

MINUTES

Special Meeting of the

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Corvallis School District 509J
1555 SW 35th Street
Corvallis, OR, 97333

I. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

The meeting was called to order at 6:30 p.m. in the Board Room of the Central Administration Building, 1555 SW 35th Street, Corvallis, Oregon. The secretary recorded those present as listed below.

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

II. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Chair Rieck led the group in the pledge of allegiance.

III. PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Heidi Garza, 1495 NW Penny Lane, Albany, thanked the board for their support of the Garfield Elementary School playground project. She distributed and read from a prepared statement that included the project's budget. (Filed in Section V of the Official 2006-07 Board Minutes.) Ms. Garza described the structure and how each phase of the project will advance, and welcomed any additional funds the board might wish to give toward the project. She pointed out that grantors are more likely to award funds when districts support the projects; regrettably, the money already given by the district for the drainage is not what grantors are looking for as a show of support.

Anita Grunder, 31459 Petersen Road, Philomath, spoke on behalf of the organizers of the Muddy Creek Charter School (MCCS). Ms. Grunder said the board's narrow vote on January 17, 2007, and the issues raised can be addressed. She said the MCCS developers will proceed with whatever the appeal process is, stating a desire to resolve the matter at the district level and not take it to the state unless it is necessary. The board thanked Ms. Grunder for outlining the group's intentions.

IV. SPECIAL REPORTS

A. School Board Recognition Month

Superintendent Tarzian explained that January is school board appreciation month. She presented each board member with a token of appreciation from the Executive Team and praised the volunteer commitment they make to the district, which exceeds all expectations. She said the district is deeply appreciative for the board's work and the hours that they invest and is sure that the community feels the same. The student representatives were not present; their gifts will be delivered at another time.

B. Superintendent's Report on the Long Range Facilities Master Plan Committee

Acting Auxiliary Services Director Noel Mingo distributed the following documents relating to the Long Range Facilities Master Plan (LRFMP) Committee: the committee charge, the newspaper advertisement inviting applications for committee membership, the list of committee members, and the agenda from the first meeting of the committee. (Filed as Supplemental Item #VII-25 in the Official 2006-07 Board Minutes.)

Mr. Mingo led review of the committee charge, which notes:

- ? The LRFMP was adopted in June 2002 and consisted of three phases of implementation spanning 20-25 years.
- ? Phase One of the LRFMP was funded through an \$86.4 million Bond Measure approved by voters in November 2002.
- ? Improvements related to Phase One are now in the final stages of completion.
- ? The LRFMP Committee will review the current LRFMP and create a new plan to recommend to the superintendent.
- ? The new plan should include phased implementation and prioritized recommendations for improvements that speak to but are not limited to:
 1. Methods for addressing projected student enrollment over or under student capacity at individual school facilities.
 2. The feasibility and necessity of the identified improvements in the remaining phases of the 2002 plan, and any other future related facility improvements deemed necessary.
 3. Additional phases of the plan as necessary to address needed improvements over the next 20-25 years.

Mr. Mingo explained that boundary decisions will stem from the work of the LRFMP Committee's recommendations about the plan. More committee members will be brought in when the boundary work begins. He said the work around boundaries will most likely begin in the fall, depending on facilities decisions; a firm grasp is needed on what changes might be made to the LRFMP. He said it is hoped that a recommendation will be made to Superintendent Tarzian by November.

Superintendent Tarzian pointed out that there are community members interested in the boundary committee and that all who applied for membership on the LRFMP Committee were appointed. She said she anticipates that when the boundary work begins, the committee will be structured to ensure representation without having to re-do the facilities work.

Superintendent Tarzian introduced Larry Earhart, chair of the LRFMP Committee, and committee member Paul Rickey, who were present in the audience.

C. Future Use of Inavale Building

Mr. Mingo distributed a document entitled *Cost Impacts of Inavale Options*, noting that the options outlined are very broad and that staff is not ready at this point to make a recommendation to the board. (Filed as Supplemental Item #VII-26 in the Official 2006-07 Board Minutes.)

