MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING
OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS
SCHOOL DISTRICT 4J, LANE COUNTY, OREGON

September 1, 2010

The Board of Directors of School District No. 4J, Lane County, Eugene, Oregon, held a regular board meeting at 7 p.m. on September 1, 2010, at the Education Center, 200 North Monroe Street, Eugene, Oregon. Notice of the meeting was mailed to the media and posted in the Education Center on August 27, 2010, and published in The Register-Guard on August 30, 2010.

ROLL CALL

BOARD MEMBERS:
Craig Smith, Chair
Alicia Hays, Vice Chair
Jennifer Geller
Beth Gerot
Anne Marie Levis
Jim Torrey
Mary Walston

STAFF:
George Russell, Superintendent of Schools
Barbara Bellamy, Chief of Staff and Communications Director
Celia Feres-Johnson, Director of Human Resources
Carl Hermanns, Assistant Superintendent/Chief Academic Officer
Laurie Moses, Director of Secondary Services
Jon Lauch, Director of Facilities Management
Caroline Passerotti, Financial Analysis Manager
Sara Cramer, Director of Elementary Education
Christine Nesbit, Associate Director of Human Resources
Larry Massey, Facilities Management

OTHERS
Jim Mabbott, Ray & Associates

MEDIA:
KRVM

CALL TO ORDER, ROLL CALL AND FLAG SALUTE

Board Chair Craig Smith called the regular meeting of the School District 4J Board of Directors to order at 7 p.m. He led those present in the flag salute.

AGENDA REVIEW

Superintendent George Russell reviewed the agenda. He noted that an amended agenda had been provided to the board that included the second item under Items for Action in regard to directing the board leadership to select a search consultant for the superintendent's vacancy.
INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS AND SUPERINTENDENT’S REPORT

Superintendent Russell recognized former school board member Virginia Thompson, who was sitting in the audience. He said Ms. Thompson would be working with the board. He also welcomed Jim Mabott to the meeting.

Superintendent Russell noted that he had been working on his Back to School presentation, scheduled for the following morning. He related that they would have special guests joining them: Michael Geisen, 2008 National Teacher of the Year, and Donna Dubois, 2009 Oregon Teacher of the Year.

Superintendent Russell stated that he intended to ask Assistant Superintendent Carl Hermanns to briefly touch on the testing results that were reported in the paper. He said a more extensive report would be provided to the board later. He also noted that Assistant Secretary of the Department of Education Dr. Thelma Melendez had been in town visiting the Bethel School District on the previous day. He related that he and other educators had the opportunity to meet with her after her visit with Bethel School District for a couple of hours. He said Dr. Melendez had shared comments in regard to where she thought the administration hoped to go with the new Elementary/Secondary Education Act authorization when it happened.

COMMENTS BY STUDENT REPRESENTATIVES

The student representatives were not yet seated at the table as school had not begun. Mr. Smith acknowledged that some were in the audience and welcomed them.

ITEMS RAISED BY THE AUDIENCE

Linda Warner provided her testimony in writing. She stated that she was the Volunteer Coordinator and Title 1 Instructional Assistant at the Arts and Technology Academy. She had read in the Register Guard that the district was considering reducing the teaching force and utilizing Instructional Assistants more. She recounted her experience as an Instructional Assistant at North Eugene High School, which she enjoyed. She had been displaced from North Eugene High School and had been moved through several schools in the ensuing several years. She considered the use of Instructional Assistants to augment certified staff to be something the district had done with much success for years and hoped the district would continue using Instructional Assistants. She hoped that she could return to a position like the one she had at North Eugene High School.

COMMENTS BY EMPLOYEE GROUPS

There were no representatives of the employee groups present.

ITEMS FOR INFORMATION

Superintendent Russell asked Mr. Hermanns to discuss the OAKS test results.

Mr. Hermanns reported that scores were released on Monday and results were a "mixed bag." He said School District 4J continued to exceed state averages and there had been significant gains in reading at the high school level. He noted that this was good news in particular
because for students in the 11th grade, OAKS proficiency in reading was a graduation requirement. He stated that some challenges lay ahead in 4th grade reading, but staff had been aware of this before.

Mr. Hermanns related that a preliminary analysis of the results indicated that African-American students had experienced a slight decline in their reading scores. He said though the change was small it was still going in the wrong direction and presented a challenge that they needed to figure out.

