

PONTIAC GOVERNANCE INITIATIVE | MASTER PROPOSAL
PONTIAC GOVERNANCE INITIATIVE
RESTORING PUBLIC GOVERNANCE TO PONTIAC SCHOOLS
BOARD GOVERNANCE, ACCOUNTABILITY & EMERGENCY VERIFICATION REFORM

Prepared by Maicol Rivera Torres
September 2026

THE BOARD GOVERNS. ADMINISTRATION OPERATES. ADMINISTRATION REPORTS. THE BOARD
VERIFIES.

FOLLOW THE NEED. FOLLOW THE MONEY. FOLLOW THE IMPLEMENTATION.
FOLLOW THE RESULTS - ALL THE WAY TO THE STUDENT.

MASTER POLICY & GOVERNANCE PROPOSAL

INTRODUCTION - WHY THIS GOVERNANCE REFORM MATTERS

I am not asking this Board to give individual trustees unchecked power. I am asking us to build stronger checks and balances into how this District is governed.

The Board of Education is elected by the people to govern the School District of the City of Pontiac. For that responsibility to have meaning, the Board must have lawful institutional tools to understand what is happening throughout the District, ask difficult questions, obtain appropriate information, hear directly from the people it serves, identify problems, verify what it is being told, deliberate openly, and collectively take action when action is necessary.

Effective governance should not require the Board to wait until a problem becomes a crisis. Teachers and staff should have safe reporting pathways. Parents and students should have a documented way to raise serious governance concerns. Board members should be able to observe operations under appropriate safeguards, request information, research alternatives, raise issues for the agenda, and require follow-through on Board directives.

This proposal does not seek to turn individual Board members into superintendents, principals, teachers, accountants, mechanics, investigators, or department supervisors. It seeks to ensure that the elected governing body has sufficient institutional independence to perform its responsibilities effectively.

LISTEN -> ACCESS -> OBSERVE -> DOCUMENT -> INVESTIGATE -> VERIFY -> OPEN AGENDA -> PUBLIC DELIBERATION -> COLLECTIVE ACTION -> MEASURE -> CORRECT -> FOLLOW UP

This is about checks and balances.

- The Superintendent should not control everything the Board is permitted to know.
- The Board President should not unilaterally control every issue the Board is permitted to discuss.
- Administration should not be the exclusive pathway for complaints concerning administration itself.
- Individual trustees should not independently exercise powers belonging to the full Board.
- Board members should not privately decide matters that belong in an open public meeting.

The goal is not power for the sake of power. The goal is a Board capable of fulfilling the responsibility the public entrusted to it and demonstrating better results for Pontiac students.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This master proposal combines the governance reforms developed for Pontiac into one policy architecture. It addresses Board authority, information access, oversight and investigations, public and employee reporting, agenda access, community engagement, financial transparency, procurement, transportation and facilities oversight, emergency governance, superintendent accountability, grant outcomes, and legal checks and balances.

The framework intentionally separates three questions: what the Board already has authority to do; what Pontiac may be able to strengthen through local bylaws and policy; and what requires additional legal, contractual, or legislative authority. Every proposed provision should be crosswalked against Pontiac's current policy manual and reviewed by qualified school-law counsel before adoption.

Michigan guidance describes the Board as ultimately responsible for district operations while also emphasizing that the Board governs at the highest level and does not manage routine day-to-day operations. The Michigan Open Meetings Act requires nearly all governmental business of public bodies to occur openly and requires decisions at open meetings. Those boundaries are incorporated throughout this proposal.

The Reform Pillars

- 1. Board Authority & Independent Oversight** - Collective governance, oversight committee, investigations, observation, audits, and corrective-action monitoring.
- 2. Information, Systems & Facility Access** - Timely information, role-based data visibility, financial dashboards, and reasonable governance access to District operations.
- 3. Public, Teacher, Staff, Student & Family Voice** - Direct reporting, tracking, conflict review, anti-retaliation, community listening, and documented disposition.
- 4. Open Agenda & Open Deliberation** - Trustee agenda access, committee referrals, public suggestions, OMA-compliant deliberation, and no private quorum decision-making.
- 5. Financial, Procurement & Grant Accountability** - Budget-to-actual visibility, market research, contract transparency, Title I/Section 31a outcomes, and year-end reconciliation.
- 6. Safety, Transportation, Facilities & Security** - Structured reporting, professional inspection, risk assessment, and Board-level follow-through.
- 7. Emergency Governance & Superintendent Accountability** - Succession, narrow emergency safeguards, directive tracking, and measurable superintendent evaluation.
- 8. Checks, Balances & Legal Review** - Due process, privacy, collective authority, no micromanagement, independent counsel review, and legislative advocacy where needed.

PART I - LEGAL FOUNDATION & GOVERNANCE BOUNDARIES

1. Michigan General-Powers Framework

Michigan law gives general-powers school districts broad authority related to educating students, safety and welfare, school property, employees and contractors, receipt and expenditure of funds, and cooperative arrangements. Michigan school-board guidance likewise describes the Board as having

ultimate responsibility for district operations. This proposal uses that broad governance responsibility as the foundation for stronger institutional oversight, while preserving statutory and contractual limits.

2. Collective Board Action

A central boundary is that the Board acts collectively. Proposed reforms should not be read as giving one trustee unilateral power to make decisions that belong to the Board. Where an individual trustee is authorized to gather information, observe, research, report, or request agenda placement, final governmental action remains with the Board unless a lawfully delegated authority clearly provides otherwise.

3. Board Governance vs. Administration

The Board sets policy, goals, budget direction, accountability expectations, and superintendent evaluation standards. Administration manages implementation and routine operations. Oversight must therefore be strong enough to verify performance without converting trustees into line supervisors.

4. Open Meetings Act

The Michigan Open Meetings Act requires nearly all governmental business of public bodies to be conducted openly, requires decisions at open meetings, and protects public attendance and participation rights. The Attorney General also notes that a public body may adopt rules providing greater openness than the statutory minimum. This proposal favors public deliberation, documented agenda access, and transparent follow-up rather than private consensus-building.

5. Legal Classification Used Throughout

GREEN - Existing authority / governance function - Functions already grounded in Board governance, subject to current Pontiac policy and law.

YELLOW - Proposed Pontiac local reform - Procedures that may be considered through local policy/bylaw changes, subject to counsel review.

RED - Legal / contractual / legislative review required - Powers or procedures that may implicate statutory limits, labor agreements, privacy, personnel due process, or authority not clearly granted today.

PART II - MASTER POLICY INDEX

Code	Policy Area	Initial Classification
0100	Board Governance & Independent Oversight	GREEN/YELLOW
0100.1	Oversight, Investigations & Accountability Committee	YELLOW
0100.2	Board Information Access	YELLOW
0100.3	Board Observation & Operational Visits	YELLOW
0100.4	Board Observation Report System	YELLOW
0100.5	Notice-to-Closure Complaint Accountability	YELLOW
0100.6	Multi-Issue Complaint Review	YELLOW
0100.7	External Finding Reassessment	YELLOW
0100.8	Independent Investigation & Conflict Review	YELLOW/RED
0100.9	Anti-Obstruction & Governance Integrity	YELLOW/RED
0100.10	Protection Against Retaliation	YELLOW/RED
0100.11	Superintendent Succession & Continuity	YELLOW/RED
0100.12	Emergency Governance	YELLOW/RED
0100.13	Presidential Temporary Protective Authority	RED
0100.14	Transportation, Fleet & Facilities Oversight	GREEN/YELLOW
0100.15	Security Risk Assessment	YELLOW
0100.16	Procurement, Cost Verification & Market Research	GREEN/YELLOW
0100.17	Transparency Before Approval	YELLOW
0100.18	Public Contract & Expenditure Portal	YELLOW
0100.19	Board Directive Tracking	YELLOW
0100.20	Superintendent Accountability Standards	GREEN/YELLOW
0100.21	Checks & Balances on Board Oversight	YELLOW
0100.22	Open Meetings & Collective Action	GREEN/YELLOW

PONTIAC GOVERNANCE INITIATIVE | MASTER PROPOSAL

Code	Policy Area	Initial Classification
0100.23	Legislative Advocacy	GREEN/YELLOW
0100.24	Open Board Agenda & Trustee Agenda Access	YELLOW
0100.25	Public, Teacher & Staff Reporting / Governance Referral	YELLOW/RED
0100.26	Board Access to Systems, Financial Data & Facilities	YELLOW/RED
0100.27	Community Listening Sessions & Public Engagement	GREEN/YELLOW
0100.28	Board Member Communications & Open Deliberation	GREEN/YELLOW
0100.29	Grant Investment & Student Outcomes Accountability	GREEN/YELLOW
0100.30	Leadership Attendance, Remote Expert Access & Continuity of Governance	YELLOW / RED
0100.31	Operations, Finance & Accountability Committee	YELLOW / RED

PART III - DETAILED PROPOSED POLICY FRAMEWORK

0100 - Board Governance & Independent Oversight

Purpose	Establish the governing relationship between the elected Board and administration.
Classification	GREEN/YELLOW

The Board of Education shall govern the District collectively in accordance with Michigan law. The Superintendent shall administer day-to-day operations pursuant to authority delegated by the Board. Delegation does not eliminate the Board's responsibility to oversee the exercise and results of delegated authority.

