Minutes – Board of Directors – February 7, 2007

MEETING CONVENCED

The Board of Directors of School District No. 4J, Lane County, Eugene, Oregon, held an Executive Session at 6:00 p.m. and a regular meeting at 7 p.m. on February 7, 2007, 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 February 2, 2007, and published in The Register-Guard on February 5, 2007.

ROLL CALL

BOARD MEMBERS:
Tom Herrmann, Chair
Eric Forrest
Beth Gerot
Alicia Hays
Craig Smith
Yvette Webber-Davis
[Dr. Martinez was absent.]

STAFF:
George Russell, Superintendent of Schools and district Clerk
Barbara Bellamy, Director, Communications and Intergovernmental Relations
Wally Bryant, Director of Human Resources
Ted Heid, director of Labor Relations
Tom Henry, Assistant Superintendent – Instructional Services & School Services K-8
Hillary Kittleson, Director of Financial Services
Kelly McIver, Communications Coordinator

EXECUTIVE SESSION: Under Provisions of ORS 192.610 – 192.690, Open Meeting Laws, the Board of Directors conducted an Executive Session for the following purpose:

To conduct deliberations with persons designated by the governing body to carry on labor negotiations, pursuant to ORS 192.660 (1) (d)

REGULAR MEETING: The Executive Session recessed and the regular meeting convened with the above board members present, along with the following:

STAFF:
Bill Hirsh, Director of Facilities and Transportation
Jon Lauch, Assistant Director of Facilities Management
Kay Mehas, Director of School Services
Caroline Passerotti, Financial Analyst
Scott Marsh, Principal for Eastside Elementary School
Carmen Urbina, Parent, Family, and Community Coordinator
Dan Feuhring, Safety Specialist
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.

AGENDA REVIEW

There were no changes or adjustments to the agenda.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS AND SUPERINTENDENT’S REPORT

Superintendent Russell encouraged the board members to sign up for the high school graduation they intended to participate in as an honorary guest, per school district tradition.

Additionally, Superintendent Russell indicated that he had included a guide for board members who were up for election in the folders of those that it was appropriate.

COMMENTS BY STUDENT REPRESENTATIVES

Caitlin Monroe, South Eugene High School, reported that the freshman class was organizing a dance for Friday, February 9. She stated that the showing of An Inconvenient Truth, which had taken place several weeks earlier, had netted a good turnout. She noted that the presentation had included a guest speaker. She added that the school was organizing “Val-o-grams” for Valentine’s Day, special messages that could be sent to students in classes.

Joseph Dombrosky, Churchill High School, stated that his school was also planning a “Val-o-grams” service. He noted that Churchill would have a “white day,” which was when all of the classes were convened in one day. He also reported that a Valentine’s Day dance was planned for February 16.
ITEMS RAISED BY THE AUDIENCE

Sherrie Kuhl, 26746 Powell Road, recounted her experience as a teacher for School District 4J. Teaching social studies had sparked a deep interest in Native American culture for her and she had engaged in a life-long interest in Native American people, their history, and interests. She registered her dismay at the recent news that the Natives Program was allegedly going to be discontinued. She related that she had attended a Pow Wow in Elmira and had been very moved by the deep sadness the young people felt because of the potential loss of the program. She understood that the program was funded with Title VII money and wondered why this funding was being taken away. She thought there must be a way to work things out so that the young people in the program would not lose access to it.

Dan Herbert, 1913 Potter Street, said he was a parent and grandparent and was proud of the school district’s work. He related that he had visited the School District 4J Web site and had reviewed the report on shaping the future of the school district. He had attended the City Club meeting at which Superintendent Russell had reported on the inequalities among the neighborhood schools. He said Superintendent Russell had stated that Eugene was beginning to see pockets of poverty. He believed that the housing patterns were having an effect on school demographics. He suggested that given that the school district did not have control over housing patterns, the district should work with an agency that did have some influence such as the Housing Policy Board in order to begin defining the patterns. He provided his testimony in writing.