Ms. Levis asked when the board would know more. Mr. Hermanns responded that it would probably take a couple of weeks to disaggregate the information.

Ms. Geller asked if they had any general sense about what was creating a challenge in writing skills. She had been troubled by it. Sara Cramer, Director of Elementary Education, responded that she had just met with Mary Ann Ochs, from the Lane Education Service District (ESD) earlier in the day to discuss this specifically. She stressed that it was an ongoing concern for the district and statewide. She said there was not a definitive reason, but she believed that though they had developed a pretty consistent curriculum for language arts, the writing component was not as good as the reading component. She averred that they needed to determine what components were missing and then work them in to the curriculum starting at Kindergarten. She related that many staff had been disappointed by the results because they had been placing an emphasis on writing without seeing a result. She said she and Ms. Ochs had spent the afternoon discussing what training they could provide and also backtracking to determine what they had done in the past and what they did not want to continue into the future. She stated that there would need to be some professional development moving forward as well as a lot of scoring and review of student work to determine where they were starting and what progress they were making.

Ms. Geller hoped they would look to see if there were particular schools that had programs that were working or utilizing more writing. Ms. Cramer responded that one of the benefits of working with Ms. Ochs was that her work across the state gave her a wider insight on the various programs.

Mr. Torrey related that they had discussed this at the board retreat. His concern continued to be in regard to how early a child was identified, and how much emphasis to put on that child's ability to both read and write. He felt that writing acumen was an offshoot of reading. He said when they began to address the challenge of the district's financial resources, they could not push these basic skills under the rug. He hoped that staff would identify the costs associated with making improvements and to keep pushing on the importance to fund this.

Ms. Cramer agreed with Mr. Torrey. She averred that they would not be able to find a one-year solution and said a budget and work plan were being developed for at least three years and likely more to improve writing at the elementary level.

Mr. Torrey stressed the importance of providing support to teachers so they could understand how they could make a better improvement.

Superintendent Russell said the board would be tested; they would have to make difficult choices about where to take resources away from in order to apply them somewhere else in the face of the situation in which there were significantly less resources to allocate. He recalled comments made at the retreat about how kids’ reading and writing were affected by how they
used media, such as the short-hand English that young people used to text one another. He said they needed to find a way to tie that into instruction. They needed to comprehend how communication media were affecting the way kids communicated with one another.

Debrief the August 19 and 20 Board Retreat

The board met for its annual planning retreat on August 19 and 20. Board members were provided the opportunity at this meeting to follow-up or comment about issues that were discussed during the retreat. A copy of the meeting notes for the August 20 afternoon session was included in the packet.

Barbara Bellamy, Chief of Staff and Communications Director, observed that the conversation they were having reiterated some of the themes that had come up at the retreat. She recounted that they had begun with discussion about the meeting processes and working agreements and the board members had filled out a board assessment that sought to identify strengths and weaknesses. She related that they had talked about leadership transitions and priorities for the next year. She said they had the biggest list of issues for the board to take on in the coming year that she had seen in her ten years. She stated that the board had begun its Friday session with a talk given by Robert Barr, and most board members had read his book in preparation for the talk. The resource principals had joined them, along with the instruction directors, to talk about the sustainable budget. She underscored that the challenge before them was to ensure that when students left the school system they had the skills to be successful in spite of the fiscal challenges they would be living with over the next decade.

Ms. Walston appreciated the summary provided to the board members.

Ms. Levis thought the schedule for the retreat and the way it had been broken up was beneficial and had worked well.

Ms. Gerot appreciated the discussion regarding what the staff needed from the board and vice versa. She said as they moved through the difficult times ahead, maintaining the collaborative relationship and making certain they shared the same understandings would be absolutely critical.

Ms. Bellamy asked the board to think about scheduling work sessions. She said she had asked the instructional staff to look back at the 21st century skills and see if they couldn't provide some information presentations with the schools, talking about how they were moving forward.

Superintendent Russell added that it was not too soon to think about the dates for the winter retreats.

Receive an Update on the State Revenue Forecast

Staff from Financial Services was present at the meeting to give an update on the State Revenue Forecast.

