MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS  
SCHOOL DISTRICT 4J, LANE COUNTY, OREGON

September 3, 2008

The Board of Directors of School District No. 4J, Lane County, Eugene, Oregon, held a regular board meeting at 7 p.m. on September 3, 2008, at the Education Center, 200 North Monroe Street, Eugene, Oregon. Notice of the meeting was mailed to the media and posted in the Education Center on August 29, 2008, and published in The Register-Guard on September 1, 2008.

ROLL CALL

BOARD MEMBERS:
Charles Martinez, Jr., Chair  
Yvette Webber-Davis, Vice Chair  
Eric Forrest  
Beth Gerot  
Alicia Hays  
Craig Smith  
Jim Torrey

STAFF:
George Russell, Superintendent of Schools and District Clerk  
Barbara Bellamy, Chief of Staff and Communications Director  
Yvonne Curtis, Director of Student Achievement  
Susan Fahey, Chief Financial Officer  
Celia Feres-Johnson, Director of Human Resources  
Tom Henry, Deputy Superintendent and Chief Academic Officer  
Carl Hermanns, Assistant Superintendent/Chief Operating Officer  
Kay Mehas, Director of School Services  
Laurie Moses, Director of High School Services  
Christine Nesbit, Associate Director for Employee and Labor Relations  
Pamela Irvine, Adams Elementary School Principal

MEDIA:
KRVM

CALL TO ORDER, ROLL CALL, AND FLAG SALUTE

Charles Martinez, Board Chair, called the meeting of the School District 4J Board of Directors to order at 7:02 p.m. He noted that Alicia Hays would be arriving later in the meeting. Dr. Martinez led those present in the Pledge of Allegiance

AGENDA REVIEW

Superintendent George Russell noted that board members and staff had no changes to make to the agenda.
INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS AND SUPERINTENDENT’S REPORT

Superintendent Russell thanked Helen Towle who had recently filled in as interim Human Resources Director for the district before introducing the new Associate Director for Employee and Labor Relations, Christine Nesbit.

Ms. Nesbit thanked the board for the opportunity to introduce herself and commented she was looking forward to working with them.

Superintendent Russell then directed the board to a list of recent additions to the 4J Department of Human Resources.

Superintendent Russell reminded the board that it was the first day of school for the district and said he had visited the back-to-school ceremonies of two district schools.

Board Member Alicia Hays arrived to the meeting at 7:07 p.m.

Superintendent Russell indicated the board had received thank you notes from the principal and staff at Meadowlark for the new modular unit classrooms.

Superintendent Russell also said that despite a few glitches, the school year had gotten off to a good start and he was glad to have students and teachers back.

Chief Financial Officer Susan Fahey briefed the board on the AA3 bond rating recently conferred upon the district by Moody’s. She indicated that the overall bond market had turned in the district’s favor and that the savings to taxpayers as a result of the favorable bond rating would be in excess of $5 million.

COMMENTS BY STUDENT REPRESENTATIVES

No comments were offered by student representatives although Dr. Martinez said district student representatives were expected to attend and speak at the next board meeting.

ITEMS RAISED BY THE AUDIENCE

David Blasher, 1300 Southwest Fifth Avenue, Suite 2300, Portland, an attorney with the Portland law firm of Davis, Wright & Tremaine spoke on behalf of the Oregon Virtual Academy (ORVA) and introduced several audience members associated with ORVA either as parents, teachers or staff members. He said he would be available to answer any of the board’s legal or technical questions regarding ORVA.

