

**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**

Chair O'Malley called the meeting to order at 7:05 p.m. in the Central Office Board Room, 1555 SW 35<sup>th</sup> Street, Corvallis. The secretary recorded those present as listed below.

<p><u>BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT</u>                  Nell O'Malley, Chair                  Kari Rieck, Vice Chair                  Helen Higgins                  Blake Rodman                  Matt Donohue                  Donna Keim                  Sara Gelser</p>	<p><u>EXECUTIVE STAFF PRESENT</u>                  Dawn Tarzian, Superintendent                  Jim Hogeboom, Assistant Superintendent                  Mary McKay, Student Services Director                  Jeanne Holmes, Human Resources Director                  Fred Wright, Auxiliary Services Director                  Julie Catala, Executive Assistant to the Superintendent</p>
<p><u>STUDENT REPRESENTATIVES PRESENT</u>                  Lynn Hector, Corvallis High School                  Brayden Moore, Crescent Valley High School</p>	<p><u>PRINCIPALS PRESENT</u>                  Lois Rawers, Lincoln Elementary</p>

A quorum was present and due notice had been published.

**II. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

Chair O'Malley led the group in the pledge of allegiance.

**III. CONTINUATION OF BOARD VALUES DISCUSSION PER BOARD GOALS:  
 #1 RESOURCE REVIEW AND PLAN AND  
 #5 ACADEMIC IMPROVEMENT**

Chair O'Malley opened the topic by stating that the goal was to further refine the values list developed by the Board at its previous meeting, which would provide guidance in addressing

their Board Goals #1 of aligning resources and #5 of articulating student learning outcomes of the Continuous Improvement Plan (CIP), a new State mandate.

Human Resources Director Jeanne Holmes provided the Board an overview of a graphic for the District's Strategic Plan which depicted values and vision as influences on Student Outcomes, CIP Process, and Resources. Assistant Superintendent Hogeboom requested that the Board provide guidance for the student outcomes using community input as the CIP Team was involved in performing a District self-evaluation. Ms. Holmes orated the organized list of values and guiding principals the Board had developed at its last meeting and Board members provided additional items to the list:

### **Values/Guiding Principles**

1. Stability
  - Stability for Inavale and Life Skills Families
2. Diversity
  - Opportunities, regardless of path
  - Methodologies/program choice/choice options (core knowledge, K-8, . . .)
  - K-8: How many, how long?
3. Equity
  - Parent access; ability to participate in school after and during
  - Don't isolate kids socio-economically
  - Inclusion in regular classrooms
  - Access to general curriculum/literacy for all
4. All kids connected/personalized education
  - No high school larger than \_\_\_\_\_
  - No middle school larger than \_\_\_\_\_
  - Class size
5. Quality instruction
  - Quality of Staffing
  - Staff development, celebrations, performance evaluations
6. Students engaged in learning throughout the school day
  - No idle children
  - Get rid of open blocks
  - As little unassigned time as possible
7. Access at all schools to what all children should know and be able to do
  - Art, music, PE, language
  - Consistency – no matter what school, consistent experience in curriculum
8. Variety of learning opportunities
  - Electives – academic
  - K-8's, core knowledge
9. Community involvement
  - Community Building
10. Prepare for life beyond school
  - Service Learning

- Extended Learning
  - Career Planning
  - Vocational /Trade training
  - Lifelong learner
  - Self-direction
  - Creating engaged citizens
11. All students deserve to learn
    - Equal access to curriculum
    - Focus on English Language Learners and at-risk students
    - All kids read at grade level
    - Inclusion in regular classrooms/access to general curriculum
  12. Focus on whole child
    - Well-rounded curriculum at all levels
    - Healthy – physically active
  13. Use dollars wisely/cost effective decisions
  14. Alignment of goals and strategic planning
    - Complete established goals
    - Blend w/CIP
  15. Safe, welcoming inclusive school culture climate
  16. Respect for spheres of influence of all individuals/parties responsible for district operations

Ms. Holmes noted that the District had been operating with a student outcomes document. It is about ten years old, entitled “Life Roles Education” and each Board member had one at their place.

