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

January 5, 2011

The Board of Directors of School District No. 4J, Lane County, Eugene, Oregon, held a work session followed by a regular board meeting at 6 p.m. on January 5, 2011, 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 December 31, 2010, and published in The Register-Guard on January 3, 2011.

ROLL CALL

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

STAFF:
George Russell, Superintendent of Schools
Barbara Bellamy, Chief of Staff and Communications Director
Carl Hermanns, Assistant Superintendent/Chief Operating Officer
Susan Fahey, Chief Financial Officer
Jon Lauch, Director of Facilities Management
Les Moore, Director of Computing and Information Services
Sara Cramer, Director of Elementary Education
Kerry Delf, Communications Coordinator
Caroline Passerotti, Financial Analysis and Budget Manager
Celia Feres-Johnson, Director of Human Resources
Laurie Moses, Director of Secondary Education
Larry Sullivan, Director of Educational Support Services

STUDENT ADVISORY PANEL MEMBERS:
Sun Sun Gan & Lydia Tam, Churchill High School
Tobiah Meinzen, North Eugene High School

OTHERS:
Dayna Mitchell, Eugene Educators Association

MEDIA:
KRVM
WORK SESSION

OVERVIEW and PURPOSE of WORK SESSION

Board Chair Craig Smith called the work session of the School District 4J Board to order. He reminded those present that the board had only a small set of items that it could decide to cut as much of the proposed budget recommendations would be determined by bargaining with employee groups and whether or not the public would support revenue measures. He said they planned to discuss the recommendations in order to provide a sense of direction from the board to the superintendent so that he could finalize his recommendations.

COMPARATIVE VIEW: REVISED vs. PRELIMINARY RECOMMENDATIONS

Superintendent Russell reviewed the Superintendent’s Revised Recommendations. He underscored the emphasis on maintaining a strong instructional program as the district continued to see its enrollment decline. He reiterated that they would have to ask the employees to "share the pain" like it or not. He stated that in 2009/10 the district had reduced its budget by $21 million and for the present year they had cut another $15 million. He observed that the future would be challenging.

Superintendent Russell considered the revised financial assumptions to be a risky proposition as it could change, the final financial forecast was not yet known.

Superintendent Russell said the staffing ratio was the most significant area of change. He had concluded that the original change in ratio was too radical and would have a negative impact on students' ability to learn. He noted his disappointment that so much of the public discourse had been about the proposed school closures and not about the reductions to staff, but he did understand the emotions involved. He stated that they still needed to have a conversation regarding the language immersion schools and their future in the longer term and whether the district should provide foreign language instruction to all schools.

Superintendent Russell explained that he was proposing to convene a Stakeholder Task Force to make recommendations regarding reconfiguration because he was concerned that the board could be pulled into a "never-never land" if it took the topic on itself.

Regarding non-instructional and student support programs, Superintendent Russell expressed reservations about cutting these items back any further than what he had recommended given the level of importance such programs had to so many students.

Superintendent Russell revisited the compensation and benefits recommendations. He said the unfortunate piece was that as the district increased the teacher/student ratio, both students and staff would be impacted. Unfortunately, he did not know what else could be cut to mitigate the reduction in funding. He underscored the need to recognize that they would be asking a lot from district employees and that when they talked about furlough days this also was a decrease in pay.

Regarding revenue enhancement, Superintendent Russell stated that the Eugene City Council would start a preliminary discussion on a potential tax measure to benefit the school district on January. He said staff would be presenting information on a potential capital bond measure in order to consider placing it on the May ballot.
Superintendent Russell stated that once the board had settled on a final scenario, there would still be a legislative session and a district budget process to go through in terms of working out particulars, in addition to a labor negotiation process. He said the final budget scenario to be adopted in February would point the district in a direction.

**REVIEW OF STAFF RESPONSES to BOARD QUESTIONS**

Barbara Bellamy, Chief of Staff and Communications Director, reviewed the staff response to questions, provided to the board in an attachment entitled *Responses to Board Member Questions for January 5, 2011 work session*.

