

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

**January 30, 2008**

The Board of Directors of School District No. 4J, Lane County, Eugene, Oregon, held a regular board meeting at 6 p.m. on January 30, 2008, at the Education Center, 200 North Monroe Street, Eugene, Oregon. Notice of the meeting was mailed to the media and posted in the Education Center on January 25, 2008, and published in *The Register-Guard* on January 28, 2008.

**ROLL CALL**

**BOARD MEMBERS:**

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

**STAFF:**

George Russell, Superintendent of Schools and District Clerk  
Tom Henry, Deputy Superintendent & Chief Academic Officer  
Barbara Bellamy, Chief of Staff and Communications Director  
Jon Lauch, Director of Facilities Management  
Laurie Moses, Director of High School Services  
Yvonne Curtis, Director of Student Achievement  
Susan Fahey, Chief Financial Officer  
Caroline Passerotti, Financial Analysis Manager  
Carmen Urbina, Parent, Family & Community Coordinator  
Scott Marsh, Eastside Elementary School Principal  
Debbie Kimball, Eastside Elementary School Teacher & Site Council Member

**STUDENT REPRESENTATIVES:**

Katie Melton, Sheldon High School  
Noah Henry-Darwish, South Eugene High School

**MEDIA:**

KRVM  
KLCC  
KVAL

**CALL TO ORDER, ROLL CALL, AND FLAG SALUTE**

Charles Martinez, Board Chair, called the meeting of the School District 4J Board of Directors to order and led those present in the Pledge of Allegiance.

**AGENDA REVIEW**

Dr. Martinez determined that board members and staff had no changes to make to the agenda.

## **INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS AND SUPERINTENDENT'S COMMENTS**

Superintendent George Russell called the board's attention to a letter from University of Oregon Athletic Director Pat Kilkenny in response to a letter from the board inquiring as to the university's intentions regarding Civic Stadium. Superintendent Russell also stated that board members received a copy of the revised board goals and principles in red folders.

### **Students Read Martin Luther King, Jr. Essays and Poems**

Superintendent Russell introduced Crista Lawson and Lisa Vreim of the Eugene Education Association, organizers of the Martin Luther King, Jr. Awards and Presentations. Ms. Vreim and Ms. Lawson announced the winners of the annual Martin Luther King, Jr., Awards, noting the theme of the contest, which was Dr. King's work to connect civil rights, economic justice, and peace. They congratulated all the winners. The 4J winners were: Alex Holland of Hillside Elementary School (honorable mention, elementary school); Noah Stoddard of Awbrey Park Elementary (third place, elementary school), and Tristan Baumgardner of Harris Elementary School (first place, elementary school); Scarlett Frunz of Kelly Middle School (honorable mention, middle school), and Alondra Rosales of Kelly Middle School (first place, middle school).

Mr. Baumgardner and Mr. Stoddard read their winning poems to the board. Ms. Frunz read her winning essay to the board. Roscoe Caron read Ms. Rosales' submittal, noting she was new to the English language and had won first place in her category.

Dr. Martinez thanked the students for sharing their submissions. The students received a round of applause from the audience.

### **COMMENTS BY STUDENT REPRESENTATIVES**

Noah Henry-Darwish reported that the South Eugene High School drama department was preparing its presentation of the *Laramie Project*, the story of Matthew Shepard, who was killed because of his sexual orientation. As a related event, South Eugene High School will host Mr. Shepard's mother, Judy Shepard, at an assembly on February 13.

Katie Melton reported that Sheldon High School students had written and directed a play entitled, *Rendezvous* that would be performed the next weekend. The school was preparing for the new semester.

### **ITEMS FROM THE AUDIENCE**

Dr. Martinez opened the public comment period.

**Chanin Santiago**, the former enrollment coordinator of Village School, believed that moving the Village School to the Bailey Hill site as proposed by Superintendent Russell would have a devastating effect on the enrollment at the school. The school had communicated to prospective parents that it would be staying at the site until 2009 based on discussions the school had with the district. Parents were turning in their applications for enrollment based on the information the school would stay in place. Families had made their decisions and much of it had to do with location. The sudden announcement of the move was disturbing to her and she thought more time was needed to make the transition, pointing out the school was currently

half-way through its enrollment process. Ms. Santiago thought the move would have a detrimental effect on the families at both Village and Bailey Hill schools, further noting that Bailey Hill parents did not have time to consider Village School as a viable option.

**Teresa Kennedy** said her family had done considerable research and moved to Eugene specifically so her children could attend Village School. Her family would not be in Eugene if the school did not exist. She spoke of the history of Waldorf schools and said the Village School was one of approximately 30 public schools in the United States using the method. Her daughter was having a positive experience at the school and was teaching her younger sister what she learned. Ms. Kennedy spoke of the unique opportunity the school offered and noted it was the only Title I school in south Eugene. She offered to work with the district cooperatively on a future move. She thought a move would have a negative impact on the school and its enrollment by placing transportation barriers in the way of students. She suggested the board delay the decision until it decided what neighborhood schools would close in South

**Martha Collins**, Principal at the Village School, acknowledged the challenge of the task facing the board and thanked it for its work. She emphasized the hard work it took to establish a school. She said that Village School's status as a Title I school provided it with an opportunity to serve struggling learners in a diverse community. She noted the rich curriculum with opportunities for advanced studies. She said the school worked collaboratively with the district, which had been noted through the renewal of the charter and in annual reviews. She spoke of the parental involvement and strong volunteer base, which took years to establish. Ms. Collins noted the school's membership in the National Alliance for Waldorf Public Education, through which it served as a consultant to other Oregon charter schools. She asked the board not to move the school more than one time and not to place it in a standalone facility.

**Jennifer Sherlock** termed it irresponsible to move any school pending the resolution of the *Shaping 4J's Future* process. She said her children attended Village School and she described its approach to education and its offerings. She said the school provided an opportunity for children to transcend the commercial culture. The school also brought diversity to the district. She thanked it for granting the school's charter. She did not support the move as beneficial to either the school or district. She wanted what was best for her friends' children at Eastside and they wanted what was best for her children.

