Meeting Convened

The Board of Directors of School District No. 4J, Lane County, Eugene, Oregon, held a regular meeting on December 13, 2006, at 7 p.m., at the Education Center, 200 North Monroe Street, Eugene, Oregon. Notice of the meeting was mailed to the media and posted in Education Center on December 8, 2006, and published in The Register-Guard on December 11, 2006.

ROLL CALL

BOARD MEMBERS:
Tom Herrmann, Chair
Charles Martinez, Jr., Vice Chair
Eric Forrest
Beth Gerot
Craig Smith
Anette Spickard
Yvette Webber-Davis

STAFF:
George Russell, Superintendent of Schools and district Clerk
Barbara Bellamy, Director, Communications and Intergovernmental Relations
Tom Henry, Assistant Superintendent – Instructional Services & School Services K-8
Bill Hirsh, Director of Facilities and Transportation
Hillary Kittleson, Director of Financial Services
Jon Lauch, Assistant Director of Facilities Management
Kay Mehas, Director of School Services
Caroline Passerotti, Financial Analyst

STUDENT ADVISORY PANEL MEMBERS:
Joseph Dombrosky, Churchill High School
Steven Brantley, IHS, All Campuses
Antonio Salgado, North Eugene High School
Dara Halligan, Sheldon High School
Caitlin Monroe, South Eugene High School

MEDIA:
Randy Larsen, KRVM Radio

CALL TO ORDER, ROLL CALL, AND FLAG SALUTE

Board Chair Tom Herrmann called the meeting to order at 7 p.m. and led the salute to the flag. He noted that all board members were present.
AGENDA REVIEW

Mr. Herrmann said that at the request by a student, the student reports would be moved ahead of the superintendent’s report.

COMMENTS BY STUDENT REPRESENTATIVES

Joseph Dombrosky, Churchill High School, reported that student leadership was working on a canned food drive with all of the food going to Food for Lane County. He said that five barrels of food had been collected along with $600. Mr. Dombrosky said that seniors were working on college applications.

Caitlin Monroe, South Eugene High School, said that a choir/orchestra concert was being held at South during the board meeting. She said that South had a practice lock down several weeks ago and discussed what to do in case of a real lock down. She said that ASAP (Asian Substance Abuse Prevention) program was active this week at school. Ms. Monroe said that Bill Bradbury had been present for a global warming awareness event. She said that the student government was busy amending its constitution. She said that students would vote on the proposed changes after Winter Break.

Dara Halligan, Sheldon High School, reported that the halls of Sheldon had been decorated with holly and that Winter Fest activities were being held this week. She said that students were ready for the Winter Break. Ms. Halligan said that student leadership had completed its Snowflakes of Joy campaign in which students were given a family from a feeder school to Sheldon to help during the holiday season. She said that a big canned food drive was planned for after the break.

Steven Brantley, IHS, All Campuses, said that seniors were completing their papers. He reported that the IHS Student Government had been invited to a Land Mines Conference in Beaverton on January 21. He said that IHS had participated in its first service event by volunteering at Food for Lane County on November 15. Mr. Brantley said that IHS was preparing for its carnival and the silent auction at the carnival. He said that the proceeds of the event would go to the Invisible Childrens’ Fund. Mr. Brantley said that the IHS Film Festival would be held at Churchill. He said that films should be submitted by January 19.

Antonio Salgado, North Eugene High School, said that this was the last week of Project Give, a food drive for families in the North Eugene area. He said that some students would win a shopping spree at Grocery Outlet. Mr. Salgado said that North had it first blood drive two weeks ago. He said that North had a big basketball game against Sheldon on December 12.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS AND SUPERINTENDENT’S REPORT

Superintendent Russell said that in light of the agenda, he would not give a report but that he did want to make one announcement. He said that this would be the last board meeting for Board Member Anette Spickard as she had resigned from the board to begin her new position as County Assessor on January 2. Superintendent Russell said that Ms. Spickard was appointed to Position 1 on January 24, 2001 and then ran for that position in March 2001 and again in March 2003. He said that Ms. Spickard had served on several key committees for the district including the Policy Advisory Committee, the Budget Committee, the Access & Options Committee, the School Construction Advisory Committee, the County School Board Association, Lane ESD Budget Committee, the County Childhood Obesity Coalition, and the board liaison to the Eugene Education Fund. Superintendent Russell said that he and the staff
had always appreciated Ms. Spickard’s willingness to work with them. On behalf of the staff, Superintendent Russell made a presentation to Ms. Spickard and thanked her for her service.

ITEMS RAISED BY THE AUDIENCE

Lorna Baldwin, Coordinator of the City of Eugene Stream Team, spoke to the quality and potential long-term affects of the Rachel Carson Center on this and many other communities in the future. She said that this fall was the 8th year of a partnership between the Rachel Carson Center and the Eugene Stream Team, which facilitated 24 students and their two teachers coming out every two weeks all school year long to make a difference in the city’s natural areas. She said that the students learned what it was like to work in nature in all kinds of conditions to transform landscapes. She said that they would learn to ask good questions, to problem solve, to develop a sense of place, practice team work, handle snakes and lizards, and run across dead foxes and all the litter left behind by their fellow citizens. She said that these students would be better global citizens because of this experience and would think about how to make decisions about land, air, and water. Ms. Baldwin said that this program was unique and that the teachers were exemplary. She said that if she could improve it she would make it available to more students. She urged the board to provide its support for this and future generations.

Kitty Piercy, Mayor of Eugene, thanked the board for its work on behalf of families and children in the area. She said that she was proud of 4J and of the student’s achievements and the faculty. She said that she enjoyed visiting the schools on a regular basis.

Mayor Piercy announced that the Eugene Land Conveyance Act had made it through Congress during the last days of the session. She said that the act completed the long-awaited land transfer of the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) property for the Wetlands Education Center. She said that the Oregon delegation made this a priority because they knew it was important to this community. She said that she had spoken with the Oregon delegation during the United Front trip last year and that they had talked about how they saw the center as an important education opportunity for the community, one that would give hands-on science experience at a time when heightened interest and skills were needed in science.

Mayor Piercy said that the City had long been committed to this project and had worked it forward to this point of readiness. She said that substantial City money had been allocated to the Wetlands Center in a recent Parks Measure that was passed. She said that just as the City partnered in that measure to support playing fields, she hoped that the district would continue to partner with the City on funding a center. She said that just as the City had supported 4J in tough times, she hoped that 4J would support the City in moving forward on this project. She asked that the district keep some money invested in this project now, whether from the source the district had delegated or from another source, to be sure that the district continued to be part of the planning process. She asked that the district consider keeping at least half of the money allocated for the project committed in order to keep the district wedded to the project.

Mayor Piercy said that the proposed sustainable building that had been proposed complied with City policies and goals. She said that these practices reduce cost dramatically over the life of a building, reduce carbon emissions, preserve our natural resources for the future, and make practical economic sense. She said that over the life span of the building, there would be substantial cost savings and energy. She noted that large businesses such as Dupont, General Electric, and Johnson and Johnson had adopted such “green practices” and had reaped savings in the millions. Mayor Piercy emphasized that this was a good deal for the community and for the students.
Mayor Piercy said that there were other private funding partners committed to the project such as Invitrogen. She said that the City would make a pitch for more support during its United Front trip.

Mayor Piercy concluded by saying that this was something that the City and the district needed to do together as partners in the community’s future. She said that the City was there to support the district and she hoped that the district would be there to support the City through a continued investment. She said that it would not be good to see the district cut off all of its financial commitment at this time. She smiled when she acknowledged how much time it had taken for the wheels of government to move in terms of funding. She said that she knew that the district was also keenly aware of how much could be accomplished when people keep working together.

Mayor Piercy urged the board to think about this gem of a center, part of making Eugene a hub of sustainable practice and learning opportunities, part of attracting businesses and visitors to our City and to keep on supporting this project.

Nancy Willard addressed the subject of Jefferson and the alternative school review. Ms. Willard said that she did not think that the Jefferson program was foresighted. She said that Chavez School was overcrowded and that the board had indicated that the Family School needed to move, and that Jefferson was struggling. She said that if the board would consider a merger of all three schools, an incredible environment could be created that would focus on arts and technology, social justice, and environmental sciences that would tie to the Rachel Carson Center. She said that she thought that this would be powerful for the region.

