

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

March 19, 2008

The Board of Directors of School District No. 4J, Lane County, Eugene, Oregon, held a regular meeting at 7 p.m. on March 19, 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 14, 2008, and published in *The Register-Guard* on March 17, 2008.

ROLL CALL

BOARD MEMBERS:

Charles Martinez, Jr., Chair
Beth Gerot
Craig Smith (by telephone)
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
Yvonne Curtis, Director of Student Achievement
Susan Fahey, Chief Financial Officer
Ted Heid, Director of Labor Relations
Jon Lauch, Director of Facilities Management
Laurie Moses, Director of High School Services
Caroline Passerotti, Financial Analysis Manager
Larry Sullivan, Director of Educational Support Services
Jim Conaghan, Research and Assessment Coordinator
Ben Brantley, Construction Program Manager

STUDENT REPRESENTATIVES:

Noah Henry-Darwish, South Eugene High School

MEDIA:

KRVM

CALL TO ORDER, ROLL CALL, AND FLAG SALUTE

Board Chair Charles Martinez 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 extended congratulations to Courtney Leonard and the staff and students at Eugene International High School for their selection as the winner of the 2007 Goldman Saxe Prize for excellence in international education.

Superintendent Russell called the board's attention to the materials in the red folder, which included a press release regarding the district's participation in a review of its administrative functions in association with the Oregon Department of Education, Oregon Association of School Business Officials, and the Chalkboard Foundation.

COMMENTS BY STUDENT REPRESENTATIVES

Noah Henry-Darwish reported that South Eugene High School was planning for the Mr. Axeman Pageant. Contestants were preparing for the event and holding several fund-raising activities. Students were anticipating spring break.

ITEMS RAISED BY AUDIENCE

Sara Kerrigan, Elizabeth Kline, and Jimmy Stewart of the Sheldon High School Honors Program offered the board suggestions for a stricter district-wide drug and alcohol policy and advocated for policy changes that penalized students more than they currently were. Ms. Kline noted that Sheldon's policy was similar for all students, whether in athletics or leadership. The current policy called for students caught possessing drugs or alcohol to be expelled or suspended, but it was not clear or detailed about the consequences of a second offense. She noted the penalties for student athletes and students participating in leadership and said Sheldon was not enforcing its problem as it should. Students who were caught merely had to admit they had a problem and needed help. They were then treated and dealt with the consequences, but could come back to school after a year on probation and participate again in student athletics or leadership. Ms. Kline objected to allowing those students to participate in those activities because she thought it set a poor example for other students.

Ms. Kerrigan offered examples of other districts' policies that the students believed were stricter than 4J's policies and should be considered for adoption. She said in Beaverton, first offenses resulted in a parental notification, suspension up to ten days, and most students attended "chemical insight class"; in Hillsboro, athletes with a first offense were suspended from participation and lost their right to represent the school for up to 90 days. In Portland, student leaders could not participate in leadership activities for up to two weeks after returning from their suspension. She reiterated that Sheldon's policies were vague and needed more detail.

Mr. Stewart shared the changes proposed by the Honors Program Class that the students represented, copies of which were provided to the board. He advocated for students with a first offense to be assigned five hours of community service which would not be counted toward the NHS, IHS, or ASB hours, an in-school suspension where students would be left alone to work on their school work, and counseling. He called for mandatory suspensions in all cases. In regard to student athletes, the class advocated for additional punishment for those individuals as they were perceived to represent the school. Student athletes would be additionally penalized with athletic probation and required to participate in practice, but could not play for three weeks. They would be required to attend a meeting with their parents, the principal, the athletic director of the school, and the coach to discuss the problem. To increase penalties for student leaders, he called for an additional punishment of a 2,000 word essay on drugs and

their effects on people, a suspension from leadership that ranged from two months to forever, and a 500-word apology to the leadership which the student must read aloud to the leadership group. He maintained that changes were improvements that would enhance the learning environment and would be good for both Sheldon and the district, but the students were calling at this time for changes to Sheldon's policy.

Tom Sims commended those parents who were attempting to work out issues between Harris and Eastside and hoped the board gave them more time. He thought it an example of how community should work, with students coming first. He hoped their work became a reality because there was no reason the two schools could not work together. Mr. Sims recollected his childhood in Whitney, Oregon and the role mothers played in establishing a school in that community. He anticipated that Coburg would continue to grow and would continue to need a school. He thought the community would eventually have its own school system.

Joan Obie thanked the board for doing the hard work it did and for thinking of the needs of district students whose parents never had and never would attend a board meeting. They needed the board the most.

Judy Volta, Mayor of the City of Coburg, expressed her pride in the residents of Coburg for pulling together to save the community's elementary school. She also thanked the board for considering the concerns of Coburg residents. She said the City of Coburg wanted to work with the district to develop some strategies so the school could continue to be viable.

Nancy Willard spoke to the "teachable moment" offered by Eastside parents who expressed anger at the board and demonstrated attitudes and values contrary to the objective of serving all children. She asked how the school could be expected to be diverse and integrated if the parents held those values. She maintained that there were a portion of parents in each alternative school who held those values, and because the district was "pandering to them" those attitudes would continue and the alternative schools would not be integrated. She thanked those Eastside parents for proving her right and thanked Eastside parents who were willing to merge and suggested the same thing happen with all the alternative schools. Ms. Willard suggested the problems the district had in south Eugene could be attributed to the many schools in the area. Moving families to Jefferson would interfere with the success of Churchill. She called for more planning in that region after the board made a boundary assessment.

