

## MINUTES

Special Meeting of the

### BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Corvallis School District 509J  
1555 SW 35<sup>th</sup> Street  
Corvallis, OR, 97333

#### I. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m. in the Board Room of the Central Administration Building, 1555 SW 35<sup>th</sup> Street, Corvallis, Oregon. The secretary recorded those present as listed below.

<u>BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT</u> Kari Rieck, Chair Donna Keim, Vice Chair Blake Rodman Matt Donohue Helen Higgins Nell O'Malley Anne Schuster	<u>EXECUTIVE STAFF PRESENT</u> Dawn Tarzian, Superintendent Jim Hogeboom, Assistant Superintendent Kathy Rodeman, Business Services Director Jeanne Holmes, Human Resources Director Julie Catala, Executive Assistant to the Superintendent  <u>STUDENT REPRESENTATIVES PRESENT</u> Zach Allen, Corvallis High School
--	--

#### II. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Chair Rieck led the group in the pledge of allegiance.

#### III. PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Tanya Freeman, 26078 SW Nicole Drive, Corvallis, distributed a Benton County zoning map to each board member and drew the board's attention to the areas that are exclusive farm use and rural residential. She referred to conversation the board had on January 8, 2007 and read from a prepared statement in response to it. (Filed in Section V of the Official 2006-07 Board Minutes.) The points she addressed included the length of bus rides, the immersion-type program offered by the Muddy Creek Charter School (MCCS), the distinction between country property and property used for farming, the place-based model offered by MCCS, equity, projected growth of Corvallis as evidenced by new

housing, and Measure 37 claims. She urged the board to approve the charter.

Vice Chair Keim joined the meeting at 7:12 p.m.

Roger Hammer, 5561 SW Otavia, Corvallis. (Mr. Hammer spoke following the Lincoln K-8 presentation and prior to Mayor Tomlinson's presentation.) He praised the Lincoln dual immersion program and offered a suggestion for a more gradual transition than going from 90% Spanish/10% English instruction in kindergarten to 50%/50% in first grade, opining that two years of the 90/10 would be preferable.

## **V. SPECIAL REPORT – LINCOLN K-8 PROGRAM**

Lincoln K-8 Principal Oscar Moreno-Gilson introduced staff members Jessica Demick, Patti Ball, Cara Takamori, Carol Brewster, Lori Greenfield, Paul Bradley and Elise Bradley, and Sue Tangeman from Head Start, the pre-K program at Lincoln. Mr. Moreno-Gilson and his staff provided a PowerPoint presentation and drew the board's attention to a printout of the presentation, which was given to each board member. (Filed as Supplemental Item #VII-22 in the Official 2006-07 Board Minutes.)

Points shared during the presentation included:

- ? The school's mission, vision and demographics.
- ? Information about technology at the school.
- ? The four key elements of the school: early childhood education, extended learning, dual immersion, environmental studies.
- ? Information about the successful Head Start program at the school, and its benefits for students, families and the community.
- ? Information about FLA (Familias Latinas Aprendiendo), which uses a grant money from the Benton County Commission on Children and Families to continue services formerly provided by the Even Start grant.
- ? Information about CAEC (Community Academic and Enrichment Clubs), extended-learning opportunities built upon collaborative and cooperative relationships, which uses money from a five-year, \$1 million grant.
- ? Information about the dual immersion program, including research data about the success of students participating in dual immersion programs, and the goals of Lincoln's program: bilingualism, biliteracy and multiculturalism.
- ? Information on science programs at the school and the long history of project-based learning taking place there. Examples included: Quest Fair, Wildlife Stewards, and science art field study.
- ? Information about the Wildlife Stewards Summit for Linn and Benton Counties, which Lincoln will host this April.
- ? Information about the middle school component of Lincoln.
- ? Information about the challenges the school faces, including a negative public perception, many

new staff members, many new students, the capacity of the dual immersion program and facilities space.

Mr. Moreno-Gilson praised the staff at the school, and thanked the board for their time and continued support. He said great things are being done at the school and everyone is excited about the future.

Lincoln staff responded to queries from the board including:

- ? The team at Lincoln is strong, works well together and is very supportive. That is the reason that so much has been done in such a short amount of time.
- ? The CAEC program is based on building strong partnerships. Grant funding will end in 2009 and staff is continuing to work on sustainability. There is hope for a south-town offering K-12 for kids, which is still in the planning stages.
- ? Coordination of the science and dual immersion emphases and the goal of a school-wide Wildlife Stewards program.
- ? There are bilingual teachers at the school who are strong in science.
- ? Staff is still working to articulate the art and science component through the K-5 curriculum, with the goal of having it K-8.
- ? Further explanation of the waiting list for dual immersion.

