

Note: This is a summary of the minutes from this meeting.

MINUTES

Regular 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 6:07 p.m. in the Construction Management Center, 1435 SW 35th 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 Kathy Rodeman, Business Services Director Mary McKay, Student Services Director Jeanne Holmes, Human Resources Director Fred Wright, Auxiliary Services Director Fred Kane, Corvallis Public Schools Foundation Duane Jager, Technology Services Manager Julie Catala, Executive Assistant</p>
<p><u>STUDENT REPRESENTATIVES PRESENT</u> Brayden Moore, Crescent Valley High School</p>	<p><u>PRINCIAPLS PRESENT</u> Cherie Stroud, Crescent Valley High School Lois Rawers, Lincoln Elementary</p>

A quorum was present and due notice had been published.

II. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Director O’Malley led the group in the pledge of allegiance.

III. COMMITTEE/BOARD MEMBER ITEMS

A. STUDENT/STAFF HIGHLIGHTS

A summary of comments by Director Rieck:

- ♦ She attended the high school professional development event, which was amazing. She was

extremely impressed with the collaboration and work being done by the staff at both schools. They are working very hard in the best interest of students.

- ♦ She knows that the training also happened with middle school and elementary staffs.
- ♦ She acknowledged the direction of Superintendent Tarzian and her staff in ensuring that everyone is working toward the future of the district.
- ♦ She expressed thanks to the staff at all schools for their work.

A summary of comments by Director Donohue:

- ♦ He visited Corvallis High School and spent time with staff and toured the facility and he encouraged the rest of board to do the same. It is an amazing building and an amazing staff who took time out of their day to demonstrate some of the new and exciting educational opportunities possible with the new building.
- ♦ Additional resources are needed if the district is going to meet the needs and expectations of students and the community.

Director Rodman attended a dance performance at Corvallis High School by the Rainbow Dance Troup, tying West African links to hip hop. It was a great performance.

Director Higgins participated in an extended learning event with the Crescent Valley veterinary medicine program. She observed a veterinarian/healer work with animals.

B. OTHER

Director Gelser alerted the board to a flyer they received regarding the Oregon School Board Association's legislative process committee. She encouraged board members to participate in the development of the association's platform.

Chair O'Malley briefed the board on research she will present at a conference in Portugal, necessitating that she join the February 27, 2006 board meeting via telephone. Her presentation revolves around keeping the arts alive in education. Her trip is being funded entirely by the Oregon State University College of Education.

IV. STUDENT REPRESENTATIVES

Crescent Valley High School Student Representative Moore said he received a lot of strong support from fellow students after the Gazette Times article appeared on equity. Students were ecstatic when they heard that the school would be getting 27 new computers.

V. SUPERINTENDENT'S REPORT - RECOGNITION OF MOLLY WHITNEY AND DEO BUENAVENTURA

Superintendent Tarzian introduced Corvallis High School students Molly Whitney and Deo Buenaventura who entered the 2005 Oregon Year of Languages Poster Contest. Molly was awarded

grand prize overall for the state and Deo received first place for 9-12 grade students. All Oregon schools, public and private, were sent a copy of Molly's poster to display in their school.

Molly and Deo shared their reflections on what prompted the designs they submitted.

Superintendent Tarzian said both students' artwork portrayed cultural understanding and diversity so well. She introduced audience members Teddi Crotti and Jane Kiekel, who were Molly's and Deo's teachers at the time the students entered the contests.

Molly and Deo introduced their parents, who were in the audience.

VI. CITIZEN PARTICIPATION

Marilyn Jordan, 623 NW Witham Drive, Corvallis – A summary of her comments: Keep Inavale K-8 open for at least three years. There is a national trend toward K-8 education. Wants the board to have a proactive plan toward what the community wants around K-8. Closing Inavale K-8 will close opportunities for all but 60-80 students (Franklin). Inavale K-8 meets creative financing and the diverse needs of the community.

Natalie Summerlin, 1120 NW 32nd, Corvallis – A summary of her comments: Inavale K-8 is a mostly successful school if you look at the big picture. One problem has been attracting new students and that is primarily due to the perceived instability of the school's future. The board's commitment to the Inavale K-8 model as curriculum and program would make Inavale K-8 a completely successful school. If Inavale K-8 cannot be maintained as a rural school, can its program be moved into town in its entirety? Can the board commit to keeping Inavale K-8 open for five years? Given a fair chance to survive, Inavale K-8 will.

Karen Wegner, 2775 NW Johnson Avenue, Corvallis – distributed "healthy waters," a publication of Healthy Waters Institute, a student-staffed research and teaching institute working to provide Oregon students with knowledge of their local land and water. A summary of her comments: Inavale K-8 became one of our most exciting schools when they joined this year. The students on the field trip were well prepared and asked engaging, relevant and thoughtful questions. Every single volunteer commented on the high caliber of students. We have four pilot programs in Oregon, one of which is in the Mary's River watershed. I am working with the Philomath superintendent to develop a comprehensive program so that every child will be exposed to relevant outdoor science education. I hope 509J will want to participate as well. Place-based education connects students to their communities. Inavale K-8 is the perfect opportunity for 509J to commit to something innovative and successful. Inavale K-8 has the perfect location including its proximity to Oregon State University. The publication I gave the board highlights an Inavale K-8 student; it was sent to more than 4000 students in Oregon.