Terrie Monroe, a Charlemagne Site Council member, thanked the board for its responsiveness to community concerns and suggested that its decisions would be better because of the time it invested. She welcomed a move that made sense for the size of the school population and that included coordination with middle and high school programs. She urged the board to adopt strategies that increased access and to give them time to work. Ms. Monroe was not convinced a move to a more central location would make school more accessible because she was not sure how key it was to families' decisions. She had heard of other locations that were much less central than the current location and out of sync with middle and high school program locations. She hoped any move made things better, not worse.

Ms. Monroe thought the students could benefit from such things as alternating preference in the lottery and from targeted outreach to specific populations to let them know a school was available and welcoming. She thought the current system was too dependent on knowledgeable parents. She thought effective outreach occurred when it reached people where they lived. She suggested that the greatest structure barrier to choice was transportation and asked the board to work to remove it. She suggested the board pilot that effort with groups underrepresented in the school population.

Joe Bussell noted his previous concerns about the potential of a merger between Eastside and Harris and said he did not mean to suggest a dialogue was not in order. His focus had been on those elements of Eastside he found critical, specifically differentiated learning between language arts and mathematics. He expressed appreciation to the board members for listening to parents.

COMMENTS BY EMPLOYEE GROUPS

There were no comments.

ITEMS FOR ACTION AT THIS MEETING

Approve Superintendent's Revised Recommendations and Alternative Options for *Shaping 4J's Future*

Board Member Craig Smith joined the board via speakerphone.

Superintendent Russell provided a PowerPoint presentation detailing how the board reached the point it had in the decision making process for the *Shaping 4J's Future* project. He reviewed the goals established by the board for the project. Superintendent Russell reviewed his district-wide recommendations and his region-specific recommendations. He noted the time frame for implementation of the recommendations.

Superintendent Russell recommended the board adopt the recommendations, minus the alternative options.

Dr. Martinez expressed appreciation for the hard work done by staff and indicated the decisions tonight did not end the conversation as the district changed and the board faced other issues related to capacity, school location, and community growth. He said the decisions did not immunize the district from other hard decisions to come. He expressed appreciation for the community's support.

Dr. Martinez said the board both listened to and was affected by what it heard from parents, surveys, staff, and experts, and used all that information to make decisions it considered to be in the best interests of students. The board also tried to consider the voices of those who did not communicate with it and were not present at board meetings or engaged in the process. He emphasized the issues facing the board were not simple. The board had not sought scapegoats in the process as the issues were relevant to all and all needed to participate to resolve them. The board had been inspired by the community's passionate engagement and openness to collaboration. He believed the board saw the larger picture involved. The board was committed to leading and would make its decisions on the superintendent's recommendations that night. The board committed to understanding the impacts of its decisions and addressing those impacts in the future.

District-wide Strategies

Recommendation 1: Differentiated Staffing Allocation

MOTION: Board Member Yvette Webber-Davis, seconded by Board Vice Chair Beth Gerot, moved to adopt the superintendent's recommendation.

Dr. Webber-Davis supported the motion as it directed resources toward schools of highest need.

Dr. Martinez believed the recommendation was a "big deal" as it was about equity. He said the recommendation was not diverse, but it would raise challenges the district must face by providing more resources to some students to accommodate their special needs and less to others. He was happy to see such strong support on the board for the recommendation.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously; 7:0.

Recommendation 2: Limit transfers for middle and high schools

MOTION: Ms. Gerot, seconded by Board Member Eric Forrest, moved to accept the recommendation.

Ms. Gerot thought the recommendation would make a big difference. Grandfathering those already in attendance was important, and she noted the lottery that currently existed and would continue to stay in effect. She supported limiting the numbers at the middle schools and high schools as proposed by the superintendent, although she acknowledged the district might find itself over desired numbers in the Sheldon area due to those living in the attendance area. .

Mr. Forrest supported the recommendation and said it was another very important step for the district to take.

Board Member Alicia Hays appreciated hearing from parents and students about the issue and acknowledged the impact it could have on families with children now in a school and their siblings who hoped to attend the same school. She thought it important that the high and middle schools have the appropriate numbers of students.

Dr. Martinez noted the board's extensive discussion of this and the other strategies recommended by the superintendent at recent meetings.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously; 7:0.

Recommendation 3: Boundaries

MOTION: Ms. Hays, seconded by Dr. Webber-Davis, moved to accept the superintendent's recommendation.

Ms. Gerot thought the recommendation long overdue. She said the district's boundaries did not reflect where they lived or the schools they attended. She looked forward to adjustments that made sense and maintained enrollment levels.

Dr. Webber-Davis also supported the motion and wanted to ensure the impact on current students was minimal. She was pleased with the board's discussion of grandfathering current students.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously; 7:0.

Recommendation 4: Transportation

MOTION: Ms. Hays, seconded by Mr. Forrest, moved to accept the superintendent's recommendation.

Ms. Hays said she had not initially favored the recommendation. Many people felt transportation would allow schools to diversify, but the studies she had read did not support that. She said that transportation was not the silver bullet some thought. She supported the study because it was just that. She did not want to purchase a lot of buses to prove the district wrong or right, but was willing to study it so the district could answer how it worked in the community.

Ms. Gerot concurred with Ms. Hays. She said it was important to study the question and answer it for the district. If an outcome was to look at all schools including alternative she would support it.