Diane Phillips, 1266 Winery Lane, Eugene, an ORVA parent and Chairperson of the ORVA Board of Directors, commented that ORVA had been approved by the Oregon State Board of Education as a virtual charter school and approved for K-8 instruction. She said that currently over 200 students from 63 different Oregon school districts had been approved to enroll in ORVA. She said the Oregon State Board of Education (OSBE) had notified her office that any Oregon school district student could enroll in ORVA with the relevant superintendent’s approval, and that she was seeking approval for nine students from 4J to enroll in ORVA.
Elena Molina, 230 Ferndale, Eugene, and her husband Sol Oxendine supported their daughter’s attending ORVA. She said she had compared ORVA with other alternative education options in the area and found it to be the best option for her daughter. She said Superintendent Russell’s decision not to allow her to enroll in ORVA was not sitting well with her family and she asked him to reconsider. Mr. Oxendine commented that the curriculum and educational opportunities a charter school such as ORVA could provide would be much better for their daughter than any of the public schools within the district.

Ethen Perkins, 2410 Monroe, Eugene, spoke in his capacity as the parent of an Adams Elementary School student. He commented he had been serving on a race matters committee at Adams for the past four years. He asked that the board, in their discussions regarding the Adams survey results, take into account a memorandum that Betsy Boyd had sent them as it had several points worth considering. He asked if Adams might benefit from a Spanish language program similar to the one at Parker Elementary School. He asked if the board might consider redefining the boundaries of Adams Elementary School. He asked if the Adams school year should be different but coordinated with the other elementary schools in the Churchill District to encourage enrollment. He summarized saying that there is a poor public perception of Adams which he felt was a result of a bias against Adams’ longstanding commitment to diversity.

COMMENTS BY EMPLOYEE GROUPS

Paul Duchin, speaking in conjunction with Merri Steele as Co-Presidents of the Eugene Education Association (EEA), thanked Dr. Martinez and Vice Chair Yvette Webber-Davis for having breakfast with them recently to speak regarding district issues. Mr. Duchin acknowledged that the back-to-school event attended by district board members had gone quite well, and that the speeches were constructive and flowed together nicely.

Ms. Steele informed the board that they were highly interested in continuing their diversity training efforts. Ms. Steele commented that the EEA was working with the Yes For Children committee and were going to have their phone banks set up to help with a local option on September 15.

Ms. Steele also invited the board to a press conference on September 4 at River Road Elementary School regarding Measure 58.

Mr. Duchin noted the EEA was looking forward to working with the new district Human Resources personnel.

ITEMS FOR INFORMATION

Receive a Report on Adams Survey Results

Barb Bellamy, Chief of Staff and Communications Director, commented that the Adams survey results were being brought before the board not as any sort of decision-making tool or attempt to call a vote on any matter, but rather as an impetus to discussion of the planning process for Adams Elementary School.

Ms. Bellamy indicated she was disappointed in the response rate of the survey, saying it was a bit smaller than she had been expecting. She said that while the survey had been submitted to all households within the boundaries of the school’s attendance area, there was a smaller return from families directly involved with Adams than those who were not.
Board Member Beth Gerot, responding to a request for clarification from Board Member Craig Smith, outlined the geographic boundaries of the Adams attendance area and the adjacent elementary school boundaries within the district.

Yvonne Curtis, Director of Student Achievement, averred that the results of the survey indicated that there was not a strong interest in Adams becoming a Chinese immersion school, nor would such an alteration provide any additional incentives to enrollment. She noted that the survey did indicate an interest in Adams providing a Spanish language program similar to the one at Parker.

Ms. Curtis proceeded to summarize elements of the Northwest Survey & Data Services (NSDS) Executive Summary of Results regarding the Adams Elementary School Parents Survey, noting it was surprising that the level of interest in before and after school programs as well as all-day kindergarten was much lower than had been expected.

Ms. Curtis reminded the board of one of the primary 4J concerns associated with the survey was who would in fact be making decisions with regard to a possible Chinese immersion program. She commented that, since the survey results had indicated a low level of interest in such a program, staff and parents should be highly involved in the decision-making process for Chinese immersion or any other similar programs.

Pamela Irvine, Adams Elementary School Principal, responding to a question from Mr. Smith regarding the tenure status of the Adams faculty, indicated that most of the staff had been there quite a long time, but there were two newer staff members who had been there only two to four years.

Ms. Curtis summarized the conclusion of the Executive Summary, saying a strong majority of the parents who live inside the Adams boundary would continue to prefer to send their children to schools other than Adams.