Manley Thompson, 30461 Oakview Drive, Corvallis – Held up a copy of the contract from 1950, when the Inavale K-8 land was donated to the district. A summary of his comments: It was called the Inavale K-8 School District at that time, not the Corvallis School District, and the contract reflected

that. If the district does not use the site for a school, it would have to remove the buildings from the property. Is the district using the Inavale K-8 site to the best benefit of all of the Inavale K-8 school district? Someone from Philomath will be working with the nature trail area that we worked with (butterfly garden) and will be teaching students how to prune trees, looking at whether those trees are the best use of the site. His goal in donating the property was that students would be taking home the information and sharing it with their parents.

Dolly Beck, 24699 Llewellyn Road, Corvallis – A summary of her comments: She has three children attending Inavale K-8, including a son who is in a wheelchair. Inavale K-8 is important for her family because it is small. Her son thrives there. He has never had to know what it is like to be teased. Kids do not have to worry if they have the right clothes, etc. The school is so special. Give the school more time.

Candace Morago – read from a prepared statement. A summary of her comments: her family lives in Albany but transferred their son to Inavale K-8 at his request. She is a master's student in social work with an emphasis in child welfare. Schools are a place for social growth as well as academics. Inavale K-8 provides several protective factors for the well-being of children. There are hidden costs to rural children by closing Inavale K-8. Girls show a decreased interest in math and science and the middle school experience is paramount to changing that interest. Inavale K-8 has a strong focus on science. As a small school, there are increased feelings of safety for students.

Jennifer Hall, 1500 Madison Street SE, Albany – A summary of her comments: Her son is on transfer to Inavale K-8 after attending a small, private kindergarten last year. Her son was in awe of the school, its very caring environment and how the volunteers called everyone by name. Classes are small, everything is different. There is a buddy program – mentors by older kids – so kids do not feel lost in the crowd. There is a spirit of community. Closing Inavale K-8 will cause many to reevaluate transferring into Corvallis.

Kristina Wonderly, 25619 Wonderly Lane, Philomath – A summary of her comments: her family owns 80 acres of land and have been in the Inavale area longer than Inavale has existed. Six generations of her family have gone to Inavale. Inavale K-8 has become their home. Her son hated school until his first day at Inavale, where he thrived. Money is discussed a lot; Inavale K-8 is said to not be financially viable. She did a non-scientific poll of her neighbors who live in the Inavale K-8 boundary. Many will consider going to Philomath – that is a hidden cost for closing Inavale K-8 that needs to be considered. Take the cost and transfer it to value. She values rural community, as does the governor. Research shows that K-8 is valued. The board has an opportunity to keep a school open that is very valued and could be very successful if given a chance. Value us like we value our school.

Bill Richardson, 24550 Ervin Road, Philomath – A summary of his comments: Oregon recognizes that rural communities are a resource that we cannot afford to lose. The governor has embarked on the sustainable rural communities' initiative. We are partnering with OSU. Inavale K-8's unique location makes it a natural partner. Other schools could come to Inavale K-8 to learn about the issues facing agriculture. Inavale K-8 could be a base and its students could be mentors for the district. It would be a tremendous waste of resources to let that go away. Keep the rural resource viable.

Tanya Freeman – ceded her time to others; she submitted written testimony filed in Section V of the Official 2005-06 Board Minutes.

Payton James-Amberg, 6240 SW Trellis Drive, Corvallis – A summary of her comments: the kindergarten program at Inavale K-8 is unique to meeting our community's needs. Last year the district decided to invest in Inavale K-8 and help us reinvent the small school to see if it could be successful. We developed a comprehensive plan with the goals of reducing costs and maintaining high educational standards. Closing the school now wastes the time, energy and money that has already been spent. We took a leap of faith to reinvent Inavale K-8 – is it fair to all of us while we are just realizing the return on our investment? We have gotten results – this is not the same situation as last year. We are attracting students from outside, our kindergarten and first grade enrollment is much larger than ever. We are obtaining grants.

Heidi Powell, 2035 SE 3rd, Corvallis – A summary of her comments: she brought her kids to Inavale K-8 for its rigorous well-rounded curriculum. Inavale K-8 students do well at the high school level and our school has high scores on the state report card. She discussed the awards students received. She questioned: Is it also a good time to take away the Inavale K-8 choice when open enrollment is being limited?

Grant Thackray – Inavale K-8 student. A summary of his comments: Inavale K-8 is a great place for field trips to a lot of interesting places that are close by (not so many cars to scare away the animals). Students can walk to most of the field trip spots, saving money on buses. He described some of the field trips he has been on, which involved dissecting owl pellets, sketching flora and fauna, and a salmon watch. The school received grants for nitrate and PH testing. The Inavale K-8 trail is being renovated. Hands-on science is a better education than just reading a textbook. Inavale K-8's humanities courses are great. Inavale K-8 is a fun and innovative place and it is the best school that he has attended.

Jessica Wheeler, 3196 SE Hathaway Drive, Corvallis – A summary of her comments: her family attends Inavale K-8 and her son has muscular dystrophy. He is physically disabled and medically fragile. Her family chose Inavale K-8 because of its size – the exposure of her son to many kids would be dangerous to his health. A lot of kids with the same condition are not allowed to go to school. When her family visited Inavale K-8, the kids invited her son in and did not even stare at him. The kids treat him the same as they treat everyone else. One day her son joined physical education class late and the class automatically adapted the activity to include him.