He led review of the four options and their associated financial impacts:

1. *Returning the property to the heirs* - \$250,000 expense to return the property to farmland. Costs could increase depending upon the condition of the underground storage tanks and any contamination of surrounding soil.
2. *Renting the facility to outside users* - \$26,893/year revenue if all square footage were rented. It may be necessary to get approval of the heirs if we rent the space to an outside group. A lease that puts the district operating at a break-even point, similar to our Dixie School lease with the Linn-Benton-Lincoln ESD, would be around \$2500/month. If the rent money could be set aside it would cover future maintenance issues that would be district responsibility. As with our other rentals, the tenant would be responsible for utilities, phone/data connections, grounds work and routine maintenance; the district would be responsible for maintaining the building envelope and heating/ventilation systems. Currently no major work would need to be done on the heat plant and the roof has at least 10 years of life expectancy. After the initial closure of Inavale we were contacted by five different groups interested in possibly renting or even purchasing the facility. As of December, none of the parties were still actively considering the site.
- 3a. *Keeping the facility for district use in a storage/non-staffed capacity* - \$6,600/year expense, including keeping the facility heated to 55 degrees.

- 3b. *Keeping the facility for district use and heating it to an appropriate temperature -* \$29,960/year expense. This would not include custodial hours or costs to renovate the space.

Other possible uses – Mr. Mingo explained that possible uses could involve collaboration with other groups, most notably Oregon State University (OSU). He said that Superintendent Tarzian is on the OSU College of Education Advisory Board; she learned this week that the college is half of the way toward being able to fund construction of a new education hall and will be looking for space to house both classes and staff during the construction. While Inavale is a remote possibility for this use, other district sites might be a possibility and could perhaps be offered in exchange for university-funded upgrades to the facilities. Mr. Mingo touched on OSU's commitment to the rural sustainability initiative, and said opportunities may exist to work with professors in seeking grant funding to make use of the space, either as an offsite classroom, extension office, or site for collaborative efforts between university research and district students. He said that depending upon what type of agreement could be reached, costs for running the building could be shared or deferred to a potential partner.

He reported that if the space is kept and used for other programs, a decision would need to be made as to whether the fire alarm system would be upgraded to the level that other district occupied buildings are. The current system is operable and should last for the foreseeable future; an upgrade would not be necessary at this time.

He said staff is analyzing what the break-even points would be for renting sections of the building, and how the district can split it into uses for multiple groups if renters could be found who were willing and able to share the space.

In response to a question from the board, Superintendent Tarzian said that a meeting was held with the covenant holders who approved the district exploring the idea of renting to daycare programs or private school programs. She pointed out that there's nothing in the covenant about that and it is unknown if it would be legally allowable. She added that the heirs have no interest in running the building but, like the district, they don't necessarily want to see the building disappear; their interest is in using the building for children and as a school.

Superintendent Tarzian recommended that the board not make any decision at this time as to the use of the building. She recommended obtaining information about what the building costs the district to keep for various uses, what it would cost to reopen and sustain, and potential compromise uses that would be affordable to the district. She said it is premature to make a decision now, adding that although the covenant outlines a deadline, she doesn't believe the covenant holders are rigid in terms of timelines. She said she didn't get a sense in the meeting with the heirs that their goal was to return the building to farmland. She said she is interested in hearing the input from the LRFMP Committee.

Responding to a question from the board, Mr. Mingo touched on a possible scenario in which an outside user rented only 80% of the facility, leaving 20% unused. He pointed out that there is a new half and an old half to the building that could be heated to be economical, but staff is still investigating what

that breakdown would be; rental costs would most likely be more than the \$.16/square foot listed above. Superintendent Tarzian expressed caution about renting only part of the building to organizations with children, referencing the difficulty in blocking off areas of the building that aren't used.