Caroline Passerotti, Financial Analysis Manager, reported that the state had updated the economic and revenue forecast on August 26 and it had, as predicted, reflected a weakened economy and tracked slightly behind the June forecast. She stated that total state General Fund revenues were predicted to be $377 million less than predicted in June, mostly attributable to lower personal income tax collections. She said if across the board cuts were applied this
would translate into a $150 million reduction in the statewide K-12 budget and that would mean a $4.3 million reduction to the district’s budget. She related that the Governor and legislative leaders had pledged to hold K-12 funding at the level promised in June by using the $118 million in Education Jobs funds and by pledging an additional $34 million in state reserves. She said if this occurred the district would receive the same level of funding as had been reflected in the budget approved by the board in June with the exception of the beginning fund balance, which would be between $500,000 and $750,000 lower. She stated that the December forecast would be presented on November 19.

Mr. Torrey related that people had asked him how the board would address adding back teacher furlough days. Celia Feres-Johnson, Director of Human Resources, replied that the district did plan to comply with the agreements made with the employee groups. She said staff was aware of the financial constraints that the district faced and meetings were planned to discuss the district's financial health.

In response to a follow-up question from Mr. Torrey, Superintendent Russell stated that the Human Resource Department was looking at what it would take to do mid-year layoffs to mitigate the financial impacts. Ms. Feres-Johnson clarified that this would happen in the event that they could not reach some kind of agreement with staff. She reiterated that the district was planning on honoring its agreements and that they were having conversations about what the next step should be.

Mr. Torrey said they had a contractual agreement and unless staff was willing to change their position, then that agreement should be adhered to. He observed that a lot of members of the public did not seem to understand that the district had been held harmless, but this did not take care of the effect of the money the district was expecting to receive from the federal education bill being rolled into the net. He understood that the district would have approximately $2 million in additional costs that they would have to find a solution for in addition to the change in the ending fund balance.

Ms. Feres-Johnson thought staff would be able to provide more information in future meetings. She assured the board that employee groups had been very collaborative, open, and supportive. She believed they understood the critical nature of the situation they were facing. She hoped the discussions would maintain the focus on the financial health of the district.

**ITEMS FOR ACTION AT THIS MEETING**

**Approve New Board Policy JHFF-Reporting Requirements Regarding Sexual Conduct with Students**

**Background:** The Oregon Legislature enacted laws amending Oregon Revised Statutes (ORS) 339.370, 339.372, 339.375, and 339.377 requiring education providers to report sexual misconduct by school employees and volunteers. Schools must conduct background checks with three previous education providers where a prospective new hire has worked. School districts are obligated to report any substantiated investigations of abuse and sexual conduct. This law also requires school districts to heighten awareness and train employees on how to report, prevent, and identify behavior consistent with child abuse and sexual misconduct. This law went into effect on July 1, 2010.

**Discussion:** Enactment of this board policy is required to comply with ORS 339.370, 339.372, 339.375, and 339.377, and necessary to continue to provide a safe learning environment for all
students. A copy of the proposed Board Policy JHFF-Reporting Requirements Regarding Sexual Conduct with Students was included in the board packet.

**Recommendation:** The superintendent recommended approval of Board Policy JHFF-Reporting Requirements Regarding Sexual Conduct with Students.

Christine Nesbit reviewed the information that had been provided the board regarding the changes that needed to be made in order to comply with the law.

**MOTION:** Ms. Gerot, seconded by Ms. Walston, moved to approve the new board policy JHFF-Reporting Requirements Regarding Sexual Conduct with Students.

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

**Direct Board Leadership to Select a Search Consultant for the Superintendent Vacancy**

Mr. Smith explained that at the last meeting an action had been taken to pursue a contract with the Oregon School Board Association (OSBA) as a consultant in the job search to fill Superintendent Russell's position after his retirement. He related that several board members had expressed discomfort at only interviewing one candidate and an interest in broadening the scope and interviewing more. He said the result had been that he, Ms. Hays, Ms. Levis, and former board member Virginia Thompson had conducted telephone interviews with other search consultant firms. He asked that the board rescind its previous motion to enter into the contract with the OSBA and to offer a motion to direct them to enter into a contract with Ray & Associates.

**MOTION:** Mr. Torrey, seconded by Ms. Walston, moved to reconsider the motion made at the previous meeting.

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

**MOTION:** Mr. Torrey, seconded by Ms. Walston, moved to authorize leadership to enter into an agreement on behalf of the district with Ray & Associates.