Mr. Forrest supported trying something. He was worried about the terminology "study the possibility" and said he would like to see a pilot project established. He said the district had a choice system, valued choice, and wanted to promote diversity. The community said transportation was an impediment, and he thought it important to study for that reason.

Dr. Martinez agreed with the other board members. He said that he supported the recommendation because it called for a study. He thought in the end, the district would have a difficult time moving on any recommendation that arose because of a difference of philosophy. If a study recommended a focus on alternative schools, he could not support that because it sends the message that choice meant alternative schools only as well as a tentative message of support for neighborhood schools. He also thought there was some community support for focusing on alternative schools to a greater degree. He was concerned about what happened after the study; would the board be able to enact its findings? He thought it worth finding out more about innovative ways to look at transportation. He was interested in looking at other models to find how they might apply to the district.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously; 7:0.

North Region

Recommendation 5: Howard and River Road

MOTION: Board Member Jim Torrey, seconded by Ms. Gerot, moved to accept the superintendent's recommendation.

Dr. Webber-Davis said while the board was going to maintain the schools in their existing locations, that did not preclude the possibility of remodels or other innovations in that region. She wanted the board to look closely at what it needed to do in that region as it considered future bond measures.

Mr. Torrey thought it important to send a message to parents and schools in that area that the board would not leave those schools in their current condition. He was convinced the schools provided a good education for the children of the area, but the board needed to say the area deserved as good a school as the two new schools built recently.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously; 7:0.

Churchill Region

Recommendation 6: Adams Program Alteration

MOTION: Mr. Forrest, seconded by Mr. Torrey, moved to approve the superintendent's recommendation.

Mr. Torrey noted the e-mails sent to the board by Parker parents asking about the impact of the recommendation. Did it mean the school lost its ability to grow? While he was very supportive of the recommendation as it related to Adams, he wanted to ensure the board did what was necessary to enhance Parker. While he supported the process being used to investigate the potential of a district Chinese immersion school, he thought the Churchill region needed a unique activity that could be provided by such an immersion school. He said Adams might not want it, but he thought the district should move toward that goal in this region.

Dr. Webber-Davis said the board would hear a report on the Chinese immersion school soon and she suggested staff coordinate its reports to the board not only about what Adams was considering, but the larger question of Chinese immersion.

Ms. Gerot supported the recommendation. She said there were nearly 500 students in the Adams attendance boundary and she wanted the community survey to occur before the board got too far into a discussion of a dual or Chinese immersion program in that school. She thought the Adams community needed to consider whether it would be a neighborhood school, an alternative school, or a hybrid.

Mr. Forrest noted his support for the recommendation and for the survey of Adams families. He suspected they might suggest there were too many schools around them now and the district had excess capacity and not enough children. He agreed with Mr. Torrey about the need for a foreign language immersion program in the Churchill area. He asked what school the district would close if Adams decided that was not the direction it wished to go, but the district decided it was important to have an immersion school in the area and there were not enough students.

Ms. Hays agreed there was a limited supply of children. She supported having a Chinese language program at Churchill, but said it would draw students from somewhere as it grew.

Dr. Martinez also supported the recommendation with the concerns expressed by others. He agreed the board needed to pursue the Chinese immersion program, consider Churchill as a site for a language immersion program, and consider the dual language immersion program issue. He thought a broader conversation about language immersion models and the needs in the district was needed.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously; 7:0.

Recommendation 7: Family School

MOTION: Dr. Webber-Davis, seconded by Ms. Hays, moved to accept the superintendent's recommendation.

Ms. Gerot expressed appreciation that Superintendent Russell had changed the time line to allow the needed discussion to occur.

Responding to a question from Mr. Torrey about scheduling, Tom Henry, Deputy Superintendent and Chief Academic Officer, anticipated the schedule would be reviewed for coordination issues with elementary school schedules the next school year.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously; 7:0.

South Region

Recommendation 8: Harris and Eastside

MOTION: Ms. Gerot, seconded by Mr. Torrey, moved to accept the superintendent's recommendation.

Ms. Gerot offered an amendment to the motion, which was accepted as a friendly amendment by herself and the second to the motion, Mr. Torrey, that the board add a guiding condition that both school communities commit to engage in the conversation with equal voice and commitment to work in good faith, recognizing that the stakes are equally high for both schools.

Ms. Gerot expected that the parties to the discussion would find success, but she requested a status report on the consolidation discussion in **December 2008**. The board would then discuss the status and fate of the schools in 2008-09.

Mr. Torrey thought the recommendation before the board represented a good example of the appropriate community process. He suggested it was a learning opportunity for children to watch their parents find a way to provide a quality education in a neighborhood with a quality facility merging with the neighborhood school. He supported the recommendation.

Dr. Webber-Davis also had expectations of success and was heartened by the choices the board heard from the school community. She expected the district would work with the schools as it went through the process. Superintendent Russell concurred.

Mr. Forrest asked if staff had expectations of what percentage of staffing would remain. Superintendent Russell said that was uncertain. Two Eastside teachers had recently announced their retirement, and a couple of others were considering the possibility of leaving. An Eastside teacher indicated to him earlier that day they might reconsider leaving if the merger talks were successful. Mr. Forrest asked if the school would be an alternative or neighborhood school when talks were complete. Superintendent Russell did not assume an alternative school, suggesting a hybrid neighborhood school would result.

Mr. Forrest concurred with the recommendation in isolation and anticipated success. He did not know what the recommendation meant for other schools. He did not think it would work for Parker and Adams, for example. He was worried about what the board was postponing and anticipated another painful discussion. He pointed out the school being created had the same

demographics as Parker Elementary. He said there were too many schools in Eugene and too few children.

