

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 6:35 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>STUDENT REPRESENTATIVES PRESENT</u> Lynn Hector, Corvallis High School Brayden Moore, Crescent Valley High School</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 Julie Catala, Executive Assistant</p> <p><u>PRINCIAPLS PRESENT</u> Gerry Kosanovic, Wilson Elementary Jay Conroy, Corvallis High School</p>
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

A quorum was present and due notice had been published.

Chair O’Malley explained how the time for presentations would be allocated.

II. PUBLIC TESTIMONY

A. USE OF REMAINING BOND DOLLARS

Dave Derlacki, 3805 NW Camas Place, Corvallis – Summary of comments: has volunteered at schools for 20 years; helped build Wildcat Park and CVHS football stadium. The bond projects list is a good use of the money. Projects will only get more expensive if you wait. Do not spend money on Franklin and Inavale until you decide what you want to do with those schools. Sell Fairplay School property and use the money for deferred maintenance. Use bond dollars for

artificial turf on CVHS's football field. He mows the field there; every year there are leaks in the irrigation system and it results in a dangerous field.

Mike Johnson, 4135 NW Boxwood Drive, Corvallis – Summary of comments re: CHS track surface. Has worked in sports facilities and their installations. The contractor for the CHS track went bankrupt. The CVHS track was insufficiently installed. The track at Linus Pauling has a deformation on the base and is starting to get a swale. The sub-base at CHS is pretty good but is pervious – water drains through the track. Recommended looking at cost and value – the surface must have good drainage, last long and be able to be resurfaced, which is not possible with an impervious track.

Denise Cardinali, 6017 SW Grand Oaks, Corvallis – Ms. Cardinali summarized her comments from a written statement. (Filed in Section V of the official 2005-06 Board Minutes.) She asked that the District proceed with Tier 1 and 2 recommended projects. She supports implementing the CHS master plan with the moving of Franklin School in fall 2007. Please involve parents with disabilities in the process of playground upgrades. Make a clear commitment regarding Garfield Elementary so the fundraising group can move forward. Form a focus group of families of children with special needs. The District's Special Education Advisory Committee (SEAC) would help. There are children with mobility challenges at several schools but most likely the most significantly mobility-challenged students attend Jefferson School. Have all future purchases and improvements look at accessibility. Look at how students get to the equipment. Asphalt gives some accessibility but does not provide a safe falling surface. The equipment does not have restraints. You have to pick up the kids and carry them to the equipment.

Brayden Moore, Crescent Valley (CV) High School Student – Summary of comments: CV students have pride in their school and his comments have nothing to do with aesthetics. Proposes using additional funds for upgrading the outdated technology at CV to allow students a better opportunity to be prepared for the college experience. Proposed replacing the language lab at the school. Recommended that the board not put any money into Franklin K-8 or Inavale K-8 to improve them, unless it is for fire/life/safety issues, until the board decides whether or not the schools will be closed.

Lynn Hector, Corvallis High School (CHS) Student – echoed Mr. Moore's recommendation about not putting money into Franklin or Inavale.

B. INAVALE DECISION-MAKING PROCESS

Payton James-Amberg, 6240 SW Trellis Drive, Corvallis – Ms. James-Amberg summarized her comments from a written statement. (Filed in Section V of the official 2005-06 Board Minutes.) Board members said a year ago they did not want to single out Inavale K-8; the work that the board is undertaking now is contrary to that statement. Encouraged the board to: complete the boundary analysis for all elementary schools; set a percentage for ideal utilization at the elementary level; apply the vital signs to all schools and share the results publicly; further analyze all schools that have poor vital signs; use the vital signs as a discussion starting point – understand what the numbers say and why; acknowledge that modification of the transfer policy will change almost all schools' vital signs; realize that the fate of Franklin could have an

enormous impact on what might happen to other schools; have meeting minutes and data publicly available in a timely manner to avoid thwarting public input; present only feasible scenarios to the public in terms of what would actually solve the budget problem; make clear any justification for deviating from previously-approved motions, processes and intentions.