Karen Hansen, 805 East 43rd Avenue, pointed out that many people were present in support of Eastside Elementary School. She stressed that the parents and teachers were passionate about what they were doing. She said the parents and teachers believed the school would become “even stronger” as they worked through the goals that they had developed for the school.

Neah Kratzer, 82959 North Weiss Road, Creswell, stated that she was a freshman at Network Charter School and had attended the school for four years. She had previously been home schooled. She felt the Network Charter School had turned her into a straight ‘A’ student and had inspired her to go further in life.

Mary Leighton, 4046 Normandy Way, said she was the executive director of the Network Charter School. She thanked the board for its support of the school and expressed hope that the board would approve renewal of the Charter for the next four years. She acknowledged that the board had made hard choices about how to spend limited resources and provide the best learning experience for young people that they could. She applauded them for reserving a “share of scarce resources” to pilot new approaches outside “the boxes of established practices.” She highlighted the distinguishing features of the Network Charter School, which included hands on learning in partnership with five different organizations and almost 50 additional community partners. She described some of the ways students learn, such as working with master gardeners, fly fishermen, and learning to cook foods from other cultures.

Fred Wilber, 370 River Loop 1, said he had come to the meeting to show support for the Network Charter School. He noted that he had been a founding teacher of Hillside Elementary School. He also wished to express support for continuation of the Natives Program. He believed the Network Charter School had filled a need. He noted that his grandchild was a member of the Klamath tribe and had found the Network Charter School best met his needs.
Carly Kratzer, 82959 North Weiss Road, Creswell, stated that she was a member of the Network Charter School and served on the Student Council. She shared that she had experienced much personal growth from the four years she had attended the school program. She believed the small class sizes and the alternative learning style contributed to her positive experience. She asked that the Board continue to support the school.

Nancy Willard, 474 West 29th Avenue, averred that the Hillside Alternative School was not doing anything unlike what every other neighborhood school was doing. She felt Buena Vista Spanish Immersion School had “legitimately been trying to change” and had increased the number of students who qualified for free and reduced lunches. She predicted that it would be “conscripted” in 18 years, but it would take 25 to 30 years for Eastside Elementary School. She asserted that the merging of Edgewood and Evergreen schools had created a school with a similar model to Eastside. She believed both schools had 100 students fewer than the number of students suggested as necessary for a school. She thought the standard should include a compelling justification to continue the two schools. She alleged that the school district had a two-class system of schools and that the collocated schools did not work “because of the inequities.” She further alleged that the alternative school communities “regularly degraded and demeaned” the members of the neighborhood school communities. She did not think housing alternative schools in their own buildings was the solution. She said the school district would need community support for the planning effort it was taking on. She opined that every newspaper article that addressed these issues spoke of “the facts of the segregation, the inequities, the aggregation of wealth, and the aggregation of poverty.”

Andy Peara, 410 East 34th Avenue, spoke on behalf of the Network Charter School. He thanked the school board for “taking a chance” on a relatively new concept, for accommodating the school’s request for special waivers with regards to the transitional teachers’ certification, for allowing the school to extend its charter from three years to four, for having patience with the leadership transitions the school had undergone, for giving area students both in and out of the district a chance to “take part in this experiment,” for empowering the district’s staff to provide flexible assistance, for sharing another charter school’s proceeds from the local option levy, and for providing the school the leeway to expand enrollment at a gradual and reasonable pace. He said they looked forward to continuing the school’s mission with the district’s support.