V. K-6 ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS TEXTBOOK ADOPTION RECOMMENDATION

Assistant Superintendent Jim Hogeboom, District Literacy Coordinator Carrie O'Bryan, Hoover Elementary Teacher Katherine Inman, and Lincoln School Teacher Patti Ball presented information to the board regarding the recommendation to adopt the Houghton Mifflin Reading program K-6 English and K-5 Spanish.

Mr. Hogeboom said the textbook and curricular adoptions have been the most important part of his tenure so far, noting that teachers initiated both of them and that they support the district's literacy initiative. He said the difference in the K-6 English Language Arts textbook adoption is that the literacy team realized a core curriculum was needed. Mr. Hogeboom led review of the Corvallis School District 2005-06 and 2006-07 Literacy Plan in terms of how it relates to the adoption. (Filed as Supplemental Item #VII-27 in the Official 2006-07 Board Minutes.) He expressed pride in the District Literacy Team (DLT), which is K-12 and honors the district's teachers, the reading experts. He said the district is trying to get back onto the state textbook adoption cycle, adding that the last time the district adopted a core curriculum was 1983.

Ms. O'Bryan drew the board's attention to a document entitled *Reading Program Adoption Process*, which outlines the extensive process used by the district literacy team to narrow the potential programs to the one that is being recommended. She pointed out that the process offered multiple opportunities for input by teachers.

Mr. Hogeboom said the program is rich in resources and will require staff development for teachers. Ms. O'Bryan added that this is a huge shift in wealth of resources for teachers.

Staff responses to questions from the board included:

- ? The program includes works such as *Frog and Toad* and *Sarah, Plain and Tall*.
- ? The program includes non-fiction works with photographs of actual events, like hurricanes.
- ? The program is sort of a marriage of basal – more scripted – and the *Impressions* series, which is very focused on comprehension and authentic literature.

Ms. O'Bryan said Harcourt and Houghton were piloted, and she drew the board's attention to a list of all the teachers involved in the piloting. She said the vote was 7-1 in favor of the Houghton Mifflin program, and she drew board's attention to the list of key reasons for the recommendation to adopt Houghton Mifflin. (Filed as Supplemental Item #VII-28 in the Official 2006-07 Board Minutes.) She pointed out that there was no consensus on the Spanish component and explained the two contingency

plans that were implemented in order to arrive at a recommendation. She said the concerns had to do with the approach to phonics/syllabication and that teachers wanted to incorporate more authentic literature.

Ms. Inman shared her experience with the pilot project. She said her students have loved the books and activities; she had the same kids last year and they realize the difference between what she taught last year and what she's teaching this year. She sees great gains in her students' skills in both reading and writing. When she compared the teaching she did before and the teaching she does now, she was amazed at how much this series helped her teaching.

Ms. Ball shared her experience with the pilot project. She likes how the program helps students understand how to read a textbook and how to really learn the vocabulary. She likes the integration of math, art and social studies. She said after piloting the program, she realized that she had not been teaching deep enough and not teaching about how to use the English language. She said having all teachers use the same materials (like graphic organizers) will help teachers across all levels.

Mr. Hogeboom explained the public input process, which included a notice in the Gazette Times about the opportunity for the community to view and provide input about the materials, which are on display at the Construction Management Center.

Board members offered comments such as the huge message sent by having highly respected teachers say how much this process helped them, as well as compliments about the non-fiction/fiction piece and the fact that the program is not scripted.

Mr. Hogeboom explained the term "core curriculum": universal curriculum reaches 80% of the kids; 20% need more intervention; 5% is the top of the pyramid – students who need more intensive instruction.

In response to a question about equity, Ms. O'Bryan said that when textbook companies get on the state system they've been pre-screened already. Superintendent Tarzian Dawn clarified that the law requires adoption of books that are on the state's list.

Chair Rieck clarified that at the February 5 meeting the board will be asked to adopt Houghton Mifflin.

