

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 6:10 p.m. in the Central Office Board Room, 1555 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 Sara Gelser Blake Rodman Matt Donohue Donna Keim</p> <p><u>PRINCIPALS PRESENT</u> Gerry Kosanovic, Wilson Elementary Jay Conroy, Corvallis High School Cherie Stroud, Crescent Valley High Sch.</p>	<p><u>EXECUTIVE STAFF PRESENT</u> Dawn Tarzian, Superintendent Jim Hogeboom, Assistant Superintendent Jeanne Holmes, Human Resources Director Kathy Rodeman, Business Services Director Fred Wright, Auxiliary Services Director Mary McKay, Student Services Director Fred Kane, Corvallis Public Schools Foundation Director Julie Catala, Executive Assistant</p> <p><u>STUDENT REPRESENTATIVES PRESENT</u> Lynn Hector, Corvallis High School Brayden Moore, Crescent Valley High School</p>
---	---

A quorum was present and due notice had been published.

II. BOARD RECOGNITION

Superintendent Tarzian made the following comments while she referred to items presented to Board members and student representatives:

- January is set aside as a time to acknowledge the commitment that school Board members across the state make.
- Board members and student representatives to the Board are providing leadership during one of the most difficult times in education with what seem to be insurmountable problems.
- On behalf of the entire District and Corvallis community, thank you for your dedication.

III. ANNOUNCEMENTS

Director Rodman introduced Fred Kane, the new director of the Corvallis Public Schools Foundation and commented positively about Mr. Kane's interview for the position. Human Resources Director Holmes shared a little bit of Mr. Kane's professional background.

Director Gelser shared her plans as they related to her term on the school Board and recent appointment to the legislature. A summary of her points:

- Where the Board is in its work, it would be disruptive to leave the Board and to add a selection process to the schedule of the Board's meetings.
- She will be leaving the school Board before the end of her term and before the convening of the legislature.
- She will leave when the school Board's agendas are lighter and do not require continuity.
- She feels a responsibility to the community to see her commitments through.

Director Rieck congratulated CVHS student representative Brayden Moore on his acceptance to Brigham Young University and to CHS student representative Lynn Hector on her acceptance to the University of Oregon Honors Health College.

Chair O'Malley reported on the selection process for Budget Committee citizen member. The selection committee, which includes Chair O'Malley, Business Services Director Rodeman and a couple of the current citizen members of the committee, will forward candidate names to the Board for appointment at its February 6 meeting.

IV. BOND DOLLARS

A. AUXILIARY SERVICES DIRECTOR RECOMMENDATIONS

Auxiliary Services Director Wright led review of the following documents, which he had provided to the Board. (Filed as Supplemental Item #VII-15 in the Official 2005-06 Board Minutes.)

- Tier 1 Highest Priorities: Health, safety, future cost savings and potential loss of service. (\$3,440,110)
- Tier 2 Moderately High Priorities: Enhances educational opportunities and environments to provide equity throughout the District, extends useful life of facility, and/or would require general fund allocations if not funded by bond dollars. Mr. Wright recommends the Board consider these along with Tier 1. If Tier 2 items are not handled now, they would require general fund dollars or contingency funds in an emergency situation (such as a failure). (\$741,636)
- Tier 3: Directly related to the Board's Key Decisions #1 and #3 (Adopt CHS Master Plan and Close Inavale, respectively). (\$168,307 and \$58,538, respectively, for a total of \$226,845.)
- Summary of Recommended Projects. (Total of three tiers \$4,408,591.)

- Projects Not Recommended At This Time.

A summary of Mr. Wright's comments and responses to questions from the Board and student representatives:

- All the play structures within the District are included, as well as some safety upgrades and drainage projects, including Wildcat Park.
- The playground audit has been done and the report is being compiled now with assistance from the City Parks and Recreation Department and District Physical Therapist Mary Devine. It will then be provided to the Board.
- The Garfield playground improvements are included in the item on the Tier I list; under the category "Safety/ADA Projects" called "ADA play structure accessibility, safety upgrades, and drainage improvements."
- The intercom upgrade at Wilson (under "Projects Not Recommended at This Time – Safety/ADA Projects") is not a safety issue. The system is working in its current state. Hopefully, the District will get another 10 years out of it.
- Regarding gymnasium bleacher replacement at Crescent Valley High School (under "Projects Not Recommended at This Time – Deferred Maintenance Projects"), we spent approximately \$30,000 of bond money on needed repair of the structures but the school has reported continuing problems. We are working with the contractor to determine what it will take to correct the problems.

Discussion took place regarding the Jefferson Elementary School playground, the school that is home to the Life Skills Program.