Debbie Egan, Lane Education Service District (ESD), addressed the board regarding the local service plan, which was new under House Bill (HB) 3184. She explained that the House had taken all of the resolutions the school district was familiar with and had put them under four core service areas: special education, technology, school improvement and administrative support, and truancy. She said they were the same services as before but grouped differently. She underscored that they were charged to provide the services with equity, cost effectiveness, and high quality. She reported that the local service plan included performance measures, listed in an attachment provided for the board. She felt fortunate to have participated in a Resolution Analysis Process (RAP), which had included Superintendent Russell among the six superintendent representatives. They had reviewed and approved the service models at Lane ESD, though they wanted some increases in school improvement and in instructional technology and a decrease in the area of prevention (partly due to the success of positive behavior support and the increase in services in special education). She looked forward to the budget process though she anticipated a slight decrease in funding because the ESD had been spending down the ending fund balance by approximately $1 million per year. She said if the state budget were $6.3 billion, the ESD would be able to provide all of its services “fairly effectively.” Additionally, she noted that the ESD staff was reading the book Good to Great with the goal in mind of providing services that were “great.” She said they were also making sure Lane ESD took into consideration the needs of both large and small school districts.
indicated that a summary of the information had been provided to the Board, including an outline of the services the School District 4J received.

COMMENTS BY EMPLOYEE GROUPS

There were no representatives of the employee groups that wished to speak at this time.

ITEMS FOR INFORMATION

Receive a Report to the Superintendent on the Proposed Changes to the Landscape Management Administrative Rules

Bill Hirsh, Director of Facilities Management and Transportation, stated that the report was included in the board packet. He introduced the members of the Landscape Management Advisory Committee.

Lucy Vinis, representing the Northwest Coalition for Alternatives to Pesticides (NCAP) and member of the advisory committee, stated that she was a parent of two School District 4J students and had a Master’s Degree in integrated pest management (IPM). She said the work of the committee had been an outgrowth of frustration with the quality and appearance of school campuses and the perceived conflict between having an attractive usable campus and not using toxic solutions to mitigate vegetation issues. She averred that IPM principles were a systematic decision-making tool that enabled landscape managers to identify pests, set thresholds, and to test and evaluate strategies for controlling them with an emphasis on the least toxic methods. She hoped the committee’s work would provide 4J facilities staff with a process and template for future work. She underscored that many of the alternatives to chemical pesticides were time consuming. She pointed out that Eugene Code requirements for attractive shrub beds in place of grass were a mixed blessing as it placed a burden on maintenance personnel. She related that another issue the facilities staff had brought to the fore was “renegade chemical treatments,” as coaches and parents sometimes took matters into their own hands and applied chemicals without permission and without posting any warnings about it. She also pointed out that the key to effective IPM was design. She stated that gravel traps at elementary schools were an example of a design problem. She said the committee supported a district effort to increase maintenance staff, to review city codes to identify points of flexibility, and to evaluate structures that could be modified in ways that would make them less prone to weed infestations. She stressed that the report was a work in progress and the committee intended to continue to meet in order to evaluate the effectiveness of tactics taken and to advocate for the continued research into sustainable and structural solutions.

Mary Bauer introduced herself as a School District 4J parent and a former teacher for the district. She stated that she was an environmental quality advocate and that both of her daughters were chemically sensitive. She quoted former School District 4J Superintendent, Margaret Nichols, who said the district must do its best for children. She discussed the committee process, which included much work on guiding principles that had enabled the committee to move forward with a shared vision. Those principles were, as follows: health and safety, functional design, aesthetics, IPM, and capital maintenance costs and use. She related that they also agreed that school grounds should be beautiful as schools played a valued part in the community. She highlighted the tensions brought about by the need to keep a playing field safe and free from gopher holes, as an example, and the potential use of chemicals to keep a playing field artificially manicured. She felt the work of the Landscape Advisory Committee represented a synthesis of the best thinking on the topic of landscape maintenance at this time and that it tried to meet the core values of Eugene.
Randy Rogers said he had joined the committee as the managing director of Kidsports and a lifelong member of the community and an alumnus of the School District 4J as well. He stated that the Kidsports families needed safe playing fields and diamonds. He felt it was critical to find healthy ways to address the issues that gophers, moles, and voles created on fields. He expressed appreciation for the mix of people who served on the committee. He averred that the document they presented to the school district represented consensus on the committee and that it represented each member’s concerns. He stated that each member of the committee recognized it was a living document and would take continued work to make the guidelines applicable into the future.