**Tom Boyatt** spoke on behalf of the students, faculty, and staff at Village School. He noted his own children's experience at Village School and said their educational success owed much to the faculty and staff at the school. Parents at the school help support the program both financially and through volunteer labor. He commended the faculty and staff. Mr. Boyatt called for fair treatment from the district and said the school's families and students were not second-class citizens. He suggested it would be hard for the board to choose one charter school over another for relocation to the extreme urban fringes absent some idea that one program took up more space than the other. However, Ridgeline and Village School occupied the same amount of space, but Village School used classrooms in the space that Ridgeline used for offices. He said that Village School could move those programs back into the grade classrooms, which was preferable to moving.

Mr. Boyatt believed a forced move was a terrible reward for a successful, diverse school in south Eugene and the reward for success appeared to be completely the opposite of the superintendent's stated goals to diversify education delivery. He said the rushed nature of the proposal left parents out in the cold. He asked the board to consider the Village School's achievements and to bring clarity and equity to the process to avoid three programs having to move for unclear reasons.

**Ellen Syversen** said the Village School was her family's neighborhood school as it was for many other school families. Her child was able to ride his bike the mile it took to reach the school. The Bailey Hill location would eliminate that option for many families and disadvantage families who could not afford the extra travel costs. She said that the dedication of her daughter's teacher allowed her daughter to feel a personal comfort level at school. She said that parents were interested and involved in the school and aware of the waiting list. Relocation to Bailey Hill would negatively affect both current and prospective families. She said the school belonged in south Eugene. She spoke of the importance of volunteers to the schools given the 80 percent funding the school received. She thought Bailey Hill would make a wonderful neighborhood school. She asked the district not to move Title I students or any schools pending the completion of the *Shaping 4J's Future* process. She asked the board to help the school find a suitable location in south Eugene.

**Theodore Shiro**, a parent at Village School, agreed with those who spoke before. He said he worked hard to find a school for his son that worked and he volunteered once weekly because he worked downtown and was able to reach the school quickly. He said the neighborhood school was Adams, but Village School was closer to his family. He thought that the district was set up so parents could be near schools close to their home. He said that being close to a school and not having to drive was part of sustainability. He did not think a move to Bailey Hill was sustainable. It was not for him because he would no longer be able to volunteer.

**David Atkin** agreed with the remarks of previous speakers. He said Village School offered things other schools did not. He was grateful for the site and acknowledged that while the district was not responsible for housing the students it was responsible for educating them. He wanted his children to go on in that school and hoped that the district would not devalue the Village School children because they were in a charter school. He said the school had an unusually high level of diversity and its central location allowed many people to reach it. It had more economic diversity than many schools and more ethnic diversity than most schools because parents were actively selecting it for that purpose. He walked his children to school each day and saw other students reaching the school on foot or by bike, and said moving the school would make it hard for that to happen. He said that it would make it very difficult for the volunteers. He would be unable to be in the classroom twice weekly as he currently was if the school moved.

**Kamala Shugar**, a Village School parent and member of the Village School Board of Directors, said the board embarked on a strategic planning process soon after she joined it, and in that process had convened focus groups of the parent population. Those parents had turned out in numbers to share their vision. Village School asked the parents what they loved about the school, wanted to see changed, and perimeter of comfort for the location of the school. Parents indicated they loved the school enough to follow it where it went, but were honest that the one-mile radius was an important element of their decision to send their children to Village School. She acknowledged that the school was leasing district property, but the school continued to hope it would have additional time to move to a new site working cooperatively with the board. Those parents were working to reduce their carbon footprint. She thanked the district for the charter and for the opportunity to grow.

**Tamara Torrence**, parent representative on the site council at Eastside Elementary, thanked Superintendent Russell for his recommendation regarding the Willard site. She said that many in the community were grateful he was not recommending the Bailey Hill site as it would be devastating to the school community. The school had been in the south part of town its entire life. She suggested that there might be a better location in the south Eugene area if

Superintendent Russell recommended school closures in that area. She said there could be an on-site shared principal rather than an off-site principal, making children and teachers feel more connected. Other staff and a resource center could be shared.

**Carolyn Sykora**, Village School parent and self-identified voter, thanked the board for giving the Village School a home. She believed the Village School families were part of 4J and hoped the board considered the welfare of the children in making its decision. Her family chose the Village School because of its K-8 status. She was concerned that a move would impact the middle school. The middle school was just beginning to gain traction and was a good option for many parents.

**Robin Hostick**, Ridgeline Montessori parent, empathized with the parents of the Village School. He thought he would have many of the same concerns if his school was proposed to move to Bailey Hill. He suggested the board pursue a third solution if one was available.

**Steve Holmes**, a Village School parent and board member, noted the many people present because of their concern about the potential move of Village School and because of the success of the school and the good job it was doing to educate all students, particularly its low-income students. He believed it was in the school and district's interests to work together to make the educational environment in Eugene the best it could be. He called for more partnering and communication with the district. For that reason, he was disappointed that the Village School learned about the proposal from the newspaper and not from the district.

Mr. Holmes expressed concern about fairness. He asked why the superintendent targeted the Village School over the Ridgeline Charter School. The superintendent was quoted as saying Village School was bigger but that was not true; Ridgeline had a larger enrollment cap, and Village School was never asked about its bottom line space needs. Mr. Holmes said that Village School's Title I student population was 41 percent, and provided balance to Eastside, which had a lower percentage. A combined Eastside-Ridgeline school would have a Title I population of only four percent. He asked what was being modeled to the community when the district's solution to the inability of two affluent schools to get along was to displace the only low-income school in the area.

Mr. Holmes said the Village School had attempted to create a dialogue with the district and to satisfy all state and district requests and requirements in a timely way and would continue to do so.

**Bonnie Souza**, a Village School parent, expressed surprise at the superintendent's recommendation to move Village School and displace the Natives Indian Education Program at Bailey Hill School. She said she had examined the school carefully before placing her child there. She liked the Waldorf basis for the school as well as the fact the school was subject to 4J requirements. She found the administration and faculty creative and open to diversity issues. She found it had a significant emphasis on bullying and conflict resolution, which had not been the case at her daughter's previous school. Ms. Souza said she understood that the Willard site was not a permanent location, but she thought the school would be presented with some options and given more time to plan a thoughtful move that would minimize disruption of the children and school community. She felt the superintendent had recommended an unworkable site that could lead to the dissolution of the school as parents and students knew it and thought that the recommendation would previously have been unthinkable. Ms. Souza shared her daughter's personal story and asked the board to give all the children the support and respect they deserved.