The board asked sixth grade student Makai Bradley what he likes about Lincoln. He replied that he really likes the large number of volunteers, which makes the groups of kids on field trips smaller than normal. He also likes the smaller middle school.

#### **IV. PRESENTATION BY CORVALLIS MAYOR CHARLIE TOMLINSON**

Chair Rieck presented Mayor Tomlinson with a framed award-winning poster created by Corvallis High School student Molly Whitney. Superintendent Tarzian explained the significance of the selection of that gift, touching on aspects of the City of Corvallis' 2020 Vision Statement.

Mayor Tomlinson complimented the presentation made earlier about the Lincoln K-8 program, stating his commitment to dispel the negative misperception about the school.

He referred to the joint subcommittee of the City and District, mentioning the names of the new appointees from the City. He outlined the work that has been ongoing between the two agencies, such as quarterly meetings of their leadership, meetings of the joint subcommittee and occasional joint work sessions of both agencies. He expressed his desire that the collaboration continue.

Mayor Tomlinson referred to the district's visioning process, opining that the City Council looks forward to it.

Superintendent Tarzian touched briefly on the fiber optics partnership, noting that a press release will

highlight how the partnership will result in resource savings.

Mayor Tomlinson shared information about weekly community meetings he will hold as a way to reach out into the community to see what's happening, what's being done well and what needs to be worked on.

The board thanked Mayor Tomlinson for his time.

Chair Rieck temporarily adjourned the meeting at 8:20 p.m. and reconvened it at 8:30 p.m.

## **VI. MUDDY CREEK CHARTER SCHOOL**

### **A. Clarifying Information Requested by the Board**

Assistant Superintendent Hogeboom referred to a handout given to each board member, and led review of it. (Filed as Supplemental Item #VII-23 in the Official 2006-07 Board Minutes.) He reminded the board that their vote tonight will be to either conditionally approve the charter or to deny it. He referenced the seven criteria for the board to use in making a decision:

1. Demonstrated sustainable support.
2. Demonstrated financial stability.
3. Capability in terms of support and planning to provide comprehensive instructional programs.
4. Capability in terms of support and planning to provide comprehensive instructional programs to academically low achieving students.
5. Extent to which the proposal addresses the criteria required in the proposal process.
6. Whether the value of the charter school is outweighed by any directly identifiable, significant and adverse impact in the quality of education of students residing in the district.
7. Whether there are arrangements for any necessary special education and related services.

Mr. Hogeboom pointed out that the district's review committee determined that criteria four and six were not met. He drew the board's attention to item 1.c. of the handout, which outlined the model used to assess the value of the charter school (criteria six).

Mr. Hogeboom drew the board's attention to item two of the handout, *Current Science-Related Projects or Programs in the District*, and shared brief information about what projects are presently being implemented in 509J elementary schools and how many teachers and students are involved. He noted that he only used three schools as examples in this section, but that they are not the only schools involved. He touched on project-based learning, with which all Corvallis schools are involved.

Mr. Hogeboom referred to item three on the handout, *Transportation Issues*, noting that the district would not be required to provide transportation to the charter school. His handout included a summary

of the longest bus rides for the district.

Mr. Hogeboom drew the board's attention to item four of the handout, *Student Enrollment*, noting that there is no guarantee that kids from the Inavale area will get to attend the charter school; it depends on the lottery that's implemented. He referenced school profiles done through the work of the Program and Resource Review (PR2) Committee, opining that there are a lot of kids in town who might want to attend MCCS, given the demographics of enrollment at the former Inavale School.

In response to a question from a board member, Mr. Hogeboom explained that the district can decide on the negotiation points for the charter. He added that if negotiations fail to work out the details in time, the charter school might not be able to open when desired. Superintendent Tarzian provided a few examples of details that could be included in the negotiations: the number of applications that must be received, the ability to get a facility, the ability to prepare kids to pass state tests, financial stability, insurance, etc. She pointed out that they are structural issues.

Business Director Kathy Rodeman gave an overview of the process used by the district's charter review committee. She pointed out that the committee included community members with backgrounds in either K-12 education or public school finance, two of the district's budget committee members, and an Oregon State University (OSU) professor who is an expert in rural schools. She explained that all meetings were held in public session, which is not a requirement of the law but which staff felt would be good for the community. She touched briefly on the amount of district money invested for the review of the charter, over \$3,000, and said all but two of the committee members recommended denial of the charter.

Ms. Rodeman said her role in reviewing the application is to represent the district's interests and provide background for the board to help their decision-making. She cited her 30 years experience in the accounting field and experience with the prior charter school. She said her estimates are conservative yet reasonable; it would be irresponsible for her not to be conservative.

Other points made by Ms. Rodeman include:

- ? The law requires 25 students to create a charter.
- ? Estimates are that 80% of applicants for MCCS would be from 509J.
- ? State law requires an open lottery process to benefit students in our district boundary.
- ? Major differences in perception exist. In Ms. Rodeman's view, the district doesn't make money or save money under the charter; there will be the same amount of fixed costs whether or not the charter is opened.