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

Ms. Levis remarked that she considered the search committee to be an "amazing group of people." She said they intended to model the search after a higher education search committee. She stated that the charge of the committee was to do outreach, gather information, and create the criteria that would set up the job description, all of which would be brought back to the board for feedback. She said the committee would then initiate the search. She stressed that the board's job would be to review what the search committee was doing, look at the finalists, and make the final decision. She related that it was the job of the consultant to lead them through that experience and to get them a great pool of candidates. She explained that from the interview they had conducted, Ray & Associates had "far and above" provided the right match for the community and the search committee. She introduced Jim Mabbott and asked him to speak to their proposal.

Mr. Mabbott expressed enthusiasm for being a part of this search. He discussed some of the process they would engage in, a process that was individualized for every district they worked for. He stressed their intention to involve as much of the community that the district wanted.
involved in the process and to find the best superintendent candidates for the district. He provided a document that walked them through the procedure. He welcomed the aid of the search committee. He also welcomed having students involved in the process. He noted that there had been some concern about how he would balance his job with the Northwest Region ESD with the consultant work. He assured them that his board and the local superintendents in the districts that they served understood the need to continue to bring high quality superintendents into the state and to continue to promote those in the state who ought to be superintendents. He averred that the way to do that was to have outstanding search processes and his board supported the work that he did.

Mr. Torrey hoped that Ray & Associates would be good at identifying the people who might be a little hesitant to come forward because of knowledge that might show up in a newspaper. He wanted to make sure that no one would be ruled out before they had a chance to be ruled in. Mr. Ray responded that the search committee would want to talk about how long they should maintain confidentiality in the candidate pool. He agreed that some people would not apply if they did not know that at least a part of the process would be confidential. He added that there were not too many people that would "need to be approached in Oregon" that he was not already aware of and he assured the board that those people who should be recruited would be recruited. He added that the board had already helped with the search by having clear goals and objectives and the board/superintendent agreements.

Ms. Walston asked about the timeline. Mr. Smith replied that one thing they had determined was that they should not cut off applicants until after the holidays.

Ms. Gerot asked when the search committee planned to begin meeting. Ms. Levis responded that they would start meeting in two weeks.

Ms. Hays appreciated their commitment to working with youth. She said she looked forward to hearing about how they planned to work with them. She did not want them to just "fill a chair." Ms. Levis assured her that this was a top priority for them.

Mr. Smith looked forward to working with Ray & Associates. He foresaw the two touch points the board would weigh in on as being approval of the criteria and selection of the candidates.

**ITEMS FOR ACTION AT A FUTURE MEETING**

**Appoint Budget Committee Members**

On June 30, 2010, the terms of District 4J Budget Committee members Shirley Clark and Debra Smith expired. At the September 15 meeting, the board is scheduled to fill two three-year terms that run through June 30, 2013.

These openings were published in the Register-Guard and on the 4J web site. Former applicants to the board and budget committee as well as members of 4J citizen committees were also notified. Applications are available online as well as from the district office. The application deadline is September 8, 2010, at 5 p.m. A list of candidates for the two positions and copies of each of their applications will be provided in the September 15 board packet.

Candidates will be invited to attend the September 15 meeting to make brief presentations explaining their interest in and qualifications for serving on the budget committee. The board will select the budget committee members by open ballot at the meeting.
The superintendent will recommend appointment of two electors to fill the vacancies on the budget committee for the term July 1, 2010 - June 30, 2013.

Ms. Passerotti reviewed the report provided in board packets.

Mr. Smith asked if there were any applicants to date. Ms. Bellamy replied that to her knowledge there was one. It had been her experience in the past that they would have more applicants as the deadline drew near.

**Adopt the Revised Guiding Beliefs and Values Statement**

The board annually reviews and affirms or revises a statement of Guiding Beliefs and Values to articulate the core values that guide the work of the Board of Directors and all 4J staff in achieving the district's mission. No changes were proposed. Any revisions suggested during the board meeting will be incorporated into the final draft that will be presented for approval on September 15.

The superintendent will recommend adoption of the Guiding Beliefs and Values Statement at the September 15 board meeting.

Ms. Bellamy asked if the board had any notes to staff or items to discuss. None were brought forward. She said board members were welcome to send comments to her.