Ms. Willard referred to a statement in the Alternative School Review Report that said that the district was desirous of an equitable system of school choice. She said that as long as the current system was in place that provided extra benefits to some schools and a requirement for parent initiative to get into those schools, the system would never provide equitable access. She said that even if the alternative schools became totally welcoming to families, there would still be some families in the community that did not have the luxury of exercising choice and therefore children who would never have equal access and opportunities. She said that these children were the ones most at risk. She said that while the district kept talking about equity, it had the inverse of equity — “all students are equal, but some students are more equal than others.”

Ms. Willard said that she thought that the district needed more data. She said that the board had been on the record since 1999 about the importance of equal access to alternative schools. She said that if these schools had any desire or initiative to change, there should be some noticeable change by now. Ms. Willard urged the board to look at the impact of sibling enrollment. She said that she did note that 45 percent of Eastside’s incoming students were siblings and would reflect the current profile of the school. She suspected that the same would be true of the other alternative schools. She repeated that the district needed data. She wondered how many decades it would take for these schools to become integrated.

Steve Gordon read a prepared statement to the board. He provided copies to all board members. He said that he served 18 years in a professional capacity working on the wetlands but was speaking as a citizen and a volunteer to the non-profit educational group in west Eugene. Mr. Gordon said that 20 years ago, ugly wetlands caused a crisis in Eugene’s western region. He said that through hard work, the community used a visioning process that turned the problem into an inspiration for hundreds of people in this community and across America. He
said that now the 3,000-acre Wetland Open Space System and the restoration and recreational efforts had been described as a “national shining star.”

Mr. Gordon said that the key to the success of the wetlands project had been the establishment of partnerships and agreement on a common mission. He said that burdens and credits were shared jointly and trust grew at each milestone. He said that the 4J School district had the opportunity to remain as a true partner in the Wetland Education Program and to share in the long-term successes. He said that with commitment and patience an educational campus would be built that would be a model for experiential cooperative learning.

Mr. Gordon said that the project would continue to garner State, Federal, local, and private support for the program. He said that the Eugene School District was an important partner in this endeavor. He said that the recent transfer of the land from BLM to City ownership would allow the non-profit to raise more private funds. He said that work on the center would commence in 2008. He said that the time for 4J commitment was now. He said that the district’s continued seamless financial support for this classroom phase of the project was timely and critical. He asked the board to help this “star” shine brighter and the light would reflect on the district, its students, and the wetlands.

Mike Shippey said that he was representing the Willamette Resources & Educational Network (WREN) board. He said that he was a small business owner and a community member who was eager to see the West Eugene Wetlands Educational Center come to fruition. Mr. Shippey urged the board to continue its commitment to the Rachel Carson component with its pledge of $500,000 and allow for flexibility for how funds would be spent.

Mr. Shippey reminded the board that in 2002, it unanimously voted to commit $500,000 for master planning and preliminary work related to the development of the Rachel Carson Natural Resources Center with expenditure of funds conditional upon securing of federal and other funding by participating partners. He reviewed what had happened since then: $206,500 had been spent by other partners paying for wetland delineation, geotechnical and survey work, site assessment and preliminary design, plus completion of the program document. He said that, in addition, WREN had recently secured a financial commitment of $150,000 from Invitrogen as well as $100,000 estimated in-kind coordinate by West Wind Forrest Products. He said that the City of Eugene had committed $340,000, in addition to the $1.75 million included in the November Parks and Open Space bond measure. He said that the BLM had committed an additional $20,000 for planning. He said that the total was $2,370,000 in secured funds.

Mr. Shippey said that the participating partners had been very successful in securing local government, federal, and private funding. He said that this project had required the partners to be dedicated, flexible, engaged, creative, and willing to take risks to see the Education Center’s success. He said that this project was an opportunity to do something innovative and wonderful for this community. He said that the board had it within its power to decide how it would manifest its commitment to the project. He noted that a recent report to the board said that the district would not be subject to an IRS penalty even if the Rachel Carson Center funds had not been spent. He said that, therefore, the board could choose to continue the commitment of bond funds to the project. Mr. Shippey urged the board to join the other partners and commit these 4J dollars now for planning and preliminary work. He said that the education center was moving forward and would be built regardless of the board’s decision. He said that he was excited about the future of the West Eugene Wetlands Education Center and he hoped that the Rachel Carson component would be a part of the final project through the district’s continued commitment to the project.
Ross Jensen said that he was a former student of the Rachel Carson program. He spoke about what a valuable experience that had been for him. He said that he had transferred from Sheldon High School to Churchill High School specifically to be part of the Rachel Carson program. He said that students were only able to participate two hours a day in the program, but that two hours a day had been one of the most fundamental experiences for him in his late teen life. He said that he was currently a student at Oregon State University and that the knowledge he gained at Rachel Carson had helped him immensely in his Biology major. He said that he could only imagine what an impact a fully funded center in the middle of the wetlands with teachers and professionals would have on students. He said that he thought that the knowledge would be even more in depth and ingrained.

Holly McCrae said that she was the Environmental Education Coordinator for WREN. She said that she had been involved with the project since 2002 when WREN’s Environmental Education Program began. She said that the program had grown at a remarkable rate in just a few years. She said that the program had reached over 9,000 students (K-12) with 2,400 being in the last year.

Ms. McCrae said that the West Eugene Wetlands had proven to be the perfect outdoor classroom for hands-on activities to learn about water resources, soil science, local wildlife, Native American history, botany, and habitat conservation. She said that the program included outreach programs into the classrooms. She said that all of the programs were curriculum based and multi-disciplinary. Ms. McCrae said that the feedback from both teachers and students had been overwhelmingly positive.

Ms. McCrae said that the best way to promote awareness for environmental issues and promote environmentally responsible behaviors was through increased access to environmental education. She said that a new report from the Environmental Education Association of Washington concluded that students in schools using environmental education consistently scored higher on standardized tests than students in schools without it. She said that the study also showed that young people exposed to environmental education tended to improve their overall grade-point average, stay in school longer, receive higher than average scholarship awards, and display more responsible behavior in school and the community. She said that these students were also better prepared for the job market.

Ms. McCrae said that the National Science Teachers Association advocated partnerships between schools and non-formal institutions because these sites “sparked curiosity and engaged students in scientific topics.” Concrete learning in natural settings helped students see inter-relationships. She said that studies indicated that non-formal sites had an impact on career paths because students had positive interactions with professionals in a scientific field. She said that this was true for her personally.

Ms. McCrae said that the West Eugene Wetlands Education Center would serve as a place where students of all ages would have the opportunity to learn from scientists about the Willamette Valley’s unique natural resources, local and global issues, and participate in meaningful research.

Ms. McCrae urged the 4J School Board to continue to be an active and engaged partner in this important community project.

Robbie Phetteplace said that he was a graduate of the Rachel Carson program and that he had also transferred to Churchill High School to be able to participate in this program. He said that the Rachel Carson program was one of the most influential programs in his life. He said
that he had worked with Lorna Baldwin with the Stream Team and Native Plan Nursery and with Tim Whitley and Helen Auberman who were two of the greatest teachers he had ever experienced.

Mr. Phetteplace said that the program helped him to decide what he wanted to do with his life and what he wanted to study in college. He said that he was currently studying Environmental Science at Lane Community College with a plan to transfer to the University of Alaska Southeast at the completion of his work at LCC.

Mr. Phetteplace said that he thought that the new proposed facility was a great idea and that he had been giving presentations to help gather support for the project. He said that the facility would allow for a greater number of students to take advantage of the program and would educate more teachers and professionals. He said that the facility would be in the wetlands environment that would allow students to be with the wildlife and the plants. He said that the facility would allow more time for students to be outdoors. Mr. Phetteplace said that he could not think of a better place for the money to go.

Allegra Helfenstein said that she worked for Invitrogen Incorporation, Eugene’s largest biotech company. She said that Invitrogen recently made a significant pledge of support to the Wetlands Education Center that would be located near Invitrogen’s Molecular Probe site. She said that this multi-year pledge stemmed from Invitrogen’s commitment to environmental sustainability but also aligned with Invitrogen’s quest for the advancement of scientific discovery.

