want the kids. Sometimes LaCrosse kids are better than our own. This has nothing to do with the kids.
- Concerned about moving activities out of our towns and how it will hurt businesses. Also concerned about practice duration due to more time away from home for families in the northern portion of the St John district. Academics should come first, then sports. Focus on SJE.
- A local business owner did not receive the survey. Even though not involved with the schools, it affects employees and friends in the community. *Superintendent Schmick explained that the mailing list is generated by information provided by the Elections office in Colfax along with our school families.* It was suggested that property tax payers might be a better source for the mailing list.

At 6:40 pm Superintendent Schmick closed the public comment portion of the session due to no other public comment.

Discussion then moved to the six points of the LaCrosse proposal. Superintendent Schmick encouraged the boards to keep in mind this is a wish list from LaCrosse. Each item was discussed individually as described below:

**1. Finances: If ALL-in, then LaCrosse pays 25% of all athletic expenses for each season.**

- a. Rationale: With only having 1 game per sport, we are not equal members in regards to playing sites.**
- b. LaCrosse is paying to transport athletes for practices and games.**

If not ALL-in, what does that mean in terms of finances? Need more clarification from LaCrosse. Are we going to request more money from LaCrosse? 30% was mentioned as an acceptable amount for all sports in both middle school and high school.

**2. Practices: The week of the LaCrosse game site, Coaches will/can schedule some practices at the LaCrosse campus.**

- a. Rationale: Give kids and coaches the home site feel and experience**

Superintendent Schmick reminded the boards that SJE's original proposal was not designed with practices in LaCrosse. The original plan would be to maintain practices in St John (for HS) and Endicott (for MS) and leave early on game day to create an opportunity for extended warm-up in LaCrosse. She stated the need to be cautious, fair and equitable to coaches. Concerns were heard regarding loss of school time due to practices and games. At the end of

discussion, the consensus was to have non-league games scheduled in LaCrosse and possibly high school basketball games on Saturdays. There would be no practices in LaCrosse but teams would arrive early in LaCrosse on game day for extended warm-ups.

**3. LaCrosse AD: Be part of the interview/hiring and evaluations of coaches and programs. Be part of developing athletic guidelines and handbooks.**

**a. Rationale: To represent our students, parents and community**

One issue with the LaCrosse AD being part of the evaluation process is they would need to travel to St John or Endicott to observe practices. This needs more discussion with LaCrosse.

**4. LaCrosse Board: Part of voting either as a board or as individual board members in approving athletic policies and decisions at the board level.**

**a. Rationale: To represent our students, parents and community**

These are not decisions that the Athletic Directors would make but would include policies & procedures involving athletics, dissolving sports programs, etc. Superintendent Schmick stated that St John and Endicott boards work together and would see all three boards making decisions for both middle school and high school athletics. The idea of a Sports Board was brought up. Discussion was held around “would it be possible to form a board with 2 representatives from each board that would oversee athletics?”. Majority would rule because there would not be a quorum of any boards. However, contract review would be full boards (SJE & L). This is an option that the SJE boards would like to explore and discuss with LaCrosse.

**5. Contracted agreements: 1-year agreement with yearly review by April 1<sup>st</sup>. Combined boards meet quarterly throughout year.**

LaCrosse is proposing a 1-year agreement however; St John and Endicott would like to see a 3-year agreement with annual reviews. St John and Endicott believes this shows there is a commitment.

**6. Role of Administration: To work together in overseeing Athletic Directors in regards to their involvement as athletic co-op progresses.**

St John and Endicott boards do not see any issues with this, as it should be expected.

Valerie Brewer feels LaCrosse has been very transparent with their situation but doesn't feel SJE has been transparent with LaCrosse about 50% of the games in LaCrosse. Jamie Misner believes we are very generous in giving LaCrosse one game per sport and we have not agreed to 50% of games being held in LaCrosse. Marvin Schmick stated that participation levels for each school would need to be evaluated and there would be no evolution until we see more participation from LaCrosse.

Shantyl McGuire has does not like the idea of a game in LaCrosse if there are no LaCrosse kids participating.

SJE Athletic Darrell Miller presented 2016-17 participation numbers:

**Fall Sports**

	<u>Signed Up</u>	<u>Actually Played</u>	
Football	19	13 SJE, 3 Lacrosse	(2 moved)
Volleyball	22	14 SJE	(1 moved)
Cross Country	6	7 SJE	(incl 2 Home Schoolers)
Football Cheerleading (Activity)	4	2	(did not have activity, needed 5 for a team)

**Winter Sports**

	<u>Signed Up</u>	<u>Actually Played</u>	
Boys Basketball	24	15 SJE, 4 Lacrosse	(2 moved)
Girls Basketball	17	10 SJE, 1 Lacrosse 1 8 <sup>th</sup> Grader	(2 moved)
Wrestling	1	0	
Basketball Cheerleading (Activity)	5	4 SJE, 1 Lacrosse	

**Spring Sports**

	<u>Signed Up</u>	<u>Actually Played</u>	
Baseball	13	5 SJE, 2-3 Lacrosse	(2 moved) (not enough for a team)
Softball	If in St. John 3 If in Lacrosse 1	0	(not enough for a team)
Track & Field	14	15	
Golf	10	6 Boys	(2 moved)

**Participation Breakdown per Class**

	<u>1 Sport</u>	<u>2 Sports</u>	<u>3 Sports</u>
Freshman	11/19	4/19	1/19
Sophomores	12/24	6/24	1/24
Juniors	10/20	6/20	4/20
Seniors	10/20	6/20	1/20

Mr. Miller stated that the above numbers have been the trend for a couple of years.

St. John Board Vice Chair Jim Rogers and Endicott School Board Chair Marvin Schmick closed the work session of the SJE Cooperative Boards at 7:35 pm.