**Alison Cantril**, Village School parent, employee, and founding board member, spoke of the outstanding education her children received at the Village School. She spoke of the school as a rewarding and stimulating place to work and commended the staff as being thoughtful in all they did for children and dedicated to the school's mission. As a board member, the school had exceeded her expectations. She noted the school's positive evaluations and responsiveness to district requests. She opposed the school's relocation to the Bailey Hill site, pointing out that many of the school's students lived nearby and could bicycle or walk to the school, while other parents moved to homes near the schools to enable their children's attendance. She pointed out that a move to Bailey Hill would require more parents to drive to the school, at odds with district goals related to sustainability. She believed the move would negatively impact parent participation and the move would be economically challenging for many families. The move would leave south Eugene with less diversity and displace the Native Indian Education Program. She thought it made no sense to disrupt existing programs and spend money on facilities until the fate of other schools was known.

**Paula Fleitell** said the district's school choice system was critical for children. She noted the schools in south Eugene her child had attended while living in the River Road area. If the district capped enrollment at South Eugene High School and her daughter had to attend North Eugene High School it would be like she moved out of Eugene because she would know nobody at North Eugene. She noted the effect of the current cap on Roosevelt and South Eugene and said it appeared that as few as 20 to 30 transfers could occur at South Eugene, and sibling preference could shut her child out of any opportunity to attend the school. She asked the board to remove choice in a phased approach rather than to affect children in the middle of their education now.

**Anil Oomen**, a teacher and parent at the Village School, maintained the Village School was considered an outsider. He held up his green card, which he likened to the school's charter. He said he was on a path to citizenship and he hoped that some day his school would be on a path to full citizenship. He and his school both served for many years with a green card and a charter, and he asked if that status relegated them to second-class citizenship or if their work for the district gave them citizenship. He had adopted his country in the same way parents had adopted the school. Many parents moved to the neighborhood to be close to the school. He believed the school had brought revenue to the district by bringing in students who would have otherwise have been home-schooled.

**David Zupan** expressed concern about what he perceived as an attack on alternative education. He was a strong supporter of alternative education for all students and was happy to see the board endorse the notion of alternative schools in the mid-1970s when he first arrived in Eugene. His children had benefited from alternative schools and he gave credit to the Eastside program for his daughter's success as a local pediatrician. He urged the board to consider that it was not merely looking at moving schools. He recommended that it delay a decision and consider what it wanted to achieve. He noted the goal to close the achievement gap and suggested it was not to be achieved by dismantling good schools, but by seeking a win-win solution that included the formation of a task force assembled of parents, teachers, and administrators of alternative schools to find a way to raise the bar for all students and share that wisdom with the neighborhood schools.

**Carma Douglas**, Village School parent, commended the Village School and said it fostered community and togetherness. She said that 4J had not wanted to repair the building or site and was intended to be demolished and rebuilt in the future. She asked why the district would spend money on updates to the Willard School when the district had programs being eliminated that could use the funding. She said that moving the school five miles to West Eugene made no

sense to her. She reiterated the percentage of Title I students and their current proximity to the school. The move would create financial hardship for many families and create a shortfall of volunteer hours. She wanted her middle school child to remain in a small supervised community at a school she could walk to.

**Cybele Higgins**, Village School parent, noted her own experience at Willard and Eastside. She spoke of the importance of living near the school, which was why she had moved to Eugene. A move to Bailey Hill would impose an unnatural hardship on her family, which already had enough stress. Her family was a Title I family and she worked three part-time jobs. She indicated that she volunteered extensively now, but it would be impossible for her to volunteer if the school moved given the location of her jobs. She agreed with others about the importance of having such diversity in south Eugene.

**Fiora Starchild-Wolf** noted the value her family placed on education and said she had spent nine years under strained circumstances driving her daughter to Magnet School in south Eugene before being able to move to south Eugene. She commended the choice system and said it provided her children with an education that was previously only available to those who could afford private schools. She spoke of the diversity of the alternatives schools and feared there was an agenda driving the district away from the choice system. She suggested the board consider how best to support all schools. She asked the board to slow down the process because there were better ways to solve the problems than by destabilizing four schools. She said moving Village School to the Bailey Hill site would be very destabilizing given the number of children qualifying for free and reduced lunch and the number of families just above that line. She said the location helped parents provide the volunteer time that made up the fact the school, as a public charter, received 80 percent of the typical per student funding. She noted the fact the Native Indian Education Program had been moved several times and questioned asking it to move again. She believed school choice was the solution if done right and asked the board to postpone its decision.

**Margie Kelly**, Eastside parent and site council member, suggested that there were opportunities for Eastside to find a long-term stable home in the south Eugene region that would permit sharing a principal and staff with a co-located alternative school. She asked the board to incorporate the decision in the *Shaping 4J's Future* process. Ms. Kelly advocated for an on-site school principal at Eastside. She said that it was a workload issue for teachers, and parents needed a third-party supervisor on site to discuss difficult issues or disagreements with teachers. The school also needed a principal to help the school meet the goals in its diversity plan. She thanked Eastside Principal Scott Marsh for his hard work.

**Carol Freitas**, Village School parent, spoke of the community created by the Village School.

**Erin Ely**, Village School parent, spoke in support of school choice. She thought it was important for all families and the community. She believed that moving Village School to Bailey Hill would be detrimental to the children. She had moved to Eugene so her children could attend Village School. She recommended the board await the outcome of the *Shaping 4J's Future* process before it made a decision about moving the school, to allow all to have a voice, and to accomplish a win-win solution.

**Kathleen Hennessy** said her three children were currently enrolled in neighborhood schools at three levels. In past years she had made other choices about her children's schooling and was pleased with the result. She supported the goals for the *Shaping 4J's Future* process but had concerns about the lack of definition of a comprehensive education program for each level of school, which made it difficult to assess the proposed school sizes in a meaningful way, and

school sizes could have an impact on schools not within the target ranges, disrupting long-standing excellent schools. On the road to equity, excellence was not expendable. Ms. Hennessy thought excellence had yet to receive the attention that equity had. She did not think the achievement of outstanding 4J schools could be attributed only to demographics. She wanted to know more about how those schools got the job done as that information could benefit all students. She was concerned that moving away from co-location did not address and could exacerbate significant inequities between neighborhood and alternative schools in the forced disparities in school sizes and using neighborhood schools as default schools. Moving toward more co-location of neighborhood and alternatives schools that were both considered to be schools of the neighborhood had helped address those inequities and provide the advantages of a “school within a school” configuration. Ms. Hennessy criticized parent input as “too little, too late.”