Carl Hermanns, Assistant Superintendent/Chief Operating Officer, added that the constraints on having Kindergarten through 6th grade schools included that it would fill up some schools.

**BOARD FEEDBACK on REVISED RECOMMENDATIONS**

Ms. Gerot commented that she was nervous in changing the budget assumption given that the new Governor was only just being sworn in. She felt better than she had when they thought there would be a $30 million cut in funding, but indicated she would feel more comfortable basing the budget on a $26 million cut.

Ms. Geller asked what the other large school districts were doing in this situation. Superintendent Russell responded that it depended on the district; some were basing their budget on an assumption that the state would have a school budget of $5.5 billion and some were basing it on as much as $5.9 billion.

Ms. Geller acknowledged the uncertainty the district was facing. It had caused her nervousness to base the budget on a $22 million cut in the face of the unknowns but she also did not want to base the budget on a number that was too high.

Mr. Torrey understood why they had two sets of numbers. He said he had called people from both sides of the aisle and while they knew where the Governor was likely "to go," but the legislators indicated that they did not see a way to reach the number. He underscored that the Governor’s budget proposal was in the hands of the Ways and Means Committee; he was worried about the district expecting a smaller cut than they might actually receive, which would cause them to have to go back and "re-trench."

Mr. Smith said there were only two things the board could do to mitigate the budget cuts: they could dip into reserves more or change the staffing ratio.

Mr. Torrey agreed that they should not dip further into reserves for the moment.

Ms. Hays observed that it did not make sense to budget on numbers they were not certain of. They were guessing what would happen in the Legislature.

Ms. Walston agreed, likening the budget to a "roll of the dice." She said the latest forecast at least bought them a little more time. Though she felt a little uncomfortable with it, she preferred to budget with the $22 million figure for the deficit.

Ms. Geller indicated that she could accept the $22 million figure after having some clarity about it.
Ms. Levis said they needed to pick a number and move forward with it at this point. She was not certain whether it would be harder to pick a lower number and then have to make more cuts or pick a higher number and then have to make fewer cuts. She was relieved to change from the $30 million deficit scenario to the $22 million deficit scenario because it provided some breathing room.

Ms. Gerot commented that if they found, in April or May, that the board was very wrong in this assumption, it would be very painful for the schools because they would have already completed their staffing plans.

Mr. Torrey underscored the necessity of presenting a balanced budget. He stated that they could not assume that they would receive outside sources of revenue. He was prepared to move forward with a $22 million scenario at this point.

Mr. Smith asked for board feedback on reduced staffing.

Ms. Geller recalled that at the joint meeting of the Budget Committee and board concern had been expressed about the impacts of an increased student/staff ratio at the high school level. She wondered what staff's feeling was about keeping the staffing cuts even across the board versus the differentiated levels for elementary and secondary schools.

Mr. Smith remembered that in the past they had made staffing ratio changes across the board.

Mr. Hermanns said they were looking at different ways of staffing, to see if it could be done in more nuanced ways. He stressed that they had to achieve savings in the budget by reducing the Full Time Equivalent (FTE) employees; they were not able to go outside of this, but he felt they could work with this in different ways to meet the needs of the kids at the levels they were at.

Mr. Smith observed that there were two expectations: that the kids would be able to meet the graduation requirements and that the district was getting kids ready to go to college. Mr. Hermanns responded that this was imperative for the district. He said what instruction would look like around 21st century skills would be foremost for the district once the "dust settled" on the budget.

Mr. Smith asked if it was fair to say that there was more ability to restructure educational services in high school than there was in elementary education. Mr. Hermanns did not agree with that statement. He explained that for the last 20 to 30 years the difficulty lay in changing the high schools. He said there were options they were looking at in the secondary world that involved utilizing technology. He felt there were opportunities and the district would get students ready to move on successfully.

Mr. Torrey asked if the district would be able to continue with the quality assessment tool currently used in this scenario. Mr. Hermanns replied that they considered progress monitoring to be a top priority and would not dismantle it. He said the cuts would not directly cut the model for Instruction Intervention Progress Monitoring (IIPN); the district was determined to keep that going. He stated that, in terms of Teachers on Special Assignment (TOSA) and staff development specialists, the budget would present a problem.