Mr. Torrey pointed out that the south Eugene area was a potential growth area for the district, and part of the situation feared by Mr. Forrest might be remedied by future growth. He thought Mr. Forrest was wise to point out the potential impact.

Ms. Hays expressed appreciation for the commitment of the two school communities to work together. She thought they had an opportunity to do the work around diversity they expressed interest in. However, when she considered what was important, she thought the district should be moving toward larger, more efficient schools with more programs that could serve students better. She believed that supporting the motion meant the district was merely postponing closing another school. She said the district needed to limit the number of schools it had.

Dr. Martinez supported the motion. He expressed appreciation for the concern expressed by Ms. Hays. He thought the board was keenly aware of the impact of its decision. He said the board faced values and goals that were in some ways in direct opposition to one another. What spoke to Ms. Hays might not speak to other people as she was favoring one core principle over another. It was a complex process. It was his view that the board did not avoid the harder conversation by failing the motion or choosing to close one or more of the schools now. He said no matter the board's decision it would need to consider capacity issues in the district. He said he considered how the board could move to close Harris given the data it had seen and its goals of having those most vulnerable least affected by the board's decision. He said the district favored choice, and closing a vibrant school like Eastside was in opposition to that value. He did not favor the alternatives. He wanted to give the school a chance. He agreed that what was being left on the table was capacity.

Mr. Forrest acknowledged Ms. Hays' concerns. However, he did not think the board was taking a big risk in predicting the future, because the future was now, given the students who were in district schools. He thought this was a great resolution for the schools in question, but agreed there were conflicting goals and the board members had to decide, based on individual perceptions and their ranking of the goals and priorities. He did not think the district had the students it needed today to meet the standards it wanted to meet, so it was making a choice to value other things more.

Ms. Hays agreed board members had different priorities. One of her priorities was stability. She had heard from parents and teachers at schools who might be in the position of being closed because of shrinking numbers about the difficulty to being continually threatened with the "chopping block" year after year. She wanted to be able to offer stability to those individuals. She said there was a cost to the board's decision.

Mr. Smith supported the motion. He said the board had addressed capacity in the past and he believed it would do so again in the future. He thought the board had an opportunity to pursue something innovative and new. He said that when the board considered the viability of Eastside in the future he would consider good faith efforts on behalf of the staff and parents to reach compromises and find results.

Ms. Gerot shared the concerns expressed by Mr. Forrest and Ms. Hays in regard to capacity. However, she supported the motion as a way to reduce the impact on the more vulnerable students, those who attended Harris. Regarding the issue of whether the school was an alternative school, she suggested the two school's staffs must make that determination, and both schools must have an equal voice, which did not mean merely a bigger Eastside, but rather

taking the best components of both schools and some innovative thinking that might be missing now to create a wonderful learning environment for students.

Dr. Martinez believed the board shared the same concerns as Ms. Hays, but different things spoke to different individuals. He did not see a good, fair alternative if capacity was the issue.

Dr. Martinez wanted an update scheduled earlier than February 2010, and suggested November 2009 as an alternative review date.

Dr. Martinez agreed that it was important the district actively support the merger effort and questioned what that meant in terms of district leadership and facilitation.

Dr. Martinez spoke to the friendly amendment, stressing its importance to the board and its interest in seeing a level playing field for the discussions to occur. Otherwise, a true collaborative model would not be the result of those discussions.

Mr. Forrest advocated for further board discussion about its expectations for the process.

Mr. Forrest thought the superintendent's original recommendation was a good solution. He noted the proximity of the schools in the area and acknowledged it would be a change for residents but over time, if Harris was closed, Edison and Parker would have become more of a neighborhood school and Adams might have grown in size.

Ms. Hays agreed with the remarks of Mr. Forrest in regard to board direction.

Dr. Webber-Davis acknowledged the concerns of Ms. Hays and Mr. Forrest but suggested that given the board's deliberations and the input the board received, she would not feel comfortable making a decision about the board's expectations too soon as she feared it would hinder the creativity of the schools and could limit what they were able to do. She wanted to weigh the issues carefully before deciding on whether the school was neighborhood or alternative.

Dr. Martinez agreed with Dr. Webber-Davis and said if the board was to embrace creativity it must be willing to listen to whatever model that emerged from discussion.

VOTE: The motion passed, 5:2; Ms. Hays and Mr. Forrest voting no.

Recommendation 9: Charlemagne French Immersion

MOTION: Ms. Gerot, seconded by Dr. Webber-Davis, moved to accept the superintendent's recommendation.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously, 7:0.

Recommendation 10: Willard Building

MOTION: Ms. Forrest, seconded by Ms. Gerot, moved to accept the superintendent's recommendation.

Mr. Torrey was concerned about how the board treated the district's charter schools. He said that the recommendation was better than what the board discussed earlier, but at some point he wanted the board to discuss the district's responsibilities toward those schools and what they could expect from the district so they had a level of certainty. He acknowledged differences in philosophy among board members on the topic, but he thought the district had a responsibility

to be predictable. Superintendent Russell recommended further discussion on the topic at the retreat or a work session.

Ms. Gerot concurred with Mr. Torrey. She anticipated that bills related to charter schools would be introduced in the next session of the Oregon legislature and the board should be prepared for that.