A summary of Mr. Wright's responses to questions from the Board:

- The assessment is to do four things:
 - ✓ Identify an access route for wheelchair-bound individuals.
 - ✓ Develop a play apparatus that can be accessible for those individuals. We are using Mary Devine's help to standardize a particular piece of apparatus because some students will not be able to use it because of their condition. We are trying to be as broad as possible.
 - ✓ Look at the safety structures of the playground equipment itself.
 - ✓ Look at accessibility, water drainage problems, etc.
- When the project is completed, a child in a wheelchair would be able to access a particular play toy but not all the equipment.
- The asphalt surfaces are accessible; wheelchair-bound individuals could go up to the grass fields. We are not planning to take ramps/accessibility surfaces out into the playfields.
- We are looking at rubber matting and/or rubber brick but more information on surfaces can be provided.

A summary of comments/questions from the Board:

- What would the cost be to have the Jefferson playground accessible to all children so they can participate not just at a single site on the playground? Given that we have a centralized

program, it would seem like a wise investment to make to meet our District goal of learning for all and being inclusive.

- Compliment on the format of the documents and how well it addressed the Board's questions.

A summary of Mr. Wright's responses to other comments/questions from the Board:

- If modulars are decommissioned they could be sold to someone else to recoup a lot of the costs involved in returning a school site to its natural state.
- Seismic sheer walls add structural support and reinforcement in case of seismic activity; the cross members visible through the windows at Hewlett Packard are an example.
- Cheldelin Middle School is a low moderate risk according to the seismic study. The seismic work was done in the hallways, but since the building is 30+ years old, we felt it was time to replace the finishes (wall, floor, ceilings). That would give the feeling of a newer surrounding.
- The Wilson project "seismic sheer walls and interior wall/floor finishes and upgrade" referenced on the "Projects Not Recommended at This Time" list, is similar to that done for Cheldelin.
- Cheldelin was identified to address two things at one time: seismic sheer walls and giving the school a newer look (to address an equity issue with Linus Pauling).
- We did seismic upgrade already to the Wilson roof diaphragms.
- Under Tier I "Deferred Maintenance Projects", we are also going to replace the diaphragms on those roofs when we replace those roofs (Adams, Garfield, District Office)
- The balance of schools is low-medium seismic risk.
- Costs for the demolition of Franklin are already included in the Corvallis High School site plan costs.
- If the Board chooses to close Inavale, there is a covenant in the deed that says the property will be returned to the state it was in when it was donated to the District, which means demolition of the buildings, removal of the asphalt, etc.
- If the previous owners of the Inavale property do not want the school there, we would have to come to the Board for a recommendation about where demolition funds would come from. A rough estimate of potential costs is \$179,000 to not only close the facility but to include unemployment and demolition costs.
- Costs for the Franklin demolition would come from remaining bond dollars of the Corvallis High School site plan and we would be doing what we promised the voters.
- There is approximately \$1.26 million remaining from the CHS project as of today but we are moving forward with the batting cage facility, which costs approximately \$225,000.

B. POSSIBLE RESERVE FOR FRANKLIN/INAVALE

Mr. Wright asked if Board members felt the need to have a reserve for Franklin and Inavale. A summary of his responses to questions from Board members:

- Some of the \$1.2-\$1.4 million will be available to deal with the Franklin issue or other facility related issues that the Board may choose.
- If Tier 3 is held in reserve until the Board decides on Franklin and Inavale an additional \$1.2 million of additional dollars would need to be set aside.

- Superintendent Tarzian clarified that within Mr. Wright's recommendations is \$1.2 million set aside unspent; potentially Tier 3 could be added to that amount.
- Once the Board makes its decision, staff will bring back additional estimates.
- The \$1.2 million is not set-aside specifically for Franklin and/or Inavale; it is just extra dollars.
- If we implemented the projects on all three of the tiered lists, there would still be an extra \$1.2 million set aside.

Superintendent Tarzian referenced the scenarios from the Program and Resource Review (PR2) Committee that were "placed in a drawer." A summary of her comments:

- Various amounts of money were outlined to do different solutions for those schools.
- Now the Board must wrestle with "is that adequate?"
- You may get public input that question whether or not this is enough.

Director Donohue asked for verification of his assumption that the Tier 2 priorities are priorities that if the District does not address now, it will most likely have to spend money on within the next 5-10 years.

Superintendent Tarzian said that it might mean laying off teachers in six years to find the money to get those things done.

A summary of Board member comments/questions:

- Request that the \$1.2 million that is not allocated in either tier be identified as remaining bond dollars, not identified for a Franklin or Inavale reserve because there are a lot of decisions and a lot of analysis we are going to have to make.
- Need information about the costs for razing the Franklin building and returning Inavale to its pre-donation state, adding to the list the reverse of what is currently shown.
- What are the costs to make the modifications at other buildings to accommodate if Franklin were razed? Some of the costs are in the PR2 committee report.
- While we are making our decisions and running these processes about Franklin and Inavale, could staff track along with us and provide us the cost information for scenarios as we go along, in a timely way so we could maintain our decision-making deadline?
- Want to issue an invitation to the community for written testimony on bond dollars.