Ross Penhallegon, Lane County Extension Service horticulturist, gave kudos to the 4J staff and its representatives on the committee. He underscored that the committee included 19 different people but with guidance, they had managed to reach unanimous consent on the document. He pointed out that this level of agreement among so many people was unusual. He reviewed the plan for IPM treatment for horsetail, outlined on page 25 of the report, as an example of the tremendous amount of work that had gone into the document. He averred that anyone would be able to pick up the document, read, and clearly understand the information presented in it.

Mr. Hirsh stated that a lot of energy and expertise had gone into the process. He thanked the committee and the district leadership for making it possible. He understood that Superintendent Russell was willing to implement the changes in the landscape management rules.

Mr. Herrmann thanked the committee on behalf of the School Board and commended them for their work.


SCHEDULE B

Jerry Henderson presented the follow-up review of Hillside Elementary School. He stated that Superintendent Russell would use the report as one component when preparing his recommendations. He read the report into the record with the aid of Power Points. He recounted the process, which had been initiated by the Superintendent’s recommendation that Hillside develop a plan for program modification, resulting from the Alternative School Review. The alternative school review team, consisting of himself, Ms. Mehas, Mr. Hermanns, and Mr. Gross, had visited the school and had spoken with staff and students. He commended the team’s guides, three fifth grade students. He described the school’s approach, which sought to develop an integrated sequential curriculum with an emphasis on global studies. He expressed the review team’s gratitude to the Hillside Review Committee, staff, principal, and parents for their open and collegial participation in the review.

Superintendent Russell stated that the board had received the original paperwork for Hillside Alternative School. He asked for a summary of its history.

Mr. Henry related that the school had changed its name and added a Kindergarten class in the mid-1990s. He said there had been no major revisions to the core values of the school at that time, as ‘Traditional Alternative’ no longer reflected the teaching style at the school.

Mr. Wilber stated that the school had arisen from parents’ desire to develop a program that harkened back to a more traditional approach to teaching and learning. Parents wanted to be involved and they wanted more focus on the basic skills. He related that it was a strongly disciplined program and the expectation on the students was high.
Mr. Forrest asked what made Hillside’s curriculum and manner of teaching different from the neighborhood schools. Mr. Gross replied that there were some of the same elements in other schools. He thought one could say the same thing about Corridor School. He believed that how Hillside Alternative School integrated its programming and “spiraled” it through everything made it distinctive.

Mr. Forrest asked if a neighborhood school could have the exact same program as Hillside Alternative School. Mr. Gross affirmed that it could. Mr. Forrest commented that it seemed that his son’s neighborhood school was taking this learning approach.

Mr. Henderson noted that the team had tried to stay within the parameters of its charge. He said they looked less at whether anyone else could have this type of curriculum and more at whether the school itself had built upon its international focus in response to the Alternative School Review.

Ms. Gerot asked at what point the school had begun the international focus. She had heard that it really became emphasized after the review process had been initiated. Mr. Henderson agreed that the first they had heard of this focus was in spring, 2006. He felt the school had always had an international focus but they had built upon it in response to the review.

Mr. Gross underscored that it was inaccurate to say that the school had turned away from what it had previously done. He said the school’s proponents were careful to explain to the team that they were carrying along a great many of the things that were the building blocks of the program that were initially in place. He related that it was the committee’s deliberation that those things in and of themselves would not make the program distinctive. He felt the school had emphasized the part of the program that made it a distinctive international elementary school in response to this feedback.

Mr. Henderson remarked that the team had gone into the school with a level of skepticism based on the previous year’s observations, but had been surprised at what they found. He felt they had left the school with their minds changed.

Dr. Webber-Davis thanked the team for the overview. She had been struck by the emphasis on the evolution of the school in the report. She said it appeared it was still a work in progress. She observed that the report indicated the school was moving toward participating in the international elementary level baccalaureate program. She commented that it was her understanding that this program had a level of rigor, expectation, and international standard that must be addressed. She asked if this was viable in Hillside Alternative School.

Mr. Henderson responded that the team did not know whether this was viable. He said the staff members at the school were committed but they were also realists and were not certain the School Board would allow them to move forward. He affirmed that the International Baccalaureate was expensive and took time and energy to engage in. He related that the school had put it out as a direction it wanted to move in, but there was no surety at this point as to whether it would be able to pursue the program.