Mr. Forrest supported the motion. He said that Willard was a great site and could potentially be a good location for Charlemagne. He suggested the board consider opportunities to remodel as opposed to new construction when considering the bond measure.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously, 7:0.

Sheldon Region

Recommendation 11: Coburg

MOTION: Mr. Torrey, seconded by Ms. Gerot, moved to accept the superintendent's recommendation.

Ms. Gerot said her vote was not based on anticipated growth in Coburg, but rather the value of the school to the entire Coburg community and its students. She commended the number of engaged community members and hoped the district and community could reach a cost-sharing arrangement.

Dr. Martinez concurred with the remarks of Ms. Gerot. He believed there were open questions about the growth to be expected, and said what was clear was that the school was a unique asset to the community, and there was no alternative to the school to be found nearby. He appreciated the discussion that had already occurred between the district and City of Coburg and looked forward to the discussions around the intergovernmental agreement. The school was clearly a neighborhood school in all ways, but he anticipated continued challenges in how to deliver education in that context.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously, 7:0.

Recommendation 12: Meadowlark and Buena Vista

MOTION: Dr. Webber-Davis, seconded by Mr. Forrest, moved to accept the superintendent's recommendation.

Mr. Forrest still wanted to look at the potential of building a new Meadowlark School at the current site. If a new field was needed to take pressure off the existing Sheldon area fields, he suggested a field could be built at Kinney Loop.

Dr. Martinez expressed support for the sentiment expressed by Mr. Forrest. He noted his support for allowing Meadowlark to continue to grow and thrive in the context of the wait created by the lack of immediate action. That could mean investment in modular structures to add capacity. He thought that Meadowlark, like Coburg, was truly a neighborhood school in the traditional manner, serving the surrounding community. He thought the board valued that, and believed the board needed to look at long-term facilities support for the school.

Ms. Gerot was pleased to see a possible boundary adjustment included in the recommendation. She said that Gilham and Holt were both larger than 500 students, and Meadowlark could use the additional students. She thought it would be great if Buena Vista could move sooner than later to a new site and add a kindergarten.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously, 7:0.

Mr. Smith left the meeting.

Request for Annexation of the Kinney Loop Property

As part of the Shaping 4J's Future process, the superintendent has recommended that consideration be given to including a new school in the next capital bond measure to be built on the Kinney Loop property. The board has asked staff to provide a time line for property development and school construction in order to determine when a school could be ready for occupancy. While there are many variables and a few uncertainties, staff believes that the soonest practical completion date for the potential/proposed school is fall of 2012. Mr. Lauch was available to answer questions.

There are a number of critical path planning items that must be addressed in order for this schedule to be possible, the first of which is annexation to the City of Eugene. Even should the board decide not to include construction of a new school at the Kinney Loop site in the 2010 bond measure, it seems prudent to proceed, as annexation of the property is required prior to any development of the property.

The superintendent recommends requesting annexation of the Kinney Loop property into the City of Eugene in order to move the property forward in the planning process so that it is closer to a point that the property can be developed.

MOTION: Mr. Torrey, seconded by Ms. Gerot, moved to request annexation of the Kinney Loop property into the City of Eugene in order to move the property forward in the planning process so that it is closer to a point that the property can be developed.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously, 6:0.

CONSENT GROUP – ITEMS FOR ACTION

Approve Grant Application: Eugene New Teacher Mentoring Project

Staff in the Instruction Department and the Eugene Education Association submitted a \$40,000 grant application to the Oregon Department of Education/Title II. The district, with partners Oregon Education Association, Eugene Education Association, the University of Oregon College of Education, Pacific University College of Education, and Northwest Christian College Teacher Education Program are proposing to expand and enhance the 4J teacher mentoring program by: 1) Incorporating Charlotte Danielson's Framework for Teaching into mentor, mentee, and administrator training; and 2) Providing specific in-depth workshops on topics requested by mentees including special needs students, licensure, diversity, professional issues, and district technology programs.

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

Approve Alternative Education Programs for 2008-2009

In accordance with ORS 336.631(3) and Board Policy IGBHA, the district must annually evaluate and approve each alternative education program it contracts with to provide services to students. During 2007-2008, Eugene School District 4J contracted with board-approved contractors to provide educational services to district students.

The programs were evaluated on several criteria. The primary factors examined were the type of service provided, the age and number of students enrolled and maintained in the program, the ability of each program to address the educational and other pre-identified needs of the students enrolled. A site visit component is also included as a part of the annual evaluation process.

Participation in the Oregon State Assessment is required of all alternative education providers under ORS 336.637, so continuation of contracts with programs is dependent upon compliance with the required assessment of students placed with outside alternative education contractors.

Contracted Service Providers

- | | |
|---|--------------|
| • Center for Appropriate Transport (ages 11-19) | Grades 6-12 |
| • Creative Minds School (ages 11-18) | Grades 6-12 |
| • Northwest Youth Corps OutDoor School (ages 14-21) | Grades 9-12 |
| • Looking Glass: Riverfront School & Career Center (ages 14-21) | Grades 9-12 |
| Lane Metro Youth Corps (ages 14-19) | Grades 9-12 |
| Teen Parent Program (ages 14-21) | Grades 9-12 |
| New Roads School (ages 14-21) | Grades 9-12 |
| • Lane ESD: MLK, Jr. Education Center (Court School) (ages 11-19) | Grades 6-12 |
| • Lane Community College (GED Prep only) (ages 16-18) | Grades 10-12 |
| • Wellsprings Friends School (ages 14-19) | Grades 9-12 |

Eugene School District 4J

Alternative Education Contracted Service Providers 2007-2008

Center for Appropriate Transport, 455 W. 1st, Eugene

Programs provided that offer hands-on opportunities for students ages 12-19. Classes include instruction in bike maintenance and repair, journalism, design, CAD/CAM and industrial sewing. CAT provides GED preparation for students 16 and above.