Ms. Irvine felt her own analysis indicated that the respondents to the survey wanted a neighborhood public school as opposed to an alternative school or a charter school.

Ms. Irvine informed the board that the Adams site council would be working on the survey results and that they would be adding several new community members to that council. She said that Betsy Shepard would be facilitating the upcoming site council meetings on September 17, October 1, October 29, and November 12, in order to have any recommendations of the site council ready to be brought to the board before the winter holidays.

Board Member Eric Forrest asked if any consideration had been given to the idea of changing the boundaries of Adams’ attendance area. Ms. Irvine replied that the ideal situation would always be to keep the neighborhoods close to the schools, although that was not always possible. Superintendent Russell added that there was a group investigating the possibility of changing attendance area boundaries within the district and that they would be presenting their information during upcoming meetings.

Board Member Jim Torrey asked how many students normally elected to attend Adams who lived outside the normal attendance area boundaries of the school, and what such students were looking for in attending Adams. Ms. Irvine replied that approximately 40 current Adams students fit that criteria and that they were generally attracted to the strong sense of community provided by a smaller school such as Adams.
Dr. Webber-Davis asked Ms. Irvine to describe in general terms the current curriculum at Adams. Ms. Irvine answered that they generally followed the district curriculum as well as the Bridges curriculum.

Ms. Irvine, responding to a question from Mr. Smith, said the current number of students enrolled at Adams was indeterminate but there seemed to be an increase from the end of the previous year. She guessed that there were approximately 300 students enrolled during the previous year.

Dr. Martinez asked if the families of Adams transfer students had participated in the survey. Ms. Irvine was not sure if those families had been included in the distribution of the survey materials. Ms. Bellamy added she would look into the matter and report back to the board. Dr. Martinez felt that learning more about how and why those families had opted into Adams might provide more information on the strengths of Adams that might be exploitable in order to strengthen its programs and increase enrollment.

Mr. Torrey asked if any of the Adams site council members had been brought into the committee that Superintendent Russell mentioned was looking into the prospect of changing attendance area boundaries within the district. Superintendent Russell answered that there was no formal committee investigating the matter and that there was only a group of individual staff that Ms. Bellamy would be meeting with to discuss the issues regarding attendance area boundaries.

Dr. Martinez stated it might be helpful to have demographic information regarding the survey respondents provided to the board so that they might be able to compare that information against the demographic information regarding Adams itself.

Mr. Torrey commented it might be helpful to try and solicit information from those people residing within the attendance area boundaries but not enrolling in Adam Elementary School to try and get a sense of why they would choose not to enroll. Ms. Bellamy replied that they were unable to survey residents or solicit information in that manner.

Mr. Forrest noted certain typographical errors in numbers 9 and 19 of the Parent Survey information distributed to the board. Ms. Bellamy responded that a corrected copy would be circulated to the board.

Ms. Gerot felt geographic issues with regard to Adams’ attendance area boundaries were very important. Mr. Forrest added that the overriding problem was that there were too many schools and too few kids in the area. He believed that without changing the model of how boundaries were drawn, moving those boundaries would not solve anything.

Ms. Irvine, responding to questions from Ms. Hays, said that approximately 59% of the Adams students were using free or reduced lunch (FRL) programs. Ms. Hays commented that the survey indicated that it was the residents with greater incomes that were choosing to not attend Adams. Ms. Irvine opined that it was also human nature and the basic desire to gravitate toward like-minded individuals, not just income, that might be leading certain demographic portions of the population to seek their educations elsewhere.

Ms. Bellamy stated that the applications for the Adams Planning Group were available on the district website.
Receive a Preliminary Report on Oregon State Assessment Results

Tom Henry, Deputy Superintendent and Chief Academic Officer, stated that the three most positive attributes of the recent assessment testing were that the testing process had gone smoothly, that the data collected had been much better organized, and that it appeared that schools within the district were scoring quite well compared to state and local averages.

