

**NOTES FROM THE NOVEMBER 3, 2000 FACILITATED MEETING  
BETWEEN THE NEW KENT COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS AND THE  
NEW KENT COUNTY SCHOOL BOARD**

**Ground rules were developed for each of the two Boards at previous meetings of the individual Boards. Dr Roberts posted those rules as a reminder:**

<b>FOR THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS</b>	<b>FOR THE SCHOOL BOARD</b>
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Mutual respect of each other's ideas and position.</li> <li>2. All act as servants (not rulers) of the community.</li> <li>3. Value diversity.</li> <li>4. Fully interdependent, <u>not</u> competitive.</li> <li>5. Really listen as allies; say what you mean; speak freely.</li> <li>6. Act as teammates; support and care for each other.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Need to really listen to each other, do not interrupt.</li> <li>2. Everyone will have an opportunity to speak on issues.</li> <li>3. Equality of each person's perspective.</li> <li>4. All to encourage open mindedness.</li> <li>5. Articulate our common similarities and our differences.</li> </ol>

**Accomplishments of the Board of Supervisors at their June 2000 retreat:**

- ~~///~~ Saw critical issue of school infrastructure -- discuss through with School Board impacts.
- ~~///~~ School (construction) needs was clearly the #1 priority.
- ~~///~~ We know there is a need; meet and figure out how to reach the outcome.
- ~~///~~ Set our sights on our top priorities -- "PLAN."
- ~~///~~ Walked out agreeing, helps us daily do our jobs better as Supervisors.
- ~~///~~ Two Boards are on the same page, let's start working . . . joint accomplishments.  
Let's get busy doing.

**Asset Analysis between the two Boards:**

Successes identified included:

- ~~///~~ Teacher pay raises
- ~~///~~ Capital Account
- ~~///~~ Capital Improvements (buses, building, etc.)
- ~~///~~ Acceptance of need for facilities
- ~~///~~ Acquisition of property for facilities
- ~~///~~ One on one meetings
- ~~///~~ Being here today together
- ~~///~~ Getting on the same wave length vs. "us vs. them"
- ~~///~~ Kept administrative staff, i.e., continuity

- ~~///~~ Progress on fiscal ability
- ~~///~~ Budget time - “Expectations” between two Boards -- less of a “guessing game” - firm positions; early information and communications
- ~~///~~ Cooperation with Parks & Recreation to use school facilities
- ~~///~~ “Relief” that school system is taking care of “school business” in a timely manner
- ~~///~~ First joint meeting -- commitment to continue meeting to talk over issues

Failures identified included:

- ~~///~~ Failure to reach full consensus, elected officials didn’t stand together
- ~~///~~ Way referendum was presented
- ~~///~~ Didn’t fully express and explore individual’s reservations
- ~~///~~ Didn’t understand or agree on what “consensus” means
- ~~///~~ “Long history” of past Boards’ actions -- lack of unity
- ~~///~~ Strategy on how to present to community -- “What,” “Why...” “How”
- ~~///~~ “Bad luck” of economic indicators at the time of referendum -- vs. general trends
- ~~///~~ Timing - “crisis” feel (ex. Colonial Downs’ ups and downs)
- ~~///~~ People need information clearly
- ~~///~~ Voters need to trust in us to make decisions
- ~~///~~ Too many things (“blank check”) without a clear sense of what facilities would be
- ~~///~~ Changing, numerous “projections” on tax implications
- ~~///~~ “Close loss” -- frustrating to most people
- ~~///~~ “Pain” impacts:
  - Divided areas/taxpayers
  - Subdivisions - “loss” -- “There they go again.”
- ~~///~~ Need better exploration of how to lessen tax increase
- ~~///~~ Didn’t sell to whole community, i.e., taxpayers without children
- ~~///~~ How would we do innovative “business school” partnerships
- ~~///~~ Ramifications on New Kent community:
  - Voters voted their “real” reasons
  - Who rejected
- ~~///~~ Need to educate/advertise county-wide v. majority of residents (limited to “grass roots” v. School Board initiated)
- ~~///~~ Too much “them vs. us” sources of information

**LEARNING ...**

**LOOKING FORWARD:**

- ?? Explain what the \$\$ effects will be . . . school construction as “seed investment” for economic health, growth
- ?? Two Boards need to be one team - “True” consensus and commitment
- ?? School Board needs to identify what should be done (options) and convince Board of Supervisors members.
- ?? Coming from two different directions -- schools/children v. wider county --  
COMPROMISE BETWEEN US

Internal between “Us” --

- ?? Need to understand
- ?? Come to Board of Supervisors with what we know to make funding decisions

“**TRUST**” is a huge issue between Boards. There was much discussion among the members of both Boards. The combined Boards came up with the following suggestions for building trust between the two Boards:

- ?? Overcome our skepticism
- ?? “Walk” in others shoes, i.e., empathy
- ?? Need good information, “facts”
- ?? BOS hear SB’s judgments/expertise
- ?? Give and take of information -- two way street. Ex. Growth projections, shared best judgments
- ?? Short term fix v. long range

?? **What is the impact of schools on a county’s economic development and residential development?** There was discussion regarding the importance of our schools being aware of what corporations look for when deciding where to build/expand. Corporations look for: variety, academics, achievements, sports, etc.

**ROLES WERE IDENTIFIED AND AGREED UPON FOR EACH OF THE RESPECTIVE BOARDS:**

<b>Board of Supervisors</b>	<b>School Board</b>
?? Provide its cost of expenses to local schools -- power of “county purse”	?? Caring for school property, erecting, equipping
?? Responsible/control funding, i.e., set tax rate	?? Operate and maintain schools
?? Legally, the “Borrower	?? Manage/control school money, incur costs and expenses
?? We are the ones who have to validate, defend the decisions	?? Educational decisions

Dr. Roberts and the Boards outlined the respective responsibilities of each Board, as well as the shared responsibilities, with regard to construction of schools as follows:

<b>Board of Supervisors</b>	<b>Both Boards</b> 	<b>School Board</b>
<p>Inform citizens</p> <p>Funding (type, fiscal limits)</p> <p>“Line” players (we need to be able to support the “play” or the “plan”)</p> <p>Revisit when affects funding and affordability</p> <p>Let go of design and construction decisions</p>	<p>Communications</p> <p>Needs assessments</p> <p>Sharing knowledge</p> <p>Shared responsibility for the best value for the money</p> <p>Listen and take input from each member</p> <p>“Brainstorm,” collaboration, walk through options</p> <p>“United front”</p>	<p>Inform citizens</p> <p>“Play” or “plan” makers</p> <p>Responsible for the schools</p> <p>“Be the play-makers”; come up with the plan</p> <p>Focus on the specifics, i.e., How?? and What??</p>

**?? At the close of the session, the two Boards were left with the following “to do” list:**

- ?? Get cost numbers
- ?? Contact architect regarding the design of a new school (“gotta have a picture”)
- ?? Fill out County’s side cost projections to share with School Board
- ?? Explore outside funding possibilities