Target Group: Middle and High School students, who are referred by the school district, of all academic abilities, particularly those who are not experiencing success in a traditional school setting.

Creative Minds Alternative School, 1115 Pearl Street, Eugene

Program is designed for middle school/high school students who are not succeeding in the regular school setting. One-to-one and small group tutoring concept is used for teaching academic skills. Social skills and community service are also stressed in the program.

Target Group: Students in grade 6-12, who are referred by the school district, who are not functioning well in the middle school/ high school setting.

Lane Community College - Main Campus 4000 East 30th Avenue, Eugene

GED Prep/Testing. Also a “testing only” option is available for students who feel they are prepared.

Target Group: 16-18 year-old students, who are referred by the school district, who would benefit from an off-campus program for GED prep.

Lane Metro Youth Corps (Riverfront School & Career Center) – 1475 Franklin Blvd., Eugene

Program provides a hands-on approach to learning. Small group setting. Students will combine classroom academics with experience in a variety of service projects in the community. Program's focus is natural resources.

Target Group: 14-19 year olds, who are referred by the school district, particularly those who are not currently attending school and would benefit from a hands-on program.

Looking Glass Teen Parent Program, 2885 Chad Drive, Eugene

Program provides specialized academic and parenting/life skill education. Referrals come from the school district and the State social worker. Primarily for GED preparation.

Target Group: 14-20 year old pregnant or parenting students.

MLK Jr. Education Center – 2727 MLK, Jr. Blvd, Eugene

Provides education services for middle and high school students referred by the courts. School credit or GED options are available.

Target Group: Middle and high school students with DYS involvement, who are referred by the probation officer or judge.

New Roads School – 941 W. 7th, Eugene

Through a partnership with the district, educational and support services are provided for students who are homeless or in transition.

Target Group: 14-21 year old homeless youth who are not currently enrolled in school.

Northwest Youth Corps Outdoor School - 2621 Augusta Street, Eugene (former Laurel Hill Elementary)

Program combines classroom work with field experience. Students spend approximately half of their time in the classroom on course work and half of their time in service projects such as trail and/or wetland restoration. Field projects are designed to provide service learning and an extension of their classroom experiences.

Target Group: 14-21 year olds, who are referred by the school district, particularly those who are not currently attending school.

Riverfront School & Career Center – 1475 Franklin Blvd., Eugene

Program provides educational assessment, basic skills instruction, GED preparation and completion, completion of a high school diploma, vocational assessment, career exploration, pre-employment training (paid & non-paid), work experience, hands-on training in manufacturing, culinary arts, health occupations, natural resources, teen parent program and special education program services. Full day and half-day options are available.

Target Group: 14-21 year olds, who are referred by the school district, particularly those who are not currently attending school and would have a difficult time completing their diploma on schedule.

Wellsprings-Friends School - 3590 W 18th Ave, Eugene

Program provides students the opportunity to participate in small group setting. Individualized programs developed cooperatively with teachers, parents and students.

Target Group: 14-19 year olds (grades 9-12), all academic abilities, who are referred by the school district, particularly those who are not experiencing success in a traditional school setting.

The superintendent recommended approval of the Alternative Education Programs for 2008-2009.

Approve Board Meeting Minutes

The superintendent recommended approval of the minutes from the following regular board meetings: November 7, 2007, November 28, 2007, December 12, 2007, December 19, 2007, and January 9, 2008.

Approve Personnel Items

The superintendent recommended approval of the personnel items included in the board packet. These cover employment, resignations, and other routine personnel matters. The board may adjourn to executive session for matters dealing with employment if it desires to do so. ORS 192.660 (2) (a).

MOTION: Ms. Gerot, seconded by Mr. Torrey, moved to approve the consent items.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously, 6:0.

ITEMS FOR ACTION AT A FUTURE MEETING

Approve Memorandums of Agreement with the Eugene Education Association

District and Eugene Education Association (EEA) representatives have negotiated four Memorandums of Agreement. The superintendent will recommend board approval of the four agreements.

- Contract section 10.1.7.b provides kindergarten teachers an option for release time for parent conferences and is silent on similar release time for part-time one session kindergarten teachers. This memorandum amends this section to include a similar option to receive eight hours of pay for part-time kindergarten teachers who select the two full days of release.
- The frequency and number of retired district teachers who are rehired in EEA bargaining unit teaching positions, is a continuing concern of the EEA. In this agreement, the district agrees to consult with EEA when a retired district teacher is rehired beginning with the second consecutive year of rehire and every consecutive year of rehire thereafter.
- Contract section 8.1.11.f. describes terms for the sick leave bank. This memorandum deletes text which created an exception to the maximum seventy (70) consecutive days of

eligibility for a teacher. The deleted text is “unless the member has been denied long-term disability or PERS disability benefits.”

- District and EEA representatives at times have disagreed on what is an appropriate FTE for a particular part-time teacher workload. This agreement describes criteria for making the part-time FTE determination. The criteria are “assigned weekly student instructional minutes divided by assigned weekly student instructional minutes of a similar 1.0 FTE assignment at the same site.”