Ms. Gerot noted that one big issue had revolved around the declining enrollment at the school. She asked what kind of work had been done on the need for greater interest in the program. Mr. Henderson replied that he was uncertain. He understood that with the ending of the grade level caps the school had reached its cap and this had necessitated the creation of a 2nd/3rd
grade classroom. Mr. Henry added that the cap was 132 and the actual enrollment was 122.5 students.

**Receive an Update on Eastside Alternative School’s Plan for Improvement**

Carmen Urbina, Parent, Family and Community Coordinator, thanked the Eastside Alternative School staff, parents, and administrators for the “incredible work” the Eastside community had done. She recalled that in February 2006, the School Board had adopted a set of recommendations related to the Eastside Elementary School. She said a key finding for Eastside had been related to attracting and addressing the instructional needs of a more diverse student population including students with a low economic status, students with special needs, students for whom English was a second language, and students of color. She had been engaged to facilitate this process. She commented that it had been a privilege to work with the Eastside community. She read the report into the record. She listed the strategies that had resulted out of the initial conversations:

- To undertake a strategic planning process to define the successes, weaknesses, opportunities, and challenges;
- To form a three-year plan that identified the needs and specific responses to those needs and the resources needed to achieve the desired outcomes;
- To develop multi-phase strategies as the Improvement Plan unfolded that would address short- and long-term strategies and to design them to be parallel to each other;
- To ensure decisions made were transparent to Eastside stakeholders;
- District support was the key to the success.

Scott Marsh, Principal at Eastside Alternative, highlighted the details of the work and the plan that had resulted from a strategic planning retreat held in April 2006. He related that the teaching staff had engaged in the Success, Weakness, Opportunity and Threats (SWOT) process at the retreat. He said a group of parent representatives would engage in that same process in second phase of the planning process.

Ms. Hays said she had reviewed the six-phase process outlined in the report and asked if she understood correctly that community members were not a part of the process until the sixth phase. Ms. Urbina replied that it was planned for the third phase and then when the staff and community members came together in the sixth phase they intended to identify who the stakeholders in the community were.

Mr. Herrmann thanked Ms. Urbina and Mr. Marsh for the report.

Superintendent Russell indicated he would bring his response to the reports and his recommendations to the board at the next meeting.

**Receive a Report on Civic Stadium**

Jon Lauch, Assistant Director of Facilities Management, noted that the district was in the process of demolishing a couple of the old bus garage structures at the Civic Stadium site. He reported that the property had been deeded to the district in the late 1930s by the City of Eugene. He had surmised that it had been a tax foreclosure. He stated that the city had passed a bond to pay for the back taxes and then had given it to the school district. He related that the recitals in the City Council and board minutes included statements that indicated the property was intended to be used as a recreation area for the school district and the municipality. He said the district had received four legal opinions since the 1970s from four
different lawyers and all four had opined that the school district could use the property as it wanted as the language was not a deed restriction, but the City continued to assert that it was a meaningful recital in the deed. He thought it was prudent to get a final answer to this question before moving forward with any process on the stadium. He noted that the district had not used the property exclusively for recreation as the transportation department had utilized it for bus storage. In closing, he stated that legal counsel would be preparing their respective legal briefs.

Receive a Report on the Market Study of Certified Staff Compensation

Ted Heid, Director of Labor Relations, presented the results of the market survey of teacher compensation for 2006-07, a survey utilizing data from 11 Oregon public school districts selected by representatives of the district and the Eugene Education Association (EEA). He noted that EEA representatives, Merri Steele and Paul Duchin intended to present a portion of the survey.