Director Donohue suggested turning the values into a vision statement akin to what was illuminated at the recent Oregon School Boards Association (OSBA) workshop, such as the one that Klamath Falls has been using successfully for 15 years. It could also be similar to the City’s 2020 Statement. Director Gelser countered that a strategic plan is problematic because resources and requirements change frequently, so the District needs to be nimble. Director Higgins expressed everybody is in a changing environment whether in education or not, a vision provides grounding. She stated that she sees current class size as the bottom line, something that the District will not increase further. Assistant Superintendent Hogeboom added that the CIP process looks at how the District is doing and cautioned that it is encompassing and includes an action plan.

Superintendent Tarzian offered a timeline for the Board to make practical decisions regarding alignment of resources with enrollment that would reflect their values. Potential decisions involve nearly every school in district as well as having an effect on the workflow of District staff, distribution and timing of facilities projects, student enrollment choices, levy needs, value of remaining bond dollars, boundaries, and other subsequent decisions. She requested that the Board direct her to use the values they have generated as the guide to select the Program and Resource Review (PR2) Committee scenario or scenarios or propose a creative alternative that

will allow decisions about Corvallis High School (CHS) and Franklin K-8 to be made no later than July 1, 2006. She also provided them with two key questions related to CHS and Franklin K-8:

*Question #1:*

Should the Board make the decision about the CHS Master Plan first, and then decide about Franklin **or** should these decisions be made simultaneously?

*Question #2:*

If the Board directs staff to make recommendations re: Franklin's future program and/or location based on

- Current articulated Board values and student outcomes
- Input gathered from community during PR2 process
- Staff's professional judgment on soundness of educational benefit for all students

does the Board want one or more possible scenarios with a ranked recommendation from the superintendent?

Superintendent Tarzian clarified that the "CHS Master Plan" includes the consideration to raze the Franklin K-8 building.

Chair O'Malley called a break at 8:22 p.m. The meeting resumed at 8:30 p.m.

Chair O'Malley proposed that a meeting date be found to consider the items proposed by Superintendent Tarzian.

Chair O'Malley, hearing no objections, exercised her prerogative and altered the order of the agenda, switching the order of Items III and IV, Discussion and Decision on Levy Option and Discussion and Decision on Lincoln K-8 respectively.

#### **IV. DISCUSSION AND DECISION ON LINCOLN K-8**

**MOTION #59:** Director Keim moved, Director Higgins seconded, to approve and accept Superintendent Tarzian's recommendations on Lincoln K-8. (See Supplemental Item #IV-37 in the Official 2005-06 Minutes.)

Director Rieck expressed her wish that there had been more time for public input; others offered that both Lincoln Elementary and Inavale K-8 staff had been visited and possible changes discussed weeks ago; parents have received the information informally. Principal Rawers stated that Lincoln's last PTA meeting had been open to Inavale K-8 parents. She added that

Lincoln parents have asked before why not have a Lincoln K-8? She included information in last Friday's school newsletter about this evening's Board meeting so she feels as far as newsletters are read that they were informed.

Ms. Holmes stated that if the recommendations are adopted this evening, parents will know formally by letter tomorrow. Transfer deadlines would need to be extended as the Lincoln 6-8 would be a school of choice. She stated that there was only one adamant opposition voiced.

After restatement of the motion by Chair O'Malley illuminating that the change would occur beginning with the 2006-07 school year, the motion was passed unanimously.

Chair O'Malley exercised her prerogative and again changed the order of the agenda, moving the "Discussion and Decision on Levy Option," Item III of the agenda, to the end of the meeting so that the remaining items of concern to the Auxiliary Services Staff could be completed allowing them to depart the meeting upon their completion.

## **V. CONVENE AS LOCAL CONTRACT REVIEW BOARD**

Chair O'Malley announced that the Board was now convened as the Local Contract Review Board for the purpose of conducting a public hearing. The purpose of the hearing is to take comment on or consider the District's proposed Findings of Fact for special procurement and exemptions from the State of Oregon public purchasing competitive bidding requirements to enable installation and operation of solar panels at Crescent Valley High School.

