MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS
SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 4J, LANE COUNTY, OREGON

August 15, 2007

The Board of Directors of School District No. 4J, Lane County, Eugene, Oregon, held an Executive Session at 6:15 p.m. and a regular meeting at 7 p.m. on August 15, 2007, at the Education Center, 200 North Monroe Street, Eugene, Oregon. Notice of the meeting was mailed to the media and posted in the Education Center on August 10, 2007, and published in The Register-Guard on August 13, 2007.

ROLL CALL

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

STAFF:
George Russell, Superintendent of Schools and District Clerk
Tom Henry, Deputy Superintendent & Chief Academic Officer
Barb Bellamy, Chief of Staff and Communications Director
Wally Bryant, Director of Human Resources
Susan Fahey, Chief Financial Officer
Ted Heid, Director of Labor Relations
Caroline Passerotti, Financial Analysis Manager
John Ewing, Financial Analyst

MEDIA:
Frank Nearing, KLCC

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 and staff present along with the following:

STAFF:
Laurie Moses, Director of High School Services
Carmen Urbina, Parent, Family and Community Coordinator

MEDIA AND OTHER:
KRVM
Dr. Ed Weeks
Hillary Kittleson
STUDENT REPRESENTATIVES:
None present

CALL TO ORDER, ROLL CALL, AND FLAG SALUTE

Charles Martinez, Board Chair, called the meeting of the 4J School Board to order.

Those present saluted the flag.

AGENDA REVIEW

There were no changes.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS AND SUPERINTENDENT’S REPORT

Superintendent Russell had no report.

COMMENTS BY STUDENT REPRESENTATIVES

No student representatives were present.

ITEMS RAISED BY THE AUDIENCE

There were no comments.

COMMENTS BY EMPLOYEE GROUPS

There were no comments.

ITEMS FOR INFORMATION

Receive Final Report for Superintendent’s Goals for 2006-07

Superintendent Russell reviewed highlights in his final report on the goals he and the board set for 2006-07, stressing accomplishments related to closing the student achievement gap. The goals dealt with student achievement, strategic planning, funding and fiscal accountability, legislative issues, and communication and governmental relations.

Receive a Legislative Report

Barb Bellamy, Chief of Staff and Communications Director, noted the legislative report from the Oregon School Boards Association (OSBA) in the board packet and gave a short list of highlights from the 2007 session. She began with celebrating the State School Fund appropriation that was allowing the district to add positions this year for the first time in a long time.

Other good news Ms. Bellamy cited, was an increase in the local option levy. She said it would be important to 4J in three to four years when forecasted declines in enrollment would have forced the district to reduce what it was able to get from the local option levy, with its per-student limit. The legislation increased the limit, effective this year, and created an index so it would increase every year thereafter.
Ms. Bellamy said the construction excise tax approved by the legislature was particularly important to rapidly-growing school districts outside the Portland metropolitan area. The tax would have to be enacted locally by the local school board. She noted that the tax would not bring in enough money to build a new facility, but it could help with upgrades and additions.

Ms. Bellamy commented that the board was already well informed about the state health insurance pool that would continue to be administered by OSBA under contract.

Ms. Bellamy said the board’s Wellness Policy reflected most of the nutrition standards the state would put in place next year, with a couple of exceptions: Calorie limits and portion sizes. In terms of physical education standards, she said the state set rigorous standards for the future, while recognizing that districts might not yet have gym space to meet the requirements. The PE standards would not go into effect until 2017. Meanwhile, the Oregon Department of Education (ODE) had been directed to collect data about programs now offered in K-8. She said a provision establishing a task force within ODE to identify best practices in business operations for use in school audits had been tacked on to the PE bill.

Ms. Bellamy said the district needed to take a closer look at charter school legislation and turn it over to legal counsel to see if a policy change would be necessary.

She also noted two measures that would be before voters in a special election in November that would affect school districts: Modifications to Measure 37 and an increase in the tobacco tax to fund a health care program for children.

ITEMS FOR ACTION AT THIS MEETING

Approve the Superintendent’s Recommendation for the Shaping 4J’s Future Public and Staff Input Process

Superintendent Russell related that Hillary Kittleson and David Piercy had met with his staff after getting input from principal groups on the Think Tank recommendations. He said the group had spent about six hours developing his recommendations and commented that the recommendations did not absolutely reflect everything the staff and principals would like to see.