Mr. Heid stated that ‘Document A’ was a portion of the survey of building principals and assistant principals from the previous year. He said the page indicated where Eugene teachers’ entry salary stood in relation to the other districts. He related that the administrative and teachers’ salaries were comparable to the other districts, “very near the top.” He reported that Mr. Duchin disagreed with the selection of districts that had been surveyed. He said ‘Document D’ was the list of districts the current survey had included. He noted, as an example, that Mr. Duchin did not feel that the Corvallis School District should be included and that he had asked that some Portland metro area districts be added. In reviewing the salary comparison, he said it appeared that the School District 4J salaries were moving ahead of the Bethel School District in regard to entry-level salaries.

Ms. Steele thanked the board for agreeing to the market survey process. She stressed that the EEA was very interested in sharing and agreeing on the information that would be used in labor negotiations. She conveyed the EEA belief that survey data would indicate that School District 4J salaries were below where they should be. She thought district representatives would realize this from the data and this would contribute to a successful negotiation.

Mr. Duchin provided overhead projections that indicated current salaries and comparators. He averred that in previous negotiations labor and management had not agreed on how to “add the numbers up.” He showed the report the EEA had received in November. He did not agree with the district’s assessment that the School District 4J teachers’ salaries were average or above average. He reviewed the different categories of teachers divided by length of time with the district and level of higher education. He believed the school district was below average in every column. He asserted that no teachers came with Bachelor’s Degrees anymore and most achieved a Master’s Degree. He averred that this meant they came to the district and were paid much less than the average.

Ms. Steele indicated that the reason the EEA had asked for the sampling of salaries to include Portland metro area school districts was that Eugene was losing teachers to that area.

Mr. Duchin reported that the district employees received a Cost of Living Allowance (COLA) in 2005-06 and 2006-07 of 2.5 percent. He related that many administrators had received an additional 5 percent. He stated that the EEA would accept the numbers the district provided because the employees believed that they showed that salaries needed to be increased.
Receive the District’s Annual Report on Compliance with Oregon Minimum Standards  
SCHEDULE D

Tom Henry, Deputy Superintendent and Chief Academic Officer, stated that he had prepared a packet for the School Board that laid out in detail the Oregon Administrative Rules (OARs) that described how and why the school district was in compliance. He had not found any areas in which the School District 4J did not meet the standards, though in some cases the district was meeting them at minimum levels. He cited the areas of media and counseling as examples of areas that only met standards at minimum levels. He said he would not go into detail at this point in the meeting but he welcomed questions from the board. He concluded by saying that he was pleased to state that the district did meet minimum standards for compliance.

There were no questions.

ITEMS FOR ACTION AT THIS MEETING

Conduct a Public Hearing and Approve Supplemental Budget #1  
SCHEDULE E

Mr. Herrmann opened the public hearing. Seeing no one who wished to speak to the item, he closed the public hearing.

Hillary Kittleson, Director of Financial Services, stated that she had reviewed the proposed changes in the Supplemental Budget #1 at the previous meeting. She indicated she was available to answer any questions.

MOTION: Ms. Gerot, seconded by Mr. Forrest, moved to approve Supplemental Budget #1.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously, 6:0.

Conduct a Public Hearing on the Request for Charter Contract Renewal from the Network Charter School

Mr. Herrmann opened the public hearing. Seeing that no one wished to speak on the item, he closed the public hearing. He noted that the comments regarding the item had been made during the public comment period and would be duly recognized.

CONSENT GROUP - ITEMS FOR ACTION

MOTION: Dr. Webber-Davis, seconded by Mr. Forrest, moved to approve the Consent Group.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously, 6:0.

Approve Board Meeting Minutes

The superintendent recommended approval of the minutes of the regular board meeting held on November 1, 2006.

Approve Contract with Qwest Corporation for Voice and Data Services

The district had issued a request for proposals (RFP) for voice and data services on December 1, 2006, for services to begin on July 1, 2007. Services were to include phone lines and related functions to all district properties and the value of the contract was approximately $245,000 per
The deadline was January 8, 2007, and only one response was received: from QWest Corporation in Portland, Oregon. Staff conducted a thorough evaluation of the services and concluded that it would be in the district’s best interest to offer the contract to QWest. The Superintendent recommended contracting with QWest Corporation for voice and data services for one year with the possibility of two one-year extensions.