Sara Cramer, Director of Elementary Education, stated that the assessments would not be affected; there were currently General Fund monies available to provide benchmarking for
students. She said when it came to progress monitoring for individual students, it would depend on how far the student/teacher ratio went. She said the real question would be how much would be left and how it would be prioritized.

Mr. Hermanns observed that the TOSAs took care of a lot of things for administration, such as English Language Learners (ELL), and staff development specialists were an anchor for providing such development. He said this was another thing the district would have to struggle with in order to figure out what the impacts would be in that respect.

Larry Sullivan, Director of Educational Support Services, echoed that the staffing specialists were the "anchor." He said it was not enough to just have the data, it was what they did with the data. He stated that staffing specialists were critically important for helping teachers to learn how to use data, make instructional decisions about data, and to provide those instructional interventions, i.e. the IIPM model.

Mr. Torrey was concerned that if the district was not able to monitor the progress of its students, some would fall through "the cracks." Mr. Hermanns agreed that this was one of the district's top priorities.

Ms. Hays wondered if they would look at the data to see if the drop-out rate would increase with the change in the staffing ratio. She had been struck by the statement made at the previous board meeting that, at present, if all of the high school students wanted to go to school full-time, the schools could not accommodate them. She asked how accurate the statement was. Laurie Moses, Director of Secondary Education, affirmed that this was a true statement. She said they did not have enough staffing for all students to go full-time and this had been the case for many years. She clarified that a student would not need to go full-time for four years to meet graduation requirements. She added that they had to be very sure that students were selecting a course load that pointed them in a direction of a future career or college.

Ms. Gerot appreciated how critical professional development was to the success of the district's students.

Ms. Walston commented that she was not comfortable with the revised staffing ratio, but was glad they were able to reduce the change from previous projections.

Mr. Torrey wanted the district to make sure it was using targeted professional development. He asked how and what staff was thinking in that regard. Mr. Hermanns replied that they were engaged in ongoing conversations about this. He said once the budget was completed they would get into more specifics. He stated that they understood they would have to use what was considered best practices and to think on how they could continue to use them under the budget constraints.

Mr. Smith solicited board input on the proposal for less school and work days.

Ms. Hays appreciated the superintendent's comments in regard to how much the district's employees had already helped to work within budgetary constraints and how much more they could potentially have to sacrifice.

Ms. Levis was supportive of Superintendent Russell's suggestion to make the sacrifices more temporary.
Mr. Smith observed that people made less money when teachers had to take furlough ideas and said it was important to remember that it also impeded kids’ access to learning because the schools were shut down. This caused him concern.

Mr. Smith asked for board comments on school closures and consolidations.

Ms. Cramer recalled her experience with the School Closure/Consolidation Committee that had worked on that topic in 1999 or 2000. She said there had been challenges and rewards in the process of closing schools. She stressed the importance of putting the kids at the center of the process because they knew that adults had a hard time with it but kids were "quite resilient." She related that when they had put energy into the students and what they could do to make their experience better, the kids had bought into it. What had been more challenging had been to help the community perceive the positive in the situation. She noted that at that time the schools were using different curricula which had presented more challenges. Because the curriculum was uniform for reading now she felt it consolidations would be more easily accomplished. She recalled that they had brought the kids that were coming into the school and put on events for them. She said they had worked to find ways to make it a school where everyone belonged. She noted that Mr. Meinzen had been a student at the school at the time.

Mr. Smith agreed that it was important to recognize that they would be trying to build a new school community. He asked what resources were available to aid in the transitions. Superintendent Russell replied that he did not have a specific budget identified. He said in the past they had used some contingency dollars to support the efforts.

Ms. Walston expressed concern about closing Parker Elementary and moving the Charlemagne language immersion school to the Parker facility. She recalled that a suggestion had been made to leave Parker whole and move Charlemagne to Adams Elementary School. Mr. Hermanns responded that staff had looked at that option and it would be possible. He said if the board wanted staff to look further into it, staff would do so.