Responses to board queries included:

- ? There are intervention materials for middle and high schools that are built off of this platform; Hoover and Mt. View are piloting Response To Intervention to see which materials are the best. There are lists already of the 10 most effective reading intervention programs.
- ? Regarding TAG students, the district will probably have to look for higher level materials for top-level readers. There are resources for those as well in some of the publishing companies. Because there are authors studies, a mini-library comes with the program so any of the 6 themes

have support materials and TAG kids are looking at those materials. There are also sets of novels that build off of the same authors or themes. Reading research projects can also be set up for teachers to use.

The board expressed appreciation for the presentation and for the work of staff in arriving at this recommendation.

Chair Rieck called a five minute break at 7:57 p.m. and reconvened the meeting at 8:05 p.m.

VI. BUDGET DECISION: ADDITIONAL ALLOCATIONS

Business Director Kathy Rodeman referred to the presentation made by Superintendent Tarzian at the January 17, 2007 board meeting and drew the board's attention to a document distributed at that time (as well as at tonight's meeting) entitled *2006-07 Allocations of Additional Resources – Superintendent's Recommendation* and reiterated that the items listed above dotted line will be implemented in 2006-7; items below dotted line will be implemented over five years. (Note: this document had been filed as Supplemental Item #VI-2 in the Official 2006-07 Board Minutes on January 17, 2007.)

MOTION #28: It was moved by Director O'Malley and seconded by Director Higgins to approve the Superintendent's Recommendation of Allocations of Additional Resources for 2006-07. The motion was voted on and passed unanimously.

Superintendent Tarzian underscored that the use of the 4.0 classified time for 2006-07 is to be used to support students' education in one of the following ways:

- ? Support for classroom instruction in core subject areas of reading or math.
- ? Support for students in large or difficult classes – 18 classes exceed 30 students.
- ? Response To Intervention teamwork to address Student Support Plans including: student behavior plan development and implementation; student assessment planning and diagnosis.
- ? Technology support where technology issues interfere with student instruction.

Superintendent Tarzian said commitments made will be reinforced in the budget allocation process.

VII. BUDGET ASSUMPTIONS AND OUTLINE FOR PROCESS

Budget Analyst Linda Martin provided the board with a document entitled *Enrollment Comparison for September 30, 2006 and 2007* and led review of it. (Filed as Supplemental Item #VI-3 in the Official 2006-07 Board Minutes.) She explained that over the next five years the district expects to see an average of 50 fewer students per year.

Ms. Rodeman provided the board with a document entitled *2007-08 Preliminary Revenue Estimate – General Fund* and led review of it. (Filed as Supplemental Item #VI-4 in the Official 2006-07 Board Minutes.) She said the information it contains should be taken with a big grain of salt because the Governor's per-district allocation of the budget is not out yet. She referenced a coalition that is working together to get a budget of \$6.3 billion, which could mean more revenues for the district. She said she will share information with the board as it becomes available.

Ms. Rodeman said she believes the cash balance will be smaller next year for investment because some of it will be used this year. She added that the local option levy is another ray of hope for the next five years. She explained that tonight's discussion is about the general fund because it's what the board has the most control over, vs. title funds and special education funds.

Ms. Rodeman led review of a document entitled *2007-08 Preliminary Expenditures Estimate – General Fund*. (Filed as Supplemental Item #VI-5 in the Official 2006-07 Board Minutes.)

Ms. Martin led review of a document entitled *General Fund Budget 2007-08 Expenditure Assumptions*. (Filed as Supplemental Item #VI-6 in the Official 2006-07 Board Minutes.) Ms. Rodeman explained that the teacher salary and benefits assumptions don't lock in the board in any way – it's a planning estimate because the process has to occur at the same time the district is negotiating with the teachers' union.

Ms. Martin pointed out that the district will track revenues and expenditures from the levy under special codes.