Gretchen Babcock, 7335 SW Deerhaven, Corvallis – A summary of her comments: in her 25 years of being in 509J, a lot of programs have come and gone. Inavale K-8 has moved steadily and quietly forward and has groomed the way for critical learning to keep education and rural farmlands alive, so children can be raised in a healthy, sustainable world. If the board keeps Inavale K-8 open it will be ahead of the pack with innovative learning. If the board closes the school, it will be a victory to everyone who wants to see the end of public education. Her passion is children; they are the storytellers. She believes in public education – have established so much potential in learning about the land, small businesses, hard work and success. Mother Nature's gifts are what Inavale K-8 has taught us. Times are financially hard and will continue to be so, especially in Corvallis with a declining student population. Are we going to continue to nickel and dime our way through, afraid to step out, afraid to

let the caged bird fly, afraid to implement the District's student learning vision? Inavale K-8 is collaborating with OSU in research and learning and is being a good steward of the land. Inavale K-8's legacy is wise. Resourceful people can keep this earth alive for generations to come.

Bill Patton, PO Box 975, Philomath – A summary of his comments: It is simple to cut off the southern part of the district's boundaries. When the young cute one gets separated from the herd, its life expectancy goes way down. He hopes the board is not a pack of wolves when dealing with schools. Make effective choices. He referred to a map with circles around the various schools, illustrating how many circles overlap each other, yet how Inavale K-8's circle stands alone. With redundancy in the center of the map, the board is considering closing the one that is by itself. Inavale K-8 would save the district the least amount of money of all schools the board could close. The Inavale K-8 community has listened to what the board and administration have said – they had tried hard to answer the questions. They have been at Inavale K-8 for years and have some knowledge about what goes on out there that cannot be gained in a couple of weeks.

Chair O'Malley temporarily recessed the meeting at 7:25 p.m. and reconvened it at 7:30 p.m.

Kathleen Westley, 31469 Peterson Road, Philomath – A summary of her comments: she is a representative of "educational mutt-ism." Her family is spread across several schools, including Inavale K-8, and she home schools one of her children. Both of her children had been in the public school system in their early primary grades. From a home schooler's perspective, Inavale K-8 occupies a unique place. Several people she knows decided to enroll their kids in half or full days at Inavale K-8; that would be a much larger percentage of the home school group were Inavale K-8 allowed to remain open.

John Gabriel, 975 SE Park Avenue, Corvallis – A summary of his comments: His family owns a local computer business and he deals with budgets every day; his background is as a scientist. He has two kids at Inavale K-8 and they are flourishing. His family was attracted to Inavale K-8 because of the K-8 model. They were also drawn because of the rural environment, the sense of community, and involved parents. Inavale K-8 is a jewel, but is it viable? There is a rumor every year that the school will close. Saturday's G-T had an article on kindergarten registration and past articles referred to possible configuration changes including Inavale. He related that the Board had aimed to look at Inavale K-8 along with all the schools in the District and he questioned the validity of the report that staff gave to the board– noting that it only looked at Inavale K-8 and the cost per student as compared to other schools is not available. He questioned how only the Barley Hill neighborhood was chosen as a possible addition to Inavale and what criteria was used to do so. He contends that Inavale is a viable school if it can be assured of staying in operation for five years. Competition between schools is not necessarily a bad thing; it has caused people to think creatively about Inavale K-8.

John Dilles, 31459 Peterson Road, Philomath – A summary of his comments: He teaches geology and research at OSU. He has three kids who have either gone through or are currently enrolled at Inavale K-8. Inavale K-8 serves a special need in the rural area. It has a long tradition of academic excellence, which he attributes to the concerned and dedicated staff, parents and volunteers and the support there (such as by the PTO). Build on the human capital. Most of the discussion about closing Inavale K-8 focuses on money. Money should follow successful programs and people. With low enrollment, the

Inavale K-8 facility costs are a little higher. Travel time for staff is greater, but going from the district office to schools on the north side of town is a similar distance. Administrative costs are well below the district average. Look at the cost/benefit. OSU grants are targeted at rural schools. The National Science Foundation has two priorities for grants – science and education (outreach). Inavale K-8 makes a positive contribution to 509J; build on it and make its success a model for how other schools should operate.

Mary Santelmann 4035 NW Morgan Place, Corvallis – A summary of her comments: She is a scientist at OSU. Inavale K-8 offers the opportunity to bring money from outside the district that could not be obtained any other way. It is hard to get grants targeted for urban schools in Corvallis because the community does not compare with other areas such as Portland. She has written three grants for 509J and the only one that was funded was for Inavale K-8. She would like to see our schools offering something to the other schools in the district. Inavale K-8 has been a leader. Over half of the land in the world is agricultural; over 70% of the rain in the U.S. falls on private land. Our kids believe that nature is someplace that you visit in a pot or you see on TV – the disconnect is not good for our country. Inavale K-8 is a way to address that disconnect. Students can learn about the people and about the way people work the land.

Jose Vega, 37272 Soap Creek Road, Corvallis – A summary of his comments: His family takes advantage of open enrollment. Chose Jefferson based on the culture there and the fact that it has the kindergarten program that was the best solution for his child. Recommended changing the grandfathering clause to eliminate the three year time limit for siblings to attend; moreover that open enrollment restrictions be set at the natural transition levels between schools. Regarding equity within the District, he has mostly heard talk of numbers; would like to hear comments like, “We must balance the resources among the offerings for our students.” This will help remind parents why the District is tackling such a heartfelt issue for the benefit of our kids.

VII. STAFF PARTICIPATION

No staff wished to speak.

VIII. OTHER DISTRICT BUSINESS

A. APPOINTMENT OF BUDGET COMMITTEE CITIZEN MEMBERS

(See Supplemental Item #VI-2 in the Official 2005-06 Board Minutes.)

A summary of Chair O’Malley’s comments:

- ♦ Last year there were five openings on the budget committee and 10 applicants.
- ♦ This year there are only two openings. Due to the number of issues the Board is addressing, consideration has been given to selecting new members via a different process.
- ♦ Director Rieck had recommended having a committee review the applications and bring recommendations to the board.