Director Keim shared a story about how different generations view money, touching on the differences in experiences with debt and the decisions that each generation faced/is facing. She likened it to the decision the Board will have to make regarding bond dollars.

Director Rodman clarified that if there are funds remaining after the Board has determined its priorities for the \$1.2 million, the Board could, theoretically, dip into Mr. Wright's "not recommended at this time" list.

C. INVITATION FOR WRITTEN INPUT AND TESTIMONY AT JANUARY 30, 2006 SPECIAL MEETING

Discussion ensued about the various options. Chair O'Malley outlined the tentative agendas for the next

several meetings (through February 6, 2006).

V. VOTE ON VITAL SIGNS AND CAPACITY

A. VITAL SIGNS

Director Higgins referenced the work of the PR2 (Program and Resource Review) Committee and referred to the document entitled “Vital Signs” that the Board received. (Filed as Supplemental Item #X-21 in the Official 2005-06 Board Minutes.) She said the intent of these vital signs is to build the framing tools for the information the Board wanted to track. She referred to the three categories of vital signs and asked for Board feedback about items the Board could not live with or what is fundamentally missing.

A summary of Board comments:

- The superintendent and business services director will know what numbers to plug in to the class size piece. The vital signs are the framework of what will be reported to the Board twice a year.
- The class size number has a profound impact on how our District is run.
- The vital signs are simply forecasting tools for the Board to understand the financial situation of the District.
- These are simply points at which a report from the superintendent is prompted. It is a trigger point – an economic indicator that causes us to stop and understand the data.
- This is the “what” that we want our superintendent to track for us. It is not the conversation about what we want our class sizes to be set at. It is not setting policy about class size.
- We are only looking at this from a structural level: are you missing anything that would prevent you from making sound financial decisions?
- We are going to use this as a distant early warning system. Could we have a tracking system so that the vital signs are a trajectory, so that if something is developing we could learn of it sooner?
- Vital signs are a way to give the Board a heads up/early warning sign; they create a point at which an analysis is needed. The superintendent would then do a report on why.
- One reason class size was included by the PR2 Committee is because we always hear from the community on this. It was intended for the Board to be able to make adjustments. It would cause us to address whether or not we needed to take further action, etc. It is the first piece to help us know what is going on in our District.
- The full report twice a year would cover the three topics, not have any topic in isolation.
- We need to agree on the tool, answering the question, “As business managers for the District, is this the kind of information that you need to make good economic sound decisions?”
- I am asking for staff to create a trajectory analysis on all of this, and the historical relationship to the other reports that have gone before (November and March each year).

Superintendent Tarzian said her report to the Board this past fall was prior to receipt of information about State revenue. The impact of the business director's information on the data that the superintendent presented was essential for the Board to have together. The request for trend data, the "what we are going to get to run our District" needs to come with the rest of these vital signs in order to give them meaning that policy makers have to have.

MOTION #37: It was moved by Director Rieck and seconded by Chair O'Malley to accept the vital signs with the addition of a fourth item about integration of the previous vital signs reports to include trend data so that the District and Board can be watching over a period of time to see collectively how things are moving either up or down.

Business Services Director Rodeman pointed out that the twice-yearly reporting schedule was created because not all of the information is available at the same time in the year. We would not look at class sizes twice a year because of the time involved (and they will not change that much). Some of these data points are only available and collected once a year, although they will be provided with a historical perspective.

A summary of Board discussion:

- Concern about a statement on the vital signs document that refers to using the vital signs information as part of the annual budget prioritizations. There are other important pieces of information that are going to be critical to the decisions that the Board makes, such as student achievement, equity between buildings, etc. As the Board uses the mathematical scientific tools to manage its dollars, it should remember that a school District is very different than a business; it is more of an art.
- Recommended making the language of the entire document easier to read and not so daunting.

The motion was voted on and passed unanimously.

B. CAPACITY

Director Higgins said the Board has already approved the capacity formula, which is the "what." (Contained in Power Point presentation filed as Supplemental Item #VII-2 in the Official 2005-06 Board Minutes.) The superintendent needs to fill in the numbers, the "how." She asked Board members to weigh in on whether they want the superintendent to make the decisions about the right class size at all levels or have the Board make that decision.

A summary of Board member feedback:

Director Rieck:

- Let the superintendent decide; she has the expertise and she was on the PR2 Committee and is fully informed.

- The administrative regulations (ARs) are the place from which the PR2 Committee first pulled the numbers; ARs are superintendent owned.