**Adopt the Revised Board's and Superintendent's Working Agreements**

The board annually reviews and affirms or revises a set of group agreements that outline how the board, superintendent, and executive leadership team will work together. No revisions to the working agreements are proposed. Any revisions suggested during the board meeting will be incorporated into the final draft that will be presented for approval on September 15. A copy of the proposed Working Agreements was included in the packet.

The superintendent will recommend adoption of the Board's and Superintendent's Working Agreements as revised.

Ms. Bellamy explained that board members were also welcome to submit comments to her in regard to this item.

**Approve the Request for Proposals for the Disposition (Acquisition) of the Civic Stadium Property**

**Background:** On June 16, 2010, the board adopted the Proposed Findings of Fact regarding the sale of the Civic Stadium property and approved the Superintendents’ recommendation for disposition of the property using a Request for Proposals (RFP) process. The board conducted a work session regarding the key elements of the RFP on August 18, 2010. Topics discussed included the evaluation criteria that would be used by a screening committee for ranking the proposals, the process to be used in selecting the most favorable proposal, and other issues.

Staff planned to provide an overview of the draft RFP at this meeting, with specific focus on the items discussed during the work session. Board approval of the final version of the RFP was currently scheduled for September 15, 2010, and would be somewhat dependent upon the
Discussion:

1. Rationale: The Civic Stadium property has been categorized as surplus property by the board since 2002. The Land Use Decision Making Process prescribed by board policy was followed and culminated in a decision to dispose of the property in order to avoid ongoing maintenance and operating costs, significant and looming capital costs, and other risks of ownership. The RFP process was selected in order to provide for the broadest range of proposed uses, including potential preservation of the stadium grandstands, and allows the board to consider other relevant factors beside the financial bottom line when deciding whether to accept a proposal.

2. Options and Alternatives: The property could be offered for sale using the typical method of establishing an asking price and soliciting offers. This process would not allow the flexibility offered by the RFP process to consider other factors such as potential preservation of the grandstands, community benefit, and other non-monetary benefit to the school district.

3. Budget/Resource Implications: Disposing of the stadium property would allow the district to avoid holding costs and could provide needed resources that could be used to improve and preserve school facilities.

4. Board and Superintendent Goals: The proposed property disposition supports the Board Goal to "Provide prudent stewardship of district resources to best support student success, educational equity and choice." The use of proceeds from surplus property to "upgrade and improve district facilities" is consistent with Board Policy DFD - Real Property Management.

Recommendation(s)
The superintendent will be recommending approval of the Request for Proposals for Acquisition of the Civic Stadium Properties, subject to final revisions.

Jon Lauch, Director of Facilities Management, indicated that a draft of the RFP was included in board packets. He said some sections had evolved and merited discussion.

Mr. Torrey wanted to ensure that if the successful RFP did not follow through that they would have a way to identify the financial impact. Mr. Lauch responded that there were several ways to address it. The RFP had been structured to ask the proposers to tell the district how they intended to address that issue, such as through a deed restriction, which would direct that the property was only for a certain use and could revert to district ownership if the use changed or a number of other ways that could be addressed financially in a final sale agreement.

Mr. Torrey surmised that the district would have the right to negotiate additional language after deciding on an applicant.

Ms. Geller expressed concern about section 3.10, in regard to confidentiality. She was unclear of what legal basis there would be for confidentiality in this process and had some concern about transparency in the process. Mr. Lauch replied that there were two areas of concern that served as the basis for confidentiality, one had to do with trade secrets and the other one
sought to protect the names of a person who wanted to make a proposal for the property but did not want their names to be made public unless they were a finalist. He said such applicants would have to demonstrate that the public process would be somehow harmed if the confidentiality was not upheld.

Ms. Geller asked if it was within the district's discretion to disclose should there be a public records request. Mr. Lauch affirmed that it was but clarified that the way it was structured, the district would have to have a conversation with the proposer about the need to release the information and the proposer would have the choice to either agree or withdraw their proposal.

Ms. Geller asked if the legal analysis was by analogy or whether it was by statute or a clear legal case. She expressed discomfort with it. Mr. Lauch responded that he thought it was by analogy.

Mr. Smith commented that ultimately, for the district, it was a business decision. He noted that their consultant, John Brown, had said they would have a broader "net" if they could implement the confidentiality characteristic. He thought they could, as a business decision, declare that everything would be public record. Mr. Lauch affirmed that they could opt to strike the section.

