The Board of Directors of School District No. 4J, Lane County, Eugene, Oregon, held a work session at 8 a.m. on March 8, 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 March 6, 2008, and published in *The Register-Guard* on March 7, 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
Laurie Moses, Director of High School Services
Larry Sullivan, Director of Educational Support Services
Dennis Biggerstaff, Principal, Churchill High School
Sally Huling, Principal, North Eugene International High School
Paco Furlan, Principal, River Road Elementary School

**STUDENT REPRESENTATIVES:**
None

**MEDIA:**
Anne Williams, *Register-Guard*
Alan Pittman, *Eugene Weekly*
KRVM

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

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

**WORK SESSION: Conduct a Work Session on the Superintendent’s Recommendation for Shaping 4J’s Future**

Superintendent George Russell invited board input into the recommendations and follow-up recommendations. He reminded the board of its overriding goals, those of increasing student achievement for all students, closing the achievement gap and ensuring the provision of equal
opportunity for all students to succeed, and ensuring graduates were prepared to be successful in college, their careers, and as citizens.

Superintendent Russell noted the direction provided to staff by the board in regard to the *Shaping 4J's Future* process and indicated the recommendations before the board covered all areas, including a reassessment of where learning programs were located and how well the district was meeting the requirements of special needs children. He emphasized that the board was setting a strategic direction for the district so it could be better prepared to meet the needs of students, taking into account the variables that affected the district’s ability to do so.

Superintendent Russell recalled that the board directed staff to consider education programs, support services, and facilities required to meet the future instructional priorities and close the achievement gap while increasing achievement for all students, and to consider where to provide instruction in light of declining enrollment, changing student demographics, and the diverse educational needs of students.

Superintendent Russell spoke to the issue of declining enrollment using a chart illustrating substantial declines in district enrollment levels over the last 20 years. He suggested the greatest impacts of that decline were felt at the secondary level. He shared data specific to each region showing the gap between in-region and out-of-region attendance, noting that in Sheldon those who lived in the region attended school there while the gap between those living in the attendance area and those coming in from other areas widened in other schools, particularly in the South Eugene region. He said the data was one of the drivers behind his recommendations. He shared data specific to the middle schools and high schools that mirrored that pattern. Superintendent Russell said that it was important to manage enrollment, particularly at the high school level.

Superintendent Russell shared data regarding changing district demographics, acknowledging the data was not precise and some populations, such as Latinos, were probably underreported. He noted the growth in free and reduced lunch students, special education students, and English Language Learners (ELL).

Superintendent Russell shared projected enrollment figures broken down on a regional basis. Board members asked questions clarifying the projections.

Superintendent Russell reviewed the goals of the process.

1. To ensure that elementary buildings have sufficient resources to offer high-quality core programs, the targeted elementary school size should range from 300 to 450 students.
2. To ensure that middle schools have sufficient resources and program offerings to provide high-quality core programs, the targeted middle school size should range from 400 to 600 students.
3. To ensure that high schools have sufficient resources and program offerings to provide high-quality core programs, high school campus size should range from 1200 to 1500 students.
4. Some smaller neighborhood schools and alternative schools may be determined to be a viable option to provide for the diverse needs and interests of students, particularly low income and English language learners; reflect district approved enrollment caps for alternative schools; meet enrollment capacity and facility needs; or serve demographically diverse neighborhoods.
5. The district will be a district of small and medium-sized elementary and middle schools, with four moderately-sized high schools and with highest priority in terms of resources, programs, and staff support directed to neighborhood schools.
6. Ensure that school choice and open enrollment do not leave neighborhood schools with limited resources or diminish ongoing efforts to integrate schools economically, racially or culturally.
7. Relocate elementary alternative schools to standalone sites or sites with another alternative school.
8. Achieve greater special education service, program and enrollment balance across the district.
9. When planning for the future, provide space for all-day kindergarten.

Dr. Martinez asked Superintendent Russell to discuss the fact that some of the goals were apparently in conflict with each other. Superintendent Russell said if one focused on a particular goal, the process did not work; he believed the board needed to arrive on a solution based on a composite of goals and principles.

Board Member Jim Torrey advocated for the goals to be available at all board discussions on the topic.