**Catia Juliana**, Village School parent and enrollment coordinator, expressed concern about the proposed move of the school. She noted the high degree of interest in the school expressed by people from around the world. Those families moved to Eugene so their children could go to the school. Ten percent of students came from other local districts, bringing in additional revenue the district would otherwise not receive. She said the school was in the middle of the lottery process and had communicated to parents it would be in the same location given the message it had received from the district until recently. The timing of the decision was potentially disastrous to the school at a time the school was close to reaching full enrollment. New families needed to know the school community would be stable next year, and location was a key part of that. She pointed out that more than 50 percent of students lived close to the school, and given many were low-income, the burden of the move would be borne by them.

**Kelsey Rose Juliana**, a Village School student, spoke of her family’s positive experience at the school and said a move would threaten her ability to attend choir with the Ridgeline students. In addition, her family was very concerned about climate change, and if the school moved, her parents would have to drive her to school.

**Shelly Bosworth**, a Village School parent, said it was a misconception that because of family involvement Village School students were easy to educate. She did not think her son would do so well at another school, and she spoke of his sadness when told that his school might move. Another misconception was that families loved Village School so much they would follow it wherever it went. She was a bicycle commuter and she asked the board not to make a decision that would force her family to make unwanted lifestyle choices or send her son to a neighborhood school without the same values as Village School. She asked the board to postpone a decision and make it in the context of the *Shaping 4J’s Future* process.

**Pat Boleyn**, a Village School parent, agreed with the remarks of previous speakers. She commended the Village School for its nurturing activities and expressed appreciation to its teachers. She would love to see the school stay in the same location and thought it would change if it was moved to Bailey Hill. She did not think it polite to move the Natives Indian Education Program. She asked the board to make it clear to the public why the move was necessary, and why Eastside School had a higher priority than other schools.

**David Sokoloff**, an Eastside parent and site council member, commended the superintendent’s recommendation to move the school to the Willard building because its facilities would allow the school’s unique programs to continue to flourish. However, he was troubled by the recommendation there be no on-site principal. He noted the work of the last three excellent principals and thought it essential such an individual be on site for the entire school day to address issues both large and small. Mr. Sokoloff emphasized the role of the principal in

diversifying the school. He suggested the school could share a building, staff, and principal with another alternative school without displacing an existing school program. He suggested the board consider that option rather than move the school to Willard next year.

**Jennefer Harper** opposed the random relocation of schools to different places. She thought it grossly unfair to the students, teachers, and staff, and it seemed like poor business sense. Children needed stability, and for some the school was the most stable thing in their lives. Changing schools would uproot them from what they were used to and it did not seem fair. The testimony that she heard seemed to be about all schools, and she wondered what was next. She perceived the superintendent's recommendations as an attack on school choice and asked the board to preserve that choice and make the right decision for the children.

**Ellie Dominguez** believed that the move of Eastside should be part of the *Shaping 4J's Future* process. Relocating Eastside to Willard was reasonable but it might not be the best option when the entire community was taken into account and she thought it should be put off for one year. She felt it was not comfortable for the charter schools to be asked to leave when one was not ready. She thought Eastside needed to be co-located but did not think Dunn or Bailey Hill would work. She thought it was a "slap in the face" to tell Eastside it could not have a full-time principal. She thought the Parker school parents could show patience for the *Shaping 4J's Future* process.

**Eric Van Houten**, an Eastside parent, encouraged the board to let the *Shaping 4J's Future* process occur before it made decisions that would impact three schools and many families. He said increasing diversity at Eastside was essential and exciting, but keeping the location in flux detracted from that goal, which he did not think anyone wanted.

**Matthew Bigongiari**, a Village School teacher and board member, recalled his appearance before the board advocating for the school's charter eight years ago. He was present to ask the board to reject the superintendent's proposal, which he characterized as "flawed." He asked all those who were in opposition to the Eastside relocation to the Willard building to stand up. Many in the audience stood in support. He believed the school had evolved into something School District 4J could be proud of and he thought it should have input into the decision.

**Andy Peara**, Network Charter Schools and a co-founder of Village School, acknowledged that Village School was lucky to have the space it rented from the district, but he believed the students involved were both the school's and the district's. He said if there was a lot of available facilities to accommodate a school of 200 that included many Title I students, it would make the district's decision, but the district owned all those properties. The school's site committee had spent years attempting to find a site. It was not easy to find and develop property in Eugene. He felt the school had done a tremendous amount to realize the promises it made and respond to the district's recommendations. To disrupt the school would be to disrupt the Title I students at the school. He asked the board to do its best to work within its principles.

**John Femal**, Village School parent, perceived an attack on school choice in Eugene and thought that unfortunate because school choice was one of the good things about living in Eugene. He said the Village School was an excellent school and for some kids it was the right school. He asked why the school was being asked to move, and it appeared there was a domino effect with the solutions it was seeking in regard to co-located neighborhood and alternative schools. He said there were families with children in Village School who were financially on the edge and for whom moving would be a hardship. He said that children bicycle and walk to school in a sustainable manner. He appreciated his family's proximity to the school.

**Don St. Clair**, a Village School parent and volunteer, said the Village School was his neighborhood school, and his child was fortunate enough to be able to walk to school. He acknowledged the complexities of addressing a demographically changing community and ensuring that schools reflected diversity. He said that making a decision tonight would be undemocratic as the public had very little time to review and consider the issue. There was much information that the public could provide to the district before it made a decision.

Dr. Martinez thanked all those who spoke and expressed appreciation for their passion and perspective. He said that the public gave the board much to think about and he encouraged those present to stay to listen to the board discussion.

## **COMMENTS BY EMPLOYEE GROUPS**

Paul Duchin and Merri Steele, Co-Presidents of the Eugene Education Association were present but had no remarks.

## **ITEMS FOR INFORMATION**

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

Superintendent Russell introduced Carmen Urbina, Parent, Family and Community Coordinator, Scott Marsh, Eastside Elementary School Principal, and Debbie Kimball, Eastside Elementary School Teacher and Site Council Member, who jointly provided a PowerPoint presentation. The topic of the presentation included background on the goals of the strategic planning process as it related to attracting and addressing the instructional needs of a more diverse school population at Eastside, its progress to date, and anticipated next steps.