Board oversight may include student achievement, safety, attendance, special education, transportation, facilities, technology, cybersecurity, finances, procurement, contracts, legal compliance, employee systems, superintendent performance, and implementation of Board directives.

No individual Board member, including an officer, shall exercise authority belonging to the Board as a whole unless law, bylaw, policy, resolution, or lawful delegation expressly provides otherwise.

Implementation requirements

- Adopt an annual governance work plan.
- Publish Board goals and superintendent performance measures.
- Use dashboards and written reports for recurring oversight.

Safeguards / legal boundaries

- Preserve superintendent responsibility for routine administration.
- Require collective Board action for decisions reserved to the Board.

0100.1 - Oversight, Investigations & Accountability Committee

Purpose	Create a standing Board mechanism for systemic oversight and corrective-action follow-up.
Classification	YELLOW

The Board should establish a standing Oversight, Investigations & Accountability Committee. Subject to lawful Board delegation, the Committee may request reports; review implementation of Board policy and directives; examine major contracts, expenditures, safety systems, transportation, facilities, and systemic complaints; recommend independent audits or investigations; conduct lawful public oversight hearings; issue recommendations; and monitor corrective action.

Final authority reserved to the full Board remains with the full Board.

Implementation requirements

- Publish committee jurisdiction and annual calendar.
- Maintain a corrective-action register.
- Report recommendations to the full Board in public session when legally appropriate.

Safeguards / legal boundaries

- Committee meetings must comply with the OMA when the committee is a public body.

- Avoid duplicating legally mandated complaint or grievance processes.

0100.2 - Board Information Access

Purpose	Create a documented route for trustees to obtain information reasonably necessary for governance.
Classification	YELLOW

A Board member may submit a formal information request reasonably related to official governance duties. Requests should identify the subject, requested records/information, target response date, responsible department, status, records provided, records withheld, and lawful basis for withholding.

Administration should provide materially accurate and complete information and should not knowingly conceal material facts, materially misrepresent records, destroy responsive information, or intentionally delay information for the purpose of frustrating lawful Board action.

Nothing in this policy requires unlawful disclosure of privileged, student, personnel, security-sensitive, or otherwise protected information.

Implementation requirements

- Create a Board Information Request form.
- Set routine, urgent, and complex-request response targets.
- Create escalation to Board counsel for unresolved access disputes.

Safeguards / legal boundaries

- Apply FERPA, attorney-client privilege, cybersecurity controls, personnel confidentiality, and applicable law.

0100.3 - Board Observation & Operational Visits

Purpose	Permit structured governance observations of District operations.
Classification	YELLOW

Board members may conduct reasonable official governance visits to schools, classrooms, administrative offices, transportation operations, facilities, programs, and support services. Members may observe, ask reasonable informational questions, document general operational concerns, and request follow-up.

Members shall comply with check-in, identification, privacy, safety, testing-security, and reasonable non-disruption requirements. An individual member shall not use a visit to supervise employees, impose discipline, alter instruction, or assume routine administrative control.

Implementation requirements

- Issue Board identification credentials.
- Create visit and restricted-area protocols.
- Provide an observation-report pathway for concerns.

Safeguards / legal boundaries

- Student privacy and instructional non-disruption remain mandatory.
- Technical hazards require qualified staff/escort where appropriate.

0100.4 - Board Observation Report System

Purpose	Convert observations into trackable governance follow-up.
Classification	YELLOW

Observation Reports should be classified: Priority I - Immediate Safety; Priority II - Urgent Governance; Priority III - Standard Oversight; Priority IV - Research and Improvement.

Each qualifying report should identify date/location, observed condition, objective description, immediate safety concern if any, evidence available, requested follow-up, responsible office, response date, disposition, and closure.

Implementation requirements

- Create a standard form and electronic tracker.
- Require professional inspection when a concern requires technical expertise.
- Report systemic trends to the oversight committee.

Safeguards / legal boundaries

- A trustee observation is not a professional diagnosis or final finding.

0100.5 - Notice-to-Closure Complaint Accountability

Purpose	Prevent serious governance complaints from disappearing after referral.
Classification	YELLOW

Qualifying systemic complaints should move through: NOTICE -> PRESERVATION -> JURISDICTION -> CONFLICT REVIEW -> RISK ASSESSMENT -> INVESTIGATION OR REFERRAL -> FINDINGS/DISPOSITION -> CORRECTIVE ACTION -> BOARD FOLLOW-UP -> CLOSURE.

A complaint is not resolved merely because it was forwarded. Closure should document the disposition, responsible office, corrective action if any, and basis for closure.

Implementation requirements

- Create tracking numbers and status labels.
- Set escalation rules for overdue matters.
- Provide anonymized trend reports to the Board.

Safeguards / legal boundaries

- Do not expose protected student/personnel information.
- Emergency threats use emergency channels.

0100.6 - Multi-Issue Complaint Review

Purpose	Ensure separate allegations receive separate dispositions.
Classification	YELLOW

When a submission contains materially distinct allegations, each allegation should receive a separate issue identifier or disposition. Closing one issue shall not automatically close unrelated issues contained in the same report.

Implementation requirements

- Use an allegation matrix.
- Record evidence, referral, finding status, and closure basis by issue.

Safeguards / legal boundaries

- Avoid duplicative investigations where one lawful process can resolve overlapping issues.

0100.7 - External Finding Reassessment

Purpose	Require reconsideration when later external findings materially change the record.
Classification	YELLOW

A later materially related finding by MDE, the U.S. Department of Education, OCR, law enforcement, a court, an auditor, or another independent authority should trigger reassessment of an unresolved prior complaint or Board concern.

Reassessment does not establish that the original allegation was true; it requires the District to determine whether the new information changes prior conclusions or corrective action.

Implementation requirements

- Create a reopening standard.
- Document whether new evidence changes the prior disposition.

Safeguards / legal boundaries

- Respect appeal rights, litigation holds, privilege, and final legal determinations.

0100.8 - Independent Investigation & Conflict Review

Purpose	Create independence when the ordinary chain of command is materially implicated.
Classification	YELLOW/RED

When allegations materially involve the Superintendent, senior administration, Human Resources leadership, or another office that would ordinarily control the investigation, the Board shall consider whether independence is required.

Subject to law and funding authority, the Board may retain independent counsel, outside investigators, forensic auditors, accountants, engineers, transportation specialists, cybersecurity specialists, HR investigators, special-education experts, or other qualified professionals.

Opening an investigation is not a finding of wrongdoing.

Implementation requirements

- Adopt conflict-screen criteria.
- Define engagement authority, scope, reporting line, records preservation, and final report procedure.

Safeguards / legal boundaries

- Observe due process, employment contracts, collective bargaining, privilege, and statutory rights.

0100.9 - Anti-Obstruction & Governance Integrity

Purpose	Protect authorized oversight from intentional interference.
Classification	YELLOW/RED

No administrator, employee, contractor, Board member, or agent should intentionally obstruct authorized oversight through unlawful concealment, material misrepresentation, destruction of relevant information, interference with an authorized audit/investigation, or witness intimidation.

Good-faith legal disagreement, lawful confidentiality restrictions, and reasonable administrative processing are not automatically obstruction.

Implementation requirements

- Define prohibited conduct and reporting routes.
- Require preservation notices for significant investigations.

Safeguards / legal boundaries

- Counsel should review enforcement language and employee due-process implications.

0100.10 - Protection Against Retaliation

Purpose	Protect good-faith participation in governance and oversight.
Classification	YELLOW/RED

No person should be retaliated against merely for making a good-faith report, truthfully cooperating with authorized oversight, requesting records, raising a safety concern, requesting an audit/investigation, challenging a recommendation, or voting independently.

Legitimate personnel action supported by lawful reasons is not automatically retaliation.

Implementation requirements

- Create an independent retaliation-report pathway.
- Track allegations and dispositions.

Safeguards / legal boundaries

- Coordinate with whistleblower law, labor agreements, HR processes, Title IX, and other protected-reporting regimes.

0100.11 - Superintendent Succession & Continuity

Purpose	Ensure continuity when the Superintendent is absent, incapacitated, suspended, or the position is vacant.
Classification	YELLOW/RED

The District shall maintain a written succession plan identifying the Acting Superintendent and order of succession, including operational, personnel, purchasing, signing, reporting, and time-limited authority.

The plan should identify when the Board must formally appoint or confirm acting leadership and how authority returns when the Superintendent resumes duties.

Implementation requirements

- Review annually.
- Align delegations with banking, procurement, HR, safety, and legal authorities.

Safeguards / legal boundaries

- Coordinate with superintendent contract, employment law, and current bylaws.

0100.12 - Emergency Governance

Purpose	Define who acts during urgent events and how the Board reconvenes.
Classification	YELLOW/RED

Emergency governance shall distinguish: operational emergency authority exercised by the Superintendent/Acting Superintendent; Board emergency authority exercised collectively through lawful Board action; and any narrowly defined presidential temporary protective authority expressly delegated in advance.

The emergency framework should prioritize life safety, continuity of operations, preservation of evidence, timely notice to Board members, and rapid transition back to ordinary governance.

Implementation requirements

- Adopt emergency decision matrix and notification tree.
- Define documentation and after-action review.

Safeguards / legal boundaries

- OMA, statutory emergency powers, labor rights, contracts, and due process remain controlling.