Director Gelsler:

- Let the superintendent make a recommendation.
- The PR2 process made clear how much these numbers drive the experience of kids in the District.
- Very vigorous disagreement with the capacity numbers that came out of the PR2 process; did not have a chance to be part of the PR2 conversation.
- Concerned to have the report have numbers be at planning capacity when one would not be in alignment with what our permit is at the high school level.
- The number that is put there could have a profound impact on how open enrollment plays out in the District.
- The Board needs to have a discussion about what is being looked at as capacity and why.
- Concerns about class size at the elementary level and perhaps about classrooms at the secondary level.
- Why do we have a document that has a planning capacity for the high school that is above our permitted number? Creates concerns in the community that we have a lot of empty seats and that we were foolish in the way that we built that school, even though at that school I see smart planning and a good building.
- Need a common understanding of what the class size number is; it impacts the open enrollment conversation.

A summary of Superintendent Tarzian's reflections:

- The open enrollment administrative regulation granted the superintendent the authority to set the capacity of each school.
- We are confronted with a declining enrollment and resource issue that now is impacting the schools that students are leaving and making them smaller.
- The Board needs to wrestle with the question, "do we wish to close our small schools and create schools of a similar size for efficiency, or do we wish to set a capacity of a school that equalizes our enrollment to create equity between the programs?" We need to do one or the other because our enrollment is declining and so are our resources.
- Her recommendation in the open enrollment policy is the best compromise to maintain the value of choice in our current financial and enrollment situation.
- She learned through the PR2 deliberations that these numbers do the best job of balancing our enrollment until other decisions are made.
- If the decisions are to close schools, she thinks our capacity numbers will increase, not because of the class size number that we have set but simply because we are going to have to move kids into our existing schools.
- If a school has increased staff based on a larger class size but no classrooms available, then we will be hiring assistants or specialists, not teachers.
- There are limited classrooms at some of those schools; we simply do not have the physical

space.

- Former Boards increased capacity through modulars.
- At the elementary level, if we increase class size and increase capacity to allow for choice, those schools will get full; then we will be confronted with the loss of specialist space or not being able to hire a teacher and instead using the certified resource in a different way.
- At the secondary level, her recommendations for open enrollment are looking more at equalizing programs at the schools we choose to keep open.
- Since there are no capacity issues at the secondary level, she does not see the class size number as overpowering other realities that the PR2 process really made clear.
- At the secondary level, she does not see decisions as reaching into the kind of instructional space that Director Gelsler is talking about that Ms. Tarzian would not want to see removed without a conscious decision about changing the way we deliver education.
- How the Board sets the elementary space will immediately impact the number of spaces for siblings or new transfers in some elementary schools.

A summary of Director Donohue's comments:

- There are some facility-specific limitations that will go into the capacity discussion. Wants that kind of information in our capacity numbers.
- This is both a policy discussion and a facilities-related issue.
- We are going to have to make these class sizes facility-specific in some instances based on the physical limitations of the space itself.
- Can we have a uniform number for elementary, middle and high school, not knowing what the staff's long term goals are and not knowing what the limitations are?
- Favors having staff make the decision but requested information from staff on the above items.

Superintendent Tarzian offered to provide the school-by-school numbers, what their capacity would be set at using the work of the PR2 Committee using the planning capacity for the secondary level. She said there are schools that exceed the target or are close to it. Those are the schools where we would be severely limiting transfers. She said she would provide the Board with exact numbers of the size of each school based on the planning capacity at secondary and the class size at elementary.

Director Keim asked for the superintendent's recommendation on the top part of the capacity formula, an area of disagreement that will impact our open enrollment discussion.

A summary of Director Rieck's comments:

- Have it go back to staff.
- Wants an environment that is conducive to our students' learning and that equalizes education.
- Every elementary school is almost the same size and both middle schools are the same size if you use the same method of counting the classrooms and using class size. It is true at the high school; they are almost identical if you were to count the same rooms and use the same class size.
- We need to rely on staff to say, "which gives our students the best opportunity for an equal education no matter which building they walk into?" given that they are all about the same in

structure.

- Staff knows where the growth areas are, they predict it; we look at it with our boundaries. Our vital signs will give us a heads up when we seem to be off kilter.
- Do not get too far down into the details, but focus on the educational environment that our students need.

A summary of Director Gelser's comments:

- Wants reassurance that we are not going to set a number at 25 when we do not have classrooms in the District that are at 25.
- Was not part of the deliberations of the PR2 Committee and does not feel as comfortable because she has not had the opportunity to have those conversations and to hear what staff has to say.

Superintendent Tarzian said she wants to be clear that the recommendation she and the staff are bringing to the Board is that they adopt the PR2 numbers. A summary of her reasons:

- At the elementary level, in a District with an enrollment decline of 8% over the past years, that decline has been felt at 16-25% at some of our schools; that has had an impact on the education of those kids.
- We have an obligation to the students at all of our schools; it is time to take a hard look at the policy.
- Of importance to her is where they want to educate kids and how much they want to insulate large shifts when the District is in a declining state anyway.
- Recommends that they do not continue to allow kids to shift into schools that are over 100% capacity in light of our current resources and enrollment.

MOTION #38: With regard to setting the class size numbers in the adopted capacity formula (Capacity = class size times the number of classrooms times 85%), it was moved by Director Donohue and seconded by Director Rieck, to adopt the recommendation of the staff, which was based on staff's analysis of the Program and Resource Review Committee's information.

