TO:      Board of Directors

FROM:    George Russell
         Superintendent of Schools

RE:      Reports and Recommendations

VII.     ITEMS FOR INFORMATION

1.     Debrief the Board Retreat Held February 26, 2007

The board will debrief the board retreat that was held Monday, February 26, 2007.

VIII.    ITEMS FOR ACTION AT THIS MEETING

1.     Approve the Superintendent’s Recommendations Regarding the Follow-Up Review of Hillside Alternative School

In February 2006, the Board reviewed Hillside Alternative School as part of a larger district review of elementary alternative schools. As a result of that initial review, the Board voted on February 15, 2006 to eliminate grade caps for Hillside and three other alternative schools reviewed in 2005-06 and took the following actions specific to Hillside:

1. Directed district staff to work with Hillside to develop a plan for program modification to address the key findings of the report related to the lack of distinctiveness of its strategy and to determine if and to what extent program modifications are feasible and practical in light of the continuing enrollment decline’s impact on their ability to continue with a strong and viable program.

2. Directed staff to begin the process of planning for a relocation of Hillside, but only if it is determined that the program modification plan will result in increased viability and a clearly distinctive strategy for the school. Relocation of Hillside to a co-location with another alternative school or a middle school should be considered as part of the district’s larger review of boundaries, enrollment patterns, and facilities planning.

In 2005-06, the Alternative School Review Team specifically concluded that Hillside, as then configured, did not represent a distinctive strategy for achieving the board’s educational goals. They found the individual educational components of Hillside’s program to be admirable but not, in and of themselves, distinctive. The Review Team also concluded that if the current enrollment trends continue, Hillside would not be able to remain viable as a separate school. At the time of the initial 2005-06 review,
Hillside’s enrollment was 111.5 (K=.5) or 121 (K=1.0), which was below the school’s enrollment cap of 132 (K=.5) or 145 (K=1).

Because of concerns about the declining enrollments, the Review Team in 2005 encouraged the staffs and parents of Hillside and Adams to begin an internal dialogue about potential remedies. They noted that Hillside was failing to attract a sufficient number of students to meet its enrollment targets and that Adams was losing a significant percentage of the students living within its enrollment boundaries to a variety of other schools (56% to alternative schools, 27% to other neighborhood schools, 16% to charter schools.)

During the Review Team’s initial meeting with the Hillside staff and parents in October 2005, a suggestion of merging the schools or creating a program within a school briefly surfaced in the context of a discussion about class size disparities and financial constraints. The Review Team encouraged the schools to further examine those possibilities. They posited that in light of the findings of their report and with the example of Edgewood/Evergreen, it could present a win-win solution. However, in subsequent conversations, the principal has been very clear that there is virtually no receptivity to the prospect of a merger of the two schools due to vastly different philosophies, educational values, and approaches to instruction.

The plan for Hillside’s program modification was initiated in Fall 2006 with an expectation that the review be completed by February 1, 2007. Two members of the district’s instructional leadership team, Kay Mehas and Yvonne Curtis, met with Hillside staff in November 2006 and again in January 2007 to talk about the follow-up review process and to provide feedback to Hillside staff on their work toward program modification.

The Alternative School Review Team then conducted a follow-up review and provided recommendations in a report to the Superintendent on January 29, 2007.

Questions Considered:

In response to the Board’s action on the initial Hillside review, there are three questions to answer. First, does Hillside’s planned program modification address the key findings of the Alternative School Review Report of December 30, 2005 related to the “lack of distinctiveness of its strategy.” Secondly, is it actually a modification of Hillside’s existing program or is it a major change in direction? Third, does the planned program modification contribute to keeping the Hillside program strong and viable in terms of enrollment?