0100.13 - Presidential Temporary Protective Authority

Purpose	Define only narrow, temporary protective actions pending full Board review.
Classification	RED

Any presidential temporary authority should be expressly adopted in advance and limited to steps such as requesting immediate factual reports, consulting Board counsel, initiating procedures to convene the Board, requesting professional safety assessment, activating established succession, preserving evidence through authorized channels, and notifying appropriate authorities.

The President acting alone shall not permanently fire staff, impose final discipline, award major contracts, close a school, adopt policy, or exercise authority reserved to the Board unless clearly authorized by law.

Implementation requirements

- Counsel should identify any actions already permitted to the President by current bylaws.
- Create automatic expiration and full-Board review.

Safeguards / legal boundaries

- Do not imply unilateral personnel or governmental powers absent clear authority.

0100.14 - Transportation, Fleet & Facilities Oversight

Purpose	Give the Board recurring visibility into safety, maintenance, and capital conditions.
Classification	GREEN/YELLOW

Administration should provide regular reports on fleet inspection status, out-of-service buses, safety defects, preventive/deferred maintenance, repair costs, accidents, replacement schedules, building conditions, HVAC/electrical/security systems, and major capital projects.

A credible trustee observation may trigger professional inspection but does not replace technical certification.

Implementation requirements

- Quarterly dashboard.
- Immediate escalation for life-safety conditions.
- Lifecycle replacement planning.

Safeguards / legal boundaries

- Professional staff determine technical repair requirements.

0100.15 - Security Risk Assessment

Purpose	Require evidence before permanent major security decisions.
Classification	YELLOW

Before permanent dedicated security staffing or substantial security expenditures, the Board should ordinarily receive a documented risk assessment addressing incident history, severity, frequency, vulnerabilities, existing safeguards, response times, alternatives, costs, district-wide comparative risk, and professional recommendation.

Immediate temporary protective measures remain available when genuine danger warrants them.

Implementation requirements

- Annual risk review.
- Post-incident after-action analysis.

Safeguards / legal boundaries

- Protect sensitive security details from inappropriate disclosure.

0100.16 - Procurement, Cost Verification & Market Research

Purpose	Strengthen Board review of major purchasing recommendations.
Classification	GREEN/YELLOW

Major purchasing recommendations should include, as applicable: price, parts/labor, shipping, warranty, competing quotations, cooperative purchasing, governmental/educational pricing, manufacturer-direct options, lifecycle cost, funding source, vendor qualifications, alternatives, safety requirements, and conflicts of interest.

Board members may independently research credible alternatives but shall not individually award contracts or obligate District funds.

Implementation requirements

- Create procurement comparison sheet.
- Document sole-source rationale and change orders.
- Include total cost of ownership.

Safeguards / legal boundaries

- Comply with procurement statutes, grant rules, ethics, and delegated purchasing authority.

0100.17 - Transparency Before Approval

Purpose	Give the Board and public meaningful information before major decisions.
Classification	YELLOW

The District should make non-confidential supporting materials reasonably available before significant Board action when practicable, including executive summaries, fiscal impact, alternatives, contract terms, performance implications, and known risks.

Late-breaking emergency matters should document why advance materials were not practicable.

Implementation requirements

- Set posting targets by agenda type.
- Use standardized decision memos.

Safeguards / legal boundaries

- Do not publish privileged, confidential, student, personnel, or security-sensitive material.

0100.18 - Public Contract & Expenditure Portal

Purpose	Improve public visibility into major commitments of District funds.
Classification	YELLOW

The District should maintain a public contract/expenditure portal showing vendor, purpose, authorized amount, amendments/change orders, approval date, term, procurement method, responsible department, and public contract documents where legally permissible.

Implementation requirements

- Searchable vendor and contract index.
- Quarterly updates.
- Link Board approvals to contracts and amendments.

Safeguards / legal boundaries

- Redact protected information and comply with applicable procurement/confidentiality rules.

0100.19 - Board Directive Tracking

Purpose	Ensure Board decisions are implemented and
---------	--

	closed.
Classification	YELLOW

Formal Board directives should remain tracked until completed, identifying approval date, responsible administrator, deadline, status, deliverables, explanation for material delay, and completion date.

A vote authorizes. Oversight verifies.

Implementation requirements

- Maintain a public/non-public tracker as appropriate.
- Report overdue directives regularly.

Safeguards / legal boundaries

- Do not use the tracker to direct individual employees outside the administrative chain.

0100.20 - Superintendent Accountability Standards

Purpose	Tie evaluation to measurable governance expectations.
Classification	GREEN/YELLOW

Superintendent evaluation should include measurable expectations concerning implementation of Board directives, transparency, responsiveness, student safety, academic outcomes, financial stewardship, legal compliance, operational performance, community engagement, organizational leadership, and Board-established goals.

Implementation requirements

- Adopt annual measurable goals.
- Use evidence sources and mid-year review.
- Connect corrective plans to evaluation where appropriate.

Safeguards / legal boundaries

- Follow contract terms and statutory evaluation requirements.

0100.21 - Checks & Balances on Board Oversight

Purpose	Prevent misuse of expanded oversight tools.
Classification	YELLOW

Oversight authority shall not be used for political retaliation, employee intimidation, personal disputes, unauthorized access to protected information, unnecessary classroom disruption, routine employee supervision, or circumvention of collective Board authority.

Board members using oversight tools should document a legitimate governance purpose and comply with adopted protocols.

Implementation requirements

- Annual Board training.
- Conflict-of-interest disclosure.
- Independent counsel route for disputes.

Safeguards / legal boundaries

- Strong oversight must remain institutionally accountable.

0100.22 - Open Meetings & Collective Action

Purpose	Protect transparent deliberation and lawful decision-making.
Classification	GREEN/YELLOW

Board deliberation and action shall comply with the Michigan Open Meetings Act. Private agreement, serial communications, group texts, email chains, intermediaries, or informal polling shall not be used to substitute for lawful public deliberation or Board action when the OMA applies.

The Board may adopt procedures that provide greater openness than the statutory minimum.

Implementation requirements

- Annual OMA training.
- Use public committee structures for recurring oversight deliberation.

Safeguards / legal boundaries

- Counsel should review novel communication practices before implementation.

0100.23 - Legislative Advocacy

Purpose	Separate desired powers from powers the District clearly possesses today.
Classification	GREEN/YELLOW

Where the Board concludes that effective oversight requires authority not clearly available under current law, it may advocate for state legislation rather than claiming the authority locally.

Potential examples for legislative study include subpoena authority, compelled testimony, inspector-general structures, enhanced whistleblower protection, or other investigatory tools.

Implementation requirements

- Maintain a legislative priorities list.
- Seek MASB and legislative counsel input.

Safeguards / legal boundaries

- Do not exercise ungranted powers while advocacy is pending.

0100.24 - Open Board Agenda & Trustee Agenda Access

Purpose	Ensure lawful matters can reach the Board without unilateral gatekeeping.
Classification	YELLOW

Any Board member may submit a written request for placement of a lawful discussion, information, policy, oversight, or governance matter on a future regular Board agenda. The request should identify the subject, requested meeting, whether the item is informational/discussion/action, supporting information, and whether expedited consideration is requested.

A request shall not be rejected merely because administration disagrees with the substance. The Board should establish a threshold - proposed here as two members - that requires placement on the next

reasonably available regular agenda, subject to law, required notice, counsel review, and preparation of supporting materials.

Neither the Superintendent nor Board President shall have unilateral authority to permanently suppress a lawful agenda matter qualifying under the adopted bylaw. Standing committees may submit recommendations for agenda placement. Residents may submit agenda suggestions through a public process; public submission does not automatically compel Board action.

Governing principle: The agenda belongs to the Board as an institution - not to one administrator or one officer.

Implementation requirements

- Create trustee agenda request form.
- Define timing and expedited process.
- Define public agenda suggestion process.

Safeguards / legal boundaries

- Special meetings and legally required notice remain subject to law/current bylaws.

0100.25 - Public, Teacher & Staff Reporting / Governance Referral

Purpose	Create a direct, trackable pathway for serious governance concerns.
Classification	YELLOW/RED

Students, parents/guardians, teachers, paraprofessionals, principals, counselors, social workers, bus drivers, custodians, food-service workers, administrative staff, substitutes, contractors, union-represented employees, taxpayers, residents, and community stakeholders shall have an accessible pathway to submit significant governance concerns for Board-level intake and tracking.

Administration shall not be the exclusive gatekeeper of communications intended for the Board. A staff member should not be required to report exclusively through a supervisor or chain of command when the concern materially involves that chain, senior administration, alleged retaliation, obstruction, fraud, significant safety, compliance, or another conflict.

Qualifying submissions receive a tracking number and status. They may be referred to administration, an existing legally required complaint process, a Board committee, independent counsel/investigator, regulators/law enforcement, or the full Board. Reporting does not establish the allegation as true.

The Board should receive anonymized aggregate reports on categories, unresolved matters, resolution time, corrective action, and reopened matters, consistent with law.

Implementation requirements

- Online, email, paper, and accessibility-accommodation intake.
- Conflict screen before routing allegations involving senior administration.
- Document every disposition.

Safeguards / legal boundaries

- Coordinate with Title IX, IDEA, CBA/grievance, mandated reporting, whistleblower, HR, and emergency processes.