Director Donohue said he would like information about how that planning committee number applied to capacity and how that is comparing to the staff's overall goals.

Director Gelser stated she would vote in opposition to the motion. A summary of her reasons:

- The PR2 numbers at the high school level are not correct. The correct number is 1550; that is what we are permitted to do, that is what we planned.
- We charged the PR2 Committee to provide a report not a recommendation.
- There are Board members who were not part of the PR2 Committee who were not able to enter into the conversation.

Director Higgins added that the PR2 Committee did not recommend a number; it took the numbers from the existing administrative regulation and used them as a way to run the calculations for elementary. The committee did not vote on whether to use the "architect" "planning" or "fill it to the gills" number.

It did not recommend a number of classrooms at the high schools; it put all that information into the tool. We are just asking the superintendent to determine the right number to be used.

Director Gelser said the number that the committee picked to do its report feels like a recommendation. That is the community's jumping off point to say, "why did you spend all this money on building a high school when you did not really need the space?" which she believes is an inaccurate criticism of the District – we did not build a high school that was too big.

A summary of Superintendent Tarzian's comments:

- 1,680 is the planning number.
- We will place no additional students in the school for which we have no permit.
- We will not supersede legal permits from the city.
- That capacity is an operating number that we will set ARs to run day-to-day operations. We do not have a permit to put more than 1,550 students in that building and we will not.
- If at any time in the future we needed to explore that, the city would be the first place we would have to go to find out if that were even viable.

Director Rieck pointed out that we do not even have enough high school students to do that. The only way that we would ever look at putting more kids in is to then go back and pull up the PR2 scenarios that talked about going to one high school. There are a lot of legal issues that do not even allow us to move forward in certain ways without going through a planning process.

A summary of Director Gelser's comments:

- Concern that we have just developed these vital signs and we are going to make decisions of the health of our District based on the capacity of the District.
- Capacity is an arbitrary number and the one we are using at the secondary level is one that is not realistic because we are not legally allowed to get there.
- Concern regarding communicating to the community that we have extra seats at Corvallis High School, which is inaccurate.

Chair O'Malley expressed agreement with Director Gelser in theory but said the Board created a committee and gave it a charge. When a committee works that hard to understand the process, we need to respect what they come up with. She is very comfortable with the fact that the superintendent was on the committee and was able to make those recommendations.

MOTION #39: Director Rieck called the question. It was voted on and passed unanimously (to vote on Motion #38).

A summary of Superintendent Tarzian's comments:

- The issue between elementary and secondary is joined.
- For every child we let shift into an elementary school there is some reduction of space for education, just as there is at the secondary level.
- It is hard on both ends because trying to set a number that pays attention to projects and room

to spread out and do education the way we want it done K-12 also went into her thinking and her recommendation, knowing that it runs headlong very quickly into some of our elementary schools for capacity, but does not into our secondary schools.

- Trying to apply a consistent standard around quality of educational delivery went into her thinking.

Motion #38 was voted upon. Director Gelser voted in opposition to the motion; all other Board members voted in favor.

Motion #38 carried by a vote of 6 –1.

Chair O'Malley temporarily adjourned the meeting at 8:00 p.m. for a break and reconvened the meeting at 8:10 p.m.

VI. OPEN ENROLLMENT MODIFICATIONS

Chair O'Malley said the first part of the conversation this evening is to clarify and deliberate on staff recommendations, some of which came out of the Equity Committee report from two years ago.

A. STAFF RECOMMENDATION

A summary of comments by Assistant Superintendent Hogeboom:

- Open enrollment was debated extensively by staffs at both the high school and middle school levels. Staff at both levels have some of the same concerns.
- It is time to make some changes in open enrollment.
- When kids stream toward one school, the quality of education suffers based on the number of courses you can offer.
- There is a negative impact on staff.
- One of the marketing theories of open enrollment is that it allows a school to look at what it can do differently. Schools do that already and are sensitive to parent input. Sometimes it is not good enough and people get beaten down.
- Smaller schools must continually make cuts to new teachers. Year after year it hurts the ability of that school to offer the same kinds of programs.
- It is making the teachers work so much harder when they really want to be teaching.
- Staff's recommendation is to limit open enrollment, not eliminate it.

Corvallis High School Principal Conroy affirmed that Corvallis has two outstanding high school choices. Maybe somewhere else open enrollment is about correcting a weak school, not so here. The "opportunity of choice" is not really for all kids because of transportation options. He mentioned how quick the pendulum can change, saying that about 10 years ago, Corvallis High School's enrollment was below Crescent Valley's.

Crescent Valley High School Principal Stroud accentuated the impact that the shift has had on staff morale. Staff has been doing a comprehensive process to look at its school community; what keeps coming to the forefront is that they cannot keep moving forward with the inequity of the enrollment. Both high schools have a very renewed spirit of collaboration; equalizing the enrollment will keep that moving forward efficiently.