- ♦ The board anticipated a lot of applications, although there were only three.
- ♦ Two deadlines were published; one application arrived according to the second deadline, and was accepted. The committee was not aware of the second deadline and met before the third application arrived. Upon knowing, the committee wanted to meet again after receipt of the third application.
- ♦ Chair O'Malley proposed that in future, if there are fewer than four applicants, all the names be forwarded to the board. If more than four, the process should be revisited.
- ♦ In this instance, she recommends that the board approve the two names the committee forwarded. If they choose not to do so then the process would start from scratch and all three applications would be considered.

A summary of comments by Business Director Kathy Rodeman:

- ♦ In developing the criteria, staff consulted with the City of Corvallis and the Salem School District. Neither had a magical process.
- ♦ The three criteria that the committee felt would help determine the best applicants included experience in financial management, involvement with 509J, and involvement with other community organizations or local government.
- ♦ Budget committee citizen members Karyle Butcher and Julie Manning were also on the selection committee and felt the two names were good matches.

Director Rieck pointed out that the process referred to above by Chair O'Malley was not the process Director Rieck had proposed.

Director Keim recommended accepting the recommendation of the committee, especially in light of the amount of work facing the board currently. If a decision is delayed on the appointments, it would delay the budget work even longer.

A summary of comments by Director Higgins:

- ♦ She would like to know how the process changed and why.
- ♦ She would like to know when appointments need to be made.
- ♦ She read from a transcript of the January 23 meeting during which the selection/appointment process was discussed.
- ♦ She said board members left the meeting expecting that the process would be streamlined.
- ♦ No board members have seen the applications.
- ♦ The committee was not asked to recommend names.

A summary of responses by Ms. Rodeman:

- ♦ The budget committee would not normally meet until mid-May.
- ♦ Three meetings would be held in May and one in June.
- ♦ The board adopts the budget at the end of June.
- ♦ Identifying budget committee members soon was desired so they could attend the board meetings where possible school closures are being discussed (and other issues the board is working on).
- ♦ There is not a drop dead date for appointing members.
- ♦ Two very, very experienced budget committee citizen members were on the selection

committee and discussion was held about the way to identify potential candidates and how the group could help the board.

- ♦ The conversation was basically that the board is really busy on other topics; this is something we can do to help the board streamline their work.
- ♦ The intent was to apply objective criteria and objectively review applications; two to four names would be forwarded to the board.

A summary of comments by Director Gelser:

- ♦ This situation illustrates a collision of good intentions.
- ♦ When this comes up next year, the board should develop process at a board meeting and put it on an agenda.
- ♦ Different people have had different expectations about the process.
- ♦ She had raised concerns about the process but felt that the committee did an excellent job and that there were three exceptional candidates.

Director Rieck pointed out that the committee was never given a charge.

Director Keim said it would have been different if there were a lot more names for the two slots, but there were only three applicants. She suggested reviewing the process for next year.

MOTION #43: Regarding citizen appointments to the District's Budget Committee, it was moved by Director Keim to accept the two recommended names from the subcommittee.

MOTION #44: It was moved by Director Higgins and seconded by Director Rieck that the board table the matter (citizen appointments to the District's Budget Committee) until February 27, 2006.

A summary of comments by Director Donohue:

- ♦ There might be a hybrid process of having board members review the three applications and then come back on February 27 and determine whether or not to adopt the committee's recommendations.
- ♦ It would just be looking at the information the committee had on those individuals.
- ♦ Rather than let the process question derail us, it might be a way to satisfy the folks comfortable with the process and those who feel they need more information.

Director Keim pointed out that the board did have an opportunity to review the applications; as they had received an email regarding the matter.

A summary of comments by Director Rieck:

- ♦ The board is trying to be transparent with the community and keep its processes clear.
- ♦ The board is looking at an appointment to the budget committee, the selection was publicly posted.
- ♦ The third candidate's name is not even available to the board.
- ♦ At a minimum, the names should be available to the community and so should their applications.

A summary of comments by Chair O'Malley:

- ♦ Ms. Rodeman sent an email to the board on Feb 2, 2006, stating the candidate names and criteria and that anyone could see the applications.
- ♦ Chair O'Malley sent out an email to the board asking about criteria and never got feedback from anyone, other than Director Gelser, until after the names were recommended to the board, so she is concerned about changing process but she will go with the will of the Board.

Director Rodman recommended taking a vote on Director Higgins' motion. If it fails, reconsider Director Keim's motion.

Director Gelser asked if the motion could be amended to have the voting happen at a date other than February 27 because the Inavale K-8 community will be waiting to find out if their school will remain open.

Director Higgins said she would be willing to amend her motion to have the vote taken on March 13, 2006 to provide full opportunity to review the three applicants.

Director Donohue asked for verification that the review process would not be starting from the beginning; it would simply be a way for board members to review the application materials.

A summary of comments by Director Higgins:

- ♦ Yes, it is putting it back into the process.
- ♦ The board never said it wanted the committee to come back with two names.
- ♦ The transcripts say the committee will forward two to four names.
- ♦ The board has a history and culture of not accepting recommendations from committees because it gets the board in trouble.
- ♦ She needs to know the background of these three people before she is comfortable making a decision.
- ♦ She may support the recommendation but she has had no time to understand the applicants.
- ♦ This process is out of integrity with board agreements.
- ♦ The board must get back to doing what it says it is going to do.
- ♦ This has happened on multiple occasions and now it is biting the board.

MOTION #45: Chair O'Malley called the question. It was voted on and passed unanimously.