Dr. Martinez solicited board questions and comments on the presentation.

Board Vice Chair Beth Gerot noted the percentage of free and reduced lunches, minority students, and ELL (English Language Learners) students had decreased each year in the information presented to the board. She asked why given the extra efforts made to increase diversity. Mr. Marsh attributed the decreased percentage to the fact the school was in the beginning process of addressing some of the deeper questions involved, and because an alternative program drew from its neighborhood and the school reflected the demographics of the neighborhood. The school had been discussing transportation and a kindergarten as ways of addressing that issue.

Board Member Alicia Hays asked if location was a major or minor factor in terms of diversifying the district's schools. Ms. Urbina acknowledged the question was a difficult one, but she thought location was a key factor in attracting more families that qualified for free and reduced lunches and minority families. The district promoted all its programs, including its alternative programs, to make people aware of their choices, but the alternative schools were restricted in their ability to market themselves. As she worked with parents and families, she attempted to promote all 4J schools and emphasize school choice.

Ms. Hays suggested the Success, Weakness, Opportunity and Threats (SWOT) analysis used by Eastside was lacking community input outside the school. Ms. Urbina said staff had discussed who the stakeholders were at Eastside, and finally concluded the stakeholders were the Eastside family. She did not think staff could go to the larger public without a specific plan and strategies. Ms. Hays expressed concern that left the community was left out of the work

needed to diversify the student body and left parents inside the school having to advocate for students, which could be challenging for parents. She hoped the board would hear from the community soon about the topic.

Also in response to Ms. Hays, Mr. Marsh indicated that larger community input was a goal, but the SWOT analysis was done at a very sensitive time and it was difficult to bring other groups in until the Eastside community had a better feel for where it stood and what its challenges were. Ms. Hays asked what plan existed to involve the community. Mr. Marsh said that staff would discuss how to involve the community as one of the steps in the process.

Board Member Eric Forrest agreed with Ms. Hays about the importance of community involvement. He said the SWOT analysis needed to consider external factors. He recalled that in the past when the board discussed strategic reviews of the schools, he advocated for every school to go through the process, including the neighborhood schools. While he recognized the work involved, he thought the process was a great thing because people had to talk about uncomfortable things and how to improve them. He wished that his children's school had Ms. Urbina's involvement and he challenged the board to think about all the schools.

Board Member Yvette Webber-Davis was interested in Phase 5, *Ongoing Implementation of the Strategies*. She asked about specific strategies. Ms. Urbina said the plan attempted to build on what had been accomplished. She envisioned the plan was really a process. The Eastside community was committed to going deeper into issues such as the intent and impact of its fundraising plan, coaching for equity and education, moving topics from "Discourse 1 to Discourse 2," and learning in-school relationships. She thought real change and equity would then begin to happen. She said strategies included an examination of those issues and implementation of the trainings needed to address them. Dr. Webber-Davis said it sounded like many of the initiatives needed leadership and she wondered who those leaders were. Ms. Kimball agreed there would be a need for leadership and "people power," and said the plan envisioned the need to identify leaders for the different initiatives and called for ongoing monitoring and check backs. She said the school had worked to do as much as it could right away and she had been amazed that the school could come up with the plan while it was implementing much of it already.

Board Member Craig Smith asked if data on special education students was also available. Mr. Marsh indicated he could provide that data and indicated numbers were up.

Mr. Smith questioned how the potential lack of a full-time principal could affect the next steps. Mr. Marsh said that was a good question. Teachers asked to take on more administrative roles would need more support, but he did not know what that would look like. Ms. Urbina emphasized the involvement of teachers and parents in the process and their commitment to the plan. The site council had stepped up to take leadership on many of the initiatives. She considered herself the facilitator of a process that belonged to the stakeholders, that is, the parents, teachers, and staff at Eastside.

Board Member Jim Torrey asked if the success of the plan depended on the move. Mr. Marsh said the work done was independent of the school's move or location and more related to the culture of the school. It represented a lifetime journey that the community was embracing wholeheartedly. He acknowledged the many stakeholders involved and said many would have to take on leadership roles throughout the process.

Mr. Torrey asked how the school reached out to the diverse community that already lived in the general geographic area to persuade them to attend the school. Mr. Marsh said that was the challenge facing Eastside.

Speaking to the remarks of Mr. Forrest, Mr. Marsh commended Ms. Urbina, saying that such a process for all schools was her eventual goal.

Dr. Martinez acknowledged the challenge of institutional change and said it must occur in real time, while the district was serving its students. He was hopeful and worried at the same time. He was hearing commitment to the plan, but his dissatisfaction was with the results out there right now. No amount of planning could replace the trends in the data and what the data told the board. The issues related to the neighborhood did not explain to him the changes in the demographics in the school over a three-year period of time and the lower diversity. He thought a lot was at stake.

Regarding the stakeholders and who they were, Dr. Martinez believed the process was missing the perspective of those families who did not have access to Eastside or to schools like it. He thought integrating those voices was essential to the plan, and was concerned it might be hard to change course if that input argued for a change.

In response to Dr. Martinez's comments, Ms. Urbina said she strongly believed in including the community and community voice in such processes. She said the community external to Eastside was initially part of the effort, but based on the work that was done and her professional judgment, she recommended against broadening input. It had been very difficult to guide Eastside to the external community at this time in the process because of public perceptions regarding the school. She emphasized it was always staff's goal to involve the community, but it was a very difficult balance. How did one bring in the larger community, and who were they? How did the district define the community it was to ask for input into one school? She thought this was not the right opportunity. Ms. Urbina pointed out there was no existing template for such an effort.

Dr. Martinez thanked the presenters for their time.

Superintendent Russell asked the board if members had follow-up requests. Dr. Martinez suggested that Ms. Urbina work with leadership in the school and district offices to identify when the board could expect to see change as a result of the plan. That might help the board decide when progress could be measured. He agreed that such things took time, but said a great deal was at stake. He also thought that Mr. Smith's questions required some staff follow-up.

Mr. Torrey noted suggestions that the Eastside process was transferable, but suggested that until the larger community had been heard from, that was premature. He wanted to know how it could work all over the district and not just for one particular school. Superintendent Russell noted the investment of time and energy that Ms. Urbina had put into the process, but given that she was only one person, it was difficult to broaden the process to other schools. Mr. Torrey clarified his interest was in completing Phase 5 and securing community input, and then seeing if the process could be moved to other schools.