Mr. Hogeboom commented briefly on the importance of communicating how well both schools are doing. He discussed the work being done collaboratively to address core offerings at both schools and aligning them, especially introductory courses for freshmen and sophomores. High school staffs have been working really hard to align, such as having a similar schedule, similar advisory programs, etc.

A summary of Board member comments:

- Do families need to submit a transfer request every year? Per superintendent Tarzian, they are automatically “in”; parents have not been asked to reapply every year.
- Superintendent Tarzian and Director Higgins met with the Crescent Valley staff in the fall. The superintendent told the staff “this is not your problem to solve” and all the teachers visibly relaxed.
- Through open enrollment, we have been creating the morale abuser of the teachers, making it seem that they are not doing enough or working hard enough.

A summary of Mr. Moore’s comments:

- Each high school has its strong points. CVHS has a lot of space for athletics and activities and a lot of areas to meet, etc.
- Sees inequality in that the new CHS has the most advanced language lab and the most advanced computer systems. There are security cameras making it a “safer” place. There is a beautiful building. The CHS theater is amazing.
- Part of the reason students are going to CHS is because of sports. They have a new weight room, new track, covered stands, Astroturf, etc. It gives an advantage; a lot of kids look at athletics.
- The teachers are great at CVHS, but the facilities are so different.
- Those are the reasons students feel inequality.
- Has seen an immense opportunity for the two schools to work together, such as the automotive program. There is a bus that runs between schools that is filled every block. But there is a burden on students. There is no way to have two identical schools. There are students who are 20 minutes late to school every day because they have to drive between the two schools.

A summary of Ms. Hector’s comments:

- The change in CVHS’s schedule was a step toward building equity.
- Are processes to build equity happening without even looking at open enrollment? If so, is that something people are interested in pursuing?
- Are equity and open enrollment so tied together?

Mr. Hogeboom said that equity takes on many facets, such as in facilities, access to different

opportunities and programs, etc. The high schools are working really well to collaborate on those areas where it makes sense to collaborate.

B. SUPERINTENDENT'S RECOMMENDATION

Superintendent Tarzian drew the Board's attention to her recommended changes to Administrative Regulation JC-AR – Open Enrollment/School Attendance Areas, which were outlined in a document that was provided to the Board. (Filed as Supplemental Item #VII-16 in the Official 2005-06 Board Minutes.)

A summary of Superintendent Tarzian's comments:

- Her strongest recommendation is that the Board looks at policy JC – School Attendance Areas.
- Several important key values of the Board are competing against each other as the District faces declining enrollment and resources.
- The policy has been in effect for 7½ years and the Board can determine whether those values are being fully realized.
- Even though administrative regulations are specifically designed by staff to manage the day-to-day operations and to implement a policy, she is putting her recommendations for changes to the administrative regulation out to the public, because this changes what she perceives to be a highly held value in this community and she desires feedback that would allow us to best implement this policy in these times.
- Declining enrollment and resources have impacted our neighborhood school program. Adding open enrollment has really put more of the burden of those shifting resources and declining enrollments onto some of our neighborhood schools.
- A school like Inavale has seen a 25% reduction in some years.
- Another concern is shifting demographics (such as socio-economic status).
- Another concern is about transportation not being provided, preventing open enrollment from being available to some.
- The discrepancy between school sizes has already been discussed tonight. Across the state and nation several initiatives are being launched to break “super sized” high schools into smaller schools of 500-600 students.
- It is important to look at what the community is requesting of its schools; she hears a strong request for as comprehensive a program as possible – the arts, PE, a broad spectrum of courses, honors, advanced placement, etc.
- How competition has played out in a setting of declining enrollment and declining resources has had an impact on staff morale and the culture in the District. Dealing with open enrollment was the highest priority that staff identified.

Board members provided feedback about what information they needed and in what direction they might be leaning.

Director Rodman asked the superintendent if boundary alterations, specifically at the elementary level, factored into her recommendations. Superintendent Tarzian said she had not taken it that far. The

Board's deliberations on Inavale will factor in; Inavale has been held more responsible for attracting students. Their continued need to market to recruit kids puts them at a disadvantage.

A summary of Director Rodman's comments:

- He is undecided at this point.
- Really understands the equity concerns. Was drawn to this system when he learned there was choice.
- Feels the pain choice causes staff.
- The superintendent's proposal does not really address the issues at Lincoln.
- A shift in the administrative regulation goes in the right direction to address inequity at a couple of schools but it does not address it at the elementary as specifically as it does at the secondary level.
- Wants to hear from the public.
- Has concerns about transportation.

Director Keim said all her concerns were touched on by Superintendent Tarzian. She said she likes the fact that Ms. Tarzian is getting her recommendations out to the public; she likes where Ms. Tarzian is going and welcomes the input from the community.