Ms. Helfenstein said that Invitrogen made a kit that laboratories used to test breast cancer patients to distinguish which ones had the kind of breast cancer that was most susceptible to a certain cancer drug. She said that the test kit identified the presence of a certain gene that was not working properly which meant that the patient would likely benefit from that drug. She said that when Invitrogen pledged support for the center, it pledged both hard cash and in-kind donations. She said that in discussing what kind of donations would be useful to the Education Center, Invitrogen considered some of the fieldwork that the high school students had already done and similar projects that could provide value to the community. She said that the wetlands were home to the endangered Fenders Blue Butterfly and that a lupine that was critical to the survival of the butterfly grew in the wetlands. She said that only lupines that had a certain kind of gene were critical for the butterflies. The same kinds of tools and techniques that could distinguish whether a patient had the right or wrong kind of gene to respond to the cancer drug could be used to distinguish which kinds of lupines had the right kind of genes for the survival of the butterfly. She said that these tools did not use to be performed by PhDs with sophisticated instruments. She said that high school students could learn these techniques and use them to help the endangered butterfly right here in Eugene.

Ms. Helfenstein said that the Rachel Carson Program had incredible potential and she urged the board not to abandon it and to use the bond funds to support it or to find other funds.

COMMENTS BY EMPLOYEE GROUPS

Merri Steele, Co-President of the Eugene Education Association (EEA) gave an update on the mentor program. She said that the EEA was delighted to have Board Member Charles Martinez speak at its fourth seminar on cultural competency. She said that the last seminar would be on Professional Development, Licensure, and Certification. She said that the EEA had also held a training for the mentors who continued to do a wonderful job.
Ms. Steele reported that the EEA Cadre was signed up to do diversity trainings at Kennedy, McCormack, and Awbrey Park on January 2. She said that she and Paul Duchin, Co-President of the Eugene Education Association, had done a True Colors training at both River Road and Awbrey Park schools and had more planned in the future. Mr. Duchin explained that True Colors was a kind of Myers-Briggs type personality inventory, which was done in a fun light way.

Ms. Steele reported that some people had come forward in the EEA Rep Council with concerns about the Literacy Adoption for the district. She said that EEA had already talked with Tom Henry, Deputy Superintendent – Instructional Services & School Services K-8, and other staff in the Instruction Department. She said that the three concerns were:

• Having clear communication about what was required
• Being able to complete a 90 minute reading segment per day
• Supplemental materials

Ms. Steele said that the EEA hoped that the some of the views of the people who were perhaps not in the majority would be heard so that an adoption would be made that would work for everyone.

Mr. Duchin said that the EEA would resume its legislative breakfasts at the end of January. He invited the board members to attend.

Mr. Duchin said that the EEA was beginning to hear more from teachers about the proposed graduation requirement changes. He said that the EEA had been having conversations with Laurie Moses, Director of High School Services, and would continue to do so. He said that teachers were finding it difficult to fill out the surveys considering their concerns about workloads juxtaposed to the proposed requirements. He said that the surveys so far showed a two to one support for the changes. Ms. Steele pointed out that the EEA had discovered that people could fill out more than one survey.

Mr. Duchin said that he and Ms. Steele had the opportunity to serve as counselors at the School of Ideas at North Eugene High School and would be visiting Harris Elementary School, Coburg Elementary School, and then back to North. He said that this kept them connected to the students and schools. Mr. Duchin said that the River Road School was a very warm and inviting school.

**ITEMS FOR INFORMATION**

**Receive a Report from River Road/El Camino del Rio Elementary School**

Over the past two years, River Road/El Camino Del Rio Elementary changed many things that resulted in great gains in student achievement. The school was recognized by Oregon’s governor as a school whose students were "stepping up to the challenge and meeting high expectations.” The principal, Paco Furlan, the student achievement coordinator Carissa Boyce, and classroom teacher Sharon Blackwell made a presentation to the board about the program and the changes that were made to meet high standards. A PowerPoint presentation was used in the report.

Mr. Furlan began the presentation by informing the board of the special recognitions that River Road/El Camino del Rio had received in the last year:
• Leah Roderick won the Ace Teacher Award from the City of Eugene and Springfield
• Great press in *The Register-Guard* about the reading program, specifically about student achievement rising quite a bit as a result of the reading program, some new configuration to the schedule, and some professional development
• Governor Kulongowski visited to recognize the students achievement in reading

Mr. Furlan said that he, Ms. Blackwell, and Ms. Boyce would report on some of the things that Academy money and support from the board enabled the school to do to create its successes. Ms. Blackwell, a third grade teacher, reported the following:

• Good participation in retreats from both certified and classified staff
• Good cooperation from both certified and classified staff working on a Positive Effective Behavior System in the school
• Participated in book groups and read *The Fluent Reader, Failure is Not an Option, Shaping School Culture,* and *Writing Essentials*
• Made extensive school visits to local and regional schools before choosing a reading option
• School-wide commitment to reading
• Work in Academy Days had been very enriching and priceless
• Building commitment and high participation

Ms. Blackwell acknowledged Mr. Furlan and Ms. Boyce for their support and incredible leadership in this process.

Ms. Blackwell said that the school made a commitment to consistent curriculum across the building. She said that this had paid off enormously for the students with incredible results. She said that the Houghton Mifflin reading curriculum was one of the top three reading curriculums in the nation and was very literature rich.

Ms. Blackwell said that the school used the DIBELS (Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy) as an indicator of student progress and achievement. She said that it was a fluency test and was an indicator of weekly progress.

Ms. Boyce said that she had been at River Road/El Camino del Rio School for seven years and that she had seen amazing progress in that time. Ms. Boyce reviewed the data which supported that the long hours and hard work had paid off at the school. Mr. Furlan pointed out that the data included ELL students, regional cognitive learning students, and special education students. She presented the data for the 2005-2006 school year and pointed out the following:

• All day kindergarten important
• Many students had been moved out of Strategic and Intensive categories up to either Strategic or Benchmark categories
• OSAT scores surpassed the State average
• Four year comparisons in math, reading, writing, and science show improvements each year

Mr. Furlan reported on the following improvements for ELL students:

• Additional teacher to work with the ELL students, so that student groups could be smaller
• Change in schedule to facilitate smaller groups
• Revamped after-school reading program to make it intensive
• New Wednesday Choice Program for an elective class for eight weeks – partnered with community partners
Mr. Furlan thanked the superintendent and the board for the opportunity to participate in the academy process.

Superintendent Russell asked Mr. Furlan to comment on the fact that increased reading skills was translating into better math and science scores. Mr. Furlan explained that the science test was really a reading test and that if kids could not read at grade level, they would not be able to do well on the science test. He said that a lot of reading was required on the math test as well. He said that the program was very rich on strategic kinds of reading that kids needed when doing story problems in math or in reading science. Mr. Furlan added that the culture in the school had been changed to one that recognized that students who had experienced trauma or difficulties needed a lot of love and care and that one of the best ways to do that was to hold that child to high standards along with giving him/her tools and support to get there.

Board member Beth Gerot said that she had visited the school at the end of last year and had experienced the positive energy there, the exhaustion of the teachers from the hard work but also their eagerness to start another year. She said that the school was doing some marvelous work.

Ms. Spickard said that she was thrilled that her last official duty would be to visit the school on December 14 along with Representative Phil Barnhart.

**Receive an Update on the Sale of the Santa Clara Property**

Jon Lauch, Assistant Director of Facilities Management, and Sue Prichard, Real Estate Consultant, gave an update on the sale of the property. Ms. Prichard reminded the board that it was party in a contract to sell the Santa Clara School property with Oregon West Management LLC. She said that the affective date of that offer was August 31. She complimented Mr. Lauch and 4J Facilities crew for the work that they did in providing the materials that the buyer needed, accomplishing the requests in the purchase and sale agreement, the survey, environmental reports, etc. She said that all of these were provided in a very timely manner so that the buyer was able to review them thoroughly. Ms. Prichard said that the buyer had completed the review and the district had addressed all of his concerns on those items so far. She said that she did not anticipate any other concerns to emerge. Ms. Prichard said that the buyer had hired Safrey & Associates to represent him in putting together the plan for applying for a zone change.

Ms. Prichard said that she had frequent contact with the buyer and that he was consistently enthusiastic about the purchase and had been diligent in doing his work. She said that he had told her that at this point he thought that he would buy this property assuming that all of his financial data supported this decision. She said that he was going through his final analysis of that data now and expected to have a good idea on that early in the week of December 18.