Ms. Rodeman apologized for giving late notice to the budget committee citizen members, two of whom were in attendance: Leanne Giordono and Arne Larson. Ms. Rodeman said she will provide all of the citizen members the materials she reviewed tonight and give them a chance to meet with her and provide input. She committed to providing the board with the input given by budget committee citizen members.

Chair Rieck touched briefly on the coalition that Ms. Rodeman referred to earlier in the evening. Chair Rieck pointed out that the Chalkboard group has opted not to participate in the coalition. She said she wanted the board to know that there are different bills being proposed that are at odds with each other, and which might cost the district money.

VIII. DECISION REGARDING PROGRAM FOR LINCOLN K-8

Chair Rieck drew the board's attention to the action sheet they received tonight, outlining the recommendation from Assistant Superintendent Hogeboom to approve the Lincoln K-8 School of Choice. (Filed as Supplemental Item #IV-20 in the Official 2006-07 Board Minutes.)

The Lincoln School community was asked to use this fall to develop a K-8 program to bring to the district and school board for approval under board policy JECC – School Choice Program. Lincoln School piloted an Environmental Studies school of choice program for grades 6-8 for the 2006-07 school year. The board received information on this program as well as three other key elements of the Lincoln K-8 program at its January 17, 2007 meeting.

The Four Key Elements of the Lincoln K-8 Program are:

1. Early Childhood Education
 - Head Start
 - FLA (Latino Families Learning)
2. Extended Learning
 - CAEC (Community Academic and Enrichment Clubs)
3. Dual Immersion
4. Environmental Studies
 - Wildlife Stewards
 - Science
 - Middle School grades 6-8

Per Board Policy JECC – School Choice Program, the board needs to approve this school of choice as a continuing program.

Additional allocations were granted to Lincoln this year to cover start up costs. In addition, potential site modifications are currently being discussed to address the implementation of this program. The budget for facilities modifications would be expended from the Auxiliary Services budget. No additional operating funds or start-up costs have been requested. The school intends to offer this program using the allocations commensurate with other district schools.

Superintendent Tarzian pointed out that Lincoln School hasn't asked for more allocations than were granted to them this year, with the exception of some facility modifications; that's not to say that they won't come to the board in the future.

Per Administrative Regulation JECC-AR – School Choice Program, the superintendent will review all newly approved specialized curriculum after the first year of implementation. Per its discretion, the board will conduct periodic reviews of all schools with specialized curriculum to ensure efficient use of district resources and conformance with the district's educational program and vision.

MOTION #29: It was moved by Director Higgins and seconded by Director O'Malley to approve the Lincoln K-8 School of Choice.

Comments from the board included:

- ? Lincoln has created a monumental program and has communicated it so effectively.
- ? A desire to see the CAEC program succeed and a query about whether the district will be working with the school to develop the sustainability. Superintendent Tarzian explained that it is school-based. She said the grant is diminishing; it cycles down every year. She said that the district's commitment to the grantors was to find community support and that if she were to recommend that the district pick up those costs it would be in her budget recommendations. The school will have district support in exploring community support.
- ? Would like to have the principal and staff present again to the board in six or nine months to tell the board how this vision is being articulated K-8.
- ? The Lincoln program didn't just blossom over six months; former-principal Lois Rawers did a lot of work to boost enrollment last year. It wasn't just because Inavale closed and Lincoln went to a K-8. The success of the 6-8 component was because teachers Paul Bradley and Lori Greenfield had a year at Inavale to develop a program. Superintendent Tarzian pointed out that those two teachers taught at Lincoln before going to Inavale, so the "story" is a long one.

Superintendent Tarzian said the question before the board is whether this is what the board wants in that school. She pointed out that when the Even Start program grant wasn't renewed, the new program (FLA) started at the school level.

The motion was voted on and passed unanimously.

IX. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business before the board, Chair Rieck adjourned the meeting at 8:37 p.m.

Kari Rieck, Chair

Dawn Tarzian, Superintendent

Prepared by: Julie Catala

(s:\do\super\julie\board\minutes\2007\january 22 special meeting.doc)