The motion (#44) to table the matter until March 13, 2006 was voted upon. Directors Rieck, Donohue and Higgins voted in favor of the motion; Chair O'Malley and Directors Rodman, Keim and Gelser voted in opposition.

The motion failed.

Director Rodman seconded the motion (#43) by Director Keim to accept the two recommended names from the subcommittee.

The motion (#43) was voted on. Chair O'Malley and Directors Rodman, Keim and Gelser voted in favor of the motion; Directors Rieck, Donohue and Higgins voted in opposition.

The motion carried.

Chair O'Malley announced the two new citizen members of the District's Budget Committee to be Lisa Ulmer and Arne Larson. She appreciated the fact that the District has such strong applicants.

Director Donohue asked if the applicants were notified prior to the meeting that they were selected.

A summary of Ms. Rodeman's comments:

- ♦ The applicants were notified about the recommendation.
- ♦ She is not sure that board action is actually legally required on budget committee member selection. It could just be an appointment by the board chair.
- ♦ We have tried to open up the process and we advertised extensively.
- ♦ For next year's process, staff will do the legal homework and find out what is required, and will give board members the facts so they can decide how they want to carry out the process.

B. INAVALE K-8 SCHOOL

1. LONG TERM VIABILITY STUDY

Assistant Superintendent Jim Hogeboom referenced a memorandum from executive staff to the board and made available tonight to the public. The document had three sections:

- I. Overall Well-being of Inavale
- II. Future Viability Factors
- III. Future Options, which concluded with a table showing the expected savings from closing the school.

(See Supplemental Item #VII-18 in the Official 2005-06 Board Minutes.) He distributed and reviewed a nine-item list entitled "District Support for Inavale K-8," noting that last spring and summer a lot of work was put into designing a mission and a purpose for Inavale K-8. (See Supplemental Item #VII-19 in the Official 2005-06 Board Minutes.) He stated that there was significant district support to help Inavale K-8 build an innovative and successful program.

A summary of the comments of Ms. Rodeman:

- ♦ She sees Inavale K-8 as more than just numbers and the decision before the board is a no-win situation.
- ♦ The PR2 Committee's focus was on the future and the District and Board's focus needs to be as well with all the financial implications involved.
- ♦ In December, she presented the best financial forecast she has been able to present in 15 years.
- ♦ But, in two years, the district will be facing a \$1.5 million shortfall that gets progressively worse.
- ♦ She highlighted financial statistics:
 - ✓ She drew the board's attention to a chart showing Inavale K-8's enrollment. (See Supplemental Item # VII-20 in the Official 2005-06 Board Minutes.)
 - ✓ Sixth grade was added in 1995 as a way of making the school larger and more capable

- of providing opportunities that students needed and in 2000 it expanded to a K-8.
 - ✓ During that time, there were typically small enrollments at the kindergarten level with enrollment picking up toward the middle school level.
 - ✓ This year is unusual in that there is higher enrollment than in years past in the primary grades, reduced enrollment in grades four and five and six through eight.
 - ✓ It raises a question about whether it is the right configuration and whether the grades can sustain themselves over time.
 - ✓ Regarding administrative support – In 1998 through 2002, there was a full-time principal at Inavale. Earlier than that the District had tried having a half-time principal between Inavale and Adams and before that there was a full-time principal. We found each time that we have tried a half time position, whether long ago or recently, that the kinds of problems that people face are not half-time problems. If a student is acting out, they do not do it just when the principal is there. If it is a personnel issue, it must be addressed full time.
 - ✓ When executive staff discusses hidden costs, one of them is for the half-time administration.
 - ✓ The current cost is in line with that of our other schools, but from the perspective of whether or not we can continue to operate that way, we cannot; and it is not about the people in the position, it is about the problems they face.
- ◆ Regarding what school is an optimum size, is there any way to look at this that would help decision-makers decide whether a school is too small or too big? We looked at other districts and the state. Seattle School District identified 250 students as the minimum enrollment at the elementary level. She talked with their budget manager today regarding what a “real number” is. Their budget manager said that enrollment of 350 is what they work with to break even but 250 is their trigger to take action. That said, Seattle’s budget manager noted that they had not been successful taking action – some of the smaller schools are the most popular.
- ◆ Oregon Quality Education Model came up with a prototype of 340 as the most economical way to operate – that is assuming full funded counseling, PE, music, art instruction, and small class sizes.
- ◆ Because the State has never funded at the Quality Education Model level, the PR2 Committee talked about an elementary school enrollment range of 350-450 that provides a full program, nears break even in terms of administrative support cost per student, and gets at the question of how we can use the resources to support all students in the best way possible.
- ◆ The savings on the last page of the packet (Supplemental Item #VII-18 in the Official 2005-06 Board Minutes) should look familiar because it is the same information that came out of the PR2 Committee process. The savings do not come from teachers because teachers would follow kids wherever they go. We are talking about changing where the students go to school. We are talking about costs to operate the school: head teacher or principal, secretary, custodial staff, and utilities. There will be some increased transportation costs if Inavale were to be closed. Net annual savings would then be about \$143,000. The first year would involve demolition costs, estimated at \$111,000. It takes time for staff to move, so that is added into the cost. The first year would cost \$23,000 to the district if the school were closed. The second year the savings would be \$143,000.
- ◆ We need to be thinking about our long-term financial future.
- ◆ This is 1/10th of the reductions the board would need to make to address for the 2008-09

school year.