Tanya Freeman, 26078 SW Nicole Drive, Corvallis – Ms. Freeman summarized her comments from a written statement. (Filed in Section V of the official 2005-06 Board Minutes.) Last year the board said it would be unfair to close any school without examining its health or the impact on the district. District policy should determine the closure of schools with data and a fair open process. Use the findings of the Program and Resource Review (PR2) Committee and develop policies. The process of determining enrollment and boundary issues in the district requires the following steps: resolve open enrollment; resolve issues of the CHS master site plan; establish policy concerning K-8 schools; determine elementary level boundary adjustments. Asked that 509J's overall needs and health be considered and that Inavale be removed from the board's list.

Anita Grunder, 31459 Peterson Road, Philomath – Ms. Grunder summarized her comments from a written statement. (Filed in Section V of the official 2005-06 Board Minutes.) Focus the decision-making process on cost versus value. The future of Inavale is not an isolated problem. A fully informed decision requires thinking ahead more than five years into the future. Conduct a complete cost-benefit analysis with full participation of representatives of the board, district office, Inavale staff familiar with the program, and the Inavale community. Form a small task force with people such as Lori Greenfield and Bill Patton. Make decisions about Inavale in context with its history. She drew the board's attention to a map of school boundaries. Explained family/community/agricultural link that is not a transferable property. Inavale is in the middle of a very important watershed – Muddy Creek. It is a model for understanding agricultural landscapes. They are now getting grants. There has been a lot of upheaval to Inavale due to small enrollment, staff coming and going, etc. It is painful to be penalized for things that were not of the school's making.

Heidi Powell – ceded her time to Anita Grunder.

C. ATTENDANCE AREAS POLICY

Ruth Heninger, 3390 NE Dorchester Way, Corvallis – Summary of comments: It is important to continue looking at open enrollment. Remember why the district went to open enrollment. Ask, "Why are students leaving the schools – what does the school not provide?" Ending open enrollment will keep people in schools that they are disappointed with and that might not be meeting their needs. Unless the same offerings are provided at every school, parents cannot be denied the opportunity to send their kids to the school that is best for them.

III. DISCUSSION AND VOTE ON USE OF REMAINING BOND DOLLARS

See the:

- o District's Long-Range Facilities Master Plan filed under the date of June 24, 2002 in Section VII of the Official 2001-02 Board Minutes

- “Facilities Improvement Bond – Potential Additional Projects” (Tiers 1,2, and 3) as Supplemental Item #VII-15 in the Official 2005-06 Board Minutes
- “Facilities Improvement Bond – Potential Additional Projects” (Tier 3 Directly Related to Key Decision #1, Adopt CHS Master Plan and Key Decision #3, Inavale Closure) as Supplemental Item #VII-17 in the Official 2005-06 Board Minutes.)

A summary of the comments of Kathy Rodeman, Business Manager and Business Services Director:

- ◆ The bond included projects at all active schools.
- ◆ All projects proposed by Auxiliary Services Director Fred Wright fall under the categories and would fit within the legal definition of what the voters approved.
- ◆ When the bonds were issues, we assumed we would follow up with a second phase within five years after completion of the last of the Phase I projects, and we had assumed the local option levy would be renewed.
- ◆ Then-board member Bob Johnson had made a real case that the board needed to consider and prioritize any operating dollars first. He had reminded the board that the local option levy provided ongoing financial and operational support and that we could not jeopardize that to count on improving buildings in the future.
- ◆ Economy is grim right now; she could not advise the board to go out for another bond sale in the near future – not any sooner than 10 years before the District could approach the public for a capital improvement levy.
- ◆ Encouraged the board to seek operating levies.
- ◆ If a roof fails at a school, we are required to fix it. If the money did not come from remaining bond dollars, it would come from contingency or operating funds, which would affect classrooms.
- ◆ The board has the option of returning the money to the voters. But there would not be checks issued to homeowners, the district would simply reduce its debt service levy for the following year by the refund amount.
- ◆ It would show under “debt service” but it would not show as a return by the district. It would just be lumped in with all of the debt service.
- ◆ If the board returned \$1 million, voters would save 23.7 cents per thousand. For a \$200,000 house, the tax statement would be about \$47 less.
- ◆ If the board returned \$5.5 million, a homeowner would save \$261 for a \$200,000 house. That would be a one-time windfall to a citizen who owns the house today. But people would continue to pay for the rest of the 14 years and the amount would go back to the same amount.
- ◆ She would be doing the board a disservice if she advised them to return the money.
- ◆ The board should look out at least 10 years.
- ◆ Consider how little impact this would have if the money were returned to the voters.
- ◆ Gave the example: a tax bill for a \$170,000 house would be \$1,000.17 for school district purposes, including the permanent tax levy.
- ◆ When voters approved the bond levy, we proposed it would be around \$1.77 per thousand; it turned out to be \$1.59 per thousand this year.