Mr. Henry commented there were still significant achievement gaps in certain groups of district students. He said the recent assessment testing indicated that 40% of tenth graders were unable to meet established standards in mathematics and 30% of tenth graders were unable to meet established reading standards. He said while it was encouraging that 4J students were testing well compared to other districts, even one student not meeting established district standards was one too many.

Mr. Smith asked if the assessment standards this year were the same as in the previous year. Mr. Henry confirmed that they were.

Ms. Curtis summarized the color-coded information she had distributed to the board, noting increases in the reading levels of fourth and fifth graders within the district and that the data corroborated the conversations 4J staff had been having with teachers regarding recent reading and language arts improvements.

Ms. Curtis said the assessment data also indicated a drop in the reading levels of eighth grade students in addition to the tenth graders that Mr. Henry had previously mentioned. She said that staff would be investigating the causes and possible corrections with regard to the drop.

Ms. Curtis pointed out that the Title I schools within 4J had been doing very well with regard to the assessment testing scores.

Dr. Webber-Davis asked why the state had changed to fourth and seventh grade assessments regarding the writing abilities of district students. Mr. Henry recalled that the state was developing assessments for each grade level in response to No Child Left Behind (NCLB) and that the district performing assessments at grades three, five, eight and ten had led to an inordinate amount of testing for the students.

Ms. Curtis felt that it might be beneficial to do some sort of internal assessment testing at every grade level so that the district might have a better sense of the current state of district students in general.

Mr. Torrey, responding to Mr. Henry’s earlier information regarding achievement gap in tenth grade math scores, asked if anything specific was being done or could be done with incoming ninth graders to better prepare them for the assessment testing. Director of High School Services Laurie Moses noted that math scores at North Eugene High School had actually increased. She responded to Mr. Torrey’s question saying that certain funds had been allocated specifically to math interventions at the high school level, that they were attempting to eliminate lower track math classes, and that two years of a summer bridge program had been funded for ninth grade students identified as needing extra math instruction.

Mr. Torrey asked if all district high schools were using a consistent math curriculum. Ms. Moses replied that this year for the first time all algebra teachers at all district middle and high schools would be using a common assessment and that the various methodologies used in math instruction were becoming more standardized. Ms. Curtis added that research showed
consistent curriculum standards were not what necessarily made a difference in math scores, but what did make a difference was access to higher level content and a rigorous curriculum. Ms. Curtis also noted that rather than a consistency among various school curriculums, a consistency of the assessments used to measure student achievement should be the goal of the district.

Ms. Curtis noted that the upcoming adoption of mathematics assessments focused on K-8 and Algebra I merited special attention by the board.

Mr. Torrey complimented Ms. Curtis on her work regarding math assessments, but was concerned that the district might not know at the end of the school year which or how many ninth grade students might need additional math resources provided to them before the tenth grade assessment testing.

Ms. Moses indicated it was relatively possible to predict the likelihood of ninth grade students being successful students or not by examining certain specific factors such as: 1) a student’s eighth grade assessment scores; 2) whether or not a student is on track to graduate; 3) whether or not a student is credit deficient or has failed classes by the end of their ninth grade year; and 4) attendance. She indicated that her office would be taking a closer look at those factors over the coming year.

Mr. Smith commented that Mr. Torrey’s earlier questions were very appropriate in that they addressed the subject of the growth model of an individual student’s success. He said that in terms of student achievement there were often two sets of discussions happening concurrently, the notion of individual student achievement and the aggregate data provided by the assessment testing. He said the public, unfortunately, primarily looked at the data provided by the assessments.

Ms. Gerot asked if anything was currently happening to help middle school students transitioning into high school to meet the standards of Algebra I and complete the graduation requirements in a timely fashion. Director of School Services Kay Mehas answered that there was a plan in place to provide extra instruction and equipment to assist district middle school math teachers.

Mr. Forrest congratulated the faculty and students of Cal Young Middle School for being one of the middle schools showing improvement in all categories of reading and writing for the sixth, seventh, and eighth grades.