Ms. Prichard said that the buyer had mentioned only one point that was of concern to him and that she thought that this point would turn out to be a condition of the sale. She said that by December 30, he had to tell the district if he was going forward and if he was what any conditions of the sale would be. The condition would be protection from the district for payment of a fee that would probably be incurred by the City of Eugene from which it would pay Measure 37 claims. She said that the zone change would probably cause a fee to be charged. She said that the fee proposed at this time by the City would be substantial. She said that paying this fee on top of paying top dollar for this piece of property would be a “deal killer” for the buyer. She pointed out that until the buyer completed his due diligence by December 30, she did not know for sure what would happen. She said that at this point things looked positive. She said that she would bring any offer and condition to the board.
Mr. Lauch explained the Real Property Value Added Charge as proposed by the City to help pay for Measure 37 claims. He said that if it was adopted it would apply to impending land negotiations. He said that the magnitude of it could be anywhere from $875,000 to $1.5 million. He said that the City Council would continue to move in this direction while waiting to see if the State Legislature would do something about Measure 37. He said that there seemed to be little support for exempting public agencies from the proposed ordinance. He said that if the buyer were interested in moving ahead, he and Ms. Prichard would be working with Legal Counsel Joe Richards and Superintendent Russell on an agreement to bring to the board.

Mr. Forrest asked if any other city was considering a similar ordinance. Mr. Lauch and Ms. Prichard both said that Eugene was on the “cutting edge” of this. Mr. Forrest asked if the council had said how the 25 percent amount had been reached. Mr. Lauch said that it had not.

Board Member Craig Smith asked if the measure was between the value without the zone change and the value with the zone change, why it would be an expense born by the district. Ms. Prichard said that the district had an impending agreement with a buyer. She said that it appeared that buyers of other properties without impending agreements were taking this fee off the top of their offering price. She said that it was a strong impact on value.

**Receive a Status Report on Jefferson K-8 Planning**

Jefferson Middle School principal Jeff Johnson updated the board on planning for a new K-8 school focused on arts and technology that would open next fall in the Jefferson school building. As a future action item later on tonight’s agenda, the board would consider the superintendent’s recommendation to create the new school, called the Arts and Technology Academy at Jefferson, effective with the 2007-08 school year, and to close Jefferson Middle School and Magnet Arts Alternative Elementary School as of June 30, 2007.

Mr. Johnson provided the board with copies of *Jefferson Academy of the Arts and Technology, A CONCEPT PAPER*. He said that a committee was formed of people from Churchill region principals, representatives from instructional leadership, finance, and ESS. He said that the committee weighed the options and decided that Jefferson would serve the neighborhood students rather than being an in-charter school. He said that the committee decided that the school would:

- Be one K-8 school
- Primarily serve the Churchill region and give preference to students that fell within the Jefferson boundary
- Have a focus on arts and technology and academics
- Continue to work with the community to develop partnerships to enrich student learning especially with the university and the arts community
- Continue the multi-cultural strand that was pervasive at Jefferson Middle School
- Pursue the modified school calendar

Mr. Johnson said that the staff had been put together for the school planning team consisting of several certified teachers and some classified staff. He said that a survey had been put out to see if parents who would like to be involved in the process and join the core planning team.

Mr. Johnson said that the next steps were to:

- Continue the process with the Core Team
• Bring in a consultant team of people from the community such as Carl Hermanns

Mr. Johnson said that he thought that the school would be ready for the beginning of the next school year.

Ms. Gerot asked if there had been any concerns about the ability to provide a comprehensive curriculum given the small size of the school, particularly taking into account special needs students and ELL students. Mr. Johnson said that conversations with ESS needed to happen. He said that the committee had looked at what the school offered and that it was clear that the school would need multi-credentialed people who were capable of teaching across subject areas. He said that the staff would need to have a K-8 license or a middle level license along with some single subject skills as well.

Board Member Eric Forrest said that he was having a struggle with the size of the school given the declining enrollment and the question of what the right size school was. He said that, frankly, as the parent of a child in an elementary school with 470 – 520 students, it was hard to think about a K-8 school of 250 students. Superintendent Russell said that hopefully there would be some growth. He said that this was also a way to keep the school alive while moving forward with the district’s strategic planning. He said that the choice was to have no school or to put something there that would potentially grow and would meet some of the district’s goals around looking at the possibilities of K-8 schools and other configurations.

Board Member Yvette Webber-Davis asked if the in-district charter was still being considered. Mr. Johnson explained that an in-district charter school was no longer being considered for Jefferson. He said that an in-district charter school would no longer guarantee that it was serving the local community, as students would be enrolled on a lottery basis. Superintendent Russell said that to ensure that the Jefferson attendance area students would have priority the district needed to go this way because the state was clear that a charter school had to be open to everyone in the district.

Receive a Report from the Alternative School Review Team

On behalf of the alternative school review team, Carl Hermanns presented a brief overview of the findings from this year’s Alternative School Review Report to the Superintendent. The alternative schools reviewed this fall were Buena Vista, Corridor, Charlemagne at Fox Hollow, and Yujin Gakuen. The alternative school review team consisted of Kay Mehas, Jerry Henderson, Ray Gross, and Carl Hermanns.

Copies of the report were provided to the board at the meeting. At the January 10 meeting, the superintendent would present his recommendations to the board and a public hearing would be held at that meeting as well.

Mr. Hermanns said that the review process was a comprehensive process for which the board had defined eight criteria that alternative schools had to address in order to retain alternative school status. He said that the Review Team gathered extensive data and visited each school being reviewed. He said that from the data and the evidence the review team crafted a report for the superintendent who used the report to make recommendations to the board.

Mr. Hermanns emphasized that the report was the Review Team’s recommendations to the superintendent and not the superintendent’s recommendations to the board, which would be presented, to the board in a few weeks. He also emphasized that his review was a broad overview of the in-depth report.
Mr. Hermanns focused his report on four topics discussed in the Introduction of the report that were pertinent to this year’s assessments: Language Immersion, Special Education and Language Immersion, Grade-level Caps, and Diversity. He also reviewed the criteria assessments for each of the four schools reviewed.

**Language Immersion**

Three of the four schools reviewed were language immersion schools. Of those, Yujin Gakuen and Charlemagne had implemented 50/50 programs in which children spent half of their day learning in the immersion language and half of their day learning in English. Buena Vista was in the process of transitioning to a full immersion program in which children spent their entire day learning in the immersion language until 3rd or 4th grade, when English instruction was added and the program would function as a 50/50 program.

**Special Education and Language Immersion**

This was examined closely to make sure that immersion schools were welcoming to special needs children and that special needs children were being served appropriately and well. Mr. Hermanns said that research showed that, in general, children with learning challenges do as well in immersion programs as children with similar challenges do in monolingual programs. He said that, additionally, children with special needs in immersion programs could become quite competent in understanding and speaking a second language. He said that it was the district’s task to make sure that it created the optimal conditions for that to happen. He added that children with certain learning challenges might need special education staff with specific understandings of language acquisition and child development to assist the school staff and the child’s family in making a program determination that would be the most beneficial to the educational success of that child.

**Grade Level Caps**

Mr. Hermanns said that after careful consideration of the data and carefully discussing it with the review committees from each school, the Review Team determined that there was not a strong educational rational to justify the continuance of grade level caps in the immersion schools or in Corridor School. He said that the Review Team was recommending to the superintendent that grade level caps be eliminated for all alternative schools.

**Diversity**

Mr. Hermanns said that the purpose of examining diversity within the scope of the review was to assess if the alternative schools were relatively diverse, were supportive and welcoming to all families and children in the district, and were ready to teach a diverse student populations effectively and well. He said that to make those determinations the team looked at two areas: objective measures of the diversity of student population including the percentage of students eligible for free and reduced lunch, the schools racial and ethnic make-up, and the percentage of ELL and special education students; and evidence of a school culture and instructional practices that could support diverse populations. Mr. Hermanns said that individual school percentages were then compared to district averages across all of the district’s elementary schools.
Mr. Hermanns explored the interaction of Corridor School with its neighborhood schools and its region to underline the complexity in examining diversity and how alternative schools could impact their communities. This was explained at depth in the report.