Chair O'Malley said the board received a fair amount of community input via email that raised questions. She asked Mr. Wright to address the questions.

Summary of comments by Mr. Wright:

- ♦ Mr. Wright distributed a draft copy of the playground audit for Hoover School.
- ♦ He outlined the scope of the audit for all schools: evaluate the condition and safety of existing equipment; appraise access to play structures for the physically impaired; review what type of play equipment is offered for the physically impaired; determine the scope of drainage or fall protection issues, if any.
- ♦ The board will receive such a report on each district facility as the reports are completed.
- ♦ He had to come up with a figure to address these issues: access, inequity, and drainage. All together for playground resurfacing, ADA (Americans with Disabilities Act), safety issues, drainage, etc., \$450,000 was identified for those items. That also deals with the renovation/replacement of Wildcat Park, once that project moves forward with help from the community.
- ♦ \$450,000 will renovate all our playgrounds, including ground covers, and bring them up to ADA standards.
- ♦ That is currently in the Tier 1 costs as a line item of the \$688,750 on the highest priorities list.
- ♦ It will bring them up to a certain level (ADA) but there may be areas in the district that we may want at a higher level for certain schools – would need to add additional dollars to Tier 1, 2 or 3.
- ♦ He supports the recommendation to install a rubberized surface at a cost of \$110,000-\$115,000. Suggested adding up to \$115,000. It would provide for some additional playground apparatus but not near the amount of structures that Garfield Elementary is anticipating at this time.
- ♦ The most current proposal from the Garfield Elementary parent group on the Garfield Elementary structure is for a partnership between the school district and the City of Corvallis to look at the improvements and how each organization might be able to help.
- ♦ He met with SEAC a few weeks ago and told them he would bring the results of the playground audits for their input.
- ♦ Every playground audit is complete although not all the reports have been written yet.
- ♦ Not all playgrounds throughout the district are equivalent.
- ♦ Playgrounds historically last 10-15 years and have been an area that the parent groups have helped out with financially.
- ♦ The age and condition of each school's equipment varies based on the priorities of each parent group.
- ♦ He is proposing that there be accessible equipment at every playground as opposed to having every piece of equipment at every playground accessible to every child.
- ♦ Student Services staff and SEAC expertise will be utilized to help come to a final recommendation.
- ♦ He will try to have reports for all the playground audits completed before the February 27 meeting.
- ♦ There is no timetable for spending bond dollars.

Director Gelser thanked Mr. Wright for his time and effort, adding that she is pleased, impressed and grateful for his leadership. She thanked him for looking at a real life application for kids versus just ADA requirements.

Superintendent Tarzian expressed appreciation to Garfield Elementary parents for their fundraising efforts. She expressed appreciation to SEAC for its offer to look at guidelines for future park development, wherever that occurs, so that accessibility is kept in view as playgrounds are enhanced, even if through parent volunteer efforts. She would like to see the district work with SEAC to design those guidelines.

Mr. Wright stated he made an oversight on the Tier 3 list, inadvertently omitting ADA play structure and accessibility upgrades for Inavale K-8 and Franklin K-8 Schools. If the board decides to go ahead with Tier 3 in the future, the list will include those two items as part of the overall dollar expenditure. The total for Tier 3, with the addition of the upgrades, is approximately \$61,000 more than before.

Mr. Wright said there are new national standards regarding slides, especially the high slides, which he recommends doing away with. His staff will be working with the schools to remove some of them in the spring and repair some of them as well. Some repairs will be done immediately if there are safety concerns.

Director Rieck asked if feedback gleaned from work with parent groups to identify projects and what equipment is to be installed could be provided to all schools and whether a system can be implemented to ensure that all parent groups work through Auxiliary Services. Mr. Wright said that work falls within the scope of the Facilities Advisory Committee.

MOTION #40: It was moved by Director Gelser and seconded by Director Higgins that the board increase the funding for playground improvements by \$120,000 to provide rubberized surfaces and accessible equipment at Jefferson Elementary School and increased accessibility at other elementary schools, and that the board approve the Tier 1 and Tier 2 projects as recommended by staff. (See Supplemental Item #VII-15 in the Official 2005-06 Board Minutes.)