Mr. Russell noted that Dr. Martinez wanted to go through the recommendations one at a time, and pointed to the document, with the recommendations of the Think Tank and the superintendent listed side by side. He did not believe there were major differences, but there were areas where they differed about whether the issue would be referred for public input or for staff exploration.

1. Elementary School Size

Mr. Russell went over the differences in his recommendations from the Think Tank’s. He cited one of three options he was recommending for public discussion, continuing current policies and practices, and noted that some people felt that would put forth an unrealistic option because of changing demographics in the district. He felt it was important to listen to people who believed things were fine as they were.

The superintendent noted that his goal of 300-500 students per school differed from the Think Tank’s recommendation of 350. Mr. Russell also stated that was consistent with his recommendations for middle school and high school, where the Think Tank recommended a specific number and he recommended a range.
MOTION: Board member Jim Torrey, seconded by board vice chair Beth Gerot, moved to accept the superintendent’s recommendation.

Board member Eric Forrest commented that this was one of the more significant departures from the Think Tank’s recommendations, and he preferred the more targeted Think Tank approach, along with its recommendation to obtain public input about creating smaller learning environments in larger schools.

Board member Craig Smith noted that the Think Tank had recommended a maximum based on site capacity, which did not create any upper limit.

Mr. Russell said the staff suggested referring learning communities to an internal instead of public discussion partly because they were unsure whether the public had enough knowledge on the subject to weigh in.

Mr. Forrest thought a lot of parents had ideas about smaller learning communities and would like to be involved in discussions with teachers.

Mr. Russell clarified that when he talked about internal staff discussions, he included internal stakeholders, both parents and staff.

Mr. Torrey felt having the superintendent’s statements and the Think Tank’s statements side by side provided a platform for public discussion. His concern was how to get all people, and not just special interest groups, involved in the discussions.

Mr. Russell stressed that the district would not be asking the public to tell it what to do, but would be seeking opinions. He felt the district may not like the response it gets, but it was important to hear how the public sees the issues involved.

Ms. Gerot thought the purpose was getting input from the internal and external community that would guide the superintendent’s decisions about what he presented to the board this winter. She felt professionals were the appropriate ones to discuss smaller learning environments, because they had a knowledge base that the public did not.

Dr. Martinez thought about the recommendations in terms of whether they were the right core frame of reference for discussion. He observed that it would not take off the table the wisdom that would be generated from community input, but he also deferred to the superintendent’s sense of what type of information would be needed to guide his recommendations back to the board.

Mr. Russell stressed that the district had a long history of engaging stakeholders before making major decisions.

After more discussion, board member Alicia Hays asked Mr. Russell to suggest an amendment that would reflect his intent to involve parents.

Mr. Russell suggested referring for internal staff discussion the issue of implementing smaller learning environments in elementary schools and ways to involve appropriate stakeholders in those discussions.

MOTION: Mr. Torrey made a motion, seconded by Mr. Smith, to amend the superintendent’s recommendation with that wording.
VOTE: The motion passed unanimously, 6-0.

Mr. Smith commented about the importance of communicating with the community about the process and the assumptions people would have.

Tom Henry, Deputy Superintendent and Chief Academic Officer, noted that the superintendent’s staff had looked at schools and numbers and felt that 300, which would mean two classes at each grade level, gave a great deal more flexibility if the district would be consolidating schools. He said the top range came from the existing 500-student capacity of larger schools, which more carefully defined the numbers than the Think Tank’s recommendation.

Mr. Forrest said that strategically, he wanted the process to set some stakes in the ground about what the district would be about and how it would do things. He felt 300-500 was a huge range, and that ranges always had buffers on either side.

Dr. Martinez stressed that at this stage, the board would set a starting point for community discussions, and the critical decisions would come in the aftermath of those discussions.

VOTE: The vote on the motion to accept the superintendent’s recommendation with the previously approved amendment was 5:1, with Mr. Forrest dissenting.