0100.26 - Board Access to Systems, Financial Data & Facilities

Purpose	Provide sufficient oversight visibility without granting operational-control credentials.
Classification	YELLOW/RED

The Board shall have sufficient, timely, independently accessible information to perform governance, fiduciary, safety, compliance, and oversight responsibilities. Where appropriate, trustees should receive role-based, generally read-only oversight access to financial dashboards, budgets versus actuals, purchase orders, vendor/contract information, grants, facilities/work-order information, transportation/fleet information, performance dashboards, and Board-directive tracking.

Oversight access does not ordinarily authorize a trustee to alter payroll, student records, grades, purchase orders, HR records, or system configurations. Student-level, special-education, personnel, cybersecurity, privileged, and other sensitive information requires lawful purpose and role-based controls.

Trustees conducting authorized governance observations should have reasonable access to District facilities subject to identification, safety, privacy, security, and non-disruption rules. Restricted areas may require an escort. Sensitive system/building access should be logged.

Implementation requirements

- Create role-based access matrix.
- Issue Board credentials.
- Log sensitive system and facility access.

Safeguards / legal boundaries

- Apply least privilege, FERPA, cybersecurity, privilege, personnel confidentiality, and labor/legal requirements.

0100.27 - Community Listening Sessions & Public Engagement

Purpose	Make the Board visible and accessible outside formal meetings while preserving OMA boundaries.
Classification	GREEN/YELLOW

Individual Board members may conduct voluntary listening sessions, town halls, coffee conversations, school-community forums, and similar outreach to receive information, hear concerns, discuss priorities, and improve communication.

Such gatherings shall not be used to make decisions reserved to the Board or circumvent the Open Meetings Act. Matters requiring Board action shall return through reporting, committee, agenda, and formal public-meeting processes.

Guiding principle: Listen where the people are. Govern where the law requires.

Implementation requirements

- Publish optional listening-session schedule.
- Create issue intake/referral form.

Safeguards / legal boundaries

- Avoid quorum deliberation outside properly noticed meetings.

0100.28 - Board Member Communications & Open Deliberation

Purpose	Protect lawful information gathering while preventing private Board decision-making.
Classification	GREEN/YELLOW

Board members may communicate, exchange information, request information, raise concerns, propose agenda items, and communicate with constituents subject to Michigan law.

Members shall not use private meetings, serial communications, group texts, email chains, intermediaries, or other methods to circumvent the OMA by conducting collective deliberation or decision-making outside a lawful meeting.

Guiding principle: Talk to the community. Gather the facts. Raise the issue. Debate the decision in public.

Implementation requirements

- Use Board training and communication protocols.
- Route substantive collective deliberation to public meetings.

Safeguards / legal boundaries

- OMA interpretation is fact-specific; seek counsel when uncertain.

0100.29 - Grant Investment & Student Outcomes Accountability

Purpose	Connect major grant spending to implementation and measurable student results.
Classification	GREEN/YELLOW

For every material federal or state educational grant, including Title I and Section 31a, administration shall provide an annual reconciliation connecting: identified student need -> award/funding -> approved strategy -> budget -> actual expenditure -> personnel/vendors/programs -> students served -> measurable objective -> actual result -> corrective action -> carryover -> final Board review.

The annual report should include final expenditures and amendments, building/program allocations, material personnel/FTE and vendor costs, students/programs served, baseline and target measures, actual outcomes, carryover calculations, required waivers/approvals where applicable, monitoring/audit findings, and corrective action.

Compliance with spending rules alone does not constitute complete Board oversight. The Board should also review whether the funded strategy produced measurable progress toward the purpose for which the funds were accepted.

Guiding principle: Follow the need. Follow the money. Follow the implementation. Follow the results - all the way to the student.

Implementation requirements

- Annual Final Investment & Outcomes Report.
- Budget-to-actual and projected-to-final reconciliation.
- Board review of corrective action when targets are missed.

Safeguards / legal boundaries

PONTIAC GOVERNANCE INITIATIVE | MASTER PROPOSAL

- Do not infer causation from spending and outcome trends without appropriate evidence.

PART IV - STUDENT INVESTMENT & OUTCOMES ACCOUNTABILITY

Why this framework is needed

Pontiac publicly presented FY2025 and FY2026 grant overviews during its June 9, 2025 budget process. Michigan also publishes final program allocations for Title I, Part A and Section 31a. These public reporting systems demonstrate that grant oversight can be organized around allocations, plans, expenditures, carryover, program implementation, and results. The purpose of this proposal is not to presume wrongdoing; it is to make that reconciliation a routine Board governance function.

Title I and Section 31a review standard

1. What student need was identified?
2. What amount was awarded and what carryover was available?
3. What strategy and measurable objective were approved?
4. What was budgeted and what was actually spent?
5. Which personnel, vendors, programs, and buildings were funded?
6. How many students were served?
7. What baseline and target were used?
8. What measurable result occurred?
9. What corrective action followed if the target was missed?
10. What funds carried over and what approvals/waivers were required?

Board-level transaction and outcome table

Grant	Need	Program/ School	Person/ Vendor	Amount	Students Served	Target	Actual Result	Correctiv e Action

This table is a template for Board oversight. It should be populated from official grant, accounting, program, and outcome records rather than assumptions or social-media claims.

PART V - IMPLEMENTATION WORKFLOWS & FORMS

A. Board Information Request

- Requesting Board member
- Date/time submitted
- Governance purpose
- Records/data requested
- Responsible department
- Routine/Urgent/Complex classification
- Target response date
- Status
- Records provided
- Records withheld and legal basis
- Counsel review, if any
- Closure date

B. Board Observation Report

- Date/time/location
- Observation type
- Objective description
- Priority I-IV
- Immediate safety action taken by qualified staff, if any
- Evidence/photos/documents
- Requested professional review
- Administrative response
- Corrective action
- Board/committee follow-up
- Closure

C. Governance Reporting / Notice-to-Closure Tracker

- Tracking number
- Reporter category (public/staff/student/parent/etc.)
- Issue categories
- Conflict screen
- Emergency/legal referral
- Investigation/referral owner
- Status
- Disposition by allegation
- Corrective action
- Retaliation concern
- Reopen trigger
- Closure basis

D. Open Agenda Request

- Requesting trustee(s)
- Proposed subject
- Requested meeting
- Information / discussion / action
- Supporting materials
- Legal review needed?
- Expedited consideration?
- Placement decision
- Reason if deferred
- Final agenda date

E. Board Directive Tracker

- Board action/date
- Directive
- Responsible administrator
- Deadline
- Status
- Deliverable
- Material delay explanation
- Completion evidence
- Closure date

F. Grant Investment & Student Outcomes Report

- Grant and fiscal year
- Identified need
- Award + carryover
- Approved strategy
- Original/amended budget
- Actual expenditures
- Personnel/FTE
- Vendors/contracts
- Buildings/programs
- Students served
- Baseline
- Target
- Actual result
- Carryover
- Waiver/approval status
- Audit/monitoring finding
- Corrective action
- Board review date

PART VI - FIRST 100 DAYS IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

Days 1-30 - Legal and Policy Crosswalk

- Refer proposal to policy/governance committee, administration, and Board counsel.
- Crosswalk each proposal against current Pontiac bylaws/policies.
- Identify statutory, contractual, privacy, labor, and OMA constraints.
- Inventory current reporting, financial, grant, transportation, facilities, and complaint systems.
- Draft revised local policy language for provisions that can be adopted locally.

Days 31-60 - Build Oversight Infrastructure

- Launch Board Information Request tracker.
- Draft Board Observation Report and Priority I-IV workflow.
- Design governance reporting intake and conflict-screen process.
- Create Board Directive Tracker.
- Design read-only Board financial/grant dashboard requirements.
- Draft superintendent succession and emergency decision matrix.

Days 61-90 - Pilot Transparency & Accountability

- Pilot quarterly transportation/facilities dashboard.
- Pilot contract/procurement comparison sheet.
- Pilot public/teacher/staff reporting workflow.
- Pilot Open Agenda request procedure.
- Develop annual Title I/Section 31a Investment & Outcomes Report template.
- Conduct Board training on OMA, confidentiality, oversight boundaries, and due process.

Days 91-100 - Public Review and Adoption Roadmap

- Publish counsel-reviewed policy drafts.
- Hold public work session/hearing as appropriate.
- Receive teacher, staff, parent, student, administrator, union, and community feedback.
- Revise implementation costs and staffing requirements.
- Schedule first/second readings or other adoption process required by current policy.
- Publish a one-year governance implementation calendar and evaluation measures.

PART VII - PROPOSED BOARD ACTION

The recommended immediate action is referral for formal review and policy development - not immediate adoption of all substantive provisions.

Suggested motion

“I move that the Board refer the Pontiac Governance Initiative - Governance & Accountability Reform Proposal to the appropriate Board committee, Superintendent/administration, and Board legal counsel for review; direct preparation of a crosswalk against current District bylaws and policies and applicable Michigan law; identify provisions that may be adopted locally and provisions requiring additional legal,

contractual, or legislative authority; and return proposed policy language, implementation recommendations, and a timeline to the Board for public discussion and consideration.”

This motion does not make findings of wrongdoing, adopt all proposed provisions tonight, or authorize any individual trustee to exercise powers not already provided by law or current policy.