Assuming these questions are affirmatively responded to, then the Board’s direction to plan for relocation of Hillside would be the next step. It should be noted that the Board’s direction in initiating the Shaping 4J’s Future strategic planning process has made it clear that all potential options related to both alternative and neighborhood schools are open for consideration as part of the process. That is, any short-term decision regarding viability does not preclude future decisions that consider longer term strategic needs of the district related to financial resources, declining enrollment, school boundaries, school closures and consolidations, reconfigurations, or alternative school relocations.
Policy Background:

Board Policy IGBH Alternative Schools states:

An alternative school is defined as any complete educational program that represents a distinctive strategy within the district for achieving the educational goals defined in the school board’s philosophy statement and in the program goals and objectives of the district’s required curriculum. The term “complete educational program” is used herein to mean a school that has an organizational structure, a teaching staff, a budget, and a specific curriculum, each of which is separate from other schools. An alternative school may share the facilities, administrative personnel, and the support services of another school, or may be an autonomous unit. An alternative school may differ from other schools in ways that include, but are not limited to, the following:

1. The school may emphasize a specific element of the district’s approved curriculum;
2. The school may present the district’s approved curriculum in a sequence different than from the order of presentation in other schools;
3. The decision-making process for governance of the school may differ from the processes used in other schools;
4. Students may be grouped for instruction in some unique manner;
5. The teachers in the school may emphasize a specific instructional strategy.

The policy provides that the superintendent will develop the process for alternative school review and determine the criteria to be used. Review criteria are approved by the Board. The policy also provides that no single criterion will be used to determine action as a result of the review process.

The Alternative Schools Review Process, approved by the Board in August 2005, includes the following provisions:

A decision for alternative school or program modification will be made by the Board of Directors by the end of February in order to allow for school choice decisions to be made for the following school year. Potential outcomes of the alternative school review will include, but are not necessarily limited to:

1. No Change in Status
2. Plan For Improvement
3. Program Modification
4. Merger With Neighborhood School Or Other Alternative School
5. Relocation
6. Closure

Initial Review: The process provided that the initial review (2005-06) of an alternative school would not result in a recommendation for merger, relocation or closure. The first-time review of an existing alternative school or program was limited to an initial recommendation of No Change in Status, Plan for Improvement, or Program Modification. In the case of a recommendation for Plan for Improvement or Program
Modification, the recommendation would include a proposed timeline for a follow-up review.

Follow-Up Review: The process requires that follow-up review be conducted after a sufficient amount of time has been given for improvement or modification to occur. The follow-up review will occur within one year, unless the review committee and/or superintendent determines and recommends to the Board that a longer period is warranted. The Board will approve extensions of follow-up reviews beyond the one-year period. The follow-up review could subsequently lead to a recommendation for merger, relocation or closure.

Discussion of Hillside Follow-Up Review:

The 2006-07 follow-up review of Hillside focused on the “distinctive strategy” criterion, which asks the following questions:

Does the alternative school/program’s educational program represent a “distinctive strategy” for achieving the board’s educational goals as defined in the board’s adopted goals, guiding beliefs and values, and educational philosophy statement?

a. How does the alternative school’s program compare to the originally approved charter or proposal?

b. To what extent and how does the alternative school or program emphasize a specific element of the district’s approved curriculum?

c. To what extent and how does the alternative school/program present the district’s approved curriculum in a sequence different from the order of presentation in other schools?

d. To what extent and how does the alternative school/program group students for instruction in some unique manner?

e. To what extent and how do the alternative school/program’s teachers emphasize a specific instructional strategy?

f. Does the alternative school/program anticipate any significant changes in its program?

In January 2007, the Alternative School Review Team consisting of Carl Hermanns, Ray Gross and Jerry Henderson conducted the follow-up review. The Review Team’s observations and conclusions were reported to the Board on February 7, 2007. The team concluded that “Hillside has taken meaningful and viable steps towards creating and implementing a distinctive curriculum that enhances the district’s educational program.”