Jon Lauch, Director of Facilities Management, stated that Adams Elementary School had a split boundary with a significant number of kids who were in the South Eugene High School region and those kids would be sent to Camas Ridge Elementary School. He said if that happened there would be no way to close Parker.

Ms. Walston thought Adams was more centrally located. She was interested in having staff look further into moving Charlemagne to that location.

Mr. Torrey related that he had spent the afternoon driving around to all of the district’s schools. He felt that the district had too much capacity in a small area with the Academy of Technology and Arts (ATA), Cesar Chavez Elementary School, and Adams. He asked to see what it would look like if they moved Charlemagne to Adams, recognizing that next year if they followed the recommendation to have two separate committees, one to look at reconfiguration and the other to look at alternative and language immersion schools, these things would be given great consideration. He believed placing the immersion school in the Adams facility would provide greater accessibility for kids. He felt that moving Charlemagne to Parker made only a minimal difference in location. He did not want to see them preclude some of the options. He added that it was his feeling that the least amount of impact would be to the school with the smallest population and in this case, that would be Adams. He stated that in terms of growth, there would be greater future opportunities for housing growth to the south than there would be in the heart of the three school configuration. At the very least he wanted staff to look at it both ways.
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and to provide a recommendation. He noted that he was still leaning toward having Buena Vista Spanish immersion school move to Willagillespie Elementary School. He also noted that if they needed to increase the capacity of Sheldon High School, Meadowlark Elementary School would be the only school they could increase capacity from.

Ms. Geller understood the emotional aspect of school closures. She also had questions about the cluster of schools Mr. Torrey had noted. She said the district had issues to address at some point with boundaries.

Ms. Levis also supported further exploration of the questions Mr. Torrey and Ms. Walston had raised. She added that she would like to know more about changing Charlemagne to a Kindergarten through 8th grade facility.

Ms. Hays pointed out that if they went with the scenario that Mr. Torrey had cited fewer schools would be closed. She appreciated that there were three schools in a cluster. She said Camas Ridge and Parker would still be close together if they left Parker whole. She felt that staff had already fully considered this issue.

Ms. Levis commented that she was not comfortable with looking at closing fewer schools. She believed the district needed to close them though she did not want to do so, personally. She said if it seemed like a better solution to go with the alternative Mr. Torrey had suggested she would support it.

Mr. Hermanns reiterated that the district was trying to make the best decisions in the circumstances that would keep teaching and learning moving forward. He said when they had taken reconfiguration off the table for the coming year, with the recommendation to have a task force look at it; they were trying to come up with something that did help the district deal with the issue of having more buildings than kids. He stressed that they wanted to do it in a way that did not preclude options that the task force might come up with.

Ms. Walston understood that the board would have to close schools. She said this was a proposal that she wanted to look into further.

Ms. Levis felt the process had been thoughtful. She did like the idea of reconfiguration because it was doing something innovative instead of "just cutting." She reiterated that they had fewer kids and too many buildings and they did need to make the right decisions for the future.

Mr. Torrey said he saw advantages of having the Willagillespie kids at Meadowlark and the Buena Vista kids at Willagillespie. He wanted to take it off the table for the present, until further study of the situation could be undertaken.

Mr. Smith asked for board feedback on the revised recommendation for materials, supplies, and services.

Mr. Torrey asked how difficult it would be to actually implement the cuts. Susan Fahey, Chief Financial Officer, responded that it would be challenging to do given the impending staff reductions.

Mr. Torrey asked if the number in the revised recommendation was realistic. Ms. Fahey replied that it was because they did not include the centralization of purchasing savings.
Ms. Geller hoped that at some point they would engage in "a lot more conversation" on paperless options.

Mr. Smith asked for feedback on school instruction and redesign.

Mr. Torrey commented that while he would not suggest changes to it, it did have a connection to a potential bond measure because monies could be used to redesign instructional opportunities within various schools.

Mr. Smith asked for board input on the recommendation for cuts to the non-instructional and student support programs.

Ms. Levis said this was the one area where they could potentially lose kids, especially at the high school level.