Mr. Forrest asked if anything could be done to address the problem of lapses in course schedules where a student might receive instruction in one subject early in their ninth grade year but not return to that subject until as much as one full year later. Ms. Moses commented that daily course schedules were different for each school and that the block schedule format that Mr. Forrest was referring to allowed for longer periods of instructional time. She added that district high schools had various solutions to address lapses in course schedules and that the staff at those high schools would be better able to elaborate on those specific solutions.

Ms. Moses said she did not have any data that supported one type of course schedule format over another in terms of how such schedules might affect student achievement, although she did not discount the possibility that such data existed.

Dr. Martinez wished to underscore the importance of the data being presented and said that although Mr. Torrey and Mr. Craig’s comments regarding individual students were valid, the
cross-sectional nature of the data itself could provide important and immediate indicators as to where the district might improve in serving the needs of its students, particularly with regard to graduation requirements.

Ms. Moses agreed with Dr. Martinez and said that they would be discussing new graduation requirements at a future board meeting.

Ms. Hays handed out pamphlets regarding the “Connected by 25” youth initiative which she had informed the board about at a previous meeting. She said that the pamphlets and the initiative itself were very relevant to the discussions the board was having regarding the best indicators of student achievement.

**Receive a Report on Eugene Education Fund Activities**

Eugene Education Fund (EEF) Executive Director David Meredith offered a recap of the EEF’s activities in 2007 where revenue for the organization had reached a record $781,000, particularly due in part to the EEF’s back-to-school gala which had generated 30% more than in the previous year.

Mr. Meredith also noted that grants received by the EEF in 2007, were actually far more than what the Register-Guard had reported. He commented that in 2007 the EEF had received 78 grants totally $128,000, which included some grants made to district-wide programs.

Mr. Meredith distributed and summarized the information from the most recent edition of the EEF newsletter. He also provided a brief overview of the EEF’s mission and history in the community in hopes of providing the board with a broad historical perspective on the organization.

Mr. Meredith then provided the board with a brief reminder and explanation of the financial breakdowns and benefits provided to the district by the EEF. He concluded by referring to a graph that showed the total revenues generated by the EEF since its inception in 1993.

Mr. Meredith, responding to a question from Mr. Torrey, said the Charlemagne meeting had been scheduled for September 10 at 10:30 a.m.

Mr. Torrey asked how the revenues generated by the EEF were invested and how they were doing with regard to current interest rates. Mr. Meredith noted that they did not hold on to revenues for very long and that when they were held, they were held in normal money market accounts with relatively small rates of return. He noted that the EEF had a $250,000 investment in the Oregon Community Foundation which, while currently producing negative return, had consistent historical growth of approximately 9%.

Dr. Webber-Davis asked for a brief summary of what sorts of items the EEF would be involved in funding in the coming year. Mr. Meredith indicated that he had not seen the submitted proposals yet, but that he expected to see them sometime before the end of September. He noted that several literacy, art and music initiatives were commonly funded by the EEF, and that the EEF expected to fund several more technology-based initiatives than in previous years. He concluded by saying all submitted proposals would be available to review on the EEF’s website.
CONSENT GROUP – ITEMS FOR ACTION

Approve Board Meeting Minutes

MOTION: Mr. Smith, seconded by Mr. Torrey, moved to approve the consent item, the approval of the August 6, 2008 minutes of the regular meeting of the Board of Directors of School District 4J.

Ms. Gerot noted corrections to Page 10 of the August 6, 2008 minutes, saying the phrase “her work and interactions” should read “the work of the district,” and that she would only be “attending” the educational equity seminar, not “coaching” one as indicated in the minutes.

AMENDED MOTION: Mr. Smith, with the approval of the second, consented to a friendly amendment of the motion to include the corrections specified by Ms. Gerot. Dr. Martinez called for a vote on the motion with the agreed friendly amendment.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously, 7:0.