### **A. OPEN PUBLIC HEARING FOR COMMENTS ON DRAFT FINDINGS FOR EXEMPTION FROM COMPETITIVE BIDDING REQUIREMENT**

Chair O'Malley opened the public hearing at 8:45 p.m. No one wished to comment.

### **B. CLOSE PUBLIC HEARING**

Chair O'Malley closed the public hearing at 8:46 p.m.

### **C. ADOPT FINDINGS OF FACT**

Chair O'Malley invited discussion from the Board. No one wished to comment.

**MOTION #60:** Director Rieck moved, Director Gelser seconded, to adopt the Finding of Fact for special procurements and exemptions from the State of Oregon public purchasing competitive bidding requirements. (See Supplemental Item #X-31 in the Official 2005-06 Board Minutes.)

The motion passed unanimously.

**VI. DISBAND AS LOCAL CONTRACT REVIEW BOARD AND RECONVENE AS SCHOOL BOARD**

So done.

**VII. AGREEMENT W/FOOTWISE, INC. FOR INSTALLATION/OPERATION OF SOLAR PANELS AT CVHS**

**MOTION #61:** Director Gelser moved, Director Rodman seconded, to approve the Agreement with Footwise, Inc. for Installation and Operation of Solar Panels at Crescent Valley High School. (See Supplemental Item #I-35 in the Official 2005-06 Board Minutes.)

The motion passed unanimously.

**VIII. AMENDMENT TO THE AGREEMENT WITH CITY OF CORVALLIS FOR OSBORN AQUATIC CENTER**

Director Rieck requested that the item be postponed as she had a remaining concern regarding in-District but out-of-City-limits patrons paying increased user fees when they paid through property taxes for construction of the pool as did within District/within City patrons. Auxiliary Services Director Fred Wright drew the Board's attention to the first highlighted sentence in Amendment #2 of the Osborn Agreement "The City shall charge fees as approved by the Corvallis City Council which may include an out of city fee for those participants who reside out side of the city limits and do not contribute through taxes to the operational cost of the aquatic center," and offered that that could answer the concern. Director Gelser further questioned the separation of the in-City/out of City fee structure by asking if it was equitable if a voter who paid to build the facility to all of a sudden no longer have the benefit of in-district due to the ownership of the facility changing hands. As the concern could not be completely addressed due to the absence of a City employee it was agreed to postpone the item to a future meeting.

Chair O'Malley called a break at 8:58 p.m. so document copies could be made. The meeting resumed at 9:04 p.m.

**IX. DISCUSSION AND DECISION ON LEVY OPTION**

Director Gelser referred to the levy Power Point presentation she had given at the previous levy discussion meeting March 13. She had e-mailed members copies this day and was providing a hard copy for this meeting. (See Supplemental Item #VII-27 in the Official 2005-06 Board Minutes.) She orally recapped the information.

She informed the group that county commissioners had not yet decided if they were going to pursue a levy, but that seems likely. She announced that next week will be a special session of legislature wherein \$43 million might be distributed from lottery funds of which Corvallis School District could receive about a half-million for the biennium, about \$250,000 per year. She will know by Friday evening.

Board members entered into a discussion of whether to pursue a District levy this November. Members expressed concern over the amount of work on their plate which also encumbers staff time and the feeling that the work might need to be completed prior to requesting additional funding, leading them to suggest 2008 as an alternative. Others countered that even if all the extra capacity were to be squeezed out of the District, it would still need money. 2008 would also be a time when the District was coming off of labor negotiations. What happens if the District goes into negotiations with a budget shortfall of \$1.5 million or \$3.1 million? Chair O'Malley noted that it takes \$800,000 to reduce class sizes by one. Desire was voiced that the needs should be articulated prior to asking for levy approval. Crescent Valley Student Representative Brayden Moore suggested drawing a comparison for voters of what they likely had when going to school compared to what today's students have. Director Gelser agreed that the Board does have a lot on its plate but part of that is due to lack of funding. She reminded them that though the last levy failed it was close, even under poor campaign circumstances. She related that someone had said the most important thing the Board/District can do is to invest in the students it has today. It would be a great change of pace to say, what the District is going to build rather than tearing apart. She stated that the executive summary of the county commissioners' survey shows voters would more likely approve a county levy if there were also a school levy on the ballot.