Mr. Torrey related that he had been contacted by many people. He was a strong advocate for these services at the current level and even at an increased level. He said if each of the schools was currently receiving a certain amount of money and would now have that money cut, they needed to figure out how to help those schools to identify an outside source to fill the gap. He stated that most of the people he had heard from had felt confident that they could fill the gap but the question they had was how it would impact the district school’s ability to keep in the OSAA situation.

Ms. Moses said she thought it was already happening; people were already contributing and it had not affected the district's involvement in the OSAA.

Mr. Smith asked for feedback on the recommendation on using reserves and one-time funds.

Mr. Torrey reiterated his concern that no properties be sold under "fire sale" circumstances. He strongly felt that the properties would increase in value if the district held onto them and that properties could be leased in the near-term.

The board moved on to discuss the proposal regarding compensation and benefits. Ms. Levis commented that this was a hard place to be in. She wanted to emphasize how appreciative she was for the people who were willing to "step up to the plate" in this situation.

Regarding revenue enhancement, Mr. Smith said the potential bond measure was probably the main focus of the conversation.

Ms. Geller observed that there were some advantages to going out for a bond in May because of the federal monies that were available. She wanted to ensure that the district did a good job of letting the public know of the district's capital needs and the benefits of a bond in May.

Mr. Smith supported expediting the decision.

Ms. Levis thought there was momentum at present. She said it would be possible to do this in May as there were more people looking for ways that they could help the schools. Ms. Walston agreed that having a discussion about the bond would be better done sooner rather than later.

Mr. Torrey said the key to its success would be what the money would be used for.
Mr. Smith asked if it would be worthwhile to enhance the local option. Ms. Fahey responded that because of compression the amount of money that would be gained would be minimal.

Ms. Geller said in addition to revenue enhancement, there should be ways to leverage community support, either in terms of people or money. She thought it should be important to think about what could be out there, such as grant money to hire a development director. She averred that the community had expressed a lot of support; they needed to have a discussion about how they could best use that support.

In response to a question from Mr. Torrey, Celia Feres-Johnson, Director of Human Resources, said the district had not seen evidence of an uptick in early retirements at this point.

Ms. Hays indicated that it would be good to see a cost/benefit analysis of early retirements. She did not think they provided that great of a benefit.

Mr. Torrey agreed that it would be beneficial to the community, from whom he had heard that the district should do more with early retirement, to know just what it saved and whether it provided savings. Ms. Hays added that sometimes a lot of expertise walked out the door.

**DIRECTION/GUIDANCE on DEVELOPMENT of FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS**

Mr. Smith reviewed the *Framing Questions* listed on the back of the agenda.

Ms. Gerot noted that Mr. Hermanns had said the dollar figure would establish the ultimate staffing ratio changes.

The work session adjourned at 8:18 p.m.

**REGULAR MEETING**

**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. He led everyone present in the Pledge of Allegiance.

**AGENDA REVIEW**

There were no changes to the agenda.

**INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS AND SUPERINTENDENT’S REPORT**

Superintendent George Russell stated that January was School Board Recognition Month. He read a proclamation issued by Governor Ted Kulongoski into the record.

Superintendent Russell noted that a letter contained in the board folder asked that the board consider extending the timeline for the Request for Proposal (RFP) process for Civic Stadium. He ascertained from the board that there was a lack of interest in doing so.
Superintendent Russell related that Eugene City Manager Jon Ruiz had called to let the board know that the City Council would be discussing a possible revenue measure for school districts on January 11.

COMMENTS BY STUDENT REPRESENTATIVES

Tobiah Meinzen, North Eugene High School, said the Mr. North fundraiser had kicked off in December, which raised money for the Children's Miracle Network. He stated that International High School (IHS) senior project presentations were coming up on January 19.

Sun Sun Gan, Churchill High School, reported that the Black Student Union was sponsoring a Martin Luther King Jr. assembly, three weeks from the present meeting, along with school leadership. Lydia Tam stated that Emily Brixie, who had been chosen for a U.S. Youth Senate Award, would be one of two students from Oregon representing the state in Washington, D.C. in May.