- ♦ In the report is the difference between the cost of a head teacher and a half-time teacher and full-time principal.
- ♦ The executive staff recommends that if Inavale K-8 remains open, that the school be funded at a full time principal.
- ♦ There are also some repairs that will cost approximately \$179,000, that have not been made. They are part of the bond process. Those repairs would need to be made if the school stays open.
- ♦ The demolition costs of \$111,000 could be paid for using Tier 3 bond money. It would fall under facilities related under our bond.

A summary of comments by Director Donohue:

- ♦ A 2001 study on this issue and the resulting recommendation from the consolidation and closure process said it would save \$215,000 in annual operating costs. Now we are saying that it is less.
- ♦ He has heard that out of district students are coming to Inavale K-8 but would probably go to Philomath. Have we factored that loss of revenue to counterbalance? What would be the net?

A summary of responses by Ms. Rodeman:

- ♦ Regarding why savings would be less now than five years ago, at that time there was a full-time principal in the position and there had not been a discussion to have a half-time head teacher.
- ♦ We factored in out of district students in 2001 and made an assumption that there would be something like 5% of students moving out. We did not specifically look at out of district students and what would happen to them.
- ♦ The district as a whole gets \$5,400 per student this year.
- ♦ Of that, schools receive about half and more of it is taken up with utilities, transportation, and maintenance. Calculating the loss of a student would be about half of \$5,400; the resultant figure does not include the cost of the principal.
- ♦ When students come to the school for one or two hours a day, the district receives a fractional part of a student in funding. It is a formula based on the actual number of hours they attended.
- ♦ With a regularly-enrolled student who attended the whole year, we would get the full payment even if the student is sick for nine days.
- ♦ Funding for home school students is based on actual attendance. The district would still need to provide the resources (i.e., a teacher) even if we do not get the funding (if the student does not attend).

In response to a question by Director Rieck as to whether the district provides bussing to Inavale K-8 from within other school boundaries, Mr. Wright responded that transportation in the morning and afternoon is on the existing Inavale K-8 routes; the routes are not changed to pick up other students. There are three stops on the way to Inavale K-8 and one on the way back.

In response to a question by Director Rieck about which other schools are affected by those stops, and whether additional costs are involved, Mr. Wright responded that there is \$2,200 in additional stop time identified with that issue. Schools that have been affected (it changed this year) are Jefferson; Garfield; and possibly Hoover and Wilson. There are students from other attendance areas that go to Inavale K-

8 who ride on buses that go right through those areas. There is a stop at the Fairgrounds, one by Harding, and an afternoon stop at Papa's Pizza. As of January 10, 2006, approximately 100 students ride in the morning and 47 ride in the afternoon.

Director Keim referenced the second page of the second section of the three-section Inavale document (Supplemental Item #VII-18 in the Official 2005-06 Board Minutes), regarding fundraising by Inavale K-8 parents. She stated she would like to see the comparison ratio of the amount raised per student at Inavale K-8 versus the amount raised by other schools.

In regard to a higher number of students enrolled at the primary level versus the higher grades, Director Gelser questioned whether it was due to a bubble in enrollment or if it was due to students leaving. (Supplemental Item #VII-20 in the Official 2005-06 Board Minutes) Ms. Rodeman responded by referencing the number of students in 6th grade in 2003, 29. The number of students the following year in 2004 in 7th grade was 25. In 2005 the number of 8th graders was 17. Based on that information, she stated that she sees students leaving in the upper grades. She noted that the trend does not seem to happen much before the middle school years. She did reference the number of students in 3rd grade in 2003, 25, and compared them to the number of 4th and 5th graders in the subsequent years, 21 and 16 respectively. She stated that the higher number of students in the primary grades as compared to the upper grades was likely due to a combination of a lot of new primary students and students leaving at the upper levels.

In response to a question by Director Gelser regarding the number of families the 47 students belong to, Ms. Rodeman said her recollection is that there are some families with multiple siblings, but she would have to consult her records to be certain.

In response to a question by Director Gelser about the meaning of a full-time enrolled home school student, Ms. Tarzian replied that the State only says that a student could not be enrolled full time and still be considered home schooled.

Director Rieck referred to a statement regarding Inavale K-8 enrollment issues that says there is an enrollment committee that would be presenting ideas to be put forth to the boundary closure committee. She asked if that had occurred. She asked if there were ideas and what became of that committee and if there was a difference between the enrollment committee and a project team.

The board called upon Inavale K-8 parent Heidi Powell to address the question. A summary of her comments:

- ♦ She said the committee was formed because Linus Pauling Middle School opened and Inavale's 6-8 population dropped.
- ♦ Around November of last year (2004), the committee presented ideas and recommendations to stabilize enrollment to then-superintendent Jim Ford and Business Services Director Kathy Rodeman.
- ♦ Ms. Powell stated that the enrollment committee and project team were two different groups. She was a part of both.
- ♦ The enrollment committee existed even before Inavale K-8 was put in front of the board – before the committee that included Jeni Richardson, Lori Greenfield, et al, was formed.

- ♦ In some ways it made Jim Ford understand some of the issues so that he had some background information before it was presented to the board.

Ms. Tarzian held up some documents, saying that she had pulled them from her archive files as many of the staff and families that are new to the school were not privy to discussion that occurred at the Board level last year. She has more documents and the board is welcome to review them.

Director Rieck asked if a plan, such as a 3-year plan, was ever put together and submitted.