PART VIII - COUNSEL REVIEW MATRIX

Proposal Area	Classification	Counsel Review Focus
Collective Board governance, policy, budget, superintendent evaluation	GREEN	Confirm current Pontiac policy numbering and delegated authority.
Open agenda / trustee agenda access	YELLOW	Review current agenda bylaws, notice, special meetings, and adoption procedure.
Public/teacher/staff direct reporting	YELLOW/RED	Coordinate with CBA, Title IX, IDEA, HR, whistleblower, mandated-reporting, and due process.
Board information requests	YELLOW	Define confidentiality, privilege, cybersecurity, and response standards.
Read-only financial/operational dashboards	YELLOW/RED	Role-based access, FERPA/privacy, audit logs, least privilege.
School/classroom/facility observations	YELLOW	Visitor, safety, privacy, labor, testing security, and non-disruption rules.
Independent investigations	YELLOW/RED	Authority, funding, counsel relationship, privilege, due process, and CBA implications.
Anti-retaliation / anti-obstruction	YELLOW/RED	Definitions, enforcement, employee rights, and lawful disagreement.
Superintendent succession	YELLOW/RED	Superintendent contract and delegated administrative authority.
Presidential temporary protective authority	RED	Must be narrow, express, temporary, and consistent with collective Board authority and OMA.
Procurement cost verification	GREEN/YELLOW	Procurement statutes, thresholds, grant rules, ethics, and delegated purchasing.
Grant outcomes reporting	GREEN/YELLOW	MDE/federal reporting, measurement validity, and causal-claim safeguards.
Subpoena / compelled testimony / contempt-like powers	RED	Do not claim absent clear statutory authority; consider legislative advocacy.

PART IX - SOURCE & VALIDATION APPENDIX

The following sources should be used by administration and counsel to validate, refine, and cross-reference the proposal. The master proposal summarizes rather than reproduces these materials.

Michigan Revised School Code - MCL 380.11a - General-powers district framework, Board procedures, collective action, and officer/bylaw authority.

Michigan Open Meetings Act - MCL 15.261 et seq. - Open public meetings, notice, attendance, decisions at open meetings, and minutes.

Michigan Attorney General - Open Meetings Act Handbook, March 2026 - Current state guidance on public-body meetings and deliberation.

Michigan Association of School Boards - What Do School Boards Do? - Michigan Board governance responsibilities, including safety, employees/contractors, property, and public funds.

Michigan Association of School Boards - New Board Member / Governance Guidance - Board governs at the highest level; day-to-day operations remain administrative; individual members do not independently exercise Board power.

School District of the City of Pontiac - BoardDocs Policy Library - Current Pontiac bylaws and policies to be crosswalked before adoption.

School District of the City of Pontiac - June 9, 2025 Public Hearing / Grants Overview - Public FY2025/FY2026 budget and grant reporting context.

Michigan Department of Education - Program Allocations - Final 2024-25 Title I, Part A and Section 31a allocation resources.

Michigan Department of Education - Section 31a At-Risk - Program purposes, allowable use framework, outcomes, and carryover information.

Michigan Department of Education - 2024-25 Title I 15% Carryover Waiver materials - Carryover-waiver process and related compliance context.

FINAL GOVERNANCE STANDARD

THE BOARD GOVERNS. ADMINISTRATION OPERATES. ADMINISTRATION REPORTS. THE BOARD VERIFIES.

LISTEN -> ACCESS -> OBSERVE -> DOCUMENT -> INVESTIGATE -> VERIFY -> OPEN AGENDA -> PUBLIC DELIBERATION -> COLLECTIVE ACTION -> MEASURE -> CORRECT -> FOLLOW UP.

FOLLOW THE NEED. FOLLOW THE MONEY. FOLLOW THE IMPLEMENTATION. FOLLOW THE RESULTS - ALL THE WAY TO THE STUDENT.

The goal is an institution where no single official controls all information, no legitimate issue can be buried solely through agenda gatekeeping, conflicts can receive independent review, public resources can be traced to outcomes, teachers/staff/students/families/community members have meaningful reporting pathways, and the elected Board has enough lawful institutional capacity to govern effectively.

DRAFT STATUS: This document is a governance and policy proposal for Board discussion, administrative review, public input, and qualified school-law counsel review. It is not a legal opinion, does not itself amend current District policy, and does not confer new authority until lawfully adopted or otherwise authorized.

VERIFIED CASE STUDY APPENDIX

Public Financial Trail: Executive Compensation and Title I

This appendix was added after independent verification of figures that had circulated in public commentary. Its purpose is not to make a finding of misconduct. It demonstrates why the governance reforms proposed in this package should require a clear, accessible trail from public authorization to expenditure and, where applicable, to student outcomes.

A. 2025 Superintendent Compensation Disclosure - Verified Figures

Pontiac City School District's public Budget and Salary/Compensation Transparency reporting, hosted through Munetrix, contains a 2025 employee-compensation disclosure with two separate rows labeled SUPERINTENDENT.

- Superintendent entry 1: \$419,215.54 Medicare Gross Pay; \$16,996.63 FICA; \$62,267.58 Retirement; other listed benefits; \$499,352.15 Total.
- Superintendent entry 2: \$187,447.68 Medicare Gross Pay; \$13,635.99 FICA; \$80,876.56 Retirement; listed medical/dental/vision/life/LTD benefits; \$299,864.35 Total.
- Combined total of the two superintendent rows: \$799,216.50.

These figures verify the numbers shown in the public post. They do not, by themselves, establish why the first row's Medicare Gross Pay was \$419,215.54, whether the two rows represent two different individuals, overlapping service, separation compensation, accumulated leave, deferred or retroactive compensation, contractual payments, or another lawful accounting circumstance. The public disclosure is position-based and does not, on its face, provide the underlying contractual explanation.

Governance Records Needed to Complete the Trail

- The superintendent employment contracts and amendments applicable to the payments.
- Any separation, transition, leave-payout, deferred-compensation, retroactive-pay, or settlement agreement contributing to the reported amount.
- Payroll calculation and general-ledger detail supporting the \$419,215.54 Medicare Gross Pay figure.
- Board agenda item, resolution, motion, vote, minutes, or delegated authority supporting any material obligation not already fixed by an approved contract.
- The funding source and accounting codes used for each payment.
- A written reconciliation explaining why two superintendent rows appear in the 2025 transparency disclosure.

Governance principle: CONTRACT OR AUTHORITY -> BOARD/DELEGATED AUTHORIZATION -> PAYROLL CALCULATION -> PAYMENT -> ACCOUNTING -> PUBLIC DISCLOSURE -> BOARD OVERSIGHT.

B. FY2026 Title I Resources - Verified Figures

Pontiac's own FY2026 Grants Overview reports Title I - Improving Basic Programs (code 601) with an estimated FY2026 award of \$5,915,732, prior-year carryover of \$3,609,514, and total available award/resources of \$9,525,246.

PONTIAC GOVERNANCE INITIATIVE | MASTER PROPOSAL

This verifies the approximately \$9.5 million FY2026 Title I figure and the approximately \$3.61 million prior-year carryover shown in the public graphic. The FY2026 document is an estimated grants overview; it is not, by itself, a final expenditure report or proof of improper carryover.

Governance Records Needed to Complete the Title I Trail

- Final approved FY2026 Title I application and amendments.
- Final FY2025 carryover calculation and any applicable carryover-waiver analysis or approval.
- Detailed Title I general ledger by function, object, grant code, location, and responsibility center.
- Personnel/FTE allocations charged to Title I and the strategy each position supports.
- Vendors, contracts, purchase orders, invoices, and material program expenditures.
- School/building allocations and number of students served by funded strategies.
- Baseline measures, measurable objectives, interim monitoring, final results, and corrective actions.
- Final year-end reconciliation comparing estimated award/carryover with actual revenues, expenditures, obligations, and carryover.

Governance principle: NEED -> FUNDING -> APPROVED STRATEGY -> EXPENDITURE -> PROGRAM/PERSONNEL/VENDOR -> STUDENTS SERVED -> MEASURABLE RESULT -> CORRECTIVE ACTION -> FINAL BOARD REVIEW.

C. What Is Verified, and What Remains Unresolved

Question	Status	What the record supports
Were two SUPERINTENDENT rows reported in Pontiac's 2025 compensation disclosure?	VERIFIED	Yes.
Did those two rows total \$799,216.50?	VERIFIED	\$499,352.15 + \$299,864.35 = \$799,216.50.
Did one row report \$419,215.54 as Medicare Gross Pay?	VERIFIED	Yes.
Does the disclosure itself explain why that gross-pay amount was so high?	UNRESOLVED	No underlying contract/calculation is shown in the position-level disclosure.
Did Pontiac report \$9,525,246 in FY2026 Title I total award/resources?	VERIFIED	Yes, in the District's FY2026 Grants Overview.
Did that figure include \$3,609,514 in prior-year carryover?	VERIFIED	Yes.
Does the FY2026 overview prove improper spending or carryover?	NOT ESTABLISHED	No. Additional grant, obligation, waiver, and expenditure records are needed.
Should these figures be treated as evidence of criminality?	NO	The verified records create oversight questions, not a finding of wrongdoing.