Superintendent Russell said he avoided placing the goals in priority order, but if he had to prioritize them it was clear to him that the first three goals would be the top priorities, with the goals providing for exceptions to those goals as lower priorities. He pointed out that the board had heard extensively from parents who wanted both small schools and services available only at larger schools, and the issue was how to balance that. Board Member Alicia Hays expressed appreciation for that point of view.

Dr. Martinez suggested the fact the goals were in conflict meant the board needed to be clearer about the principles, values, and trade-offs driving its decisions. He liked the idea of having the goals posted at each discussion.

Board Member Craig Smith questioned what the board was talking about when it discussed a comprehensive educational experience for students and how that compared to a Harris experience, for example. He acknowledged the additional funding the school received because of its title status. Tom Henry, Deputy Superintendent and Chief Academic Officer, said Harris had some musical and physical education offerings. However, he pointed out the fact of the blended classrooms and the constraints created by both that and the small school size. Harris received the most resources per pupil of all elementary schools in the district due to the academy and Title I funds. In spite of those resources, it was challenging to provide services with 1-1/2 teachers per grade given the importance and benefits of teacher collaboration. Principals present at the meeting who had small school experience confirmed Mr. Henry’s response.

Mr. Smith said that Eastside was a small school that he termed “inherently blended” that had enjoyed success and asked what characteristics of that school were transferrable to other schools. Mr. Henry said the school had a unique curriculum built around its blended classrooms and it provided core instruction part of the day with project-based learning the remainder of the time. The student population differed demographically from that of Harris. Eastside did not have the same number of high-needs students as other schools. Superintendent Russell reminded the board that Eastside representatives had indicated the school would no longer be able to do many of the things it did now if it was no longer collocated with a neighborhood school.

The board agreed to discuss the district-wide aspects of the recommendations first.

*Develop proposed differentiated staffing ratio strategies.*

At Board Vice Chair Beth Gerot’s request, Principal Paco Furlan described River Road’s positive experience with academy funding.

Minutes – Board of Directors – March 8, 2008
Superintendent Russell described how allocations would be made, likening it to the state allocations process to the district, which was based on similar needs.

Mr. Smith asked if staff was thinking about transportation to address the issue of student mobility. Mr. Henry said yes. He said that staff could run additional scenarios that considered mobility. He noted the state did not recognize transportation in its formula.

Board Member Eric Forrest supported the recommendation. He suggested that if the district could create good systems that kept children in their neighborhood schools, it would be a good investment.

Mr. Torrey noted the limited funding options available to the district. Superintendent Russell agreed, noting the city levy had allowed the district to use funding for such initiatives.

Responding to a question from Dr. Martinez, Superintendent Russell said the board approved the academy dollars for a three-year period and they were scheduled to be eliminated. He envisioned a phase-out as the district phased in the staffing formula component. He suggested the answer lay in part on the status of district resources over the next few years.

Ms. Gerot concurred with Mr. Forrest. She said the district needed to build a foundation for all students to be successful when they reached middle and high school.

Mr. Smith concurred with previous remarks.

**Review boundaries and propose adjustments.**

Superintendent Russell said that the proposal was not for a wholesale boundary study, but for a review that would be a response to the changes the board decided upon as well as some “clean-up” to recognize past adjustments and school closures.

There was general support for the recommendation.

**Consider possible transportation options for alternative schools for 2009-2010.**

Ms. Hays observed that many residents appeared to believe that transportation was the answer to the question of the diversity issues facing the district. Her understanding of the topic did not suggest that was the case and she wanted that to be clear to the public. She was unsure she could support the recommendation. Ms. Gerot agreed. She pointed out the survey indicated that people supported transportation but then indicated they would not use it. Transportation was very expensive and did not necessarily have anything to do with student achievement. She was also concerned that providing transportation to alternative schools alone would set them up as “special schools.”

Mr. Smith shared the concern that transportation would not work but the experiment would be very expensive.

Mr. Forrest believed the board should consider the option given that it was frequently identified as a barrier. He said it might not have worked out at the national level, but perhaps Eugene could be successful at the regional level.
Dr. Martinez shared the concerns expressed by Ms. Gerot. However, given the use of the word “consider,” he was curious about what an analysis would reveal and suggested the district might be able to operate a pilot in a selected region that informed future decision making. He acknowledged that transportation was mentioned as a barrier by many alternative school parents.