The superintendent will recommend approval of the four memorandums. Copies of the memorandums were included in the board packet.

Ted Heid, Director of Labor Relations, briefly reviewed the item and was available to answer questions.

Ratify Contract with Eugene Association of Substitute Teachers for 2007-09

District and Eugene Association of Substitute Teachers (EAST) representatives reached tentative agreement on a two year successor contract to the contract that ended June 30, 2007. EAST members have ratified the contract. The contract term is July 1, 2007 through June 30, 2009. The key economic changes are as follows.

- The daily pay rate increases from \$146.96 to \$151 for 2007-08 and then to \$156 for 2008-09. Except substitute teachers who choose to continue to receive the district monthly \$360 insurance contribution will be paid at the state minimum rate beginning 2008-09.
- As an incentive to accept district substitute assignments, new differential pay rates of five and ten percent are available based on the number of substitute days worked in the prior year. Substitute teachers who work 50 or more full or half days in the prior year are eligible for an additional 5% of the daily rate and those who work 80 full days, or a combination of full and half that equals 80 full days in the prior year, are eligible for another 5% or a total of an additional 10% of the daily rate.
- Retired 4J teachers hired as substitutes and difficult to find special education substitutes are eligible for the 10% differential without meeting the minimum days worked standard.
- The current district monthly insurance contribution of \$360 does not change for the term of this contract. The current twelve eligible substitutes will continue to be eligible next year if they substitute a total of 80 days this year and other substitutes will be eligible for 2008-09, if they substitute 100 or more days this year.
- The total increase in the base contract cost from 2006-07 to 2008-09 is 8.99%.
- Other language changes were made to describe current practice, collaboration on the move to OEBB insurance, and end of the joint benefits committee by June 30, 2009.

The superintendent will recommend ratification of the two-year renewal contract with EAST.

Mr. Heid briefly reviewed the item and was available to answer questions.

Approve Wage Increase for Certain Transportation and Custodial Employees to Remain Competitive with the Relevant Labor Market

The district financial policy for employee compensation states that “compensation of employees will be competitive with that of comparable public and private sector employers in the relevant recruiting or market areas.” District and Oregon School Employees Association (OSEA) representatives have mutually addressed the issue of competitive compensation with comparable public and private sector employers since the fall of 2003. Consequently, there have been numerous classified employee classification changes to a higher paying pay grade. Some of these changes came as a result of a market survey process jointly developed and implemented by district and OSEA representatives. The district initiated other pay grade increases as a solution for the inability to hire any qualified applicant for a vacancy. OSEA has agreed to all these pay grade increases. As of July 2006, the continuing joint market survey process resulted in a list of several classifications that were slightly below to significantly below the relevant labor market average wage. Two of the classifications below the relevant labor market were custodian and custodial coordinators; there are 96 FTE in these classifications which presented the issue of a significant cost increase. A decision on implementation was deferred to obtain further market data and to consider impact on upcoming OSEA contract negotiations.

The new four year contract agreement with OSEA was reached in October 2007, and shortly thereafter, we returned to the issue of competitive market compensation for classified positions. The most recent market data for the custodian classification indicates the entry level custodian position wage at pay grade 5 is significantly below the relevant market average, while the custodian coordinator classifications are just slightly below the market average. The district has experienced increasing difficulty in hiring and retaining qualified entry level custodians over the last several years.

The Transportation Department has similarly experienced increasing difficulty in hiring and retaining qualified bus drivers during the last several years. Consequently, the district conducted a market survey of bus driver positions. District bus driver wages are competitive with other school bus drivers in Lane County, but are not competitive with other public and private sector driver or similar positions. Many positions in the Transportation Department require the incumbent to have bus driver experience as well as the ability and a license to drive a bus when necessary. Therefore, all bus driver and related bus driver positions are recommended for a one pay grade increase.

The superintendent will recommend a one pay grade increase to pay grade six for the custodian classification and a one pay grade increase for the school bus driver and related Transportation Department classifications effective July 1, 2007.

Mr. Heid briefly reviewed the item and was available to answer questions.

Approve the 2008-09 School Calendars

The 2008-09 school year calendars are similar to the current school year calendars, except most dates are two days earlier in the calendar year. The student school year starts the day after Labor Day on Wednesday, September 3, 2008 and ends on Wednesday, June 17, 2009. The teacher work year begins Monday, August 25, 2008 and ends Thursday, June 18, 2009. Winter break begins Monday, December 22, 2008 and students resume classes on Tuesday, January 6, 2009. Spring break continues to follow the University of Oregon schedule during the fourth week of March, Monday, March 23, 2009 through Friday, March 27, 2009. Students

resume classes on Tuesday, March 31, 2009. Attached are the 2008-09 calendars for elementary, middle and high school.

The most significant calendar change is combining most early release days to make full days without students when teachers have a half day for progress reports, teacher planning, staff development or a combination of these activities. These full days during the student year are: Friday, October 3; Friday, November 7 (full student day for elementary); Friday, December 12 (an early release day for elementary only); Monday, January 5; Monday, February 2; Friday, March 6; Monday, March 30; Friday, April 10; and Friday, May 8 (full student day for elementary). The proposed calendar is supported by the Eugene Education Association.

The school calendar for the Arts and Technology Academy is expected to be ready in April. The Academy is reviewing its modified calendar which includes an extra week at winter and spring breaks and a two week later ending date.

The superintendent will recommend approval of the school calendars for the 2008-09 school year. Copies of the school calendars were included the board packet.