ITEMS FOR ACTION AT A FUTURE MEETING

Approve Revisions to Board Policy IGBH, Alternative Schools

On June 4, 2008 the board directed staff to review Board Policy IGBH Alternative Schools and propose revisions that reflect board direction over the past four years during Access & Options, Alternative School Reviews and Shaping 4J’s Future. As proposed, the revised policy addresses the following:

- Deletes a reference to the District Curriculum Council, which no longer exists.

- Adds a definition of an “alternative program”. The policy defines an alternative school as “any complete educational program that represents a distinctive strategy within the district….,” and goes on to define complete educational program as “a school that has an organizational structure, a teaching staff, a budget, and a specific curriculum each of which is separate from other schools.”

Some of our current secondary school alternatives, such as language immersion schools at the middle level and International High School, are not complete educational programs but rather are alternative programs within the school. Students in these alternative programs attend a block of classes with a specific curriculum focus, such as language immersion, then take the remainder of their classes along with other students in their middle or high school.

- Addresses co-location of two schools in the same building. The revised policy would allow the co-location to two alternative schools, but would not allow co-location of a neighborhood school and an alternative school.

- Deletes language prohibiting the location of a student’s residence from being a factor in evaluating applications for enrollment. This revision is consistent with recent revisions to Board Policy JECC School Choice which states:

  “The Board may establish attendance area priorities for students who reside in an attendance area”
The Arts and Technology Academy (ATA) at Jefferson gives enrollment priority to elementary students who reside within ATA’s middle school attendance boundary. International High School programs at Churchill, Sheldon, South Eugene also give enrollment priority to students who reside within each school’s respective attendance boundary.

Ms. Bellamy reviewed the proposed revisions to Board Policy IGBH for the board, saying they were designed to align the policy with the directions given to staff.

Mr. Forrest asked how many alternative programs existed at the high school level under the definition included in the proposed revision to the policy. Ms. Moses and Mr. Henry answered that certain programs at the Eugene International High School and the Rachel Carson Program at Churchill High School might be affected by the new policy definition.

Ms. Bellamy, responding to a question from Mr. Forrest, confirmed that honors programs would not be considered alternative programs under the board policy revision.

Ms. Bellamy, responding to a question from Dr. Webber-Davis, confirmed that the immersion programs were not classified as alternative programs as they were part of the Eugene International High School.

**Approve Revisions to Board Policy JECC, School Choice**

After drafting proposed revisions to policy IGBH Alternative Schools, staff reviewed policy JECC School Choice to ensure that the two policies would clearly align. Some minor changes are recommended to the School Choice policy to clarify and align the wording.

Ms. Bellamy reviewed the proposed revisions to Board Policy JECC for the Board, noting that there were no changes to the substance of the policy, only the language of it.

**Approve Middle School Alternative Program Review Process**

Carl Hermanns, Assistant Superintendent/Chief Operating Officer, reviewed the proposed review process for middle school alternative programs for the board, noting that the proposed process followed a similar format to that used for middle school program reviews. He added that the language of the proposed review process explicitly clarified the distinctions between middle school programs and alternative programs.

Mr. Hermanns noted the primary difference between the review processes for middle school programs and alternative programs was the addition of a preliminary assessment for both the daVinci Middle School and the Family School Middle School alternative programs. He explained the reason for the preliminary assessments for those alternative programs was due to the fact that it was currently indeterminate if either of them as currently configured continued to represent a distinctive strategy for achieving the board’s educational goals.

Mr. Hermanns summarized his presentation saying that should the proposed review process not be approved by the daVinci or the Family schools, he would envision a continuation of the meeting process similar to that of the Edgewood and Evergreen schools.

Mr. Forrest asked if a similar alternative program review process for high schools in the 4J area was currently being considered. Superintendent Russell answered that such a review process
was under consideration but that it would most likely be proposed after the middle school level alternative program review process had been agreed upon.

Approve the Contract Between the Eugene Education Fund and School District 4J

In February of 1994, the board and the Eugene Education Fund entered into a contract specifying how the district and EEF would work together and how donations given through EEF would be distributed. The board approved an addendum to the contract in 1997 that provided for an annual payment of $65,000-$75,000 to EEF for fundraising services including technical assistance to schools, coordination of fundraising, and administering the distribution of donations in keeping with donor wishes.