Ms. Hays also appreciated the recommendation to “consider” transportation as it was a way to get the option off the table cleanly. Dr. Martinez said the board might consider the option and recommend no action. He interpreted the recommendation as a recommendation for more analysis.

Mr. Henry recalled two transportation pilots performed by the district in the past, one which was intended to keep students stable in the schools and one which was intended to provide regional transportation in the south region. Neither had worked.

Mr. Torrey said if a pilot was to be done, he would like to see it done within a region and focused on a neighborhood school.

**Consider enrollment management.**

There was general support for the recommendation. Superintendent Russell indicated staff would return with a more detailed proposal on how such management would work.

The board then turned to discussion of the recommendations related to the different regions.

**North Region**

Superintendent Russell noted the revised recommendation to consider a new elementary school in the north region, possibly consolidating River Road and Howard schools.

Mr. Torrey indicated that after hearing from Mr. Henry and the two schools involved, he was no longer interested in moving forward on the recommendation, but he continued to believe that the district needed to provide more quality infrastructure in that region. He suggested there might be other alternatives to the north.

Ms. Gerot did not support the revised recommendation for a consolidated school, particularly with the high-needs students at River Road, who might not benefit from a larger school.

Board Member Yvette Webber-Davis agreed with Ms. Gerot.

Dr. Martinez concurred with Mr. Torrey. He believed that the quality of the infrastructure, particularly as it related to technology, was an issue not just at River Road but at schools such as Meadowlark. He thought the board would be constrained in its ability to respond.

Mr. Smith concurred with previous speakers.

**Churchill Region**

Superintendent Russell noted the recommendation that Adams explore program options to strengthen the school and draw more students from its attendance areas. To that end, Adams was discussing a Spanish dual immersion or Chinese immersion program and a survey of area parents was planned. He said additionally, the Family School would be moved to the Jefferson
building to share the building with ATA, and middle school grades would be added progressively. He said he understood a Chinese immersion program had not been embraced but he understood there was some support for a dual language immersion program. He suggested a Chinese immersion program would be another alternative school, and asked the board to consider the impact on neighborhood schools and where the students would come from.

Dr. Webber-Davis asked what consideration was given to the different schedules of Family School and ATA, and when Superintendent Russell anticipated the changes would be implemented. Superintendent Russell envisioned implementation in 2009, with planning to occur in 2009. He said Family School had not indicated interest in the ATA schedule, and he agreed there were issues around that. He was unsure that outside of sharing special education staff the schools would have much in common at the elementary level.

Mr. Torrey believed Adams needed time to do the needed analysis, survey, and marketing.

Mr. Smith supported the recommendation.

Ms. Hays said she had the opportunity to visit Adams and found it to be a great school.

Mr. Forrest supported giving Adams the opportunity to explore its options and the moves recommended by the superintendent.

Dr. Martinez also favored the recommendations. He believed the board needed to explore the importance of language immersion to the district, particularly as it considered where choice existed, particularly in regard to language. He advocated for more board discussion of the role of a Chinese immersion and dual Spanish immersion programs. Mr. Forrest concurred. He said the board also needed to discuss whether the district had sufficient students for those programs. Other board members agreed further discussion was needed.

**South Region**

Superintendent Russell reviewed the initial recommendations in this region, to close Harris, move Eastside, and combine Eastside and Charlemagne at the Harris building. The revised recommendation was to consider the possibility of Harris and Eastside consolidating, an idea which had gained momentum after being proposed by a Harris teacher and Eastside teacher. The Willard building would be closed at the end of 2010 and the charter schools would move from that location. A bond measure in 2011 would be proposed, and the future location of Charlemagne determined. The district would also remodel or rebuild Roosevelt Middle School.

Dr. Martinez asked Superintendent Russell to explain his revised recommendation. Superintendent Russell said that he believed in terms of long-range direction for the district, his first recommendation was the best one. If the board wanted to be sympathetic to the proposal from Harris and Eastside, the revised recommendation was an option to consider if the board thought it could be made to work. However, he believed increasingly that the proposal would not work because of the testimony the board received from Eastside parents. He expressed disappointment in what he had heard from the Eastside parents and said that teachers with opinions that differed from the parents should not suffer verbal abuse about those viewpoints. He said that at this point, he was inclined to make a recommendation to close both schools.