2. Grade Configurations

MOTION: Mr. Forrest, seconded by Mr. Smith, moved to accept the superintendent’s recommendation.
VOTE: The motion passed unanimously, 6-0.

3. Middle School Size

MOTION: Mr. Smith, seconded by Ms. Hays, moved to accept the superintendent’s recommendation.
VOTE: The motion passed unanimously, 6-0.

4. High School Size

4.1, 4.2 Superintendent Russell highlighted the range of topics the staff had discussed and noted a size tipping point at which operating a comprehensive high school program became difficult.

4.3, 4.4 Mr. Russell went over his recommendation that career academies and small learning communities be referred to internal staff for research and discussion. He recommended getting staff and public input on the question of whether the district should include physical infrastructure for career academies and small learning communities in its next bond measure. Mr. Smith observed that these were questions the Think Tank had recommended referring to the public.

Laurie Moses, Director of High School Services, said high school principals were united in their desire to develop small learning communities and career academies in each school, but concerns about whether the public understood what they were prompted superintendent’s staff not to want to take the issue to the public yet.

MOTION: Ms. Gerot moved, seconded by Mr. Smith, to adopt the superintendent’s recommendations.
Mr. Torrey wondered about letting the public weigh-in on the question of offering alternative opportunities for the non-traditional student to get career-oriented training that did not preclude academic studies. He felt unless there was some description of what career academies meant, the district would be inviting disaster in a public forum.

Superintendent Russell commented that part of his struggle with the issue was tied to the different perceptions people had about career academies, because a career academy aimed at college preparation would be very different from one preparing studies for a student going directly into the workforce after high school.

Ms. Hays felt it was intriguing that the Think Tank could not define career academies. She agreed with not inviting community discussion until there was more clarity around the topic.

Superintendent Russell said a separate question could be posed asking the public whether the district should be doing more for students not going to college to prepare them for careers.

Mr. Torrey shared that his idea was a hybrid, because he felt basic needs of non-traditional students were not being met. He felt there was tremendous public concern that all students would be treated the same.

Mr. Russell said internal research and discussion meant eventually the issue would come back to the board for discussion. Ms. Hays said she supported having a board conversation before a public discussion.

Mr. Forrest agreed, noting that many other topics had been discussed by the board for a number of years, while this one had not. He felt the board needed to have an in-depth conversation and show leadership before getting public comment.

**VOTE:** The motion passed unanimously, 6-0.

5. Alternative Schools

Superintendent Russell noted that this topic evoked considerable staff discussion about subjecting alternative schools and neighborhood schools to the same size criteria, and whether alternative schools should be allowed to share a site to meet the enrollment targets.

**MOTION:** Mr. Forrest, seconded by Ms. Hays, moved to adopt the superintendent’s recommendation to seek public and staff input on alternative school enrollment.

Mr. Forrest wondered how the staff felt about co-locating neighborhood and alternative schools.

Superintendent Russell noted that the board had made a decision not to co-locate the two types of schools. Mr. Forrest felt it was confusing.

Dr. Martinez observed that it was not clear what continuing current practices meant, because it referred to a board decision that had not yet been implemented.

Dr. Weeks commented that the policy would be described in the information that would go to the public.

**VOTE:** The motion passed unanimously, 6-0.
6. Early Education Infrastructure

**MOTION:** Mr. Torrey, seconded by Ms. Gerot, moved to accept the superintendent’s recommendation regarding early education infrastructure and public and staff input.

In reply to Mr. Torrey’s question about whether Title schools had full-time kindergarten, Mr. Henry said just five had chosen to do so, because it took a big chunk of their Title 1 funds. Mr. Torrey wondered if the program had been going long enough to know the benefits. Mr. Henry said preliminary data had shown it was beneficial, significantly so, in some cases.

Mr. Torrey wanted to give the public the opportunity to ask for leadership on this issue. Mr. Russell noted that the recommendation would have the public weigh-in on whether to include building infrastructure for kindergarten in the next bond issue.

Dr. Martinez commented that he felt this was a small, but important change from the Think Tank recommendation, which he felt would force a different kind of conversation in the community. He felt the conversation would be more about values and whether early education was important enough to give up some other things. Mr. Russell said the board already had a goal to provide more full-day kindergarten as resources became available.