The Review Team determined that in response to the Board’s directive to pursue program modification, Hillside has worked diligently to create and implement an increased and coherent school-wide focus on international studies. They concluded, based upon their interviews and observations, that the Hillside staff has made substantial progress in implementing an international studies focus. They further determined that being only one year into their expanded focus, this effort is “obviously a work in progress.”
After receiving the report, I posed the following clarifying questions to the committee:

1. Does Hillside’s educational program now represent a distinctive strategy within the district for achieving the board’s educational goals, as defined in the Board’s Alternative Schools policy?
2. Are the changes at Hillside truly a program modification? That is, is it an evolution or an extension of their previous educational program, rather than a new focus or a new way of being distinctive?
3. Will the planned program modification contribute to keeping the Hillside program strong and viable in terms of enrollment?

In regards to the first question, the Alternative School Review Team responded that Hillside staff has worked diligently on creating an integrated curriculum with an international studies focus. The Review Team’s report observed evidence of this curricular emphasis throughout the school and found that it was being systematically implemented. However, the team also stated that implementation of the international studies curriculum is a “work in progress”. School staff acknowledged the need to expand their efforts in order to fully develop a program that is clearly distinctive from that of other schools in the district. The Review Team believes that given additional time Hillside will achieve the goal of being fully “distinctive” as an alternative school consistent with board policy. Their progress this year, as evidenced by their steps towards effectively integrating their global focus throughout the school, indicates a strong desire and capacity for further refining and implementing their international studies curriculum.

While the Review Team finds that Hillside’s program modification, with the developing focus on international studies, meets the definition of being a distinctive educational program, I find myself skeptical. Many of our neighborhood schools have taken similar steps to develop and implement a special curricular emphasis. Crest Drive Elementary School, for example, has developed an integrated school-wide science curriculum focused on our local natural waterways. Other neighborhood schools also have developed focused curricular offerings. The difference, according to the Review Team, is that Hillside presented a framework for an integrated and sequential K-5 curriculum with a specific and in-depth international studies focus that is a significantly enhanced exploration of elements that had previously been a part of their curriculum but now are being brought to the fore in a systematic, sequential, and integrated way, across grades K-5.

My second question was whether the changes Hillside has made are truly a program modification or evolution of their previous educational program. The information provided by Hillside during its initial review in 2005-2006 did not mention a prior emphasis on international studies. Hillside reported a continued focus on “the mastery of the basic skills of language, math, and reading” as presented in its original charter. The 2005-2006 Alternative School Review Report summarized Hillside’s educational program description as follows:

- Hillside continues to emphasize advanced skill development in the basic academic core subjects.
- The philosophy of Hillside Traditional School is that the child learns best through a structured and positive learning environment. We seek to develop within the student maximum individual potential and positive self-concepts through a specific behavior policy, a rigorous academic program that includes homework requirements, and self-contained classrooms.
• Hillside was founded on, and continues to support a strong triangular relationship between the students, the teachers, and the parents.

In reviewing other district documents, I have not found reference to international studies as a particular emphasis at Hillside until recently. This has led me to question if the development of an international studies curriculum truly is an evolution or expansion of an element that was integral to Hillside’s previous program or to their original alternative school proposal or whether it really constitutes a substantial redirection of the program, which should require Board approval as a new or differently-focused alternative school. But as referenced above, the Review Team concluded that Hillside’s global emphasis is a significantly enhanced exploration of elements that had previously been a part of their curriculum and that their program modification continues to reflect the strong school value on parent-student-teacher communication and cooperation — what Hillside refers to as the “triangular relationship.”

My third question is whether the planned program modification will contribute to keeping the Hillside program strong and viable in terms of enrollment. At the time of the initial 2005-06 review, Hillside’s enrollment was 111.5 (K=.5) or 121 (K=1.0). For 2006-07, the enrollment has grown to 115(K=.5) or 131(K=1), higher than 2005-06 but still less than the enrollment cap of 132 (K=.5) or 145 (K=1). Projections for the next few years are for it to remain at around 120 (K=.5), and then increase to the cap in 2009-10.