Mr. Torrey spoke to the Harris-Eastside consolidation proposal, saying he believed with the passion shown on both sides the proposal could work. He said the students needed to be the
focus of the discussion, and if the district had two great programs he thought the district should take advantage of them. He asked Mr. Henry if he thought the proposal would work. Mr. Henry responded yes, in theory. He was not convinced that the district had the proper dynamics in place to ensure equal participation and a consolidated school.

Ms. Hays said she was struggling with the same issues mentioned by Superintendent Russell. She has been disheartened by what the board heard from Eastside parents. She said that being inclusive was to consider all the issues and how best to accommodate the needs of all. She did not think that Eastside was viable because she did not believe it was going to be able to diversify, and was not inclined to put people through the work of studying the potential.

Mr. Forrest said his issue with Harris was its declining enrollment. The district had too many schools and too few children. He believed that what seemed like the right thing to do now might not be the right thing in the long-term. He acknowledged the wounds created by school closures but suggested humans healed fairly quickly and formed new bonds. He noted the relatively short distances between the involved south Eugene elementary schools currently and suggested that students could bicycle easily to a new school location at Harris. At this point, Mr. Forrest was inclined to close Harris.

Dr. Webber-Davis concurred with much of what Mr. Forrest said. She reminded the community that students grow up and move on. The passion that people felt for their schools was real, but children did not stay there. She was very disturbed at what she was hearing about Eastside. She asked if Eastside was a viable school at the Harris location. Superintendent Russell said that the school would not be viable unless collocated with Charlemagne. Responding to a follow-up question from Dr. Webber-Davis, Superintendent Russell indicated he did not believe the Eastside parents would be as committed as staff to the consolidation with Harris.

Mr. Henry reviewed the details of the original recommendation as it regarded Eastside.

Mr. Torrey questioned the impact of moving Eastside to Bailey Hill or doing another analysis of Eastside. He did not believe the district would realize the desired diversity at Eastside. Superintendent Russell recalled that the district had considered moving Eastside to Bailey Hill at one time. Speaking to a re-analysis of Eastside, Mr. Henry recalled it had been reviewed through the Alternative Schools process and was found to be a viable program at that time. Superintendent Russell recalled that the board heard an update from Eastside about the results of its planning efforts and at that time board members had commented the school seemed to be less diverse. He believed the board could request a progress report on that issue.

Mr. Smith believed the Harris staff was interested in exploring all options. However, it did not appear the Eastside parents shared that interest. He said the merger was one way for Eastside to become more diverse quickly. If there was reluctance to do that, it seemed a waste of a year to discuss the issue. If the fallback was the original proposal, the board would be saying that Eastside would continue in its current configuration and the board would track its efforts on diversification. The net effect was that the school would get what it wanted, and that outcome was bothersome to him.

Dr. Martinez said the issue was a difficult one because of the passion people had for their schools. He also thought there was an undercurrent feeling that the district was out to get Eastside, which he understood because of the alternative schools review. He thought the review was grueling and families had a lot of anxiety. Now the district was contemplating new recommendations affecting the school. He thought that led people to believe that the district was contemplating closing Eastside. He said that was not his agenda and he did not think it
was on the agenda of any board member. The spirit of the recommendation was to acknowledge the strengths of both schools and allow them to develop a system where choice was embraced while meeting the needs of both school communities. For that reason, that was why he supported the revised recommendation. However, he was unsure it was tenable if the two school communities were not equal partners in the discussion. He did not know how to proceed.

Dr. Webber-Davis agreed with Dr. Martinez. She recalled the testimony the board heard in regard to the issue and said that many board members were excited about the potential. She asked if discussions continued and if progress was being made. Superintendent Russell said the staffs were continuing to talk, and talks were planned between the Harris and Eastside parents.

Superintendent Russell said he was now worried about how “Eastside could be Eastside” if half or more of the teachers wanted to move on to other schools because they felt tired and beat up by some of the parents and other staff and many wondered if the effort to make the school better was worth it.

Mr. Forrest asked the impact of the consolidation on Parker and Adams given the finite number of students and excess number of schools. He agreed with Dr. Webber-Davis that board members had been excited about the consolidation proposal, but after he thought about it, the solution being proposed seemed like moving deck chairs on the Titanic.