Director Higgins said she is leaning toward modifying the existing policy so the superintendent can work on implementing her recommendations, which are sound and address the concerns with a good balance. She expressed continued concerns about modulars and said modulars and boundaries have to be part of the discussion.

Director Rieck said she would like to see policy modified. She asked about the timing for the values discussion about what will change in the policy itself.

A summary of Superintendent Tarzian's comments:

- She turns to this policy for guidance; there are values she has heard articulated by the Board and community that are not in the policy. She encouraged the Board to discuss what they are.
- She believes the policy was written with two distinct goals in mind: attendance areas and boundaries and what would make strong attendance area schools; and the offering of choice and movement. Both worked well, and maybe continue to, depending on the Board's deliberation on this issue. But if they are not working, why are not they working? That should be put into the policy to help give guidance now.
- That would then give her guidance about what is more important and what is less important when a choice must be made; we do not have the money to do both.

A summary of Director Donohue's comments:

- We do not have an "open enrollment" policy; it is a liberal transfer policy.
- One of the things that is inherently wrong in an open enrollment system is transportation. It has already been identified as an issue that is causing inequity in our District and it is a discussion we need to be having.

- If we are not going to have competition between schools, how are we going to pull things up to the District level umbrella to take the pressure off the schools so that the schools can focus on the pedagogical issues versus trying to get kids into their schools?
- The current policy is very hard on District staff.
- Is strongly leaning toward changing the policy but also feels we need to rebuild everything from the assumptions up.
- Likes the superintendent's proposal.
- Wants information on what we can do to equalize the problems that currently exist, like 300 fewer students at CV – chronic deficits.

Superintendent Tarzian said that as the administrative regulations are written, there would be a much larger freshman class at CVHS next year because there would not be transfer opportunities for students to attend CHS, and that would probably occur the year after as well. Then CHS would have lost its two bigger class sizes to graduation; they would have had smaller freshman and sophomore classes, and at that point they could start to take some freshman. So in four years the schools would probably be back about the same size.

A summary of Director Gelser's comments:

- Superintendent Tarzian really heard her concerns and incorporated them in the report.
- She struggles with the question of open enrollment because she hears the problems at the secondary level.
- She strongly believes that parents know what is right for their children. There are better outcomes when parents feel they have chosen what is right for their child.
- No one school is right for every child. Parents choose schools based on their children's cousins' schools, daycare providers, etc.
- Will probably be leaning toward not changing the policy unless we could separate out the elementary and secondary portions.
- Recommended changing the decision date to February 27, 2006 to allow adequate input and dissemination of information to all families. Requested that we get out the proposed changes to all of the parents clearly stating what the impact of the changes will be so that they can provide input.
- How will capacity at Jefferson and Linus Pauling Middle School will be set?
- What happens with the dual immersion program at Garfield?
- What happens if a family moves to a different school boundary – can they transfer?
- What would be the downfall of moving the sibling's grandfather clause to 2010-11?
- Does the percent limit apply at the grade level or to the total number of students? Would there be any greater impact on blended grade classrooms?

A summary of Chair O'Malley's comments:

- She is leaning toward voting to look at changing the policy.

- She thinks the superintendent's report is spot on.
- It is hard to imagine an open enrollment policy that we could afford.
- Has questions about modulars and boundaries.
- The superintendent provided us with a very realistic and supportive framework.
- There are misperceptions about the quality of education at our schools. There is a mythology that gets perpetuated about our schools when people talk to parents before their kids get in school.

A summary of Mr. Moore's comments:

- Concurs with Director Donohue's comments about transfers within the District.
- Has learned to appreciate structure and this policy is so open.
- The superintendent's 7% idea is very well thought out and we should scrupulously look through her recommendations toward our District's open enrollment policy because he sees a lot of opportunities for great improvement and happiness through the general public.

A summary of Board member feedback about the type of input process:

- The public would want to give input on the administrative regulations.
- Need to understand what steps we are going to take to change our policy and when and how are we going to do it. Could we just do policy first?
- Give more of a focus to the input we want from the community versus "what do you want?"
- At the January 30 meeting, come up with some general direction that Board members are leaning toward (sticky dots) and then go out to the community. Perhaps use the City Council Comment Corners and a forum about the issue.
- Draft a good policy statement, one that we would all agree with. We could lay down language that would restate the policy but the community would have more input on the way the administrative regulation interprets the policy.
- It was generous of the superintendent to bring the administrative regulations to us. I think it is the will of the Board to move forward; get this to the parents and have time at the next Board meeting for testimony.
- Is there anything in the superintendent's recommendation that is in violation of the existing policy?