Options for Board Action:

On February 15, 2006, when the Board approved the recommendations following Hillside’s initial review, I committed that the Board would review the modifications to Hillside’s program and have an opportunity to respond and give staff direction. Based on the Review Team’s follow-up report and the discussion herein, I believe the following options are available to the Board:

1. Adopt a finding that Hillside Alternative School has met the requirement to develop a plan for program modification to address the key findings of the report related to the lack of distinctiveness of its strategy and that the program modifications are feasible and have a practical impact on their ability to continue with a strong and viable program, including an evaluation of enrollment.

   This action would signal Board support for continuation of Hillside as a “traditional” alternative school with a distinctive strategy focused on international studies as a part of the district program of school choice.

2. Adopt a finding that Hillside’s program modification has substantially met the intent of the requirement for program modification to address the key findings of the 2005-06 Alternative School Review Report related to the lack of distinctiveness of its strategy, that given additional time it can fully meet the requirement, and that the program modifications are feasible and can have a practical impact on Hillside’s ability to continue with a strong and viable program, including an evaluation of enrollment. Additionally, this action should require district staff to provide support and monitoring as Hillside’s plan for program modification proceeds.
This action would signal Board support for Hillside to continue development and implementation of a distinctive strategy focused on international studies as an evolution and expansion of the existing “traditional” alternative school.

(Note: adoption of either option 1 or 2 would then trigger the process of planning for a relocation of Hillside and consideration of its longer term viability as part of the district’s Shaping 4J’s Future process.)

3. Adopt a finding that Hillside’s program modification does not meet the intent of the requirement for program modification to address the key findings of the 2005-06 Alternative School Review Report related to the lack of distinctiveness of its strategy, and direct staff to develop a transition plan for either re-application as a new or different alternative school, merger or closure.

This action would signal that the Board does not find the implementation of an international studies focus to be a program modification, but rather a new focus or significant redirection that would require either:

a) re-application for Board approval as a new or different alternative school under board policy IGBH, or
b) discontinuation of Hillside as an alternative school effective July 1, 2008 and either a merger with Adams or closure.

This would allow Hillside to operate for one more school year and provide for a smoother transition for students, parents and staff. It will also ease the impact on Adams Elementary, the co-located neighborhood school, which shares music, physical education, library and learning center staffing and services with Hillside.

The closure of Hillside Alternative School also may have consequences for other elementary schools in south Eugene. Due to declining enrollment, the district may need to close more school buildings. We now have four neighborhood elementary schools in the South and Churchill regions that have 250 students or less (Adams, Crest, Harris, and Parker). Allowing Hillside to continue operating for one more school year will allow time for our strategic planning process, Shaping 4Js Future, to unfold. The strategic planning process will provide direction for how we configure our programs, services and facilities in the future. We expect to have some possible options or scenarios to discuss with the Board and the community next fall.

Superintendent’s Recommendation:

The Superintendent recommends that the Board:

1. Adopt a finding that Hillside’s program modification:
   a. has substantially met the intent of the requirement for program modification to address the key findings of the alternative school review report related to the lack of distinctiveness of its strategy;
   b. given additional time can fully meet the requirement; and
   c. is feasible and can have a practical impact on their ability to continue with a strong and viable program.

2. Direct district staff to provide support and monitoring as the plan for program modification proceeds.
2. **Approve the Superintendent's Recommendation on Eastside Alternative School's Plan for Improvement**

In February 2006, the Board reviewed Eastside Alternative School as part of a larger district review of elementary alternative schools. As a result of that initial review, the Board voted on February 15, 2006 to eliminate grade caps for Eastside and three other alternative schools reviewed in 2005-06 and took the following actions specific to Eastside:

1. Direct district staff to work with Eastside to develop a plan for improvement to address the key findings of the report related to assisting Eastside to attract and address the instructional needs of a more diverse student population, including low SES, special education, ELL and students of color.

2. Direct staff to begin the process of working with Eastside to develop a plan for relocation of Eastside from Parker Elementary to a standalone site or co-location with another alternative school or middle school as part of the district's review of boundaries, enrollment patterns, and facilities planning.