Dr. Webber-Davis perceived some board sentiment for giving the two schools a chance, but pointed out the board had yet to hear about the beginnings of a plan. She suggested the board could solicit input from the schools about how they might pursue the proposed collaboration before the next work session. Superintendent Russell said he continued to hear from the two schools that they needed more time. He said that several Eastside and Harris teachers planned to meet early the following week, and he would solicit their feedback. Mr. Torrey encouraged him to pursue that course. Ms. Hays concurred that should occur if possible.

Dr. Webber-Davis agreed with the remarks of Dr. Martinez regarding the potential of an additional review of Eastside.

Mr. Forrest questioned the existing capacity of Willard school, and posited a solution where Eastside moved to Harris for a year and then moved to Willard to collocate with Charlemagne. Superintendent Russell thought the two schools would fit from a capacity standpoint, but suggested that capacity was a lesser issue than the cost of remodeling. Mr. Forrest suggested that would be minor compared to the cost of building a new grade school. In addition, the district would realize gains in its goals related to transportation, diversity, and a good learning environment. Superintendent Russell said that staff would investigate the possibility. He pointed out the charter schools currently occupying that space would have to be moved.
Dr. Martinez questioned the cost of Mr. Forrest’s suggestion and said it also assumed the
Eastside staff would remain intact, which he questioned. Mr. Forrest agreed that was a
concern.

Dr. Martinez emphasized the need for a fall-back option in case nothing became of the
consolidation proposal.

There was general support for the superintendent’s recommendation to move Charlemagne to a
new location. Ms. Gerot and Ms. Hays noted the difficulty of accessing the current school
location at the edge of town, which was not an option for many families.

Mr. Forrest left the meeting.

Responding to a question from Mr. Torrey, Superintendent Russell indicated he would oppose
any proposal to locate a charter school in Harris after it was closed and a neighborhood school
moved to that space. Mr. Torrey asked if that meant the board should inform the charter
schools that the district’s facilities were not a viable option for them in the future.

Superintendent Russell did not know the legal limits restraining the district in that regard and
believed the district needed to give the charter schools a reasonable chance to use its spaces.
He thought the district needed to more strategic about those opportunities and give thought to
the potential impacts on district schools, no matter their location.

Barbara Bellamy, Chief of Staff and Communications Director, said that a bill passed by the last
legislature mandated that districts must provide a list of available vacant facilities but does not
stipulate that they must be offered to a charter school.

**Sheldon Region**

Mr. Torrey did not think the district should eliminate Meadowlark, which he termed a great
neighborhood school. He thought extra capacity should be added to manage the crowding. He
also did not think the district should close Coburg and should work with the community to find a
financial solution. He was not sure about Buena Vista as a standalone school at the proposed
location as he was unsure there would be community support for a measure to fund the school.
He suggested that a proposal that included both Buena Vista and Roosevelt or some quality
facility in the Sheldon area, might have a chance.

Ms. Gerot favored developing an intergovernmental agreement with Coburg that kept the school
open if Coburg could help provide the resources needed. She did not support moving Buena
Vista out of the Sheldon region because of the board’s interest in having a language immersion
school in each region. She was curious about other possibilities that existed for Buena Vista
that avoided capping enrollment at Meadowlark and adding modular units at that school. She
suggested the two schools could be collocated for longer than the four years currently called for.

Superintendent Russell observed that staff could look at other options for Buena Vista, although
they were narrowed if one did not look outside the Sheldon region.

Superintendent Russell reported that the cost of portable modular units was $350,000 apiece.
He continued to struggle with that, particularly if a more long-term solution was four to five years
away. He emphasized the impact of transfers on Meadowlark and said growth was not
predicted to be significant in that area for the next few years. Dr. Martinez pointed out the
number of students in the attendance boundary now was sufficient to grow the schools if one
went on the assumption the students would want to attend Meadowlark. He said the Meadowlark community had pointed out it would have an opportunity to focus its program without trying to manage its relationship with Buena Vista, which could attract students to stay in the area.