Mr. Hermanns reviewed each school report briefly. He noted that the findings and how the team arrived at those findings were reported in detail in the report provided to the board.

Mr. Hermanns and the Review Team thanked the Central Office staff for its help on preparing the report.

Ms. Spickard asked what the timeline would be for schools to follow through with the recommendations. She noted that the recommendations seemed to include a lot of extra work for Carmen Urbina, the district’s Parent/Family and Community Coordinator. Superintendent Russell said that he needed to read the report and digest it and then to bring his recommendations to the board. He said that he anticipated that a response to Ms. Spickard’s question would be dealt with in his response.

The board took a short break at 8:50 p.m. to 9 p.m. During the break, cake was served in Ms. Spickard’s honor.

**Receive a Report Regarding Future Changes in State Assessment Standards**

Tom Henry, Deputy Superintendent and Chief Academic Officer, updated the board on changes with Oregon State Assessment Tests that would take effect during the 2006/07 school year. The U.S. Department of Education required Oregon to immediately review achievement standards and make necessary revisions to comply with the No Child Left Behind legislation. Susan Castillo’s appeal to delay the changes until next year was denied by federal officials. Mr. Henry said that this meant that the district would have to start its base line of data all over again.

Revisions included setting new benchmark levels for student proficiency and new assessment measures for special education students. The assessment changes would take effect immediately and the State Board of Education would set the achievement standards in March. He said that the federal government wanted all students to take tests at grade level and be exposed to the general curriculum. He said that the implementation of this would be very challenging and stressful for teachers and students.

**ITEMS FOR ACTION AT THIS MEETING**

**Consider the Redirection of 2002 Bond Levy Funds Originally Designated for the Rachel Carson Environmental Center**

Superintendent Russell noted that the history of the district’s involvement was captured in the board report and would be part of the written record in the minutes. He said that he would not review the history but would move directly to his recommendations.

The May 2002 Capital Improvement Bond included $500,000 as “seed money” toward the several million dollar development of a Rachel Carson Environmental Education Center to be constructed adjacent to the West Eugene Wetlands, subject to adequate fund-raising and contributions from others. (The $500,000 included $25,000 for design services and related costs; approximately $4,000 that had been spent to date on planning costs).
On February 27, 2002, the board unanimously authorized referring a $116 million bond measure to voters. Included in the motion to approve was the following adjustment:

- Reduce the proposed $3 million for school safety and security renovations to $2 million.
- Include $500,000 for master planning and preliminary work related to the development of the Rachel Carson Natural Resources Center, with expenditure of funds conditioned upon securing of federal and other funding by participating partners. If such funding does not materialize within three years then the funds will be recommitted to school safety and security renovations. (emphasis mine)
- Include additional $500,000 for replacement of portables at Monroe Middle School with classroom/bathroom additions.

In November of 2003, members of the Willamette Resources Educational Network (WREN) the non-profit group that was sponsoring this development appeared before the board and requested additional time to conduct fundraising. In response, the board approved the following motion:

Authorize the superintendent and designees to continue planning for up to two years from today [November 19, 2003], for the proposed phase 1, as described in the board report, with the expectation that the 4J School District would be entitled, subject to agreement among all the partners, to have use of the entire facility after the complete buildout and full use of a classroom in Phase 1 during the school year. No district bond money will be spent on the project until there is a certainty that full funding for phase 1 is available, except that up to $25,000 (less $4000 expenditures to date) can be spent on design and related services, as deemed appropriate by the superintendent, to assist with fund raising and grant development. (emphasis mine)

In November of 2005, the superintendent requested, on behalf of district staff involved in the project and WREN that an additional year be granted to allow for more fundraising. At that time, it was estimated that the amount of additional funding needed to complete the phase 1 of the environmental education center was approximately $550,000. In response the board approved the following motion:

Grant an extension of time of one year from the date of this action [November 9, 2005] for WREN and/or others to identify adequate (and certain) funds to complete the first phase of the environmental education center. It was understood that if this extension was granted by the board, no further extensions could be given, and should adequate (and certain) funding not be identified in the specified time period, this project would be deleted from the bond list and the funds ear-marked for this project would be used for the next highest priority, bond-eligible, unfunded district capital projects. (emphasis mine)

Since that time the project cost had grown. In particular, initial infrastructure estimates had proven to be too low. This added further to the design and construction cost. The current total cost for phase 1, including all soft costs, infrastructure, and phase 1 buildings, was in excess of $4 million; the original project budget was $2,076,767 (including $655,000 for land). A comparison of the two budgets was attached.

Following was a brief summary of the project and efforts to date:

The Bureau of Land Management, City of Eugene, Bethel School District, Eugene 4J School District and WREN have continued to show support for this effort. By 2005, representatives
from these entities reinforced their commitment by signing an Education Center Partnership statement. When completed, the West Eugene Wetlands Environmental Education Center campus will include a laboratory, green house, auditorium, reference library, classrooms, meeting rooms and staff and volunteer offices.

The current strategy is to build the center in phases. The first phase of the project includes: initial site development, a storm water demonstration project for sustainable landscaping, roadway and parking development, a composting toilet that conserves water, an information kiosk, laboratory for school groups and interpretive programs, mudroom to support volunteer and education participants, and a public reception area with volunteer staff to answer questions and schedule programs. District 4J’s funds would be used to construct two classrooms to house the Rachel Carson Environmental Center, currently offered through Churchill High School.

The City of Eugene has expressed interest in seeing the project completed. The successful Parks and Open Space Bond (on the November 2006 ballot) included approximately $1.7 million for the infrastructure for the entire center. In addition, the City has committed $340,000 to this project.

The proposed land transfer from the BLM to the City of Eugene, requiring an action of the US Congress, has not yet occurred, but appears imminent when Congress reconvenes. The architect selection process has been completed. The Eugene firm of Rowell Brokaw Architects has been ranked #1 by consensus of the selection committee. If the District contracts to build Phase 1, it will attempt to negotiate a contract with Rowell Brokaw subject to appropriate award.

WREN estimates that its current fund raising efforts will generate approximately $500,000, leaving a balance of $1.0 – 1.5 million (depending on contingency levels) needed to complete the project in addition to the District’s participation.

Given this progress, it seemed more likely that the project could move forward in the future, but not immediately.

In earlier board meetings on this topic, the staff raised concerns about potential IRS penalties if bond proceeds were not spent within three years of issuance. In response to a question from Board Member Charles Martinez at the November 15, 2006 board meeting regarding the amount of the penalties, Mr. Hirsh asked district staff to research further the IRS requirements related to bond spending.

After detailed discussion with bond counsel, the staff had ascertained that the district would not be subject to an IRS penalty as long as 85 percent of our total bond funds were expended within three years of issuance. If funds earmarked for the Rachel Carson Center were not released, there would be more pressure to spend bond funds in other areas. However, the staff estimated that the bond fund balance would be below 15% by August 2008, even if the Rachel Carson Center funds had not been spent. Therefore, the Board could choose to continue the commitment of bond funds to the project, without being subject to IRS penalty.

**Legal Limitations and Potential for Penalties**

The primary legal limitation related to the spend-down of funds was that, unless an issuer qualified for certain exceptions (which did not apply in the district’s case), it could not earn a higher interest than that paid to bondholders. If the funds did earn higher interest, the district...
would have to pay the difference to the IRS in the form of yield restriction or arbitrage rebate payments. These payments did not represent penalties.

A major exception to this limitation was the ability of the issuer to earn market interest on the bond proceeds in the three years following bond issuance if the issuer reasonably expected at the time of issuance of the bonds that at least 85% of the proceeds would be spent during that time period. In District 4J’s closing documents for the August 2005 bond issue, the district stated its expectation to spend 85% of the bond proceeds within three years.

If the IRS were to audit the district and find more than 15% in unspent bond funds after August 2008, it would ask for an explanation. If that explanation were not satisfactory and the IRS believed the district’s expectations regarding the spend-down of bond funds at the time of issuance were not reasonable, the IRS would inform the district that it intends to declare the bonds taxable unless the district pays a penalty. The basis of the IRS’s initial calculation of a penalty would be the revenue the federal government lost by not taxing the interest earnings of the bondholders for this particular bond issue (an amount in the millions of dollars). If the district refused to pay the penalty, the IRS would declare the bonds taxable and try to collect from the bondholders. It also should be noted that, at present, the IRS was focusing on areas of abuse and random audits, rather than systematic audits of all bond issuers.