Ms. Gerot noted that there had been movement by the legislature to provide funding for kindergarten and pre-K. She said this question focused on whether the district should assume early education was something good for kids that probably would be funded in the future and would provide the spaces as new buildings were constructed.

Mr. Torrey echoed her comments, adding that by not providing physical space the district was in effect saying early education was not that important.

Superintendent Russell pointed out that the second paragraph in Section 7 stated if funds should become available, public and staff input would be requested at that time.

**VOTE:** The motion passed unanimously, 6-0.

7. Operation of Early Education

Superintendent Russell noted that this included both kindergarten and pre-kindergarten, to refer to internal staff research and discussion, with the caveat that it would be referred for public input if more funding became available.

**MOTION:** Mr. Forrest, seconded by Mr. Smith, moved to adopt the superintendent’s recommendation.

**VOTE:** The motion passed unanimously, 6-0.

8. English Language Learner

Superintendent Russell said his recommendation closely paralleled the Think Tank’s. The recommendation would refer the improvement of ELL services, creating a dual Spanish immersion program and grouping of ELL students in low incidence regions for internal staff discussion. The issue would then be referred to the board for discussion.

**MOTION:** Ms. Gerot, seconded by Mr. Smith, moved to adopt the superintendent’s recommendation regarding public and staff input.
Mr. Torrey felt this would be a big issue and the district needed to be prepared and make sure all players were involved. He wanted all kids to succeed and did not want the program torn apart by special interest groups.

Dr. Martinez noted that the superintendent’s recommendation was very explicit that the discussion was to include parent stakeholder groups. He agreed that this was a difficult issue for the community. He was not sure how he felt about the Think Tank’s recommendation not to take the issue to the community, because it almost seemed like an avoidant response to tensions in the community. On the other hand, he noted the complexity of the issue, even to understanding how the program worked and the dozens of languages within the district which made having the conversation difficult. He thought the board would need to be strong and exercise its leadership skills in terms of how to engage this massively growing population.

Superintendent Russell acknowledged that part of his struggle centered around how to put the issue out to the community, since there were federal laws regulating these services, as well as what the board had determined was a moral obligation to meet the needs of this population.

**VOTE:** The motion passed unanimously, 6-0.

**9. Technology**

**MOTION:** Mr. Torrey, seconded by Mr. Forrest, moved to accept the superintendent’s recommendation to refer for public input increasing infrastructure for technology and for internal staff input on increasing technology services.

Mr. Torrey said he hoped the internal staff would show efficiencies for teacher-to-student face time by using technology that might not be used by the teacher, taking some of the pressure off teachers to use technology for testing.

**VOTE:** The motion passed unanimously, 6-0.

**10. Special Education**

Mr. Russell noted that his recommendation was consistent with the Think Tank’s about not taking the issue of how best to deliver special education services to the public, but refer them for internal staff research and discussion. He commented that a lot of the equity issues and instructional-related issues that the Think Tank had reflected upon when looking at school size and configuration came back to finding ways to provide equitable services to special needs children. He noted that the issue presented similar challenges to ELL in terms of finding ways to educate the public about changing demographics in the district and what the district would be facing in the next ten years. By not taking the issue to the public, he did not want to miss the opportunity to have the conversation about conflicts that may arise because of these needs.

Mr. Forrest felt the discussion would take place around school size and why the numbers were selected. Ms. Gerot believed putting a face to the numbers with real examples would be helpful.

**MOTION:** Mr. Torrey, seconded by Mr. Forrest, moved to adopt the superintendent’s recommendation.

**VOTE:** The motion passed unanimously, 6-0.
Mr. Forrest noted that the changing demographics in the district had produced “aha” moments for many Think Tank members and reiterated his belief that this was a key issue the district needed to communicate.

11. Title 1

Mr. Russell acknowledged that this might appear contradictory. He felt the issue had the potential to generate interesting conversation.

**MOTION:** Mr. Torrey, seconded by Ms. Gerot, moved to accept the superintendent’s recommendation to refer how best to deliver Title 1 services for internal staff research and discussion and to seek public and staff input on whether and how to implement a target of ensuring that no more than 50% of a school’s enrollment qualify for free and reduced lunches, considering an array of options.