A summary of Ms. Tarzian's responses:

- ♦ She referred to two documents with graphs on them, regarding curriculum and sustainability; those are the plan documents.
- ♦ There were two simultaneous processes going on – one set of notes concerning deliberations with staff and one with the project planning team that was talking about a new vision for the school. Those discussions were occurring simultaneously in February of last year, prior to the Human Resources Department decision to allow teachers to transfer to implement that sustainability in curriculum planning.
- ♦ Regarding the enrollment committee, Inavale K-8 was coming off a difficult discussion with the district around a one-week fundraising initiative to retain a teacher.
- ♦ What came out of that process was a change in board policy and a request for Inavale K-8 to address its enrollment without having to fundraise in the fall.

Ms. Powell added that the enrollment committee was the idea of Inavale K-8 parents because they did not want to ever have to go through that again.

Chair O'Malley recessed the meeting at 8:55 p.m. and reconvened it at 9:05 p.m.

Director Gelser said one of the pieces of information she had asked for was the cost to fully fund Inavale K-8 to make it equal in opportunities as other schools. She pulled out the half-time versus full-time principal figures and saw a difference in PE charges and wondered if they cost more at Inavale K-8.

Ms. Rodeman said the district has already invested some extra cost – PE and music are good examples. To provide a full complement for next year, the school would need a full-time principal versus a half-time head teacher.

Ms. Tarzian said the issue of small schools comes into play when talking about the equity of programs. The smaller the school, the more every student represents a greater percentage of that school's enrollment; therefore shifts in enrollment have a greater effect. Currently, we shift resources based on a change of 1.5% of the students. In this way, funding follows the students and is in alignment with a District that has an open enrollment policy. In looking at adjusting that to 5% instead of 1.5%, the example at Corvallis High School would be 88 students, meaning the school could assume 88 students before resources would be shifted. At Inavale K-8, with an enrollment of 200 students, that ends up being 10 students at 5%, which does not feel like very much. Some of the governor's issues about sustainability of rural schools has very much to do with this issue. The smaller the system, the more

difficult it is to manage stability. Unless you are willing to fund at a level that mitigates that shift, you are going to see the impact of pretty small changes in enrollment. It has been dealt with using District money and sometimes with fundraised money.

Director Gelser said her concern about Inavale K-8 has never been about capacity or money but about whether the district is meeting its obligation to students. What would it take to provide stability and the full range of educational services, knowing there would be grants to supplement that, what would that real cost be and what would it take for this board to provide it so we can weigh that against the other choices across the district?

Ms. Tarzian said the answer was the information that Ms. Rodeman provided along with the fact that school needs to maintain an enrollment of 220 students and the school would need to be funded as if there were 220 students there. She only used 220 because that is the school's capacity. The site could be altered to get closer to the 350 enrollment figure – that is closer to a sustainable program. The board received information that it cannot sustain a school in Oregon with less than 350 students.

Director Gelser questioned the proper figures to use to determine the additional funds necessary to provide maximum funding to the school at capacity of 220 students. Ms. Rodeman replied that it would be the difference between 41 students times \$2,700 per student, plus the change to a full-time principal.

Summary of comments/questions by Director Donohue:

- ♦ He is seeing the blended grades in the lower- to mid-30s for blended grades.
- ♦ If the school gets increased enrollment, it looks like there would be a need to expand or split some blended grades.
- ♦ How many Full Time Equivalent (FTE) teachers does Inavale have and which blended grades are they teaching?
- ♦ If we have the number of teachers there to accommodate the increase, that is one thing, but if we needed to add another teacher, that is another thing.

Inavale K-8 teacher Lori Greenfield was asked to speak to the question. She reported that there was a half-time kindergarten, a straight first grade, 4 blended grades and a half-time Learning Resource Center staff person.

Director Rieck asked if, from a union perspective, there is an issue with having a lead teacher at the school that puts that lead teacher in a position that might be more difficult to manage.

Corvallis Education Association President Eneke Warnke responded that the only problem relates to evaluations – the person conducting evaluations is not part of the staff and is doing evaluations on a drop-in basis.

Ms. Tarzian explained that lead teachers have been part of leadership team meetings and it takes more of a lead teacher's time to attend. There is a different contractual obligation with teachers vs. administrators. It has been a burden in terms of additional work for a lead teacher. Lori Greenfield is highly respected by the teaching staff at Inavale K-8.

In response to a question from Director Gelser about the costs involved with a charter school option, Ms. Rodeman confirmed the costs would be 80% times \$5,400 per student.

2. SUPERINTENDENT'S RECOMMENDATION

Ms. Tarzian read quickly from her prepared recommendation in the interest of time, stating that she would provide a copy to the board after the meeting. (See Supplemental Item #VII-21 in the Official 2005-06 Board minutes.)

Her oration highlighted the steps that led to the evening's discussion regarding Inavale K-8's viability and future predictions of the District's budget calling for further tightening. She stated that it is for financial and enrollment reasons that she recommends the closure of Inavale K-8 school for the 2006-07 school year, using the spring to support the current Inavale students, staff and community partners into our existing school facilities. She made reference to:

- past Superintendent Ford's recommendations
- necessary upgrades the building would need if it were to remain open
- the demonstrated need for a full-time or more than part-time principal
- efforts to increase enrollment
- operating in the same cost-per-pupil range as other schools and whether what could be provided at that level at Inavale K-8 would be equitable when compared to other schools
- the increased fluctuation in operating costs per pupil that small schools experience
- efficiency of size
- excess capacity district-wide
- effect of enlarging Inavale K-8's boundary
- proximity of Inavale perhaps being unwelcomed if students were forced to attend as their neighborhood school as well as the usual "grandfather" allowances
- The grants and partnerships to operate Inavale K-8 taking additional staff time
- Her satisfaction with Inavale K-8 staff and leadership
- Problem areas, challenges, and requirements in the District needing resources of attention and money such as class sizes; unassigned periods in high school, new state graduation requirements of increased periods in math and science, more 6th graders than 8th passing reading tests

She concluded by stating that if she could sustain Inavale she would. She stated she needs to prioritize appropriately and that it is not an easy recommendation. She said that it is with a deep understanding of what she will be dismantling and she is doing so against a large number of people that she respects greatly and that she does not take the action lightly.