Mr. Heid briefly reviewed the item and was available to answer questions. Responding to a question from Mr. Forrest, he indicated that people preferred two weeks on either end, and in order to do that the dates had to be changed yearly.

Approve Revisions to Special Education School Board Policies

The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act of 2004 (IDEA 2004) is the federal special education law. This law outlines specific requirements for school board policies. The district's school board policies are required to be updated by April 15, 2008. By this date, the district must submit to the Oregon Department of Education (ODE) an assurance statement that updated policies and accompanying administrative rules have been adopted. Districts were given the options of writing their own policies (requires ODE approval) or adopting the Oregon State Boards Association (OSBA) policies or the ODE special education policies and procedures. After researching options, Education Support Services (ESS) is recommending adoption of the OSBA policies. Policies covered by this requirement are listed below.

Required Policies

Students with Disabilities (IGBA) - *Replaces current Board Policy IGBA*

Special Education - Personnel (IGBAC) - *New policy*

Special Education - Participation in Regular Education Programs (IGBAE) - *New policy*

Special Education – Individualized Education Programs (IGBAF) - *New policy*

Special Education – Procedural Safeguards (IGBAG) - *New policy*

Special Education – Evaluation Procedures (IGBAH) - *New policy*

Special Education – Private Schools (IGBAI) - *New policy*

Special Education – Free Appropriate Public Education (IGBAJ) - *New policy*

Special Education – Public Availability of State Application (IGBAK) - *New policy*

Special Education – Services for Home-Schooled Students with Disabilities (IGBAL) - *New policy*

Special Education – Discipline of Disabled Students (JGDA-JGEA) - *New policy*

Student Records (OSBA = JO) – **See comments below** – *Replaces current Board Policy JO*

Student Records (OSBA = JO)

The decision has been made to incorporate special education records requirements into current student records policy JO. OSBA is working with ODE to rewrite policy JO and potentially add policies JOA and JOB. At this time, the OSBA policy is not completed and is not available for review. As the district is required to adopt a policy that incorporates the special education records component by April 15, 2008, ESS is proposing that the district temporarily adopt Section 8: Student Education Records, Access, and Confidentiality of the ODE Policy and Procedures for Special Education. Once OSBA makes the Student Records policy available, it is the intent of ESS to request that the board replace Section 8 with the OSBA policy. The content of Section 8 and OSBA policy will essentially be the same, however formats may differ.

The superintendent will recommend approval of the revised special education board policies. Copies of the revised policies were included in the board packet.

Larry Sullivan, Director of Educational Support Services, reviewed the proposed changes and invited questions. There were none.

COMMENTS AND COMMITTEE REPORTS BY INDIVIDUAL MEMBERS

Dr. Webber-Davis reported she attended the 4J Charter Council meeting and found it very informative. The council discussed the site reviews that would occur during the spring. She also visited Adams Elementary School to learn about its program and speak to some people, and she had enjoyed her visit there. Dr. Webber-Davis thanked the local NAACP for a vibrant and engaging Freedom Fund Dinner held earlier in March.

Mr. Forrest expressed appreciation to the energy demonstrated by the board, staff, and the community during the recent *Shaping 4J's Future* process.

Ms. Hays thanked the community, board, and staff for the extensive process they had gone through.

Mr. Torrey expressed appreciation for the external audit. He thought the public found it useful. Mr. Torrey reported he went to Meadowlark Elementary School to read to some first graders and they had discussed the origin of Pinocchio. A teacher picked up a picture of the Leaning Tower of Pisa and discussion proceeded from there.

Mr. Torrey complimented Dr. Martinez and Ms. Gerot for their leadership.

Ms. Gerot said she recently toured the Sonoma Valley with her daughter and was able to put some of the local issues in perspective. It had occurred to her during her visit that democracy was messy, adaptive change was messy, and the board would not get everything right this time. She believed the board might question its own decisions and wonder why it had not made others, but she thought it was a good process and staff would continue to evaluate those decisions and the board would make others to adapt to future conditions.

Ms. Gerot said she visited Sheldon High School the day before with Senator Ron Wyden and noted the board's invitation to the School Health Center fund-raiser.

Dr. Martinez expressed appreciation to the board members for their engagement and support. He said the process had been very challenging and it made him question why he had agreed to serve as chair. However, while it had been challenging and anxiety-provoking for all, he had

learned to trust the board's process. He was informed by all the members and thought it an honor to serve with them. He expressed appreciation to Superintendent Russell and other district staff for all the work they had done and for their response to the board's direction, which was not always clear. He commended Superintendent Russell for his leadership and said the board would look to him as the district moved forward. He specifically recognized Mr. Henry and Barb Bellamy, Chief of Staff and Communications Director, for their assistance.

ADJOURN

Mr. Martinez adjourned the meeting at 9:24 p.m.

George Russell
District Clerk

Charles Martinez, Jr.
Board Chair

(Recorded by Kimberly Young)

Attachments to Official Minutes:

1. Superintendent's Revised Recommendations and Alternative Options for Shaping 4J's Future: Setting a Strategic Direction for 2008-2013 - Timeline
2. Grant Application: Eugene New Teacher Mentoring Project
3. Board Meeting Minutes – November 7, 2007, November 28, 2007, December 12, 2007, December 19, 2007, and January 9, 2008
4. Personnel Action Items
5. Four Memorandums of Agreement with the Eugene Education Association
6. Draft School Calendars for 2008-09
7. Required Special Education Policy Updates 2008