Mr. Forrest said according to his rough calculations, elementary schools were currently at 43% free and reduced lunch overall, not including alternative schools. He wondered if 50% would be high enough considering growing numbers, and if the district would be setting itself up for something it could not accomplish.

Dr. Martinez suggested that there was another issue around implementation, because the data source had many unreliable variants that could lead to very specific decisions on the part of the district.

Mr. Russell did not want to get hung up on the number, but focus on the concept. He noted that some people would call it social engineering, whether the enrollment of a school should be managed by controlling how many students from different backgrounds, in this instance poverty, could attend. He mentioned Cambridge, MA, which had instituted programs that had resulted in increased racial segregation and isolation. He wondered how much the district should do to manage the impacts of poverty in the schools.

Ms. Gerot said the question raised equity issues for her. She noted the huge inequity in the district that resulted from the disparity between the lowest poverty school at 6% and the highest at 80%. She felt the issue needed to go to the public in a big way. She said it also pointed out the inequity between most of the alternative schools and the neighborhood schools.

Dr. Martinez pointed out that the recent Supreme Court ruling on racial segregation and how that ruling would affect poverty presented an untested policy issue for the district.

Mr. Smith saw an interesting theme driven by City Council decisions about housing development in the city, which Jim Carlson described as high end and low end.

Ms. Hays felt this was an intriguing question for the community and looked forward to a conversation about it.

**VOTE:** The motion passed unanimously, 6-0.
12. School Closure & Consolidation Policy

**MOTION:** Mr. Torrey moved, seconded by Mr. Smith, to accept the superintendent’s recommendation to seek public and staff input on criteria for closing and consolidating elementary, middle and high schools, considering an array of criteria.

**VOTE:** The motion passed unanimously, 6-0.

13. School Choice Policy

Mr. Russell noted that his recommendation veered substantially away from the Think Tank’s, because he felt the board had already received extensive input about the district’s school choice policy.

**MOTION:** Ms. Gerot, seconded by Mr. Smith, moved to accept the superintendent’s recommendation.

**VOTE:** The motion passed unanimously, 6-0.

14. School Attendance Boundaries

**MOTION:** Mr. Torrey, seconded by Mr. Forrest, moved to accept the superintendent’s recommendation that the board seek public and staff input on how to establish and change attendance boundaries that meet a list of criteria.

**VOTE:** The motion passed unanimously, 6-0.

15. Site-Based Decision Making

**MOTION:** Ms. Gerot, seconded by Ms. Hays, moved to accept the superintendent’s recommendation that the board refer the issue of site-based decision making for internal policy clarification and staff training.

**VOTE:** The motion passed unanimously, 6-0.

16. Professional Development

**MOTION:** Mr. Torrey, seconded by Mr. Forrest, moved to accept the superintendent’s recommendation that the issue of professional development to increase successful support of high needs students, technology and site-based decision making be referred for internal discussion.

**VOTE:** The motion passed unanimously, 6-0.

Public Input Process

Dr. Ed Weeks from the University of Oregon’s Department of Planning, Public Policy and Management (PPPM) was joined by Hillary Kittleson, former Chief Financial Officer and member of the Strategic Planning Committee, and Carmen Urbina, Parent/Family and Community Coordinator, who have been working with him on developing a proposed plan for the public input process. Dr. Weeks wanted to address the board’s deep concerns expressed at the last meeting about wanting to engage groups that historically did not participate fully in public processes. Dr. Weeks went over the threefold purpose of the public involvement process: To increase knowledge and understanding of the issues facing the district; to identify public preferences about how those issues would be addressed; and to build public support.

Dr. Weeks observed that the key approach would be a broad public dialogue. He noted Mr. Torrey’s concern that all voices be heard, which he said was at the center of what his group was
trying to do. He highlighted the three important constituencies: The staff; parents; and the general public. The primary mechanism for discussion would be a tabloid-size newsletter, which would describe the background and context, with a discussion of the issues, with the pros and cons of all the sides, including an opportunity to choose favored options.

Dr. Weeks described approaches that would be used to engage people in the various constituencies and asked Ms. Urbina to discuss efforts that would be made to reach the Latino community.