ITEMS RAISED BY THE AUDIENCE

Jared Weybright, Parent Teacher Association (PTA) president for Adams Elementary, shared his school's position that the Adams community was full of elementary-aged kids and the school facility was top notch. He did not see a reason why it could not be a vibrant neighborhood school in its present location. In response to concerns expressed in the meeting about three schools being clustered together, he related that Adams’ parents thought this was appropriate. He said if one considered the size of the boundaries, they were nearly equal. He thought that if Adams closed students there would be funneled to several schools. He averred that if the ATA became some kind of hybrid school with two alternative schools and a neighborhood school, bringing Charlemagne into the Adams facility would not further the interest of equity. He declared that Adams was one of the most diverse and successful schools in South Eugene.

Christina Howard, parent of Adams Elementary students, understood the proposal on the table remained the superintendent's revised recommendation which would maintain a consolidated neighborhood school at the Adams facility. She shared the parents' belief that this was the solution that made sense. She said a guiding principle in this situation should be that whenever possible, they should put the schools where the kids were. She stated that the two elementary attendance areas in the Churchill and South Eugene High School regions were the Adams and Cesar Chavez Elementary Schools. She noted that the population in the Chavez attendance area for the current school year was 564 and in the Adams attendance area it was 467 students. She said the population in the Crest Drive Elementary School area for the present year had been 235 and for Edgewood Elementary it had been 379. She averred that it was entirely appropriate to maintain two elementary schools in the Adams/Chavez area even though they were less than a mile apart. Additionally, she pointed out that there was a larger amount of affordable housing stock that young families could buy in the Adams area. Regarding achievement, she considered their record to be sterling; Adams students had scored higher on standardized tests than all but three elementary schools in the district. She underscored that they had achieved this with a population in which 60 percent qualified for free and reduced lunches. She also noted that Adams had received a recent Green Energy grant from the Eugene Water & Electric Board (EWEB). She reiterated their support for the revised recommendations, adding that the staff and families at Adams Elementary were absolutely committed to entering into a consolidation as a true partnership by taking the best of both programs and trying to make something better.
Hillary Johnson thanked the board for taking on this "thankless job." She declared that 4J schools were already not meeting Oregon's requisite number of instructional hours and this was in spite of the fact that Oregon already had the shortest school year in the nation. She said half of 4J's elementary schools were not providing the minimum number of instructional hours for 4th and 5th graders in the present year. She noted that Roosevelt Middle School was also failing to meet that requirement. She said by February 14 the district had to present its plan to the state for how it would increase the school time in the coming year. She wondered how the district could do this when the recommendation was to keep the present furlough days and possibly add to them. She had been inspired to find new sources of revenue for the local schools and this had been in the form of a new tax to help them. She hoped the board would speak out and let the community know the dramatic measures they were facing and the necessity of increased revenue. She underscored the need for a vision of hope.

Pamela Gutierrez recalled that she had shared her story of choosing to move to Eugene from Florida, though she and her family could have moved anywhere. She reiterated that one reason had been Crest Drive Elementary School. It appeared to her that the costs of moving and the renovations required for the consolidations practically negated the first year of savings. She proposed that the decisions be left until a more long-term plan could be considered. She said if the board felt the decision to close schools should move forward, she would encourage them to reevaluate plans for the Churchill High School region. She noted that others had pointed out that the assumptions regarding ratios, expansion, and capacity at Crest Drive were faulty. She pointed out that in the responses to board questions it stated that closing Crest Drive and Twin Oaks Elementary Schools would bring students in toward the core of the city and would place students in the larger elementary schools in the region. She declared that this philosophy went against the preservation of the neighborhood schools system. She said the attractive part of Crest Drive for her family was that kids could walk to school with others who lived close to them. She averred that the situation made community building effortless as the children played together and parents were involved in the school together. She believed that if they closed both Crest Drive and Twin Oaks there would be a "vast portion of the southern Churchill region" left without a school. She felt that when children were bused to another area of town, it distanced people from the schools and the communities they created. She predicted that the change would have a significant impact on property values and retail traffic in the southern part of the community. She felt it appropriate to move alternative schools more toward the center of the community to increase access, but she believed it was the board's duty to ensure that all of the neighborhoods were served. She urged them to place the highest value on community building through neighborhood schools and postpone irreversible decisions until a long-term plan that would preserve community could be established.