She noted that Business Services Director Rodeman predicted \$143,000 savings in the second year of closure, not including the cost of a full-time or half-time principal. Closing Inavale K-8 would bring the Board 10% closer to balancing the District's budget in the next 2 years. She noted that reconfiguring is not yet done in this District.

She added that she is compelled about what she has heard regarding K-8 interest and will be an advocate to preserve this option as the District faces difficult decisions ahead.

3. BOARD DISCUSSION

Director Higgins stated that she would like some time to think about the matter and would like to close down the meeting to which Vice Chair Rieck agreed.

Director Donohue expressed his desire to move the Inavale program intact to another school, preserving their science and technology program, possibly attracting more students. Superintendent Tarzian stated she would provide him the capacity available at other schools. He observed that there seems to be three layers of curriculum/pedagogy: K-8; science and technology; and place-based education, which is not transferable.

Director Gelser questioned where Inavale K-8 students would attend if there school was to be closed and how that would mesh with the proposed changes to the District's Open Enrollment policy. She noted that Superintendent Ford had recommended that the Inavale K-8 community be involved in determining where students could attend.

Director Rieck desired information regarding the possibility of Inavale K-8 combining with Franklin K-8. Superintendent Tarzian responded that this decision would then need to move to another timeframe to match it with the Franklin K-8 decision. Director Donohue stated he would like to know what the combination would look like prior to making that decision, if it is a possibility: size of the program, the facility that could support it, and the cost of the program.

Director Rodman expressed his difficulty in imagining the two schools merged as he sees them providing very different educational opportunities: one content, one process. Chair O'Malley added her agreement seeing them as core knowledge and science lab based.

Director Rieck stated if the decision is made to close Inavale that it would be important to hear Inavale community preferences, noting that last year the majority of parents surveyed selected Franklin.

The Board will address additional information requests regarding Superintendent Tarzian's recommendation directly to her.

IX. CONSOLIDATED ACTION

Director Rieck requested that Item B.3. Agreement with Benton County for School Based Health Center be held for discussion.

MOTION #46: Director Gelser moved, Director Rodman seconded, to approve the Consolidated Action Items with the exception of Item B.3. Agreement with Benton County for School Based Health Center.

The motion passed unanimously.

A. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes of July 28, 2005; August 15, 2005; September 12, 2005; and September 19, 2005 were approved as presented.

B. SUPPORT SERVICES ITEMS

1. LICENSED PERSONNEL RECOMMENDATIONS

The Board approved the recommendations. (Filed as Supplemental Item #IV-31 in the Official 2005-06 Board Minutes.)

2. IN-KIND DONATIONS

The Board accepted the donations. (Filed as Supplemental Item #X-22 of the Official 2005-06 Board Minutes.)

3. AGREEMENT WITH BENTON COUNTY FOR SCHOOL BASED HEALTH CENTER

Held For Discussion: Director Rieck explained to those present that she had conferred with Lincoln Principal Rawers, ascertaining that the Agreement refers to only providing services to Lincoln Elementary students as the grant received is specifically tied to same.

MOTION #47: Director Rieck moved, Director Higgins seconded, to approve the Agreement with Benton County for School Based Health Center. (Filed as Supplemental Item #I-32 of the Official 2005-06 Board Minutes.)

The motion passed unanimously.

X. CONSOLIDATED INFORMATION

A. CORRESPONDENCE

Filed in Section V of the Official 2005-06 Board Minutes.

B. INSTRUCTIONAL SERVICES ITEMS - INTERDISTRICT TRANSFER INFORMATION

The Board received information on 24 interdistrict transfers.

C. SUPPORT SERVICES ITEMS

1. NON-LICENSED PERSONNEL INFORMATION

(Filed as Supplemental Item #IV-32 in the Official 2005-06 Board Minutes.)

2. UNAUDITED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

The Board received the unaudited statements of revenues, expenditures, and fund balances for the various funds of the District for the period ending December 31, 2005. (Filed as Supplemental Item #X-23 in the Official 2005-06 Board Minutes.)

3. CHECK REGISTER

The detailed check distribution ledger is on file in the Business Services Office and is available for information during business hours. (Filed as Supplemental Item #X-24 in the Official 2005-06 Board Minutes.)

4. BOARD POLICY **JC** – ATTENDANCE AREAS – REVISION – FIRST READING

Several Board members expressed the need for time to hear each other's views, discuss the topic, and provide opportunity for public testimony and discussed how that could occur given the lateness of the hour and the planned timeline of adoption by February 27. An additional meeting time will be sought with Board member feedback provided in advance; especially regarding what they feel might be missing from the policy.

Vice Chair Rieck expressed that the policy committee's thinking was to provide the Board's educational goals and values in the policy that will give direction to the superintendent for the running of the District. The "hows" were pulled from the policy, to be delineated in the related administrative regulation.

XI. EXECUTIVE SESSION

The Board did not meet in executive session directly before, during or after this meeting.

XII. ADJOURNMENT

Being no further business, Chair O'Malley adjourned the meeting at 10:22 p.m.

Kari Rieck, Chair*

adoption.

Dawn Tarzian, Superintendent

*Chair at the time the minutes were submitted for

Prepared by Jolene Shute

(s:\super\julie\board\minutes\2006\february 6.doc)