D. Proposed Permanent Public Financial Trail Standard

For every material executive-compensation obligation, major contract, grant, or program expenditure, the District should maintain and make available, to the extent permitted by law, a record sufficient to connect the public decision to the public expenditure.

- Executive compensation: Contract -> amendment/authorization -> calculation -> payment -> accounting -> public disclosure.
- Major contracts: Need -> procurement method -> bids/alternatives -> Board authorization -> contract -> invoices/change orders -> final cost -> performance.
- Educational grants: Need -> award -> approved strategy -> spending -> intervention -> students served -> measurable outcome -> corrective action -> carryover/reconciliation.

If a payment or expenditure is lawful and properly authorized, the governance system should make that trail easier - not harder - for the Board and the public to understand.

E. Verified Source Notes

- Munetrix / Pontiac City School District - 2025 Employee Compensation Information: position-level compensation disclosure showing the two SUPERINTENDENT rows and component amounts.
- School District of the City of Pontiac - FY2026 Grants Overview: Title I estimated award \$5,915,732; prior-year carryover \$3,609,514; total \$9,525,246.
- School District of the City of Pontiac - Public Hearing Proposed Budget page: identifies and publishes FY2025 and FY2026 Grants Overviews.
- School District of the City of Pontiac - Board of Education and Office of General Counsel pages: official Board, policy, minutes, and FOIA access points.

Important: This appendix intentionally distinguishes verified public-record figures from unanswered questions. It should not be read as a finding that any individual committed misconduct or that any payment or grant expenditure was unlawful.

PART X - CONSOLIDATED 2026 EXPANSION: EMERGENCY VERIFICATION, CONTINUITY & OPERATIONS ACCOUNTABILITY

This Part consolidates the Emergency Verification Reform framework with the broader Pontiac Governance Initiative. It is intended to be read together with Policies 0100 through 0100.29. Where language overlaps, the more specific emergency, privacy, due-process, or legal safeguard controls. This is proposed policy language for Board and school-law counsel review, not a declaration that an individual trustee presently possesses every authority described below.

Source integration note: The Emergency Verification framework emphasizes that administration remains responsible for day-to-day operations; trustees may inquire, observe, request verification, and activate established oversight procedures; and formal governmental action remains with the Board when law requires collective action.

0100.30 - Leadership Attendance, Remote Expert Access & Continuity of Governance

Purpose. Ensure that the Board receives timely operational information and expert participation even when a particular administrator, professional, or presenter cannot be physically present, while preserving Michigan Open Meetings Act requirements applicable to elected Board members.

Policy standard. District leadership should treat attendance at Board and committee meetings as an accountability responsibility when the agenda requires that leader's report, expertise, or response. Physical absence should not automatically become informational unavailability.

- Superintendent and designated administrators should attend in person when their presence is reasonably required, except for illness, emergency, approved leave, official District business, or another legitimate circumstance.
- When an administrator is physically absent but able to participate, the District should provide secure remote participation by Zoom, Teams, or comparable technology, or designate an informed substitute when appropriate.
- The Board meeting room should maintain reliable hybrid capability: large display, camera, microphones, speakers, captions where available, screen sharing, and secure presentation access.
- The Board may invite the CFO, department directors, attorneys, auditors, engineers, transportation professionals, MDE representatives, grant specialists, consultants, and other experts to appear remotely when lawful and useful.
- If the Superintendent is genuinely unavailable to perform required duties, the succession policy in 0100.11 controls rather than allowing an accountability gap.
- Repeated avoidable or unexplained failure by the Superintendent to provide required Board participation, reporting, or a knowledgeable designee may be documented as part of performance evaluation, subject to contract and law.

Trustee safeguard. Nothing in this section creates a right for an elected trustee to attend, deliberate, count toward quorum, or vote remotely when Michigan law does not permit it. Current OMA requirements control. The District may use hybrid technology for administrators, presenters, experts, and public access without treating that technology as authority for unlawful remote Board-member participation.

Governance principle: ABSENCE SHOULD NOT AUTOMATICALLY MEAN UNAVAILABILITY.

0100.31 - Operations, Finance & Accountability Committee

Purpose. Establish a standing Board committee focused on recurring operational, financial, grant, procurement, facilities, transportation, technology, contract, and performance oversight. The committee is designed to strengthen the Board’s ability to verify implementation without converting trustees into operational managers.

Recommended structural distinction. The existing Oversight, Investigations & Accountability Committee under 0100.1 should focus primarily on investigations, conflicts, complaints, integrity, corrective action, and independent review. The Operations, Finance & Accountability Committee should focus primarily on recurring dashboards, budgets, grants, contracts, procurement, transportation, facilities, technology, and performance monitoring. The Board may combine these functions if current policy, workload, or counsel review favors one committee.

- Review budget-to-actual reports, material variances, cash-flow and financial-condition indicators appropriate for Board oversight.
- Review Title I, Section 31a, and other material restricted grants from need and award through expenditure, implementation, students served, outcome, carryover, and corrective action.
- Review significant contracts, vendors, purchasing methods, competitive alternatives, amendments, change orders, and total cost of ownership.
- Review transportation reliability, fleet condition, safety defects, preventive maintenance, facilities work orders, deferred maintenance, capital projects, and recurring failures.
- Review technology, cybersecurity, business continuity, and major systems risks at a governance level without publicly exposing sensitive security details.
- Review implementation of Board directives, major operational projects, Partnership Agreement commitments, and measurable student-outcome connections.
- Receive reports from the Superintendent or designee and invite appropriate staff or independent experts to explain material issues.
- Recommend corrective action, audit, professional assessment, agenda referral, or further investigation to the full Board when warranted.

No administrative command. The Committee shall not independently employ, terminate, discipline, supervise, or direct District employees; award contracts; obligate District funds; alter student services; or exercise authority reserved to the full Board, Superintendent, or another legally designated process. Committee recommendations requiring Board action shall return to the full Board.

OMA safeguard. Counsel should determine whether the committee is a public body under the Michigan Open Meetings Act based on its creation, delegation, membership, and authority. The Initiative favors public notice, accessible materials, minutes, and open deliberation whenever legally required or appropriate rather than structuring a committee to avoid transparency.

Monthly Operations Accountability Dashboard

Domain	Minimum Board-Level Indicators	Status / Follow-Up
Finance	Budget-to-actual; material variances; audit findings; corrective actions	Green / Yellow / Red
Grants	Award; carryover; expenditures; strategy; students served; target; result	Green / Yellow / Red
Contracts & Procurement	Major awards; amendments; change orders; alternatives; vendor performance	Green / Yellow / Red
Transportation	On-time reliability; out-of-service buses;	Green / Yellow / Red

PONTIAC GOVERNANCE INITIATIVE | MASTER PROPOSAL

	safety defects; repeat repairs	
Facilities	Life-safety issues; work orders; deferred maintenance; capital milestones	Green / Yellow / Red
Technology & Security	Major incidents; continuity; remediation status; material risk	Protected detail / Board status
Board Directives	Owner; deadline; deliverable; status; evidence of completion	Open / At Risk / Complete
Partnership Agreement	Benchmark progress; barriers; supports; financial/resource alignment	On Track / At Risk / Off Track
Corrective Actions	Finding; responsible official; deadline; evidence; verification	Open / Verified / Overdue

PART XI - EMERGENCY VERIFICATION & RESOLUTION PROTOCOL

A. Emergency or Urgent Oversight Situation - Expanded Definition

An Emergency or Urgent Oversight Situation exists when credible information creates a reasonable concern that delay in verification, preservation, referral, or lawful response could materially increase risk. Activation is a governance trigger, not a finding of wrongdoing.

- Immediate or substantial risk to the health, safety, or welfare of a student, employee, visitor, or other person.
- A credible concern that a student with a disability may be denied required services, accommodations, supports, placement procedures, procedural protections, or other rights.
- Abuse, neglect, discrimination, harassment, bullying, retaliation, sexual misconduct, or other serious misconduct.
- A potentially significant violation of Board policy, state law, federal law, or a binding District obligation.
- Reasonable risk of destruction, concealment, alteration, or loss of relevant records or evidence.
- A substantial financial, procurement, cybersecurity, transportation, facilities, operational, or reputational threat.
- A significant matter in which ordinary administrative channels have failed to provide a timely response and continued delay creates material risk.
- Other extraordinary circumstances requiring prompt Board-level awareness or verification.

Ordinary disagreement with an administrator, employee, parent, student, Superintendent, or trustee does not by itself constitute an emergency.

B. Activation by Any Individual Trustee

Any trustee may initiate the Emergency Verification Protocol when the trustee reasonably believes a qualifying circumstance exists. Initiation does not authorize the trustee to decide the merits, command staff, seize records, alter an IEP, impose discipline, spend funds, or exercise powers reserved to the full Board or administration.

Activation should cause the concern to be timestamped and documented; relevant information to be preserved through authorized channels; designated officials to be notified; an initial severity level to be assigned; and a verification path to begin.

Immediate Verification Questions

11. What happened?
12. Is anyone presently at risk?
13. What do available records establish?
14. What law, policy, plan, IEP, Section 504 plan, contract, procedure, or control applies?
15. What has administration already done?
16. What immediate lawful step can stabilize or de-escalate the situation?
17. Does the matter require counsel, an outside agency, a special meeting, independent review, or full-Board action?