Mr. Forrest believed that each neighborhood school should be able to say what the school stood for and what it meant to the community to give the community the opportunity to coalesce around that. He believed that strengthened all schools. He said that like a business, a school needed to know what it was attempting to accomplish and what it wanted its students and teachers to feel so it could work on those things that needed improvement. Superintendent Russell reminded the board each school did a school improvement plan, but perhaps were missing the more expansive look by the larger community suggested by Mr. Forrest and done for the alternative schools review.

## **ITEMS FOR ACTION AT THIS MEETING**

### **Approve the 2007-2008 Lane Educational Service District Local Improvement Plan**

Superintendent Russell reminded the board that it approved such a plan each year. He recommended adoption of the plan.

**MOTION:** Mr. Smith, seconded by Ms. Hays, moved to approve the 2007-2008 Lane Educational Service District Local Improvement Plan.

**VOTE:** The motion passed unanimously; 7:0.

## **CONSENT GROUP – ITEMS FOR ACTION**

### **Approve Expenditures for June, July, August, September, October, November, and December 2007**

Oregon Revised Statutes (ORS) 332.255 requires that the district school board approve all expenditures for funds. A summary of the expenditures for June 2007, totaling \$38,507,085.96; July 2007, totaling \$13,727,361.04; August 2007, totaling \$17,425,403.76; September 2007, totaling \$17,076,206.95; October 2007, totaling \$17,598,606.19; November 2007, totaling \$17,910,832.44; and December 2007, totaling \$19,594,443.47 were included in the packet.

The superintendent recommended approval of the June, July, August, September, October, November, and December 2007 expenditures.

### **Approve Grant Application: Safe and Savvy – A Sustainable BTA 6<sup>th</sup> Grade Physical Education Bike Safety Program**

Staff at Roosevelt Middle School submitted a \$5,000 grant application to the Alliance for Community Safety in Oregon (ACT). The primary focus of the grant was the purchase of 25 mountain bicycles to support the 6<sup>th</sup> grade bike education class at Roosevelt Middle School. Classes will follow the Bicycle Transportation Alliance curriculum. This grant was supported by the Roosevelt Middle School Safe Routes to School Committee, which includes Roosevelt staff, community members and parent volunteers.

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

### **Approve Personnel Items**

The superintendent recommended approval of the personnel items included in the packet.

**MOTION:** Ms. Gerot, seconded by Dr. Webber-Davis, moved to approve the consent items.

**VOTE:** The motion passed unanimously; 7:0.

## **ITEMS FOR ACTION AT A FUTURE MEETING**

### **Approve the Superintendent's Recommendation to Relocate Eastside Alternative School**

Superintendent Russell noted his previous recommendation through the alternative schools review process that Eastside Alternative School should be relocated at the end of the school

year, which led to the update just provided to the board and his decision to make a recommendation related to the school's location by February 2008. He noted the three options he considered in making his recommendation, that Eastside be located in a district building as a standalone or with another alternative or charter school; that the school be provided with adequate classroom space to support its programming within its current enrollment cap; and that there be potential to add kindergarten if enrollment permitted. He noted the board was scheduled to make a decision on February 13.

Superintendent Russell believed each building option was reasonable for three to five years. He was willing to consider additional options as he developed the recommendations that would result from the *Shaping 4J's Future* process. He had not seen any other viable options at this time that did not involve the consolidation or closure of existing elementary schools. However, if the board considered other options, it needed to decide if it was interested in closing a neighborhood school to make space for an alternative school.

Superintendent Russell reviewed the buildings he had considered in making his recommendation and recommended that Eastside Alternative School be relocated to the Willard site now housing Village School and Ridgeline School. He reviewed the pros and cons of that recommendation, included in the materials provided to the board and public. He emphasized that it was not a recommendation about moving Village School, but a recommendation about displacing Village School from its current location to make room for Eastside.

Mr. Torrey asked if the district had made a commitment to Village School about the use of the space. Superintendent Russell was unaware of such a commitment. He had shared with the school the potential that he could make such a recommendation. Jon Lauch, Director of Facilities Management, indicated that he had been in conversations with the school about the future of the building for several years. He said the lease was a year-to-year lease. There were questions each year from both Ridgeline and Village School about the future of the facility because the district continued to communicate to the schools that the property was reserve property.

Mr. Forrest wanted to receive the February 13 report so he could think strategically about all the schools. He did not think it was fair to say that the district would be closing a neighborhood school in favor of alternative schools. He believed there were many things to consider, including resources, growing district diversity, the shrinking school populations and high cost of living in Eugene. Mr. Forrest noted that there was not a lot of empty developable space in the community.

Mr. Torrey asked the downside of postponing a decision. Superintendent Russell noted his commitment to move the school by the end of the year. The board had not indicated disagreement. He thought the community expected it to happen. He said the neighborhood school principals, had they been present, would have a lot to say about the impacts of school choice on their schools. Mr. Marsh agreed that Parker and Eastside were awaiting the decision. He noted that Parker had also filled its mission and grown to the degree that teachers were teaching in the library and two teachers were on carts.

Ms. Gerot supported Mr. Forrest's comments, saying it was premature to make a decision before the board had more information about the *Shaping 4J's Future*. She was also concerned about investing in Willard for such a short time period.

Mr. Smith agreed with Ms. Gerot and Mr. Forrest. He pointed out, however, that if the outcome of the process was to close schools, it was independent of the process of relocating Eastside and would be driven by community trends and demographics.

Dr. Martinez agreed with the remarks of other board members, saying he was concerned about making such a decision without more information. He did not want to say to any school that it was immune from the possibility of closure/consolidation.

Dr. Webber-Davis agreed with other board members but thought the board needed to be clearer in the message it was sending to the public. It was saying it wanted to complete the *Shaping 4J's Future* process but Superintendent Russell had indicated a decision would be made by the end of the year.

Responding to a question from the audience, Superintendent Russell suggested that Village School should indicate to potential families they could end up someplace other than the Willard location.

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

Mr. Forrest said that after discussion with his family, he had decided to serve out his term on the board. Board members expressed pleasure at Mr. Forrest's decision.

Dr. Martinez recessed the meeting to the Parr Room for the work session item.