Since 1997, the contract has been renewed each year with no increase in the annual payment amount. Over that 11-year period, cash contributions generated by and through EEF have increased from approximately $350,000 to more than $780,000 annually.

Recognizing that EEF’s expenses to support fundraising activities have also increased over that time, the district and EEF are proposing new contract terms that would increase the district’s annual payment to EEF for fundraising services. As proposed, the base annual payment will increase and the incentive for reaching higher donation levels will be on a sliding scale. This incentive structure recognizes that EEF’S expenses increase in relationship to an increase in donors and contributions.

The changes in the financial terms of the contract are shown in the chart below; all other contract provisions are essentially the same.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Contract Terms Since 1997</th>
<th>2008-09 Proposed Contract</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annual base payment</td>
<td>$65,000</td>
<td>$85,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual &quot;incentive payment&quot;</td>
<td>$10,000 payment for raising $500,000 or more in a fiscal year</td>
<td>$2,500 payment for raising up to $750,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,500 for each $50,000 increment above $750,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum annual payment (base+incentive)</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since 1994, EEF has raised more than $5.6 million in donations for school district programs plus an additional $1.4 million in development funds that go to support fundraising efforts. Over $1 million has been given to schools in equity grants, which help schools maintain educational programs. Direct donations to schools have been increasing each year. During the last campaign cycle alone, January through December 2007, the EEF raised $781,462.

Ms. Bellamy reviewed the proposed contract between the 4J School District and the EEF, noting that the amount of the contract had been static for the past eleven years.

Ms. Bellamy indicated that the EEF had proposed a graduated incentive stipulation to the contract whereby greater contract incentives might be awarded to EEF to offset the administrative expenses involved in procuring greater donations. She indicated that the base
payment to EEF as specified in the contract would be $85,000 with incremental incentives to begin once EEF’s fundraising efforts had reached $750,000. She guessed the out-of-pocket payment to EEF for next year would most likely be between $87,000 and $90,000 based on their current fundraising progress.

**Conduct the Annual Evaluation of the Superintendent**

Dr. Martin noted the annual evaluation of Superintendent Russell would take place during an executive session following the regular board meeting. He reminded the board that they should have received the evaluation materials as well as Superintendent Russell’s self-evaluation. He indicated that summary results of the individual evaluations would be distributed to the board prior to their executive session meeting.

**COMMENTS AND COMMITTEE REPORTS BY INDIVIDUAL BOARD MEMBERS**

Ms. Hays briefed the board on her work with the Yes For Schools campaign and distributed letters regarding that program for the board to review and send out. She noted that the Yes For Schools kick-off event was scheduled for September 17.

Ms. Bellamy said site council meetings were scheduled for September and October for all school buildings within the district. She said that district staff would be coordinating with Yes For Schools representatives at those meetings in order to raise awareness of key budget issues within the district. She said that she would distribute a schedule of the site council meetings so that board members could attend them.

Ms. Bellamy, in response to a question from Ms. Gerot, said the site council meeting schedule would also be distributed to budget committee members.

Ms. Gerot commented that the EEA and the Oregon Education Association would be making donations to the Yes For Schools campaign.

Dr. Martinez commented he had recently visited the modular classroom units at Meadowlark Elementary School and that they were a very nice addition to the school.

**ADJOURN**

Dr. Martinez adjourned the regular meeting at 9:01 p.m.

George Russell
District Clerk

Charles Martinez, Jr.
Board Chair

(Recorded by Wade Hicks)

**Attachments to Official Minutes:**
1. Adams Survey - Executive Summary, Survey Questionnaire, Narrative Responses to Open-Ended Questions, and Comments with Multiple Responses
2. Draft Board Policy IGBH, Alternative School Policy
3. Draft Board Policy JECC, School Choice
4. Middle School Alternative Program Review Process