Ms. Geller pointed to the one sentence she had discomfort with, on page 12, which read: "If the proposer disagrees with the district's decision, the proposer will be afforded the opportunity to withdraw their proposal from further consideration." She wondered if they could really make something "non-public" just by giving it back. She pointed out that when facilities staff was working with construction contracts, they were governed by a particular statute and there was no statute they could relate this particular RFP to. She was amenable to the rest of the language. She understood that someone could maintain confidentiality due to not wanting to share trade secrets; there was statutory language in this regard.

Mr. Lauch referred to the language and noted that it did say that for each RFP the contracting agency shall prepare a list of proposals and the two key elements of that were what the proposer intended to do with the property and how much revenue would come to the district. He said in talking about cancelling the solicitation, it indicated that the contracting agency could return a proposal to the proposer that made it and that the contracting agency would keep a list of the returned proposals. To him this suggested that the list was public record but the proposals themselves were not.

Ms. Geller reiterated her discomfort with that sentence.

Mr. Lauch said in general they could only hold themselves to that standard of confidentiality, but they could not hold the proposers to it. He suspected that they would receive proposals that the proposers would want the public to know about. He did not know that the confidentiality clause would even come into play.

Ms. Walston appreciated the legal analysis.

Ms. Geller asked if there was any concern that by referencing the ORS by number that the district could open itself up to someone accusing that it had not followed the statute. Mr. Lauch replied that he was not aware of anything in the statute that would trip them up. He felt that the statute gave the district the flexibility they were looking for. He suggested that one alternative would be to extract the information out of the statute and to say this would be the process that they would use, but they had not chosen to do so at this point in time. He said it would provide
the flexibility the district needed to potentially negotiate with proposers and withhold some information from disclosure until they were at a point in the process where it seemed more appropriate. He was certain that if they did not do this, the district would receive requests to see the proposals immediately after the deadline.

Mr. Lauch proposed that after the meeting, any editing or changes that they would make would be provided to the board. He noted that there was some language in regard to access issues that legal counsel had recommended they include, as an example.

Mr. Torrey asked what would happen if they took all the references out to the legal description and simply said this was how the process would proceed. Mr. Lauch replied that they could add a section in which they extracted the language from the legal process and include it. He ascertained from Mr. Smith that the board was in support of doing so.

Ms. Geller reiterated that she just wanted to ensure that there was a clear legal basis for a procedure in which proposers could withdraw their proposal rather than have their proposal made public. She did not want to "work in a grey area" in regard to this. She said if they were working in a grey area they should weigh the business value of proceeding in this way versus the possible risk.

Ms. Levis remarked that they could spend thousands of dollars on legal fees for "something that would never happen." To her, there had not been a contract written that could not be brought to court and interpreted a different way. She felt they needed to make the best case to get the most money for the district and this could be money spent to offset something that would not happen.

Mr. Torrey thought they were close to agreement. He thought that Mr. Lauch could come up with alternate language that would meet Ms. Geller's concerns.

Mr. Lauch reiterated his belief that they were safe in the requirement that a proposer should cite the statutory basis for an exemption from public records law and the reasons why public interests would be served by the confidentiality. He added that if the draft was not right by the next meeting, it could wait until the meeting after it. He stressed that staff was willing to make changes until the board was comfortable with it.

Ms. Levis said she would like to have Mr. Brown's opinion on the language. Mr. Lauch stated that both Mr. Brown and legal counsel had reviewed it and they were both very comfortable with it, with the exception of the changes that legal counsel had recommended.

Mr. Lauch reviewed Section 4, regarding the evaluation and selection process. He acknowledged the board's desire for a two-step process and said staff had developed it that way. He explained that the screening committee would first develop a short list using the scoring criteria they had discussed in the previous week. He stated that the screening committee would consist of district staff and Mr. Brown, as currently proposed. He said the short list would be sent to the board, along with all of the proposals for its evaluation and review. He read the goals that the evaluation of the proposals would be based on:

- The primary goal would be to dispose of the property for the highest possible revenue.
- To the extent that it did not affect the primary goal, the district had as a secondary goal to sell the property to a buyer that submitted a proposal that provided other non-monetary benefits to School District 4J, provided community benefit, was compatible
with the surrounding neighborhood and proximity to South Eugene High School, and that potentially preserved the Civic Stadium grandstands as an assembly venue.