### **WORK SESSION**

#### **Conduct a Work Session on the Superintendent's Report and Recommendations for Shaping 4J's Future (Part 1)**

Superintendent Russell shared a map showing attendance areas and where schools were located, a map of the Adams boundary area showing where the children in the boundary actually go to school, and a map showing the distribution of students receiving free or reduced price lunches. He noted how school boundaries had evolved as schools closed and suggested there was a better way to draw boundaries.

Superintendent Russell noted the testimony received by the board regarding the issue of transportation, and suggested more discussion was needed in regard to that subject. He recalled the board's discussion of region versus district in regard to its goals for alternative school diversity; that is, should diversity reflect the district percentages or the region percentages? If the board wanted to consider regional transportation patterns, what would be the impact of that?

Superintendent Russell anticipated he would offer the board recommendations about boundaries. For example, he pointed out that in one area, students were transported past Bertha Holt to attend Willagillespie.

Superintendent Russell solicited questions regarding the maps and the report and asked if the board had any "sacred cows" it wished him to avoid.

Dr. Martinez did not like sacred cows and thought it important to approach the issues involved fairly. However, he thought there were things in the principles and goals that were very important, such as vibrant neighborhood schools. That suggested the board might decide a

neighborhood school would not be closed to accommodate an alternative school. He said that did not mean the district would not place an alternative school in a neighborhood school that might close for other reasons. Superintendent Russell said that several board members appeared to have suggested that economic considerations should be a factor in regard to where the board invested its dollars, and the long-range impact of those investments.

Responding to a question from Ms. Gerot, Tom Henry, Deputy Superintendent and Chief Academic Officer, said that the district's free and reduced lunches had gone up in the last three years. There was some confusion about the accuracy of the data the board had received.

Dr. Martinez said data seemed to be important to board members and it was important to have the right data. He thought the board needed to consider trends for Eastside. He suggested that one had to contemplate change over a longer time period than it was given that evening if data was to drive the process. He reiterated that data was important and it was vital to have full access to the data so it was not under interpreted or over interpreted.

Speaking to the principles and goals, Superintendent Russell suggested laying out a series of scenarios that could potentially occur over a period of time. He noted the concern raised in testimony that discussion of a school closure was a death sentence for the school and it might as well be closed now rather than the closure phased over three years. There were others who believed such a phased process was the best approach.

Ms. Gerot agreed that the concern voiced in testimony was an issue with Hillside. She said the district did not have the capacity to effectively close schools in the same manner it had in the past, which had led to successful transitions. Families had felt the district was attentive to their needs and that it shared information. She did not want the district to do wholesale school closures in one year.

Mr. Henry recalled that during the school closures and consolidation process, schools on the list of possible schools to be closed lost enrollment.

Dr. Webber-Davis expressed surprise at the cost of the facilities associated with each school. She suggested that some of what the board did in regard to school closures would depend on the condition of its buildings, and she wanted a thoughtful way to incorporate that issue into the board's discussions.

Mr. Forrest suggested that school closures could create capital. He said the school lacked ongoing money for teachers in the classroom, but it did have considerable assets in its school properties and could use revenues from the disposal of those assets to fund capital maintenance or capital improvements. Superintendent Russell noted the board's policies supported such an approach.

Dr. Webber-Davis asked which buildings were the oldest and required the most work. Superintendent Russell indicated that he would provide that information to the board.

Speaking to the issue of sacred cows, Mr. Forrest posited a situation where the district moved Meadowlark out of its existing building and moved Buena Vista into it. He suggested that would be controversial. Dr. Martinez questioned how the principles and goals would guide the superintendent in his thinking about that issue as he thought it spoke to the issue of the value of neighborhood schools. Superintendent Russell said he could argue to move Meadowlark out, keep Buena Vista there and strengthen some other smaller neighborhood schools within the Sheldon region.

Superintendent Russell suggested a sacred cow existed to some degree in the question of whether the district should have four high schools and eight middle schools.

Ms. Hays did not consider the number of high schools and middle schools to be a sacred cow.

Dr. Martinez suggested that the superintendent had created a sacred cow of the high schools by stating specifically in the goals and principles that there would be four moderately sized high schools.

Mr. Forrest did not want to change the language in the goals and principles. He did not think the community was prepared to accept the closure of a high school.

Mr. Torrey asked if school choice as it currently existed was a sacred cow.

Ms. Gerot said she would not support eliminating school choice but agreed with a suggestion from Mr. Forrest that choice could be "tweaked."

Dr. Martinez thought the board needed to discuss what school choice meant; some thought it referred to a family's decision to send a child to an alternative school, which was one version of the choice that existed.

Mr. Torrey suggested that the board would have a difficult time of reaching the goal of equity if it continued school choice as it currently exists.

Superintendent Russell did not think choice was a sacred cow, but pointed out that the board had taken a strong position that there would be choice. He suggested the form of that choice and how it was managed was another discussion to be had.

Dr. Martinez thought the issue of regional versus district was important. He said if one considered choice as reflected in the alternative schools, those schools were not located with any consideration of their regional aspects. They were district alternative programs located long ago where there was interest and room. That they drew from the high school regions was obvious. If the board wanted to consider choice more regionally, he thought it would mean the board thought differently about the menu of choices that existed by region and ensured they were sufficient across the regions. Mr. Forrest suggested that would open up the transportation opportunities that the board heard a need for, and provided a potential for greater impact on SES and free and reduced lunch students.

Responding to a question from Superintendent Russell, Mr. Forrest said he believed having only one alternative school in the Sheldon area was a bad thing. He envisioned a situation in which the district had an emergent school and another choice school in each region with transportation provided to get students to school. He thought that would help keep the neighborhood schools healthy as well.

Ms. Gerot said that raised the issues of facilities.

Dr. Martinez observed that his family exercised choice by leaving its neighborhood school in favor of another neighborhood school because of its diversity. That was not the type of choice people typically discussed.

Using the map showing district boundaries, Mr. Forrest pointed out how far one had to drive from the north to reach an alternative school. Mr. Forrest emphasized the need to find a balance; the district could not retain two high school regions with 1,100 students and two regions with 1,100.

Ms. Hays suggested a principle that school choice was used to ensure equity within the schools and did not adversely impact equity.