Dr. Martinez supported the revised recommendations for the Sheldon region, and shared Ms. Gerot’s sentiments regarding the location of Buena Vista in the Sheldon region. He expressed concern about a possible bond measure and said the board had no information about the public’s support for a bond measure that included a standalone Buena Vista, and the board needed a fallback position. He thought the current situation suppressed Meadowlark’s ability to have its own identity. He wanted to look carefully at any investment in modular units and asked if there were any other modular units available in the district. Mr. Henry said the district had some older units but they were all in use. He said he would ask that question of Facilities staff.

Ms. Gerot said she was less concerned about transfers in the Sheldon region than in the South region because schools were over capacity in the South region. She suggested that the board discuss whether the enrollment at Gilham and Holt schools should be limited to actual capacity, which would allow Meadowlark to take in some additional students.

Dr. Webber-Davis also supported the recommendations in this area. She hoped that Coburg could show growth in the future given the development potential in the community. She also supported the retention of Buena Vista in the Sheldon region to ensure alternative school choice was available throughout the district.

Dr. Webber-Davis thought the use of modular units was viable at this point given the uncertainty of the future and the existing space constraints.

Regarding the Kinney Loop site, Dr. Webber-Davis suggested the only alternative was the existing Meadowlark site. She was unsure the board had time to consider options around Monroe.

In regard to the suggestion that another school be added at Meadowlark, Superintendent Russell said that would intrude on existing facilities at Sheldon High School.

Mr. Torrey suggested there was “nothing sacred” about the Kinney Loop site and recommended that staff explore the potential of a land exchange with the assistance of real estate professionals. Superintendent Russell indicated staff was exploring such options.

Mr. Smith did not think the district should discourage growth at Meadowlark, and if that required modular units, he did not object to them.

Dr. Martinez solicited additional comments from the principals and staff that were present at the meeting. Those individuals encouraged the board to keep the principles and goals of the process in the forefront of its thinking; emphasized the impact of declining enrollment on the district’s ability to serve all children; asked the board to consider how best to maintain four viable regions; asked the board to consider the positive outcomes of past school closures on students; emphasized the challenge of consolidating a neighborhood and alternative school; emphasized the challenge of providing programming and services for all students to ensure that they could access and participate in the general education classroom; encouraged the board to have high expectations for all students; expressed support for new buildings in the North region; commended the Harris decision as good for Parker, Edison, and for neighborhood schools in general; recalled past attempts at consolidation between Harris and Eastside and emphasized
the degree of work necessary to make that happen; noted the successful consolidation of River Road/Camino del Rio that occurred in spite of parent objections; and encouraged the board to make the tough decisions now.

Mr. Henry said the enrollment management strategy that the board appeared to favor would be challenging, but he thought it was the right thing to do if the district wished to maintain four regions and four regional high schools.

Dr. Martinez solicited board comment.

Ms. Hays commended the conversation and expressed appreciation to the board for its candor. She also expressed appreciation for the community input she had received.

Mr. Torrey noted the new graduation requirements taking effect in 2014, and emphasized the need for the district’s students to be ready so they could go on to successful careers, whatever they were.

Dr. Webber-Davis expressed appreciation for the work session and thanked the principals and staff for their input. She said the discussion helped to crystallize her thinking and to remember what was so attractive about the district. She thought the district was attractive because of what it did for students and because of the insight, passion, and commitment of staff.

Dr. Webber-Davis said the decisions facing the board were difficult but she believed they created opportunities for additional academic achievement. Although the process might be painful now, she agreed with Mr. Smith’s remarks about the positive outcome of past closure and consolidation processes.

Mr. Smith characterized the process as a fluid one because of the complexity of the recommendations before the board. The board’s prior decisions about closures and consolidations had been “almost obvious” because of the need to take capacity out of the system; while the decisions were difficult, the outcome was clear. In this case, the outcome was not clear, and he commended the process as one of the best he had been involved in. Ms. Gerot concurred.

Ms. Gerot reported that she had visited Harris earlier in the week and talked with teachers supportive of the consolidation proposal. They had acknowledged that the board might make another decision, but were accepting of that because they felt as though they had been heard.

Dr. Martinez thanked the board for its hard work and open-mindedness to new ideas. He thought the respect board members had for each helped contribute to the process. He had confidence in the decisions the board made because of that respect.
ADJOURN

Dr. Martinez adjourned the meeting at 11 a.m.

_____________________________    _______________________________
George Russell               Charles Martinez, Jr.
District Clerk                Board Chair

(Recorded by Kimberly Young)
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