Carmen Urbina, Parent, Family, Community Coordinator, and Scott Marsh, Principal at Eastside Elementary School, provided an update on the strategic planning process that Eastside has undertaken to address the directive from the board to meet the instructional needs of a more diverse student population, including low SES, special education, English language learners, and students of color. The process has engaged the Eastside staff, site council and parents in discussing the school's mission, culture, vision, strengths and weaknesses, and to identify strategies and activities that will address the goals stated in the Eastside Elementary School Improvement Plan Executive Summary Update:

**Main goal:** To improve Eastside Elementary School capacity to welcome, support, and effectively serve diverse learners and their families—and then to do so—in order to meet the Board’s requirements for retaining alternative school designation.

**Outcome of the process:** To develop an improvement plan to increase equity and diversity.

To date, Eastside staff and parents are in the process of completing the third of six phases of their strategic planning process and are now working on initial recommendations. They expect to finish their work and present a three-year plan with an implementation schedule and measures by June 2007. As the final step in their planning process, community members will be asked to join with Eastside staff and parents in discussing the key learning from this process and how Eastside plans to move forward. The Eastside Elementary School Improvement Plan - Executive Summary Update was included in the board packet at your last meeting.

**Superintendent's Recommendation:**

The Superintendent recommends that the board:

Adopt a finding that Eastside's plan for improvement has met the intent of the requirement to develop a plan for improvement to address the key findings of the report related to assisting Eastside to attract and address the instructional needs of a more diverse student population, including low SES, special education, ELL and students of color, and at this time no further action is necessary.
3. **Approve English/Language Arts Instructional Materials Adoption** (Staff: Yvonne Curtis)

The Eugene School District follows the Oregon Department of Education (ODE) "State Instructional Materials Adoption Schedule," and the 2006-2007 school year is identified for adopting English/Language Arts (ELA) instructional materials.

Our district process for reviewing and selecting programs included several steps.

1. The 4J Instructional Leadership Team and school principals came to consensus on guidelines for reviewing, selecting, and implementing ELA instructional materials.
2. The ELA adoption teams were formed and met to learn about the guidelines and develop a research-based ELA instructional materials evaluation rubric. The elementary team consisted of 36 members (a classroom teacher from each elementary school, special education teachers, English language learner (ELL) teachers, and central office staff). The middle school team consisted of 16 members (a language arts teacher from each middle school, special education teachers, ELL teachers, and central office staff).
3. The ELA adoption teams used the rubric to evaluate and rank order the five programs recommended by the state. The middle school adoption team invited 2-3 additional teachers from each middle school to join the team for evaluating programs.
4. The ELA adoption teams met to review their evaluations, the results of the rank ordering, and make recommendations.

The elementary and middle school ELA adoption teams recommend the following comprehensive ELA instructional materials for approval by the 4J School Board:

**Elementary School Level (Grades K-5)**

- **Houghton Mifflin Reading (c. 2006)** published by Houghton Mifflin
- **Treasures (c. 2007)** published by Macmillan/McGraw-Hill

**Middle School Level (Grades 6-8)**

- **Elements of Literature (c. 2007)** published by Holt, Rinehart & Winston, a division of Harcourt, Inc.

The superintendent recommends adoption of the English/Language Arts Instructional Materials as outlined above.
IX. CONSENT GROUP - ITEMS FOR ACTION

1. Approve Board Meeting Minutes

The superintendent recommends approval of the minutes of the regular board meeting held on November 15, 2006.

2. Approve Personnel Items (Staff: Wally Bryant)

The superintendent recommends approval of the personnel items included in the packet. These cover employment, resignations, and other routine personnel matters.

Oregon Revised Statutes requires districts to inform probationary teachers and administrators of their future contract status by March 15 of each year. A list of teachers and administrators being nonrenewed and those being advanced to 2nd and 3rd year probationary status and contract status, along with recommendations regarding school nurses and other certificated staff on annual assignments is include in the packet. Temporary teachers and administrators who are recommended for nonrenewal are also included and will be considered for position openings that develop for the 2007-2007 school year.