Mark Callahan, father of two Bertha Holt Elementary School students, related that over the holidays he had tried to come up with ways of finding the optimistic $22 million needed to maintain the school district budget at current levels. He noted that the most common and least favorable solution was to cut teachers. He believed that teachers were the key to the quality of their children's education and their future. He had reviewed the proposal to cut administrative staff and suggested that perhaps they should focus the consolidation efforts on that area. He proposed that the administrative staff report directly to the board. He believed that nearly $200,000 per year could be redirected back to the budget to help schools maintain quality and possibly stay open a half day more. He thought another benefit would be an increase in accountability and transparency, given that staff would be reporting directly to the board. He felt this would make the administrative staff more accountable to the people instead of to the superintendent. He also objected to hiring an outside search firm to find and help hire a new
superintendent. He thought that time, effort, and money could have been redirected to contributing to the actual stakeholders and customers of the school district “i.e. the students.”

**Becky Gordon** noted that she was a mother of 4J students and a psychiatrist. She had watched them work on the budget. She wanted to know if the school board as a group would consider officially endorsing a tax measure specifically designed to decrease the teacher/student ratio and to restore school days.

**Joy Marshall**, director of Stand for Children, was concerned about placing the construction levy on the ballot when there did not seem to be real clarity on what was needed. She said the district still did not know for certain what schools would be closed and whether grade reconfiguration would be needed. She stated that given the economy at present the operating needs were so much greater than capital needs. She averred that the kids needed school days restored and the line on class size to be held; this would be what the voters would be support. She thought the public was not yet aware of how much high school programs would be cut. She asked the board to do more promotion of a revenue measure. She acknowledged that there would still need to be cuts, but they needed to do what they could; the parents needed the board to step up and start explaining to the public what they needed.

**Sara Case** was concerned that placing the construction bond on the May ballot might make it difficult for voters to comprehend in the face of proposed school closures. She questioned why, unless they expected the 4J population to grow, they would not redraw school boundaries to represent a long-term plan for existing schools and consider which schools were expensive to operate from a maintenance standpoint and close them. She asked the board to voice strong support for a local tax that would be dedicated to reducing class size and restoring days.

**Michelle Lodwig** hoped that board members would continue to ask questions in order to make informed and appropriate choices for the entire community. She suggested some questions to consider:

- Did it make sense to spend large amounts of money in moving costs for closing and relocating schools when the district was on the verge of new leadership?
- Did they have correct information, such as what the correct capacity for Crest Drive Elementary -- some sources estimated that it could hold 300 to 330?
- Why did the district consider Crest Drive Elementary to be more difficult to add on to?

She said it had been stated that if all of the current Crest Drive students attended Adams that the Adams site would be short one classroom. She also had concerns about transportation given that the changes to Crest Drive had made it narrower and more difficult and dangerous for buses to traverse.

**COMMENTS BY EMPLOYEE GROUPS**

There were no comments offered at this time.

**CONSENT GROUP - ITEMS FOR ACTION**

**MOTION:** Ms. Hays, seconded by Ms. Levis, moved to approve the Items in the Consent Group and the minutes for the meeting held on October 27 as amended.

Ms. Gerot offered a correction to the meeting minutes of October 27. She said she had been listed as vice chair in error. Ms. Levis noted that her name had been misspelled.
VOTE: The motion passed unanimously, 7:0.

Approve Board Meeting Minutes

The superintendent recommended approval of the minutes from the October 27, 2010 special board meeting, the November 3, 2010 regular board meeting, the November 10, 2010 regular board meeting and work session, and the November 16, 2010 special public input meeting. Copies of the minutes were included in board packets.

Approve Personnel Items

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

Approve Grant Application: Laura Bush Foundation

Staff from Howard Elementary School submitted a grant application to the Laura Bush foundation in the amount of $6,000. The grant would assist in purchasing reading selections for the Howard Elementary library. With support from the Laura Bush Foundation, the school would like to replenish and replace the damaged and/or lost materials so that the children have access to the quality collection of books they deserve.