C. Verify-the-Source Standard

A legitimate Board inquiry should not be considered resolved solely because an administrator provided a verbal conclusion. When reasonable verification is requested, administration should identify the appropriate evidence, record, report, data source, policy, procedure, or other basis supporting the representation unless disclosure is legally restricted.

Operational phrase: DO NOT MERELY TELL THE BOARD. SHOW THE BOARD HOW THE CONCLUSION CAN BE VERIFIED.

D. Special Education / IEP Emergency Verification

When a parent, guardian, student, employee, or trustee raises a credible concern involving an IEP, Section 504 plan, placement, services, accommodations, behavioral supports, safety plan, evaluation, parent participation, or procedural protection, the District should use an expedited verification pathway proportionate to the risk.

Verification Question	Evidence / Responsible Process	Trustee Boundary
Does a current IEP/504 plan exist and what does it require?	Authorized special-education records and responsible administration	Governance verification only
Were required services/supports actually delivered?	Service logs, schedules, progress records, authorized staff response	Trustee does not direct providers
Did required meetings/notices/evaluations occur?	Meeting records, notices, evaluation timeline, procedural documentation	Do not substitute for IDEA process
Is there an immediate health/safety/access concern?	Safety assessment and authorized operational response	Emergency protection through authorized staff
Can administration promptly resolve the issue?	Corrective action, parent communication, implementation evidence	Board tracks material/systemic closure
Is formal dispute resolution relevant?	Procedural safeguards, mediation, complaint, due process, legal review	Trustee does not adjudicate dispute

A trustee may activate verification and receive information that is legally appropriate and reasonably necessary for governance. A trustee shall not personally rewrite an IEP, determine eligibility, select placement, direct service providers, or substitute the trustee's judgment for the legally required IEP/placement process.

E. Parent De-escalation & Resolution Standard

The first objective in an urgent parent or student complaint is safety and lawful resolution, not institutional defensiveness. The response should identify what is known, what remains unverified, who owns the next step, when the next communication will occur, and what escalation routes remain available.

PROTECT -> LISTEN -> VERIFY -> DE-ESCALATE -> RESPOND -> FOLLOW UP

- Use one responsible contact whenever practical so the family is not repeatedly transferred without ownership.
- Distinguish allegations from verified facts and avoid promising a final outcome before review.
- Explain the applicable process in plain language, including external rights or timelines when required.

PONTIAC GOVERNANCE INITIATIVE | MASTER PROPOSAL

- If the ordinary chain of command is materially implicated, route the matter to an independent or alternative authorized pathway.
- Document the resolution and verify implementation before closing a Board-tracked matter.

PART XII - BOARD OVERSIGHT & RESOLUTION REGISTER - SYSTEM SPECIFICATION

The Board Oversight & Resolution Register is the operational accountability layer of the Initiative. It is not a second administrative case-management system for trustees to run. It is a governance register that provides structured initiation, status visibility, pattern detection, escalation, and evidence-based closure.

Required Case Fields

Field	Required Content
Case ID	Unique, non-meaningful identifier
Date / Time Received	Automatic timestamp
Source Type	Parent / Student / Employee / Trustee / Community / Audit / Agency / Other
Category	Safety / Special Education / Bullying / Retaliation / Finance / Procurement / Facilities / Transportation / Cyber / Policy / Other
Severity	Critical / Urgent / Priority / Routine
Conflict Screen	Whether ordinary chain is materially implicated
Assigned Verification Official	Authorized administrator, counsel, investigator, auditor, or specialist
Mandatory External Process	911 / CPS / law enforcement / Title IX / IDEA / OCR / other, if applicable
Response Target	Internal target; never supersedes legal deadline
Status	Received / Triage / Verifying / Corrective Action / Board Review / Closed
Evidence of Closure	Record, report, action, inspection, payment correction, service verification, or other proof
Pattern Flag	Building / department / vendor / category / policy / repeat issue
Access Log	Who viewed or changed protected case data and when

Severity & Response Matrix

Level	Illustrative Standard	Initial Internal Target	Examples
Critical	Imminent threat or legally time-sensitive emergency	Immediate / as law requires	Violence threat; medical emergency; suspected abuse; active cyber incident
Urgent	Material risk if delayed	Same day	Serious IEP implementation/safety concern; retaliation; evidence-preservation risk
Priority	Significant governance concern without immediate danger	1-3 business days	Repeated parent complaints; procurement concern; unresolved policy failure
Routine	Normal governance inquiry	Reasonable administrative timeframe	Data request; implementation question; trend inquiry

These are proposed management targets only. Statutory, regulatory, contractual, emergency, Title IX, IDEA, child-protection, law-enforcement, or other controlling deadlines supersede them.

Pattern & Early-Warning Rules

- Repeated concerns by building, department, category, vendor, policy area, or unresolved status should generate a governance-level pattern flag.
- A pattern alert is a signal for review, not proof of wrongdoing.
- Patterns involving protected student or personnel information should be reported to the Board in aggregate or de-identified form unless lawful access to more detail is necessary.
- Overdue corrective actions should escalate to the responsible executive, then to the appropriate Board committee or full Board when governance significance warrants.
- Closed matters may be reopened when materially related external findings or new evidence could change the prior disposition.

Secure Role-Based File Access

Access should follow least-privilege principles. Trustees should receive the governance-level information necessary to perform lawful duties; operational staff should receive the case-management permissions necessary for implementation. The system should not create blanket trustee access to every student, personnel, medical, attorney-client, security, or investigative record.

- Multifactor authentication for sensitive systems.
- Read-only trustee access where editing is unnecessary.
- Logging of confidential-record access.
- De-identification or aggregation where identity is unnecessary.
- Restrictions on local downloads of protected records except when authorized.
- Retention and deletion schedules consistent with District policy and law.
- Annual confidentiality, FERPA, cybersecurity, OMA, and governance-boundary training.

PART XIII - STATE PARTNERSHIP AGREEMENT ACCOUNTABILITY

CROSSWALK

Pontiac's 2026 Partnership Agreement with the Michigan Department of Education and Oakland Schools provides an immediate, concrete reason for disciplined Board verification. The Agreement preserves District control of its schools while assigning defined responsibilities to the Board, Superintendent, intermediate district, and MDE. The following crosswalk is based on the signed Partnership Agreement supplied with this project and should be verified against the official executed copy before Board adoption of any policy.

A. Governance Responsibilities Created by the Partnership Agreement

Partnership Agreement Responsibility	PGI Mechanism	Board Verification Question
Board supports Superintendent and ensures community engagement	0100; 0100.27; public reporting	What engagement occurred, what barriers were heard, and what changed?
Board reviews Partnership Agreement progress at regular meetings	0100.19; 0100.31 dashboard	What benchmark moved, what did not, and what evidence supports the report?
Board reviews financial reports and aggregated student data	0100.29; 0100.31	Are resources aligned to the identified need and measurable result?
Board reviews challenges, barriers, and celebrations	Directive/corrective-action tracker	Who owns each barrier, by when, and what is the closure evidence?
Superintendent provides regular Board updates and implements Agreement	0100.20; 0100.30	Are updates timely, complete, and connected to evidence?
MDE liaison/expertise supports efficient/effective use of resources	0100.29; committee expert access	What outside support was requested and how was it used?

B. CSI Schools & Benchmark Monitoring

The Partnership Agreement identifies Herrington Elementary, Pontiac Middle School, and Pontiac High School as CSI schools subject to Partnership Agreement benchmarks and accountability provisions. Alcott Elementary (TSI) and Whitman Elementary (ATS) are included in supports but are not subject to the same Partnership Agreement benchmark/accountability structure. The Board should monitor official baseline, 18-month, and 36-month measures without silently changing values or correcting apparent drafting inconsistencies in the executed Agreement.

School	Selected Baseline Measures in Executed Agreement	Governance Use
Herrington Elementary	i-Ready Math 16.2%; Reading 21.4%; M-STEP Math 4.4%; Reading 7.5%; chronic absenteeism 69.9%	Track 18/36-month progress, intervention implementation, attendance strategy, resource alignment
Pontiac Middle	i-Ready Math 22.6%; Reading 22.2%; M-STEP/PSAT Math 7.95%; Reading 18.33%; chronic absenteeism 62.4%	Track benchmark movement, barriers, student supports, and spending-to-outcome connection
Pontiac High	NWEA Math 50.5%; Reading 56.2%; SAT Math 1.39%; SAT Reading 26.32%; chronic absenteeism 72.3%; graduation 66.37%	Track academic, attendance, graduation, and implementation measures; flag textual inconsistencies for clarification

Document-control caution. The executed Agreement appears to contain textual inconsistencies in some Pontiac High 36-month math/attendance language and a timeline/signature-date discrepancy. The

PONTIAC GOVERNANCE INITIATIVE | MASTER PROPOSAL

Initiative should flag those items for clarification with MDE/Oakland Schools rather than silently correcting the official document or treating the discrepancy as evidence of wrongdoing.