Mr. Smith ascertained from staff that their discussion and ranking of proposals would be held in executive session. Mr. Torrey noted that the board would have to come out of the executive session to make the decision on the proposals in a public meeting.

COMMENTS AND COMMITTEE REPORTS BY INDIVIDUAL BOARD MEMBERS

Ms. Levis said she looked forward to the Back to School event scheduled for the following day.

Ms. Gerot reported that the first meeting of the Governor’s Educational Reform Work Group had convened on the preceding day. She said it was an organizational meeting. She related that Tim Nesbit and Margie Laue, from the Governor's office, were staffing the committee and Bev Stein was facilitating. She stated that their desired outcome was to look at the best next steps after the Race to the Top work and to build on the work they had done. They had talked about lessons learned from the Race to the Top process. She had learned much from the information provided. She related that "an amazing number of groups" were meeting and talking about budget issues or the quality of education in Oregon. She said everyone involved shared "their own piece" and they determined they would spend time at the next meeting mapping out what all of those efforts were. She stated that there was a lot of interest in looking at ESD and the regional service delivery that was proposed in the reset committee. She explained that another group to be led by Mr. Nesbit would process that information and come back to the next meeting to provide their synthesis of it, scheduled for the end of September. She noted that the Governor had originally intended it to be a K through 12 discussion, but the group had determined that they preferred to have it be a pre-K through 20 discussion. They hoped to complete their work by the end of October.

Continuing, Ms. Gerot had enjoyed the opportunity to go the Food Services Back to School event. She noted that Ms. Hays and Ms. Walston had also attended. She stated that Stephanie Kimmel from Marché restaurant and Megan Kempel from Farm to School had spoken to the food service workers about some of the work they were doing to improve the quality of food in the schools. She had also attended the 4J Leadership Training and one of the significant things for her was the influence of media on young people's lives. She said in the 1950s the greatest influence on kids was their families. It was now the media and this had an impact on the way schools delivered instruction to the students.

Ms. Hays also had enjoyed the food service event and extended her congratulations to all of the winners. She also wanted to thank Mr. Smith for the work he had done over the previous weekend. She commented that it had been interesting to talk about media and texting. She noted that her son made fun of her for texting slowly because she wanted to spell and capitalize words correctly.

Ms. Walston enjoyed attending the nutrition services kick-off. She reminded everyone of the upcoming luncheon that featured a presentation called Whatever it Takes: Geoffrey Canada's Quest to Change Harlem and America, to be given by Paul Trogue and sponsored by United Way. She said she could provide tickets. She stated that John Kitzhaber planned to come and speak about education at the September 24 City Club meeting. She was also looking forward to the new year and the new students on the board.
Ms. Walston had seen a picture of Donna Dubois posted at a Wells Fargo branch. She commented that it was great to see the local banks embracing education in the community.

Ms. Geller shared that she had come home from the retreat, though the issues they faced were weighty, with the sense of the positive energy that the staff and board shared regarding facing the district's situation and doing what was best for the kids. She had come out of it feeling pretty good about a lot of things and appreciated the attitude and commitment of the staff.

Ms. Geller had marched in the Eugene Celebration parade with Stand for Children. She said over 100 people had marched in support of a rainy day fund for the state to offset the volatility of the revenue.

Mr. Torrey noted that both Superintendent Russell and Ms. Gerot had talked about the presentation at the leadership group. He said the two presenters were extraordinary. He thought students would benefit from hearing from them, especially the younger of the two. He also related that he had read a story in the Wall Street Journal about how the Chinese government had hired Disneyland to teach children from age two to age six how to speak English, using technology.

Mr. Smith stated that as they talked to the legislators to whom they were assigned, they should be connecting the financial information from the Oregon Business Plan. He said the core of it was that the only way the state could recover financially would be grow the income levels for its residents and the way to do that was through education. He underscored the importance of linking those concepts.

**ADJOURN**

Mr. Smith adjourned the meeting at 8:44 p.m.

_____________________________  __________________________
George Russell     Craig Smith
District Clerk      Board Chair

*(Recorded by Ruth Atcherson)*

Attachments to Official Minutes
1. Board Policy JHFF, Reporting Requirements Regarding Sexual Conduct with Students