Ms. Rodeman referred to the charter review committee's report, given the board previously, and noted that the financial impact scenario in that document is not a worst-case scenario. She provided the board another scenario she referred to as legitimate and defensible, outlined in a document she distributed to the board. (Filed as Supplemental Item #VII-24 in the Official 2006-07 Board Minutes.) She led review of the document, referring to the committee's recommendation. She highlighted the estimated

additional operating costs to the district if the charter were implemented, such as for business services, curriculum and testing, and special education travel and oversight.

Ms. Rodeman explained that, based on historical enrollment data and the number of current Lincoln students that had previously attended Inavale, the impact is closer to 30-40 students that might leave Lincoln to attend the charter school. She explained that charters are a component of the district and that the district ensures that the charter complies with state law. She clarified that rental income is not shown as an offset to expenses because we would rent the facility to other groups and would have rental income even without the charter school. She pointed out that a public school district is prohibited from making money; we have to show the costs as well as the income, creating a net zero effect. She touched briefly on some of the costs associated with a facility, including telephone and data connections, roofs, parking lots, etc.

Ms. Rodeman explained the budget model that takes projected enrollment into account when finalizing the budget allocation for a school. Certain levels of fluctuation in enrollment would not result in reduced allocations. Example: in the spring, a principal estimates enrollment and the school's funding and staffing is based on that enrollment. If the school is short students but falls within a certain percentage of change (up to 20 for a 400 enrollment school), they'd still get their funding as estimated on their earlier enrollment projection. So the school would get the funding for those 20 students and the charter school would get the funding for those 20 students. Superintendent Tarzian explained the care principals use to project enrollment and said we'd probably know which students would go to the charter because they would have indicated it in the spring.

Superintendent Tarzian reiterated the recommendation she made at the December 4, 2007 board meeting to deny the charter, and outlined her reasons:

1. Confidence in the review committee process used.
2. MCCS doesn't offer a new program that isn't available in our district.
3. Potential access for all students, regionalization of the needs of the students in this district and how the board will monitor its values as criteria if they add location to weighing consideration.
4. First priority to weigh carefully whether or not the charter proposal will truly enhance the learning opportunities or options for our children rather than focusing on relationships and emotions.

She said creative endeavors will be proposed regularly; how will the board recognize which are important to do? She urged the board to continue to rely on staff's recommendation.

#### **B. Board Decision Regarding Muddy Creek Charter School Proposal**

**MOTION #26:** It was moved by Director Higgins and seconded by Vice Chair Keim to deny the Muddy Creek Charter School application.

Extensive board deliberation ensued and included the following comments:

- ? The merits of the charter school outweigh the adverse impact.
- ? MCCA is a viable, sustainable and different alternative.
- ? MCCA will give choice to a group of people who see things differently in our community.
- ? MCCA is fiscally sustainable and is worth the drain on the district's budget.
- ? If MCCA is successful, other schools will look to emulate its components.
- ? Concern about low or inequitable staff salaries, having a part-time administrator, and how floundering students will be served by the charter.
- ? Oregon is an agriculture-based state and we need future farmers and kids to appreciate the rural aspect of the state and to improve on it.
- ? OSU is spending \$2 million to support a rural initiative; MCCA is keeping up with cutting edge institutions.
- ? The style of instruction at MCCA can result in better retention rates.
- ? When Inavale was closed, it was because of a building site and about doing what was best for the entire district.
- ? The district has had 12 years of cuts and has made tough changes in the transfer policy; responsibility to be a steward to all of the families who have lost their communities in the past, and in protecting the quality programs in the district.
- ? The concepts of small schools and small class size are the ideals for all students; Inavale was not considered a rural school by the definition of the law, so the district wasn't eligible to receive additional funding.
- ? The loss of funds will have a significant impact on the rest of 509J's students.
- ? Impact to district schools could happen if a partnership with an outside agency was formed exclusively with the charter; it would reduce the ability for the district to partner with that agency too.
- ? Concerns about fiscal sustainability and high turnover of staff because of lower salaries.
- ? This is about taking away money, partnerships and opportunities from our other students in order to grant a small school that will offer the same curriculum and project-based learning to 60-80 students.
- ? Must use the criteria given us to make this decision, not a philosophy or statement about public education.
- ? Not much difference between MCCA and Lincoln.
- ? We offer the same experiences in the district; MCCA is not innovative and new.
- ? MCCA is not a uniquely different way and doesn't outweigh the impact.
- ? I don't have a more educated view than the team of people who reviewed the charter and the educators who made the recommendation.
- ? Statute is clear about the purpose of charters.
- ? Director Donohue referred to the meeting notes of the charter review committee and asked that they be placed into the official record. (Note: these notes had been filed as Supplemental Item #VII-16H in the Official 2006-07 Board Minutes on December 4, 2006.)
- ? Lincoln programs are similar to MCCA and Lincoln is serving many more students than MCCA will serve.