C. Partnership Agreement Quarterly Board Review

Quarterly Question	Required Evidence
What was the identified student need?	Needs assessment / Michigan School Index / local data
What strategy was approved?	Partnership Agreement action / improvement plan / grant application
What resources were assigned?	Budget, grant, staffing, vendor, schedule
Was implementation delivered as designed?	Program logs, staffing, attendance, service delivery, milestones
What happened to the student measure?	Benchmark data and trend
What barrier remains?	Written barrier analysis and responsible official
What corrective action is required?	Action, owner, deadline, evidence standard
What will the Board verify next quarter?	Follow-up item entered into Board Directive / Resolution Register

PART XIV - IMPLEMENTATION FORMS & WORKFLOWS

Form 1 - Board Information / Verification Request

Field	Entry
Requesting Trustee	
Date / Time	
Governance Purpose	
Question to Be Verified	
Records / Data Requested	
Relevant Policy / Law / Plan	
Urgency	
Requested Response Date	
Confidentiality Classification	
Administration Response	
Evidence / Source Provided	
Access Limited or Denied - Basis	
Follow-Up / Agenda Referral	
Closure Date	

Form 2 - Board Observation Report

Field	Entry
Trustee	
Date / Time / Location	
Observation Type	
Priority I / II / III / IV	
Objective Observation	
Immediate Safety Concern	
Evidence Available	
Professional Inspection Needed?	
Responsible Administrative Office	
Requested Follow-Up	
Response / Corrective Action	
Evidence of Completion	
Pattern Flag / Related Cases	

Form 3 - Emergency Verification Intake

Field	Entry
Case ID	
Initiating Trustee / Source	
Date / Time Received	
Immediate Risk?	
Mandatory External Report?	
Category	
Severity	
Conflict Screen	
Records Preservation Needed?	
Assigned Verification Official	
Parent / Student Contact Owner	
Initial Stabilization Action	
Next Communication Deadline	
Board / Counsel Escalation	
Corrective Action	
Evidence of Closure	

Form 4 - Board Directive Tracker

Board Action	Date	Responsible Executive	Deadline	Deliverable	Status	Evidence	Board Follow-Up

Form 5 - Grant Investment & Student Outcomes Report

Field	Required Entry
Grant / Program	
Identified Need	
Award / Carryover / Total Available	
Approved Strategy	
School / Program	
Personnel / Vendor	
Actual Expenditure	
Students Served	
Baseline	
18-Month / Annual Target	
Actual Result	
Variance / Barrier	
Corrective Action	
Carryover / Reconciliation	
Board Review Date	

Required logic: NEED -> FUNDING -> APPROVED STRATEGY -> EXPENDITURE -> IMPLEMENTATION -> STUDENTS SERVED -> TARGET -> ACTUAL RESULT -> CORRECTIVE ACTION -> CARRYOVER / RECONCILIATION -> BOARD REVIEW.

Form 6 - Operations, Finance & Accountability Committee Referral

Field	Entry
Referral Date	
Referred By	
Domain	
Question / Issue	
Supporting Materials	

PONTIAC GOVERNANCE INITIATIVE | MASTER PROPOSAL

Administrator / Expert Requested	
Financial Impact	
Student / Safety Impact	
Committee Finding / Recommendation	
Full Board Action Needed?	
Corrective Action Owner	
Deadline	
Verification / Closure	

Form 7 - Corrective Action Verification

Problem / Finding	Responsible Official	Required Action	Deadline	Evidence Standard	Evidence Received	Verified By	Status

PART XV - LEGAL & ETHICAL GUARDRAILS - CONSOLIDATED CHECKLIST

The following safeguards are mandatory design constraints. They are intended to prevent stronger oversight from becoming unlawful micromanagement, privacy intrusion, retaliation, private deliberation, or interference with legally assigned processes.

Area	Required Safeguard	Counsel / Implementation Question
Michigan OMA	No private quorum deliberation; collective decisions in lawful meetings; current remote-participation rules control	Does any committee/dashboard/email workflow create a public-body or deliberation issue?
FERPA	Legitimate educational interest, least privilege, logging, de-identification where possible	Which trustee roles qualify for which student-level records and why?
IDEA / Section 504	Trustee verification cannot replace IEP/placement/evaluation/dispute-resolution processes	What information may be shared for governance without interfering with procedural safeguards?
Title IX	Board process cannot delay or replace legally required Title IX response	How are urgent referrals handed to the Title IX process immediately?
Mandated Reporting	No Board verification step may delay CPS, emergency services, law enforcement, or other required report	What automatic escalation rules are needed?
Employment / Labor	No informal trustee discipline; preserve due process, contracts, CBAs, and supervisory chain	What matters require closed session, counsel, HR, or collective Board action?
Attorney-Client Privilege	Define who may engage counsel and how privileged advice is distributed/protected	How can trustees obtain needed advice without uncontrolled legal spending or waiver?
Cybersecurity	MFA, logging, least privilege, protected security details, incident response	Which systems can safely expose read-only Board dashboards?
FOIA / Records	Trustee notes, case logs, dashboards, and messages may create public records	What retention, classification, and production rules apply?
Due Process / Fairness	Allegation is not finding; conflict screen; independent review where appropriate	How are notice, response opportunity, evidence standards, and appeals protected?

Individual Trustee vs. Full Board - Decision Boundary

Action	Individual Trustee	Full Board / Authorized Administration
Ask a good-faith governance question	Yes	May respond / establish procedures
Request verification through adopted process	Yes	May set scope/procedure collectively
Observe under adopted protocol	Yes	Administration maintains safety/privacy rules
Initiate Emergency Verification	Proposed: Yes	Authorized officials triage/respond; Board acts when required
Direct an employee to change operations	No	Superintendent/authorized supervisor
Rewrite IEP / select placement	No	IEP/placement process
Order independent investigation at District expense	No unless expressly delegated	Board or authorized contracting official

PONTIAC GOVERNANCE INITIATIVE | MASTER PROPOSAL

Award contract / spend funds	No	Board/authorized administration
Impose final employee discipline	No	Authorized administration/Board as law and contract require
Place lawful matter on agenda	Request under adopted pathway	Agenda process / Board procedures
Make District policy	No	Board collectively
Deliberate toward Board decision privately with quorum	No	Open meeting, subject to lawful exceptions

PART XVI - FINAL BOARD / COUNSEL REVIEW & ADOPTION ROADMAP

Board/Counsel Review Checklist

- Map every proposed 0100-series section to current Pontiac bylaws and policies; identify conflicts, duplication, and required repeals or amendments.
- Confirm which information and verification rights may be exercised by one trustee and which require Board authorization.
- Define Superintendent response obligations and reasonable limits for burdensome, duplicative, privileged, or legally restricted requests.
- Define FERPA legitimate educational interest and configure role-based access accordingly.
- Review IDEA, Section 504, Title IX, Michigan special-education procedures, and parent procedural safeguards.
- Review OMA implications for committees, email, group messaging, dashboards, special meetings, closed sessions, and remote participation.
- Review FOIA and records-retention implications for trustee notes, reports, case logs, attachments, and communications.
- Review collective bargaining agreements, employee due process, whistleblower protections, anti-retaliation, and investigation procedures.
- Define Board-counsel engagement, independent investigator engagement, privilege, and funding authority.
- Define mandatory-reporting and emergency escalation that cannot wait for Board review.
- Approve cybersecurity, access logging, breach response, and annual trustee training requirements.
- Clarify the Partnership Agreement's apparent drafting/timeline inconsistencies with MDE/Oakland Schools without altering the executed record.
- Pilot the Board Oversight & Resolution Register and Operations Dashboard; audit access, timeliness, and burden after 90 and 180 days.
- Adopt measurable annual governance metrics and publish lawful aggregate results.

Recommended Adoption Sequence

18. Counsel crosswalk and legal classification of each provision.
19. Public Board work session explaining the governance/administration boundary.
20. Administrative and employee-process review, including labor and privacy impacts.
21. Parent, student, teacher, staff, community, and special-education stakeholder feedback.
22. Revise policy text and identify implementation cost, staffing, software, and training needs.
23. First reading / policy committee review under current District procedure.
24. Second reading and collective Board action where required.
25. 90-day pilot of forms, dashboards, access controls, and committee reporting.
26. 180-day audit and corrective revision.
27. Annual governance effectiveness report to the public.

Consolidated Proposed Board Motion

"I move that the Board refer the Pontiac Governance Initiative - Restoring Public Governance to Pontiac Schools: Board Governance, Accountability & Emergency Verification Reform - to the appropriate Board committee, Superintendent/administration, and Board legal counsel for review; direct preparation of a

crosswalk against current District bylaws and policies, the 2026 Partnership Agreement, and applicable Michigan and federal law; identify provisions that may be adopted locally and provisions requiring additional legal, contractual, or legislative authority; and return proposed policy language, implementation recommendations, fiscal/technology requirements, and a timeline to the Board for public discussion and consideration.”

This motion is intentionally a referral for review and policy development. It does not make findings of wrongdoing, immediately adopt every proposed provision, or create unilateral authority for an individual trustee.

FINAL GOVERNANCE STATEMENT

A strong Board does not wait for a crisis to become a scandal before asking questions. It listens early, protects people, verifies facts, respects lawful roles, corrects deficiencies, and confirms that the correction actually occurred.

THE BOARD GOVERNS. ADMINISTRATION OPERATES. ADMINISTRATION REPORTS. THE BOARD VERIFIES.

STUDENTS FIRST. FAMILIES FIRST. PONTIAC FIRST.

DRAFT FOR POLICY DEVELOPMENT, PUBLIC DISCUSSION, ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW, AND BOARD COUNSEL REVIEW.