Ms. Urbina said the district would engage natural leaders in the Latino community and facilitate regional meetings through these leaders. She said the district would engage the support of both natural and traditional leaders in the Latino community and keep them informed about the process. She noted that churches have been an effective outreach tool for this community. In addition, she said, mail would be sent home with students in their backpacks and meetings would be held.

Mr. Russell said Mr. Torrey had raised an interesting issue regarding how the district would guard against stuffing the ballot box.

Dr. Weeks replied that was one reason a random sample would be important as a benchmark.

Ms. Gerot wondered if Dr. Weeks had given much thought to the way the background information would be presented, citing her biggest concern, that the Think Tank had spent months grasping the issues faced by the district. She wanted to make sure the public gained a clear understanding of the reasons for this initiative, including changing demographics, declining enrollment, and changes in what all students needed to know and be able to do.

Dr. Weeks said he had given that a lot of thought. First, people would be given background and context, he said, listing some of the items people would need to understand. He said some people needed a narrative, or a story, while others wanted facts, while most people wanted both. He said the information in the survey would be pre-tested on naïve subjects first.

Mr. Torrey felt that testing the narrative would be a key component.

Dr. Martinez wanted to talk about the scientific issues involved and focus on the methods. His experience with vulnerable communities was that methods could skew the results and give unreliable data, because some methods were culturally loaded. His experience with that in his work at the Oregon Social Learning Center prompted his concern.

Dr. Martinez felt a representative sample could give a useful picture of the district, but he was concerned about a potential big data shortfall with vulnerable groups. He suggested getting more input from them.

Dr. Weeks replied that at the board’s direction, his group could stratify the sample. With the Latino community, he said, the sample would need to be at least 400 people. He said it would be purely a financial issue, but the point was well taken and his group would come back to the board with options.

Dr. Martinez felt the board needed to decide what it wanted from certain subgroups within the district.

Ms. Urbina said the group had considered different levels of literacy and would have trained bilingual facilitators. She said parent groups from seven elementary schools, five middle
schools and two high schools would receive data, in addition to 300 people who would be contacted through churches.

Dr. Martinez suggested doing the survey through an interview format, because a cultural issue requiring interaction with the interviewer was involved, not just the literacy issue.

Dr. Weeks said the board and survey team should have more conversations. He noted that the entire effort was focused on having every voice heard as much as possible, stimulating a real dialogue in the district.

Dr. Martinez thanked the team for their hard work.

CONSENT GROUP ITEMS FOR ACTION

**Approve Grant Application: Comprehensive Guidance and Counseling Workgroup (CGC)**

Staff in the High School Services Department submitted a $10,081 grant application to the Oregon Department of Education. The project would implement district-wide Pre K-12 Comprehensive Guidance and Counseling programs with Oregon CGC Framework. The project would also align school counseling programs with state and national standards as well as new diploma requirements.

A district Comprehensive Guidance and Counseling team would be created and would include administrators, counselors, teachers and other staff. The 4J team would participate in workshops on August 2, 3 and 15, with its designated CGC team and travel expenses will be funded by this grant. The District Project Director would assure proper use of training funds. The district’s financial obligations for administrative costs would be minimal.

The superintendent recommended approval of the grant application. A copy of the grant description form was included in the packet.

**Extend Contracts with Looking Glass for a Variety of Services**

The district contracts with Looking Glass Youth and Family Service, Inc. (“Looking Glass”) to provide a variety of alternative education services, including special education services, under Board Policy DJCA, Personal Services Contracts.

The following policy provisions apply, since the district has had contracts with Looking Glass since before the June 2001 board policy revision:

- DJCA 8. Contracts normally shall be written for no more than three years; with the ability to renew the contract for another three-year period upon a finding that it is in the public’s best interest to do so, with a written statement addressing one or more of the following factors: Financial implications; complexity of scope of the contract and the services provided; unique or technical nature of expertise that is delivered; value of ongoing relationships; and any other applicable factor. The contract may be further extended for subsequent three-year periods, provided that before each such extension there is a written finding meeting the above criteria.