Although this new information would allow the board to continue to commit bond funds for the Rachel Carson Center without incurring an IRS penalty, the time line for construction was still uncertain. The board, in approving prior extensions, explicitly provided that if funding did not materialize within three years, the $500,000 would be committed to school safety and security renovations.

Superintendent Russell believed it was time for the board to redirect the bond funds to the security allowance line item within the bond. This would allow the district to move ahead with several important security projects, which were now unfunded. Notwithstanding his proposed redirection of $500,000 to security projects, he continued to support the development of the Rachel Carson Environmental Education Center, and believed the board should identify an alternative source of funds to support the project when additional fund raising had been completed. He suggested that one of the places to get the $500,000 would be from the proceeds of the sale of the Santa Clara property. He said that it could also be included in a potential bond measure for 2008.

Mr. Smith asked if any of the arbitrage rebate would go to the IRS. Hillary Kittleson, Director of Financial Services, said that the overall purpose of all of the IRS regulation was that the district would not earn interest higher than the bond yield. She said that there was a three-year window after the issuance of bonds during which the district could earn higher interest for the purpose of averaging with an interest earning lower than the bond yield at some point in order to average out as high as possible. She said that the district was currently managing that three-year window and was earning in excess of the bond yield. She said that when the bonds were issued, the district stated that it would spend down 85 percent of the bond proceeds within three years. She said that the staff thought that it would be able to do that, with or without this particular decision, and would be within the regulations. She said that the yield restriction payments that the district made were not penalties, but were calculations. She said that the penalty would come if the district did not spend down to 15 percent and the IRS noticed that during an audit, and were not satisfied with the district’s explanation of why the district had not done it. She said that the IRS could then declare the bonds taxable. She said that in that case the district would enter a penalty phase and that the district would pay a penalty rather than
having the bonds declared taxable. She said that the arbitrage payments were simply calculations to make sure that the district did not earn more than its bond yield.

Mr. Herrmann asked that the recommendation be considered in two separate motions.

Recommendation

Superintendent Russell recommended that staff be directed to (1) redirect $496,000 currently designated for the Rachel Carson Environmental Center ($500,000 project amount less $4,000 expended to date) to the support of school security projects as included in the initial bond proposal; and (2) develop optional approaches to support the Rachel Carson Environmental Education Center through use of existing non-bond capital funds or future bond funds and establish funding parameters, including that additional district funds not be expended until substantially all project funding was secured.

MOTION: Craig Smith, seconded by Yvette Webber-Davis, moved that the staff be directed to redirect $496,000 currently designated for the Rachel Carson Environmental Center ($500,000 project amount less $4,000 expended to date) to the support of school security projects as included in the initial bond proposal.

Ms. Gerot Superintendent Russell if he had considered allocating $21,000 ($25,000 assigned to the design process less the $4,000 already spent) for the design process since it seemed that the project, by hiring an architect, was entering that design phase. She said that this would, in a sense, would keep the district in the game by being engaged in the design of the center. Superintendent Russell said that if the board agreed that it wanted to continue to proceed and did ask him to find an alternate approach he would be willing to consider this option. He said that the district would have to feel convinced that the project was going to go ahead. He added that there was more evidence now that it probably was going to move ahead. He said that this would depend on whether or not the board wanted to continue to support the project. He added that he thought that the board should continue this support.

Dr. Martinez said that while it was logical to consider the recommendation in isolation, the two parts were so interconnected that it was hard for him to think about point one in lieu of the second recommendation. He said that the second recommendation could mean a lot about the future and that it was not clear what could happen, partly because of the uncertainty about the Santa Clara property and the potential for other resources. He said that because of this the decision on recommendation one becomes much more profound. He said that for him personally it was hard for him to disentangle the two points.

Mr. Forrest asked Mr. Hirsch if the architectural engineering fee of $930,000 on a project of $4.4 million seemed high. Mr. Hirsch said that the fee was for master planning for an entire complex and not just one school. He said that for the LEEDS platinum construction, there would be a premium of cost because there was quite a bit of complexity that the architect and engineers had to do that was not a normal part of the process. He said that his understanding was that these were appropriate numbers for this type of project. Mr. Forrest said that he was struggling with the fact that originally the project was a $1.4 million project and was now a $4.4 million project. He wondered if the projected costs would go even higher if the project was delayed even more. Mr. Hirsch said that his understanding of the budget was that it was now much more accurate than the original budget. He said that, for example, the budget now had contingencies, design fees, square footage costs, and costs for a field lab at the size desired by the community. Mr. Forrest noted that the date on the figures was December 2005 and that it was now December 2006. He assumed that it would be another year before the project was
Mr. Hirsch said that the budget would be inflated to some degree. Mr. Forrest said that he was not saying that the district should not be committed to the project, but that he did not know if the $500,000 placeholder that the district had for this project was the way to go about it.

Ms. Spickard said that she had been a supporter of the project from the beginning. She said that she hoped that the project came together because she thought that it would be a great asset for the community. She said that she was nervous about removing it from the bond proceeds without knowing how the vote on recommendation two would go. She repeated that she was in support of the project and hoped that there was a way to continue the district's involvement in it and have it come to fruition.

Dr. Martinez said that it seemed to him that the fundamental question was if the district had confidence that the project would be completed rather than specifics about how potential budget inflation would be addressed through fund raising. He said that a need for additional funds could be moved through a fund raising process. He said that, at this point, the district was not looking at a potential new commitment to offset those differences in budget. Dr. Martinez said that assuming that the project did come to fruition, the involvement of this district in the past of supporting this project and what it would mean for the district's students and the community would have gigantic benefits. He expressed his support in seeing this project through.

Mr. Smith said that having been on the board since the beginning of this project, he had questions about whether or not the project would be feasible. He said that he knew that the district had security needs today. He said that he thought that the more responsible action would be to take the $500,000 and use it for current needs rather than reserving it for possibilities some day in the future. He said that it would be a disaster if there the district had a serious incident in one of its schools and people asked why the district did not spend $500,000 on security. He said that he thought that the district had been generous in extending deadlines and that the money should now be put into a useful purpose. Mr. Smith added that, in regard to recommendation two, he thought that the district would be able to find funds in the future to support its commitment to space in the project.

VOTE: All members present voted yes, 7:0.

MOTION: Yvette Webber-Davis, seconded by Charles Martinez, moved that the staff be directed to develop optional approaches to support the Rachel Carson Environmental Education Center through use of existing non-bond capital funds or future bond funds and establish funding parameters, including that additional district funds not be expended until substantially all project funding was secured.

Ms. Spickard asked that if one of the options for funding was the proceeds from the sale of other surplus property that had already occurred, would it require a change in the existing policy for the use of those funds. Ms. Kittleson said that it would not because the policy was to direct the funds toward capital projects.

Mr. Forrest suggested that the district have a conversation with the City, in the event the district had to pay a fee to the City as a condition of its sale of the Santa Clara property, and suggest that the fee could go to the Rachel Carson Center.

Dr. Martinez asked the superintendent, given the language of recommendation two, how confident he was that there would be options other than the sale of Santa Clara for supporting this project. Superintendent Russell said that there was money from the sale of other properties that the district could use. He said that it just depended on what the board wanted to do.
said that knowing that the district was supposed to get $7.4 million in should make it more palatable to take $500,000 from that and continue to support the project. He said that if that sale did not happen, the board might think differently about taking $500,000 from the $2 million in Fund 400.

Ms. Spickard asked if approving the motion as stated, would provide the flexibility for the superintendent to commit money for the design process. Superintendent Russell said that he would come back with options and that one of the options could be that the board release up to $25,000 for the design process.

Dr. Webber-Davis said that as a new board member she had gone back and read about the project and the board's involvement with the project. She said that she thought that it was a very valuable project for the community and that she hoped that it came to fruition. She added, however, that what was guiding her was the reluctance to set a precedent in the way that the board worked. She said that given the board's responsibilities regarding fiscal appropriateness, it was important for the board to put parameters around these kinds of projects. She said that there might be many projects that would be valuable for the district and the community, but that the district also had other needs. She said that was the approach she was taking not having all of the history of working on this project.