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

Approve the Board Goals and Annual Agenda

Per the board’s conversation and agreement at the December 15 board meeting, the revised copy of the Board goals for 2010 changing Key Result 2 under the goal of "provide prudent stewardship of district resources to best support student success, educational equity and choice" was included as an attachment. Key Results number 2 will now read: "By 2014-15, the district will implement a sustainable budget strategy that maintains reserves at or above board targets, minimizes the use of one-time funds for ongoing expenses, optimizes the use of short-term resources to improve student achievement, and increases operational efficiency while reducing long-term capital needs."

A copy of the revised board goals was included in the packet.

ITEMS FOR ACTION AT THIS MEETING

Adopt the 2010-11 Superintendent’s Goal Statement and Establish the Criteria for the 2010-11 Annual Evaluation

The contract between the superintendent and the board states that the board will evaluate the superintendent at least once each year based on the goals and objectives agreed upon by the board and the superintendent, and the terms of their contract. ORS 192.660 (2) (i) requires and School Board Policy CBB states that the standards criteria and policy directives to be used in
evaluating the superintendent shall have been adopted by the board in meetings open to the public no later than January of each year.

Superintendent Russell proposed that the criteria to be used in his annual evaluation consist of the agreed upon goals, the contract between the superintendent and the board, the position description contained in School Board Policy CBA, and a Self-Evaluation Feedback form.

Since the December 1 board meeting, Superintendent Russell revised the draft goals pertaining to achieving a sustainable budget to state that the strategy he presented would present a path for achieving a sustainable budget by 2014-15 rather than 2012-13. This assumes that the board is willing to also adjust the timeline that is stated in the board goal. In addition, he included a superintendent goal that addressed implementation of the board sustainable budget strategy, following board approval of a strategy in January.

A copy of the superintendent's proposed goals were included in the packet.

The superintendent recommended approval of the Superintendent's Goals for 2010-11.

Superintendent Russell said they had reviewed most of it. He was providing them the opportunity to ask any questions.

Mr. Smith asked if the beginning of the 2012/13 school year was the deadline or whether it would be in the school year. Superintendent Russell suggested that they change the language to clarify that it would be within that school year.

**MOTION:** Ms. Gerot, seconded by Ms. Levis, moved to adopt the 2010-11 Superintendent's Goal Statement and establish the criteria for the 2010-11 annual evaluation with the clarification.

Mr. Torrey said some had asked him why they had backed off the sustainable budget. He believed that though they had called the proposed budget a bridging action, it was the beginning of the long-term sustainable budget.

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

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

Ms. Levis stated that the Eugene Education Fund had met its goal for the year. She thanked all of the people who had given to the fund and commended the work of the staff there. She said the Superintendent Search Committee was on target for its timeline and had a rich pool of applicants. She concluded by saying "go Ducks."

Ms. Walston attended the Graduation Requirements Committee but had to leave before its conclusion. She said she would not be able to attend a critical meeting of the committee on January 11 as she would be in Washington, D.C. She stated her intention to participate in the board meeting by telephone.

Ms. Geller had just sent an email regarding the Graduation Requirements meeting. She averred that they were at a critical juncture; it was going to take a greater staff investment by staff which was difficult to consider in the face of the current budget.
Mr. Torrey indicated his willingness to attend the meeting. He thanked the board for "putting up" with his board participation via Skype when he had been out of the country.

**ADJOURN**

Mr. Smith adjourned the meeting of the School District 4J School Board at 9:11 p.m.

_____________________    ___________________
George Russell     Craig Smith
District Clerk      Board Chair

*(Recorded by Ruth Atcherson)*

**Attachments to Official Minutes:**
1. Letter from Ron Crasilneck – Request for RFP Amendment
2. Personnel Items
3. Grant Description: Laura Bush Foundation
4. 2010-11 Board Goals & Annual Agenda (Revised)
5. Superintendent’s Goals for 2010-11
6. Summary of Proposed Criteria to be used in the Annual Evaluation of the Superintendent