- DJCA 9. Personal services contracts in existence prior to the adoption of this policy may be renewed for three-year periods, upon a written finding prior to each three-year period, addressing the criteria listed in DJCA 8 above.
In 2006-07, the district paid a total of $874,244 to Looking Glass for this range of services. Staff believed amounts to be paid in 2007-08 would be comparable.

Specifically, for 2007-08, the following contracts and findings were proposed.

**Residential Schools Contract: Pathways, Evaluation and Treatment Center, Transition Shelter - $150,535**

**Description:** The Looking Glass Residential Schools Program provides an educational program designed to meet the individual needs of students who are in the custody of the State or Lane County and have been placed by court order through the Oregon Department of Human Services or the Lane County Department of Youth Services.

**Findings:** The district is obligated to provide educational services to students residing within its boundaries. The Looking Glass Residential Schools contract and Residential Schools Title IID contract were the most cost-effective ways to provide a well coordinated educational and treatment program in the best interest of the student. The program provides curriculum goals and objectives and measurable student performance objectives.

**Center Point School - $93,384**

**Description:** The Center Point School Day Treatment Program provides services to students with severe emotional and behavioral disabilities, and is the only day treatment program in Lane County offering mental health and educational services to adolescents.

**Findings:** Students on an Individual Education Plan ("IEP") that require intensive treatment services not available in the district’s regional learning centers or students who are transitioning from residential programs are placed at Center Point School for mental health and educational services. The school works collaboratively with district staff to provide a highly effective program and is the most appropriate and cost effective local service agency available.

**Stepping Stone School - $175,687**

**Description:** The Stepping Stone Residential Treatment Program provides residential mental health and educational services to adolescents experiencing significant behavioral problems who are at risk to the safety of themselves or others. The school is a residential program within Lane County and primarily serves students who are involved with the juvenile justice system.

**Findings:** Stepping Stone School offers a highly structured program for youth needing individual, group and family therapy at a cost that is significantly lower than other residential programs within the state. The services provided by Stepping Stone School are extremely effective for youth at risk.

**Tutoring - $37,691**

**Description:** A small number of district students with autism require special educational programs taught by tutors trained in Discrete Trial Instruction--a highly specialized approach to instruction that has proven effective in students with autism. These students generally receive tutoring services in the home, which may include a community program; the tutors are hired on an as needed basis.
Findings: Looking Glass is the hiring agency used by the district to ensure that a sufficient number of tutors are available when needed to provide the required tutoring services listed on a student’s IEP. The district recruits, interviews and trains all tutors recommended for hire; Looking Glass provides hiring, fingerprinting, background check, and payroll services—on a reimbursable basis, for tutors who have been recommended. Essentially, the tutors are employees of Looking Glass. This relationship has proven to be both efficient and cost effective to the district.

**New Roads School - $135,186**

Description: New Roads School provides educational programs for runaway and homeless youth ages 11-21. Students collect credit for high school diplomas, prepare for GED tests, and gradually gain the skills they need to find jobs and prepare for adult, independent life. The goal is to stabilize students and then either transition them back into programs that grant high school diplomas or prepare them to successfully pass the GED tests.

Findings: The district requested that New Roads establish a school for runaway and homeless youth because the New Roads staff was already working with these youth and it could operate the program at a lower cost than the district. District staff estimates that the per pupil cost of a district-operated program would exceed the state’s General Purpose Grant per pupil.

**Riverfront School and Career Center: Lane Metro Youth Corps, Teen Parent Program, and Riverfront School - $281,761**

Description: Riverfront School and Career Center is designed to serve high school students 14-21 years of age in grades 9-12 who have a variety of at-risk factors and barriers to academic and work-place success. The program addresses these factors by providing small classes (up to 12 students per class), pre-employment training and work experiences, integrated education with hands-on natural resource projects in the field, on-site drug and alcohol counseling, parenting and life skill education, and coordination with other Looking Glass Programs.

Findings: Riverfront School and Career Center offers a structured program for students residing in the district who have dropped out or are at risk of failing in a traditional school environment. Riverfront works collaboratively with district staff to provide the best option for the students on an individual basis and is a very cost effective local service agency.