A summary of Superintendent Tarzian's comments:

- If she changes the administrative regulations to implement this policy differently, it will be a substantial change in the way the District does business.
- She feels an obligation to the Board and community to lay out her recommendations.
- She wants the Board to be clear on why the staff is implementing the policy differently now.
- She wants the Board to be at least enough in support so that when appeals about decisions under this policy come to them that they have weighed why they would want the District to head in this direction and can articulate it.
- It was driven home to her during the PR2 process when closing enough schools to fill all our schools to capacity would, in effect, end open enrollment.
- Is the Board confident that they are able to provide an equitable, good education at all

neighborhood schools or in every school of choice in the way we are currently implementing this policy? That is what she needs the Board's direction and discussion on.

Director Higgins said her point is that we should not spend energy rewriting the policy; take the superintendent's recommendations as our point of deliberation to keep the conversation and feedback focused and keep moving forward with the timeline that we had originally projected.

A summary of Board member comments:

- We should review the policy precisely because it is so broad.
- We have not addressed big issues, such as transportation.
- We have said we want open enrollment because we do not want to trap any child in a school, yet we are trapping every child who cannot afford transportation.
- It is a funding priority that the Board must decide on.
- Have a couple of people work with the superintendent to draft a sample policy.

Superintendent Tarzian clarified that she has authority under the current policy to institute her recommended changes to the administrative regulation.

A summary of Board member comments:

- We are in danger of asking for public input on an issue that has almost been decided and it feels like we are being disingenuous. Wants public input.
- Our job is policy, not administrative regulations. The staff has heard loud and clear what each Board member's concerns are. Ask staff to draft a policy based on what they have heard from us, for us to review next week. That would prompt our values discussion. Have it as a preliminary discussion/first read, etc. and still have the chance to make a decision by February 27.
- Should Inavale be closed, when would the boundary changes take place?
- We need to communicate, "These are the changes; what concerns you?" not "What do you want?"
- Has confidence in the superintendent's recommendations.

Superintendent Tarzian said the community's input is helpful to her and she is sincere in wanting to receive it. But she also needs the Board's acknowledgement that our resources are impacting her recommendations. It is not because she does not like choice or options. It is that hard discussion she wants to happen in public so that the community understands why she would come in and make a change to something that is very important to the community.

A discussion about the community input process took place.

Chair O'Malley temporarily adjourned the meeting at 9:35 p.m. for a break and reconvened the meeting at 9:40 p.m.

VII. PLAN FOR INAVALE K-8 DISCUSSION

Chair O'Malley opened the floor for Board members to share what they need to move forward in the Inavale K-8 discussion.

A. K-8 SURVEY

A summary of Board member feedback:

- Would like information from staff about: what a K-8 program is; how it integrates into our current delivery system; a general overview of how it is viewed by the staff; the opportunities it provides; any unique needs; and how it fits with our current system.
- A survey of the need will not do much good because the desire for K-8 will change as we change options for choice.
- Wants two different types of presentations: 1) K-8 and 2) core curriculum, including information on whether core curriculum comes with the K-8 model or if there are different types of K-8s.
- If we decide we want this concept of K-8 in our District, once we have made the enrollment and capacity decisions, then tell us specifically if there are there a number of families who desire K-8 and if so, how many?
- Wants to understand the space that would be required to expand. If Franklin is our only K-8, and we have a 200-250 waiting list, explain the space needs.
- Why are we going to survey about K-8 when we are deciding whether or not to close Inavale? Is it about "we do not need K-8s" or is it about "yes, we need more K-8s?" Confused about why we are into this conversation and why we are crossing over into the area that the strategic plan is working on. Is it jumping or tying in?
- Does not understand how the K-8 survey fits with the Inavale discussion but agrees we need to understand the key differences between Franklin's and Inavale's programs.
- It is a distraction from the Inavale process.
- Tease out what it is about K-8s that people are turning to. What is it that people want?
- Does not want the K-8 survey linked to the Inavale process.

Ms. Holmes explained that the reason the K-8 survey fell under the Inavale discussion on the agenda is because at least one Board member on January 9, 2006 said they would not be able to make a decision about Inavale without having information about K-8s.

A summary of Board member feedback:

- Not willing to disentangle the needed information about the K-8 program. If the community really wants a K-8 program, tell us what it will take to move it. It is integrated very closely into the decision about Inavale. Wants the information before we deliberate on either Franklin or Inavale.
- The question of families would be "would you attend an Inavale K-8 if it were at a different school?"
- Wants a breakdown of what classes and arts, etc. are being offered at Inavale and the teacher

FTE (full-time equivalent) for each (cost/benefit information).

B. SOLICIT INPUT

Director Gelser said it is important to set out a block of time to take input on Inavale and open enrollment; have time devoted to each topic.

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

Superintendent Tarzian distributed the information on capacity that she had mentioned earlier in the meeting.

Being no further business before the Board, Chair O'Malley adjourned the meeting at 9:55 p.m.

Nell O'Malley, Chair

Dawn Tarzian, Superintendent

Prepared by: Julie Catala

Edited by: Jolene Shute

(s:\do\super\julie\board\minutes\2006\january 23 special meeting.doc)