Dr. Martinez said that he appreciated the strong language in recommendation two about having fund being contingent on having secured the funds needed to see the project through to completion. He said that this helped him support this recommendation.

Mr. Smith said that he thought that the conversation was developing in two directions: 1) the board would decide if this project was as important as other expenditures of funds, and then 2) the board would be looking at the feasibility of the project. Superintendent Russell said that was not what he was hearing. He said that his thinking was that the vote would say whether or not the board supported continuing to move forward to support this project and for him to come back with options that would allow the district to do that. He said that if the board voted no, it would mean that the board was not interested in trying to find other dollars to support the project. Superintendent Russell said that the district would not release the dollars until I had assurance that ground was going to be broken for the project. Ms. Gerot said that the superintendent would be looking at current dollars for facilities or including the money in a 2008 bond measure.

Mr. Forrest asked if the district was creating an obligation whether or not the Santa Clara property sold and whether or not the next bond measure passed. Mr. Smith clarified that the board would be saying that it would use certain funds if the project were feasible. Superintendent Russell said that funding parameters would include feasibility of the project as well as other parameters for example, spending $25,000 on the planning and design stage with the rest of the money not available until other conditions were met.

Dr. Martinez clarified that by supporting this motion, the board was saying that, in principle, it supported pursuing funding to replace the dollars that had been reallocated and that Superintendent Russell would present options for this funding. He continued and said that the board would then consider the options in light of the district's resources at the time that the options were presented. Superintendent Russell said that his assumption was that if the board said yes to the motion, that, in principle, it supported the project and would like for the superintendent to find a way for make it possible to put resources toward it based on feasibility, etc. Dr. Martinez said that if the parameters were in conflict with district priorities or its budget, the board could say that the risk was too great because the board had not actually approved
funding for the project at this time. Superintendent Russell said that he would not give a recommendation that would affect the General Fund budget. Dr. Martinez said that the assumption was that the superintendent would be able to find options to support the project. Superintendent Russell agreed. Mr. Smith said that the board would then have to decide if it agreed with the superintendent’s options.

**VOTE:** The motion passed, 6:1, with Mr. Herrmann opposing.

**CONSENT GROUP - ITEMS FOR ACTION**

**MOTION:** Ms. Spickard, seconded by Ms. Gerot, moved approval of the Consent Group.

**VOTE:** All members present voted yes, 7:0.

**Approve Board Meeting Minutes**

Superintendent Russell recommended approval of the minutes of the regular board meetings held on October 4 and October 18, 2006 and the Board Work Sessions held on October 11 and October 18, 2006.

**Approve Expenditures for June, July, August, September, October and November 2006**

SCHEDULE A

Expenditure reports for June through October were included in the board packet that the board received before the meeting. Financial Services provided the November expenditure report for approval as well.

ORS 332.255 required that the district school board approve all expenditures for funds.


**Award a Sole-Source Contract for the Supply and Installation of an HVAC Control System at Churchill High School**

In approximately December of 2003, in response to a competitive RFP process, the Board awarded Clima Tech a contract for HVAC control systems for the four new schools funded by the bond. On 2/23/2005, pursuant to Board Policy DJC, the Board approved an exemption permitting the sole source procurement of HVAC control systems, where needed, from the firm, Clima Tech, for remaining projects funded by the 2002 capital improvement bond. Control systems for Churchill High School were specifically mentioned as a potential project.

The staff was negotiating a contract with Clima Tech for the control system at Churchill High School, based on unit pricing for control points and other system components. The approximate initial cost would be $500,000. The actual cost might vary somewhat as the actual scope was further clarified.

Superintendent Russell recommended that the superintendent or designee be authorized to negotiate, subject to unit pricing and other relevant factors, and execute a contract with Clima Tech, for approximately $500,000, for HVAC control systems at Churchill High School. It was
understood that the actual contract cost might vary somewhat from this amount subject to further refinement of the project scope.

Approve Grant Applications

Churchill Japanese Program Expansion

Staff at Churchill High School submitted a $7,000 grant application to the Japan Foundation. The project would provide additional teaching time so that Churchill’s Japanese teacher could better serve upper level Japanese students, who were now combined into a multi-level class that includes level III, level IV, AP and IB.

Superintendent Russell recommended approval of the grant application.

Modern Electronics Implementation

Staff at South Eugene High School submitted a $7,000 grant application to the M. J. Murdock Charitable Trust. The Scientific Theories and Practices class at South Eugene was relatively new and based on several older classes and teachers’ materials. The science program needed to be updated in content as well as means of presentation. There had been many scientific and pedagogical discoveries since the currently used materials were created. By bringing in a new set of classroom materials and lab equipment, complete with cutting-edge information, staff could rework the existing class into a more relevant and rigorous learning experience.

The area of Scientific Theories and Practices that needed the most modernization was the unit on Electricity and Magnetism. There was currently only one lab on static electricity in the unit. With the implementation of the new equipment, staff would be able to conduct an entire inquiry based lab unit.

The other large change to the class would be with the implementation of a Smartboard, which would allow the use of computer simulations and presentations. The Smartboard use would not be limited to the Electricity and Magnetism unit, but it would enhance all areas of science learning. One specific learning enhancement would be in allowing staff to easily record the information on the board, thereby creating printable note for those who missed class or have learning disabilities.

The Smartboard would help make real strides towards two of the school’s improvement goals by increasing success of freshmen and closing the achievement gap. It was the belief that by providing the freshmen with greater learning opportunities they will see greater success at all levels.

Superintendent Russell recommended approval of the grant application.

Approve Personnel Items

Superintendent Russell recommended approval of the personnel items included in the packet. These covered employment, resignations, and other routine personnel matters. (See attached)
ITEMS FOR ACTION AT A FUTURE MEETING

Approve the Superintendent’s Recommendation to Close Jefferson Middle School and Magnet Arts Elementary School and Create the Arts and Technology Academy at Jefferson

In the spring of 2006, Superintendent Russell proposed closing Magnet Arts Elementary School and Thomas Jefferson Middle School due to declining enrollment and initiated planning for a new, small K-8 school focused on the arts and technology to open in 2007-2008 in the Jefferson building.

Since that time, the staff had worked to further develop the framework for the new school. The board was asked to consider two actions: closing the two existing schools as of June 30, 2007 and approving the creation of the new Arts and Technology Academy at Jefferson, including the proposed grade structure, attendance boundary and enrollment priorities and key concepts proposed below. This would enable staff to provide clear information about the new school to the parents and students during the district’s school choice period, which would start in January.

Proposal to Close Magnet Arts and Jefferson Middle School

Jefferson Middle School had experienced significant declining enrollment over the past five years. In 2000, Jefferson’s enrollment was 463. This year, only 219 students were enrolled. Magnet Arts enrollment had declined from 128.5 students in 2000 to 88 students this year (kindergarten students counted as .5). With smaller enrollments, it was necessary to provide additional resources to both schools for 2006-07 in order for them to provide a viable program.

Proposal to Create the Arts and Technology Academy at Jefferson

The creation of a new school provided an opportunity to implement a fresh, new school with a different grade configuration and to incorporate new approaches that had proven successful in improving teaching, learning and student achievement. Superintendent Russell proposed the new school be named the Arts and Technology Academy at Jefferson.

The Arts and Technology Academy at Jefferson would:

• Serve 250-300 students in kindergarten–grade 8 as one school with a single staff, site council and budget and with an integrated academic program. The intent was to create a unified K-8 school, as opposed to operating as an elementary school and a middle school that were housed within the same building.

• Emphasize integration of the arts and technology with high achievement in academics and expand access to technology for students.

• Operate with a modified school calendar to reduce the length of time that students are out of school during the summer and, if feasible provide inter-session schooling during the seasonal breaks. The school planning team in consultation with parents would develop the school’s specific calendar, including the length of the school day and the schedule for the school year.

• Provide full-day kindergarten and extended learning activities, to the extent feasible within the resources available to the school
Attendance boundary, enrollment priority and process:

The neighborhood attendance boundary for the new school would be consistent with the existing attendance boundary for Jefferson Middle School.