The superintendent recommended renewal of the contracts with Looking Glass for the 2007-08 fiscal year, with potential contract extensions for two (2) additional years. Staff would continue to monitor these contracts on an annual program-by-program basis to make sure the district made the best use of its resources for special and alternative education and mental health services.

**Approve List of Alternative Education Programs for 2007-08**

Under Board Policy IGBHA, adopted September 6, 2006, the Board was required to approve a list of alternative education programs that had been selected to serve students in the district whose needs and interests were best served by participation in an alternative education program.

As specified under this policy, alternative education programs could be public or private and must have met all requirements of ORS 336.625, 226.631, and 336.637. Private programs must have been registered with the Oregon Department of Education. Board policy also...
required district staff to evaluate alternative education programs annually in accordance with ORS 336.655 and OAR 581-022-1350.

The following providers served district students in 2006-07 and were proposed as alternative education programs for 2007-08. Programs represented organizations serving regular education students; programs serving special education alternative education placements were governed under ORS 336.635.

Center for Appropriate Transport  
Creative Minds Alternative School  
Full Circle Farm  
Looking Glass Programs  
Northwest Youth Corps  
SCAR/Jasper Mountain  
Wellsprings Friends School

The superintendent recommended approval of the above-listed alternative education programs to serve district students in 2007-08.
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ITEMS FOR ACTION AT A FUTURE MEETING

Approve a Revision to Board Policy IGBHA, Alternative Education Programs

Ms. Bellamy reviewed the information about HB 2040, which amended state statute regarding alternative education programs in Lane County that became effective July 1, and the policy change proposed to bring board policy into compliance. She noted that the change reflected a new provision that the district no longer had to evaluate students before they enrolled in HomeSource, the sole qualifying private alternative education program.

Ms. Bellamy noted that although HB 2040 stated that the parent of a home schooled child must obtain approval from the resident district to enroll in HomeSource, the statute was vague regarding whether there was any basis for a district to withhold consent.

Mr. Smith was shocked by the actions of State Senator Vicki Walker and others in the area delegation endorsing what he considered a voucher program allocating taxpayer money to private schools. He felt this was wrong and was also shocked that the Oregon School Board Association had supported the bill.

Dr. Martinez noted that one of the grey areas dealt with a district’s determination of meeting educational needs within schools.

Mr. Henry related that as he understood the bill, the Bethel School District would be responsible.

Dr. Martinez was concerned that the district would be giving up its authority to assess what was best for the child, which he saw as a very big change.
Ms. Gerot wanted information regarding home schooled special needs children. Mr. Henry said that by law, the district was accountable to special needs children in a different way.

Mr. Smith felt that because the law singled out the Bethel School District and HomeSource, this was a constitutional issue.

COMMENTS AND COMMITTEE REPORTS BY INDIVIDUAL BOARD MEMBERS

Ms. Gerot pointed out material from the ExEL Leadership Program in the board packets and noted that it would be discussed at the upcoming board retreat.

Dr. Martinez shared that Ms. Bellamy had sent out a board leadership rotation schedule and asked directors to let her know about known travel plans. He said a date was still being sought for the board retreat.

ADJOURN

Dr. Martinez adjourned the meeting at 10:10 p.m.

George Russell
District Clerk

Charles Martinez, Jr.
Board Chair

(Recorded by Susan Wulfekuhler)

EXECUTIVE SESSION: Under provisions of ORS 192.610 – 192.690, Open Meeting Laws, the Board of Directors planned to conduct an Executive Session for the following purpose:

To conduct the Annual Evaluation of the Superintendent to review and evaluate, pursuant to standards, criteria, and policy directives adopted by the governing body, the employment-related performance of the executive officer pursuant to ORS 192.660 (1) (i).

The board chose to postpone the Executive Session to the September 5 board meeting.

Attachments to Official Minutes:
2. 2007 Legislative Summary
3. Superintendent's Recommendations and Response to the Think Tank Report
4. Proposed Superintendent's Recommended Public and Staff Involvement Plan for Shaping 4J's Future
5. Grant Application: Comprehensive Guidance and Counseling Workgroup (CGC)
6. Proposed Change to Board Policy IGBHA, Alternative Education Programs
7. House Bill 2040