Mr. Torrey noted the passion expressed by charter school parents and said he was concerned about the students whose parents lacked that passion and did not get well-educated because the money was drained from their neighborhood school and directed to an alternative school to support the students who could afford to attend it. He said that affordability did not involve just money, but a strong commitment on the part of a parent to support education even if it brought financial strain to their home.

Ms. Hays expressed appreciation for Mr. Torrey's comments. She said that it was not just money that was being drained from neighborhood schools, but the talent, time, and family involvement crucial to school success.

Responding to a question from Mr. Torrey about the district's obligations to its charter schools, Superintendent Russell said the district had some limited fiduciary responsibilities, but the school's teachers were not the district's employees and the school had its own board. The only recourse the district had in the case of a dispute was to pull the charter, which was a long process. He said the charter school was viewed in the community as part of the district's choice program, and that was reflected in parents' testimony.

Mr. Forrest noted the preponderance of options in the south Eugene area if one included the two charter schools.

Tom Boyatt, a Village School parent, said the district could make a policy choice to treat Village School as a district school irrespective of who was in control. He said that districts around the country have made the decision to promote and support their charter schools and to provide them with 110 percent of district funding and space because of the cutting edge nature of the educational model. He said that threatened the "status quo," but it did not have to. He thought the charter schools gave the district the ability to look ahead.

Barb Bellamy, Chief of Staff and Communications Director, reviewed the changes made to the goals and principles as a result of the board's last discussion and the board offered some minor modifications which Ms. Bellamy recorded.

Speaking to the first principle, Mr. Torrey posited a situation where the district established a 600-student school in the area south of the Beltline and above the river that was a "Cadillac" attracting families from throughout the region; he asked if the district was precluded from establishing such a school. Dr. Martinez did not think it was an option at this time. He interpreted the principle as establishing a ceiling rather than a floor. Superintendent Russell suggested the answer was yes and no; he pointed out the use of the word "target" which argued that the district was striving to achieve that target. He said that one could argue that 450 students was too small a number but a school such as Gilham at 500 students thought it was too big. He observed that a 600-student elementary school was considered medium and even small-sized in some areas, and the principles reflected a community value for smaller schools, which was supported by research.

Mr. Forrest suggested that if the district could afford it, the target would likely be less.

Dr. Martinez expressed concern that raising the ceiling could have the potential of concentrating the diversity problem further.

Ms. Hays preferred to leave the target as it was, with the caveat that the board could go above it in the right circumstances.

Mr. Torrey advocated for putting more money into River Road and Howard to improve the schools and help retain and attract students. He asked if the district was prepared to make the investment for quality opportunities for students in all parts of Eugene. He asked how many students would attend those schools if there was no choice. Superintendent Russell said that he would provide that information. He confirmed that many students who would otherwise attend those schools instead attend alternative schools or other neighborhood schools.

The board discussed the distinction between “regional” and “district” alternative schools as it related to Principle 8. Dr. Martinez argued that the issues around access were created by transportation issues, with had nothing to do with the school or the program but with the ease of access. He said the schools were not set up regionally. If the district was to move to a regional model, he would want to consider the choices within each region and ensure that language immersion was available in each region and the appropriate distribution of choice across regions.

Superintendent Russell acknowledged the original language had referred to “region.” He recalled that the Access and Options Committee had recommended the district look to more regionalization of alternative schools and to seek a balance across regions so they had proportionate shares of programs. The change was made to reflect the board’s last conversation.

Mr. Torrey wanted to know what a regional approach would look like, and its advantages and drawbacks. He asked Superintendent Russell if it could be done. Superintendent Russell said that he did not think one could meet the standard for alternative schools without providing transportation.

Dr. Martinez thought there were some very important issues related to regionalization, such as transportation. He questioned why the principle was necessary to the formulation of the superintendent’s recommendations as it pertained to the process. Superintendent Russell said that it spoke to his thinking about where Eastside should be located, for example. He did not think that Eastside at Parker would have as good a chance of becoming diverse as it would if located in a more diverse neighborhood. The same was true of Charlemagne. If the district was to think of them as magnet schools with a district-wide draw, which they were, they should reflect the district. Dr. Martinez suggested the superintendent’s analysis consider both regional and district demographics as they pertained to those schools and their location and ease of access.

Mr. Forrest questioned how the district could achieve desegregation without transportation. Dr. Martinez did not think that transportation was precluded. Mr. Forrest pointed out the district did not provide such transportation today. He thought it important that the district’s goals should be attainable. He wanted to make schools work regionally to begin with and then the district could determine how to move to the next step.

Ms. Hays agreed that desegregation was not attainable now.

Dr. Martinez thought the board needed to see what the data showed in regard to regional segregation in the district as he thought it would inform the conversation.

Mr. Torrey suggested the board discuss career vocational education and a regional approach that included career opportunities in each region. He said that students who were not going on to college needed skills to be prepared for the future. He suggested the potential of apprenticeship programs associated with the schools. If it could not be done at one high school, could it be done in four regional areas?

Dr. Webber-Davis suggested that Mr. Torrey's suggestion could be another aspect of district choice, noting she had seen it done successfully in Chicago, where such programs ended up acting like magnet schools because of their excellent reputations.

Superintendent Russell conceded that providing an education to students seeking career choices could be challenging. Mr. Torrey wanted to know how the district could assist such children and if it could be done in more than one location.

Ms. Hays suggested that Mr. Torrey's topic be placed on a future agenda. Superintendent Russell said that he would provide the board with information about what the district did now. Ms. Hays also thought the board needed to resolve the district/region issue. She suggested the board place the discussion "on hold" until it saw more regional and district demographics.

Dr. Martinez said it appeared there was an energy on the board in looking at what regional models might look like and uncertainty in how to apply that energy in light of Superintendent Russell's recommendations.

### **XIII. Adjourn**

Dr. Martinez adjourned the meeting at 11:12 p.m.

---

George Russell  
District Clerk

---

Charles Martinez, Jr.  
Board Chair

*(Recorded by Kimberly Young)*

#### **Attachments to Official Minutes:**

1. Eastside Alternative Elementary School's Strategic Plan
2. Resolution Adopting Local Service Plan for 2008-2009
3. Summary of Expenditures for June 2007 through December 2007
4. Grant Application: Safe and Savvy – A Sustainable BTA 6<sup>th</sup> Grade Physical Education Bike Safety Program
5. Personnel Action Items
6. Revised Core Values, Goals and Principals for Shaping 4J's Future