The superintendent recommended contracting with Qwest Corporation for voice and data services for a one (1) year period, with the possibility of two (2) one-year extensions.

**Approve Grant Application: Community Dental Health for Eugene’s Low Income Youth**

Staff in Health Services submitted an application to United Way for a $9,000 grant for the *Community Dental Health Program for Eugene’s Low Income Youth*, a community volunteer partnership between the Eugene School-Based Health Centers, the Assistance League’s Children’s Dental Clinic, the Lane community College Dental Hygiene Program, and the Federally Qualified Health Center Dental Program. This program provides dental health education, prevention, restorative care, and orthodontics to 500 to 800 low-income children annually. The Superintendent recommended approval of the grant application.

**Approve Personnel Item**

The superintendent recommended approval of the personnel items included in the packet. These cover employment, resignations, and other routine personnel matters. (See attached)

**ITEMS FOR ACTION AT A FUTURE MEETING**

**Consider Renewal of the Public Charter School Contract Between Eugene School District and the Network Charter School**

Londa Rochholz, Alternative Education Coordinator, stated that the board had before it the superintendent’s proposed findings and recommendation to accept the Network Charter School’s renewal request for another four years. She said a District Charter Team consisting of herself and four others had conducted the review. She reported that Network Charter School staff had responded favorably to all of the district’s requests both financial and instructional. She conveyed the team’s belief that the school had achieved its goal of having a network of providers who implemented a comprehensive instructional program. She stated that the team’s analysis had determined the Network Charter School to be financially stable and that it provided a distinctive and valuable service to the district’s students. She highlighted the proposed actions recommended by the superintendent:

- Approve the application for charter renewal submitted for a period of four years contingent upon successful negotiation of the contract;
- Permit the school to revise the range of grades it serves to grades 7 through 12 from grades 6 through 12.

**Consider the 2007-2008 Lane Education Service District Local Service Plan**

As required by House Bill 3184, Lane Education Service District has developed a Local Service Plan. The process in developing this plan included analysis of all resolutions/core services with the 16 component districts. Through this process, component districts had the opportunity to gain knowledge, share and discuss their needs and provide recommendations for the local service plan.
In accordance with ORS 334.175 (2), the Local Service Plan contains all services mandated by law.

1. Programs for children with special needs, including but not limited to:
   • Special education
   • At-risk students
   • Professional development for employees who provide those services

2. School Improvement services for component school districts, including but not limited to:
   • Meeting the requirements of state and federal law
   • Services designed to allow the ESD to participate in and facilitate a review of the state and federal standards related to the provision of a quality education
   • Support and facilitate continuous school improvement planning
   • Support for school-wide behavior and climate issues
   • Professional technical education
   • Professional development for employees who provide these services

3. Technology support for component school districts and the individual technology plans of those districts, including but not limited to:
   • Technology infrastructure services
   • Data services, instructional technology services, distance learning
   • Professional development for employees who provide those services

4. Administrative and support services for component school districts, including but not limited to:
   • Services designed to consolidate component school district business functions
   • Liaison services between ODE and component districts
   • Registration of children being taught by private teachers, parents or legal guardians pursuant to ORS 339.035

5. Other services that an education service district is required to provide by state or federal law, including but not limited to services related to compulsory attendance required under ORS 339.005 to 339.090.

A copy of the Local Service Plan, Summary of the Local Service Plan, and Resolution Adopting the Local Service Plan are included in the packet. For 2007-2008, the Lane ESD has proposed the following services be funded under the Local Service Plan.

• Students with Special Needs
• School Improvement
• Technology
• Administrative and Support
• Additional Services

Superintendent Russell indicated that this would come before the board at the next meeting as an action item.