The board may adjourn to executive session for matters dealing with employment if it desires to do so. ORS 192.660 (1) (a)

X. ITEMS FOR ACTION AT A FUTURE MEETING

1. Optional Approaches to Support the Rachel Carson Environmental Center Project (Staff: Hillary Kittleson)

Background

The May 2002 Capital Improvement Bond included $500,000 as "seed money" toward the several million dollar development of a Rachel Carson Environmental Education Center to be constructed adjacent to the West Eugene Wetlands, subject to adequate fund-raising and contributions from others. (The $500,000 included $25,000 for design services and related costs; approximately $4,000 that has been spent to date on planning costs).

On February 27, 2002, the board unanimously authorized referring a $116 million bond measure to voters. Included in the motion to approve was the following adjustment:

- Reduce the proposed $3 million for school safety and security renovations to $2 million.
- Include $500,000 for master planning and preliminary work related to the development of the Rachel Carson Natural Resources Center, with expenditure of funds conditioned upon securing of federal and other funding by participating partners. If such funding does not materialize within three years then the funds will be recommitted to school safety and security renovations.
- Include additional $500,000 for replacement of portables at Monroe Middle School with classroom/bathroom additions.
In November of 2003, members of the Willamette Resources Educational Network (WREN) the non-profit group that is sponsoring this development appeared before the board and requested additional time to conduct fundraising. In response, the board approved the following motion:

Authorize the superintendent and designees to continue planning for up to two years from today [November 19, 2003], for the proposed phase 1, as described in the board report, with the expectation that the 4J School District would be entitled, subject to agreement among all the partners, to have use of the entire facility after the complete buildout and full use of a classroom in Phase 1 during the school year. No district bond money will be spent on the project until there is a certainty that full funding for phase 1 is available, except that up to $25,000 (less $4000 expenditures to date) can be spent on design and related services, as deemed appropriate by the superintendent, to assist with fund raising and grant development.

In November of 2005, the superintendent requested, on behalf of district staff involved in project and WREN that an additional year be granted to allow for more fundraising. At that time, it was estimated that the amount of additional funding needed to complete the phase 1 of the environmental education center was approximately $550,000. In response the board approved the following motion:

Grant an extension of time of one year from the date of this action [November 9, 2005] for WREN and/or others to identify adequate (and certain) funds to complete the first phase of the environmental education center. It was understood that if this extension was granted by the board, no further extensions could be given, and should adequate (and certain) funding not be identified in the specified time period, this project would be deleted from the bond list and the funds ear-marked for this project would be used for the next highest priority, bond-eligible, unfunded district capital projects.

Since that time the project cost has grown. In particular, initial infrastructure estimates have proven to be too low. This adds further to the design and construction cost. The current total cost for phase 1, including all soft costs, infrastructure, and phase 1 buildings, is in excess of $4 million; the original project budget was $2,076,767 (including $655,000 for land).

Following is a brief summary of the project and efforts to date:

The Bureau of Land Management, City of Eugene, Bethel School District, Eugene 4J School District and WREN have continued to show support for this effort. By 2005, representatives from these entities reinforced their commitment by signing an Education Center Partnership statement. When completed, the West Eugene Wetlands Environmental Education Center campus will include a laboratory, green house, auditorium, reference library, classrooms, meeting rooms and staff and volunteer offices.

The current strategy is to build the center in phases. The first phase of the project includes: initial site development, a storm water demonstration project for sustainable landscaping, roadway and parking development, a composting toilet that conserves water, an information kiosk, laboratory for school groups and
interpretive programs, mudroom to support volunteer and education participants, and a public reception area with volunteer staff to answer questions and schedule programs. District 4J’s funds would be used to construct two classrooms to house the Rachel Carson Environmental Center, currently offered through Churchill High School.