- ? MCCS will compete directly with Lincoln because MCCS is K-6. That's adverse impact that's not outweighed.
- ? The increased drain on resources to serve special needs students at MCCS is an adverse impact to the district.
- ? The purpose of charter schools isn't to create small schools or place-based schools.
- ? There are not enough of the models and catalyst, research and development in this charter to allow a yes vote.
- ? The analysis of the committee was important.
- ? MCCS will be different from what currently exists in the district; the afternoon is set up to allow things for students they won't otherwise get in the district.
- ? It's not an automatic assumption that kids who live near MCCS will automatically send their kids to MCCS.
- ? MCCS would be an asset to the district.
- ? The law was helpful in asking the question: "do we need a catalyst to drive change in this district"?
- ? Just offering choice at the expense of the other 6,000 kids in the district isn't what the charter is about; it's to give the district a laboratory for innovative programs or assessment tools.
- ? The small school environment will be the draw and that's not one of the things that the charter law is supposed to foster. The district already knows that project-based learning is important and it's moving in that direction. I don't see the catalyst or innovation from MCCS.
- ? MCCS will not compete with Lincoln.
- ? One of the negotiation points could be tweaking the educational program of MCCS.
- ? One reason for the charter school movement is to address high stakes testing.
- ? MCCS has the opportunity to break ground in terms of partnerships – to develop a model that we can learn from and build on, and to develop partnerships with OSU that we don't have yet.
- ? A 509J school could offer project-based learning every afternoon if desired. The district is doing innovative assessment of service learning and project-based learning through E-folios, and development is underway of the processes and assessing student work.
- ? MCCS is a progressive model for a school that really taps into where kids are, and uses kids' interests and strengths to pursue their own interests in a constructivist sort of way.
- ? MCCS does not create a new opportunity to export a new learning model into our schools that will increase the flexibility of our system and increase the choices for our students district-wide. That's because MCCS is based primarily on its size.
- ? MCCS does not create the ability for all students to try new curriculum or testing and assessments or new administrative paradigms.

**Vice Chair Keim called the question. Director Higgins seconded it.**

**The motion was voted on. Chair Rieck, Vice Chair Keim and Directors Donohue and Higgins voted in favor of the motion. Directors O'Malley, Rodman and Schuster voted in opposition to it. The motion carried.**

Chair Rieck temporarily adjourned the meeting at 10:30 p.m. and reconvened it at 10:35 p.m.

## **VII. DECISION REGARDING PURCHASE OF REAL PROPERTY**

Acting Auxiliary Services Director Noel Mingo reported that a tentative offer was reached with Trish Weber based on the parameters set by the board. (Filed as Supplemental Item #I-21 in the Official 2006-07 Board Minutes.)

**MOTION #27:** It was moved by Vice Chair Keim and seconded by Director O'Malley to authorize staff to enter into a sales contract with Ms. Trish Weber for the purchase of property at 1252 NW Pierce Way, Corvallis, and to have Business Director Kathy Rodeman sign all appropriate sale documents on behalf of the District.

The motion was voted on and passed unanimously.

## **VIII. BUDGET ALLOCATION RECOMMENDATIONS**

Superintendent Tarzian referenced funds from a previous Public Employees Retirement System (PERS) ruling combined with the unanticipated ending fund balance from 2005-06, which created a \$3.5 million pool of one-time problem-solving money for the district. She explained that the district engaged the community, the board and staff in determining the best way to spend the revenue; recommendations from the process totaled over \$20 million. She said the district was influenced from the feedback received.

Superintendent Tarzian distributed a document entitled *2006-07 Allocations of Additional Resources – Superintendent's Recommendation*. (Filed as Supplemental Item #VI-2 in the Official 2006-07 Board Minutes.) She explained that at its January 22, 2007 meeting, the board will need to either adopt her recommendation or modify it and that the decision must be made on that date in order to allow hiring of staff. She led review of the document, which was divided into two areas: "Hot Spots" to address 2006-07 school year only; and five-year costs, for a total recommendation of \$3.5 million.

Superintendent Tarzian drew the board's attention to a packet each member received that night about the work being done by the high school schedule committee. She said the board would not be voting on the schedule but she would be bringing it to the board for information.

**IX. ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business before the board, Chair Rieck adjourned the meeting at 10:50 p.m.

---

Kari Rieck, Chair

---

Dawn Tarzian, Superintendent

Prepared by: Julie Catala

(s:\do\super\julie\board\minutes\2007\january 17 special meeting.doc)