- All students currently attending Magnet Arts Elementary School and Jefferson Middle School would be allowed to enroll at the new school in 2007-08, regardless of where they resided.
- Students in grades K-5 who resided within this boundary would be given priority for enrollment. These students would need to make application to the school, as the school’s overall enrollment would be limited. In 2007-08, the staff expected the K-5 enrollment would be 125 students.
- This would continue to be the neighborhood school for all students in grades 6-8. This might need to be reviewed and changed if significant enrollment changes took place.

Superintendent Russell pointed out that there was still a lot of work to be done on the project. He added that he had a strong bias to year-round school and that he hoped that the design team would conclude that it would be a K-8 school with a year-round or at least modified calendar.

Dr. Webber-Davis asked if there were any year-round schools in Oregon. Superintendent Russell said that he understood that the Portland School District was going to have several of its planned K-8 schools be year-round. Mr. Henry said that Salem and Woodburn had schools with modified calendars.

Superintendent recommendations:

1. Superintendent Russell will recommend that the board close Magnet Arts Alternative Elementary School and Jefferson Middle School, effective June 30, 2007.

2. Superintendent Russell will recommend that the board authorize the establishment of the Arts and Technology Academy at Jefferson as described above, beginning with the 2007-08 school year, and designate it as an academy school for 2007-08 and 08-09.

Approve Revisions to Board Policy IGBC Title I/Parent Involvement Policy

Currently Eugene School District 4J has Board Policy IGBC called *Comparability Requirements of Title 1* that was adopted and revised on 12-11-02. This current board policy was not complete enough, nor did it reflect all the required parental involvement components of NCLB. The new proposed policy brought the district into compliance with the NCLB requirements of having a district parent involvement policy. The new proposed Board Policy IGBC called *District Title I/Parental Involvement*, from the sample Oregon School Board Association policies, was reviewed and edited by the Title 1 Principals and Coordinators, as well as a group of educational leaders and parents.

The draft policy had also been taken to the ILT (Instructional Leadership Team) for their input and support. This new policy would meet the Title 1 requirements and the NCLB federal monitoring requirements for parental involvement in the district and its Title 1 schools. It would provide future support and guidance for the district’s schools and the district, as it implemented and strengthened its work with parental involvement.
Janis Swan, Federal Program Coordinator and Tami Walkup, Title I Parent Involvement Coordinator was at the meeting to respond to any questions from the board. A copy of the proposed policy and the old policy were included in the packet. There were no questions from the board.

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

Tom Henry gave a brief explanation of the two options for the policy change.

School Choice Policy JECC was attached to the agenda packets outlining recommended changes in priorities for student enrollment. The policy established priorities for students to be placed on waiting lists to enroll in schools other than their neighborhood schools. District staff was recommending that a priority be added to Policy JECC to establish attendance area priorities for resident students in identified schools to manage student enrollment. For example, the policy change could give priority to students living in a high school attendance area applying to the International High School campus located in that attendance area. If enrollment in IHS were to be limited, this would give students priority to attend the IHS program at their neighborhood high school. Copies of School Choice Policy JECC – marked A and B were included in the board packet.

One additional policy revision for student priority was provided for consideration. Board member Martinez at the last meeting requested that staff include a revision to the current policy that gave priority to students who qualified for free or reduced meals, and were applying to elementary schools that were below the district average for free or reduced meals. The suggested policy change would extend this SES priority beyond elementary schools to all schools that were below district averages for free and reduced meals. A chart showing the schools that would be below the district FRL and therefore would be subject to providing “alternative basis” priority was attached. While Superintendent Russell was in agreement with this direction, as were the high school principals and director of high school services, he was not convinced that the district had done the same due diligence analysis and research related to this suggested change as was previously done for making the change at elementary level as part of the whole access and options process. For that reason, he believed it appropriate to hold off on this change and consider it as a part of the strategic planning process currently underway to review enrollment patterns, school boundaries, alternative school relocation, and future school consolidations or reconfiguration. (See information attached to Policy JECC - “B”)

Superintendent Russell recommended approval of the addition of priority 3.a., which stated: **The school board may establish attendance area priorities for students who reside in an attendance area to manage student enrollment capacity.**

Superintendent Russell at this time did not recommend a change in 3.b. to extend the SES priority beyond elementary schools.

**Establish Residence Priority for International High School Students**

The International High School would be limiting enrollment to projections at high school campuses next year to prevent over-enrollment on any one campus. If more students applied than there was space available, establishing priority for students who resided in the attendance area would provide students a better opportunity to attend their neighborhood school for IHS. For example, if South was projected for 181 ninth graders at IHS and 240 students to apply, South students would be placed in IHS before students from other attendance areas.
Subject to approval of revisions in School Choice Policy JECC, Superintendent Russell recommended that priority be given to students who lived in a high school attendance area applying to the International High School located in that attendance area.

**Appoint a Board Member to Fill the Unexpired Term of Anette Spickard**

Barb Bellamy, Director of Communications and Intergovernmental Relations, reviewed the process for appointing a board member to fill the unexpired term of Anette Spickard who was resigning her position on the board, effective January 2, in order to devote her attention to the elected position of Lane County Assessor, a new office she was assuming in January.

Oregon Statute specified that the board shall appoint a successor to serve through June 30, 2007. If the appointee wished to continue to serve on the board thereafter, he or she would need to run for election in May 2007, to serve a four-year term from June 1, 2007-June 30, 2011.

Staff had prepared an application, news media announcement, and schedule for filling the vacant position. The announcement and application would be posted on the district web site, released to the news media and publicized beginning December 14. Persons who were interested in applying for appointment to the board must submit an application to the superintendent's office no later than 5 p.m. on Thursday, January 4, 2007.

The board was scheduled to hold a board meeting on Monday, January 8, 2007 at 7 p.m. to appoint a new board member to fill Position 1. Candidates would be invited to attend the meeting and make a brief presentation explaining their interest in and qualifications for serving on the board. The board would then have an opportunity to ask questions of each candidate.

The board then would select Ms. Spickard's successor by open ballot. The new board member would receive the oath of office and assume his or her responsibilities on January 8.

Superintendent Russell would recommend that the board appoint one elector to Position 1 on the Board of Directors to serve from January 8, 2007-June 30, 2007.

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

Mr. Herrmann presented Ms. Spickard with a card and a gift to thank her for her service as a board member.

Ms. Spickard spoke and said that serving on the school board had been a fabulous experience along with being difficult, challenging, nerve racking, as well as very rewarding. She reminisced about her first board meeting at which the board voted to close several schools. She said that there were many things that she would like to see happen and that she hoped that once she was accustomed to her new job that she could be engaged with the district in some way. She thanked all of the other board members and said that she had enjoyed getting to know them.

Mr. Smith said that he noted in Ms. Spickard’s resignation letter all of the many things that had happened during her term. He said that it had been a great joy to serve with Ms. Spickard and to “weather the storms” with her. He said that he appreciated Ms. Spickard’s focus on what was happening in the schools.

Ms. Gerot noted that Ms. Spickard had been on the Budget Committee since 1995, four years longer than she had. She said that Ms. Spickard’s commitment had been incredible in terms of her political work with the Legislature and in getting into the schools to see what was going on.
She said that Ms. Spickard had done a tremendous job in understanding the issues facing the district. She thanked her for her work.

Mr. Herrmann complimented Ms. Spickard on her work on the board.

Dr. Martinez told Ms. Spickard that he would miss her so much and her ability to cut through to the important questions on complex issues. He said that he was sad for the board but excited for Ms. Spickard and her new position.

Mr. Forrest said that the time he had served with Ms. Spickard on the board, two years, had gone by fast. He admired her ability to serve on the Budget Committee since 1995. He thanked her for her service and said that he appreciated the opportunity to serve with her and get to know her.

Dr. Webber-Davis wished Ms. Spickard all the best as she moved on to greater things. She noted that she would no longer be the freshman member of the board.

Ms. Spickard said that she hoped that the board would get a good pool of candidates. She said that she would be glad to meet with the new board member.

Ms. Gerot asked board members to review the hand out in the red folders titled Shaping 4J’s Future, University Think Tank, Outline of Potential Organization and to make any suggestions for people to sit on the Think Tank.

ADJOURN

Mr. Herrmann adjourned the meeting at 9:55 p.m.

______________________________  ______________________________
George Russell                     Tom Herrmann
District Clerk                     Board Chair

(Recorded by Elise Self)
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