Continued discussion revealed comments of:

- The District's work is never going to be done; there's always going to be difficult decisions, and the District is in need of funds.
- The Board would do the work of the levy, not district staff. District staff cannot campaign for this, cannot participate in activities of the political action committee (PAC), cannot draft, photocopy, or proofread literature. Staff cannot draft numbers in favor or opposition. They can draft neutral analysis of what it may or may not do. Anything beyond that is prohibited by state election law. They cannot dedicate their resources or time, or the District's resources towards advocating a political position. Board members are the only ones in District that can campaign.
- Levy funds would plug the budget gap that will only grow due to declining enrollment over the next five years. It is the only way to plug the gap. This is an opportunity to stop something that can be seen is going to happen.
- Inavale parents were told the Board/District would do all they could to improve the District. If say do not want to go out for campaign levy because we think we might lose, we won't get support next time from parents who are being asked to sacrifice due to tough decisions.
- Understands per Business Service's Director Rodeman's presentation at previous meeting that PERS (Public Employees Retirement System) adjustments actually will allow use of

new levy funds for buying back services or reducing class sizes, and even put some away for future cuts. It would not just be stop-gap money. If levy were \$3.2 million / year over 5 years may not make further reductions over the 5 years and would have \$1.3 million per year for enhancements.

- If the Board were more efficient in its decision-making, pursuing a levy would become more doable. Very much in favor of if can follow a timeline such as the one created by Superintendent Tarzian, which has the Franklin decision scheduled for June.
- Concerned about mixed messages from parent groups as to whether to pursue
- Won't find in history that 100% of people affected vote for. If asked do you want more things or less taxes, they say yes, wanting both.
- Concerned about staff time as they would likely need to be relied upon to provide information
- Concerned about additional meetings which pursuing a levy might incur
- Concern that if had had this levy money, would the decision to close Inavale been made?
- Due to the tax structures, not everyone in the taxing district would contribute to the levy, different landowners pay differing amounts.
- Will have a very organized group working against levy

Superintendent Tarzian stated she was committed to supporting the Board's decision. Director Gelser stated that an adequate decision point for the evening would be to decide whether to pursue the levy; the amount could be determined at a later time. Chair O'Malley confirmed that if the vote were split, all members should support the vote as part of their Agreements. Those who were not in favor of pursuing a levy expressed that it was not the levy itself but the timing, feeling the need to take care of other District business first and having the ability to be more prepared.

Crescent Valley Student Representative Brayden Moore noted that the proposed levy is small when compared to the approved \$86 million capitol improvement levy. He suggested that even if only 300 of the District's 2400 high school students work towards levy passage that would be quite a student movement.

**MOTION #62:** Director Higgins moved, Director Rieck seconded, to delay a vote on whether the District should pursue an operating levy to the next voting meeting.

Directors Higgins and Rieck voted to approve the motion; all others voted in opposition. The motion failed by a vote of 2-5.

**MOTION #63:** Director Donohue moved, Director Rodman seconded, that the District should pursue an option levy in 2006, details to be determined later.

Directors Higgins and Rieck voted in opposition to the motion; all others voted in favor. The motion passed by a vote of 5-2.

Director Gelser requested to start a political action committee for the levy to which Chair O'Malley replied in the affirmative.

**X. OTHER BUSINESS**

Director Rieck distributed Budget Advisory Committee Process Recommendations to the Board.

**XI. ADJOURN**

Being no further business, Chair O'Malley adjourned the meeting at 10:04 p.m.

---

Kari Rieck, Chair\*

---

Dawn Tarzian, Superintendent

\*Chair at the time the minutes were submitted for adoption.

Prepared by Jolene Shute  
(s:\super\julie\board\minutes\2006\april 10 special meeting.doc)