Consider the 2007-2008 School Calendar

The 2007-08 school year calendar schedule is similar to the current school year calendar except the two-week winter break begins and ends mid-week. A change to two weeks beginning Saturday December 22 through Sunday January 6 is being actively considered. The student school year starts the day after Labor Day, Wednesday September 5, 2007 and ends Thursday June 12, 2008. The teacher work year begins Wednesday August 29, 2007 and ends Friday June 13, 2008. Winter break begins Wednesday, December 19, 2006 and students resume
classes on Thursday January 3, 2008. There are staff development days (no students) following the vacation breaks on Wednesday January 2, 2008 and Monday March 31, 2008. Spring break continues to follow the U of O schedule during the fourth week of March, Monday March 24, 2008 to Friday March 28, 2008. Students resume classes on Tuesday April 1, 2008.

The proposed calendar is being reviewed by the Eugene Education Association, which may result in modification.

The superintendent will recommend approval of the proposed school calendar for the 2007-08 school year.

Mr. Heid noted that the calendar in the board packets was the “proposed” calendar. He noted that the only unusual feature in the calendar was a potential change in the starting and ending dates of the winter break.


The firm of Grove, Mueller and Swank, P.C. has completed the annual audit in accordance with Oregon Revised Statutes. The district's Financial Policy Committee of which board member Yvette Webber-Davis is a member, has reviewed the "Comprehensive Annual Financial Report," the "KRVM-FM Radio of Lane County School District 4J Financial Statement", the report to management, and the staff response to the management report. Copies of the reports were included in the board packets.

The superintendent will recommend acceptance of the audit report for fiscal year 2005 – 2006.

Ms. Kittleson welcomed questions on the audit report.

Dr. Webber-Davis wished to thank the entire staff for the hard work that had been done and the large amount of material that had been covered.

Consider a Resolution Opposing Senate Bill 426 Creating a Statewide Insurance Program for Public Education Employees

Board member Craig Smith stated that this was the third time a bill similar to this had been introduced in the Legislature. He felt it had better “political legs” in its present iteration. He reported that he and Ms. Gerot had witnessed this idea for three sessions and their feeling was that the alleged savings were “ephemeral at best.” He stressed that the legislation would require the district to go to a statewide pool for insurance. He noted that under the current proposal it would be run by a board not unlike the Public Employees Retirement System (PERS) board. He believed the district should have a choice and should be involved in the creation of a benefits structure.

Ms. Gerot echoed Mr. Smith’s sentiments. She pointed to a lack of language in Section 4 of the bill there was nothing in the goals that speak to cost savings or efficiencies and that in Section 17 there was nothing that looked at future costs. She recommended the Board read the bill before the next meeting. She noted that the Board’s folder included an analysis from the Oregon School Board Association (OSBA) of Section 17. She called the legislation a “political dance” that would come at the expense of school districts.
COMMENTS AND COMMITTEE REPORTS BY INDIVIDUAL BOARD MEMBERS

Dr. Webber-Davis related that she had been a reviewer of a school-to-work program for senior projects. She had reviewed the projects of five seniors and had been very impressed by them. She said the students had entered into the projects as just one more thing to do but for many of them it had reinforced the passion they had for a particular area. She commented that she continued to be impressed with the staff and students of the School District 4J.

Ms. Gerot encouraged any of the board members to attend the OSBA Conference scheduled for February 18 and 19. She stated that there would be an educational rally at noon on the 19th.

Ms. Gerot reported that she had the opportunity to participate in the National School Board Association (NSBA) and Federal Relations Network in Washington, D.C. during the previous week. She felt that often the school boards received too much information from the NSBA, but she had found the information to be more distilled and more accessible at the conference. She related that she had met with Representatives Peter DeFazio and Greg Walden and had talked to aides from some of the other elected officials in Washington, D.C. She had encouraged Superintendent Russell to continue to send at least one board member to the annual conference.

Mr. Smith reported that he had joined a breakfast with the EEA representatives and State Senators Floyd Prozanski and Vicki Walker and found the discussion to be informative.

Mr. Smith stated that the ACE awards would be held on May 2. He also announced that he would run for reelection.

ADJOURN

Mr. Herrmann adjourned the meeting at 9:23 p.m.

______________________________  ______________________________
George Russell                     Tom Herrmann
District Clerk                     Board Chair

(Recorded by Ruth Atcherson)
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