The City of Eugene has expressed interest in seeing the project completed. The successful Parks and Open Space Bond (on the November 2006 ballot) included approximately $1.7 million for the infrastructure for the entire center. In addition, the City has committed $340,000 to this project.

Congress has authorized the transfer of the property from the BLM to the City of Eugene. The architect selection process has been completed. The Eugene firm of Rowell Brokaw Architects has been ranked #1 by consensus of the selection committee. If the District contracts to build Phase 1, it will attempt to negotiate a contract with Rowell Brokaw subject to appropriate award. WREN is preparing to begin the design process this month.

WREN estimates that its current fund raising efforts will generate approximately $500,000, leaving a balance of $1.0 to $1.5 million (depending on contingency levels) needed to complete the project, in addition to the District’s participation.

Given this progress, it now seems more likely that the entire project can move forward.

Most Recent Board Direction

On December 13, 2006 the board adopted the following motions:

1. Redirect $496,000 currently designated for the Rachel Carson Environmental Center ($500,000 project amount less $4,000 expended to date) to the support of school security projects as included in the initial bond proposal.
2. Develop optional approaches to support the Rachel Carson Environmental Center through use of existing non-bond capital funds or future bond funds and establish funding parameters, including that additional district funds cannot be expended until substantially all project funding is secured.

The $496,000 in bond funds have been redirected to security projects, as proposed in the initial bond proposal. Optional approaches to supporting the Rachel Carson Center are discussed below.

Optional Sources of Funding


Staff is projecting undesignated reserves of approximately $2 million in Fund 400, the non-bond capital fund, at the end of this fiscal year. Given the uncertainty about the timing and passage of a future bond, I believe those reserves should be kept for highest priority district capital projects.

2. Future bond measure
The Rachel Carson Center project could be included in a future bond, but a vote would occur no sooner than November 2008.

3. Undesignated proceeds from sale of property.

Currently, most of the proceeds from the sale of surplus property are being used to support a five-year preventive maintenance and interior painting program. I believe that any balances, along with the proceeds from the sale of Santa Clara, should be kept for highest priority district capital projects.

4. Reserve for Measure 37 Real Property Value-Added Charge related to the sale of the Santa Clara site

On February 28, 2007 the sale of the Santa Clara site was complete. The property sold for $7.4 million and the district received proceeds of $6.7 million, net of the Santa Clara Grange’s share (8% of the net proceeds) and closing costs. Of the $6.7 million, $1.38 million will be held in reserve to pay a potential Measure 37 Real Property Value-Added Charge currently under consideration by the City Council (the district will also reserve $120,000 on behalf of the Santa Clara Grange, from the Grange’s proceeds). If the charge is not enacted, the $1,380,000 can be released for capital projects. If the charge is less than the amount reserved, the balance will be released for capital projects.

**Recommendation**

The superintendent will recommend option 4, that is, the use of up to $496,000 from the Reserve for Measure 37 Real Property Value-Added Charge, should the charge not be enacted or should the charge amount to less than $500,000. If the Real Property Value-Added Charge is more than $500,000, any amount in excess of $500,000 would be deducted from the $496,000 designated for the Rachel Carson Center. This option preserves capital reserves currently known to be available to the district, while allowing for the possibility of a contribution to the Rachel Carson Center project from funds which are less certain, pending a City Council decision on the value-added charge.

XI. Comments and Committee Reports by Individual Board Members

XII. Adjourn

**CALENDAR FOR BOARD MEMBERS**

**MARCH**

Wednesday, March 14  Work Session/Equity Committee  5:30 – 7 p.m.

Wednesday, March 21  Board Meeting  7 p.m.

**APRIL**

Wednesday, April 4  Board Meeting  7 p.m.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Saturday, April 7</td>
<td>Breakfast with Lane County Legislators – Ed Center Auditorium</td>
<td>9 – 10:30 a.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, April 18</td>
<td>Board Meeting</td>
<td>7 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday, April 30</td>
<td>Budget Committee Meeting</td>
<td>7 p.m.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>