A summary of Board discussion and staff responses to questions:

- ♦ Regarding the impacts of boundaries and the shifting of schools in relation to approving the Tier 1 and 2 projects, how soon would those go into place to prevent putting money into a school that might be closed? (Keim) Mr. Wright's response: the PR2 Committee forecasted enrollment projects for a number of years into the future. Using that as a basis for a decision about facilities and using what is on your plate right now would take you out 10 years and would protect your interests in your physical plants.
- ♦ Tier 1 priorities are necessary and are issues of liability, particularly about playgrounds. Tier 2 items have the potential to give the board options regarding decisions that it will have to make later on. Make the decisions about Franklin K-8 and Inavale K-8 and then come back and look at the Tier 2 decision after learning the impact. (Donohue)

- ♦ The difference between Tiers 1 and 2 is that it changes the types of improvements the board said it would make with bond dollars. The board was very clear to voters. Tier 2 items are clearly justifiable under the bond. The benefit of approving them now is more in the ability to move forward in getting bids and being able to do the work when the kids are not in school (or having to wait another year). There will still be money left that the board can set a strategy for after approving Tiers 1 and 2. (Gelser)
- ♦ It is unknown what will happen with the district's facilities; some of the "not recommended" items might end up on the "need to do" list. (Donohue)

Superintendent Tarzian said district staff spent time analyzing Director Donohue's question. Staff went back to the work of the PR2 Committee in costing out scenarios and challenged each other to think of new scenarios to respond to how much flexibility would be left for this very issue. She asked Mr. Wright to address the board about what would or would not be affordable. She reminded the board that the PR2 Committee process revealed that there is enough capacity for all 509J students without building or reopening a school.

A summary of Mr. Wright's comments about his recommendation for Tier 3 money to be set aside and what it can/cannot afford in terms of options:

- ♦ Based on the proposal that was placed on the table tonight about adding back funds for Jefferson, there is \$1 million of additional bond proceeds available to the board to look at other facilities within the district that would deal with the Inavale and Franklin issue. He read some of them and noted that all were submitted to the PR2 Committee for its review: relocate Franklin and Wilson to Cheldelin (requiring approximately \$675,000 in facility changes). It ranges from that to a high of \$1,577,000 to relocate to Harding. Also, relocate Franklin to Lincoln, requiring approximately \$840,000.
- ♦ The \$1 million that would be set aside would go a long way to deal with some of these different scenarios as it relates to relocating facilities within the district.
- ♦ Tier 3 dollars would be set aside until the board made its other decisions, including approximately \$170,000 within the current bond identified for those two facilities that has not yet been spent, but it is not part of these additional bond dollars. In the event the board chooses to move forward with it, it will be included with those other projects that we go to bid with this spring.

Ms. Tarzian pointed out that if the board approved Tiers 1 and 2, there would not be enough money left over to implement Harding.

Mr. Wright indicated that the remaining site improvements at CHS, including razing of Franklin, are still held in abeyance for the CHS project.

A summary of Board discussion and staff responses to questions:

- ♦ If the playground audits reveal the need for major renovations, will there be enough money to fund improvements? (Rieck) Mr. Wright's response: not district-wide. Six schools are identified under Tiers 1 and 2, and two schools are identified under Tier 3.

- ♦ Would like to see the board take a vote on this matter on February 6 and continue to get public input on Tiers 1 and 2 specifically, and get an understanding of the playground audits to the community. (Rieck) Mr. Wright's response: playground audits will not be completed before February 27.

MOTION #41: It was moved by Director Rieck that the vote on the use of remaining bond dollars be postponed until February 6, 2006.

A summary of board member discussion:

- ♦ Vote tonight. The board has been receiving a good volume of email and information has been posted on the district's Web site. The input has been extremely consistent. Move forward knowing that there is another \$1million left over to apply to playgrounds if needed. (Gelser)
- ♦ Vote tonight. Another reason to hold off on approving Tier 2 funding until after receiving the playground audit information is that there might be higher priority issues than are currently on the list now. The board committed to make its decisions engaged with the public; by voting on Tier 2 tonight, the board is doing that in some respect and is eliminating options that might have a lot of traction with the community. (Donohue)
- ♦ At least approve Tier 1. (Keim)
- ♦ Move ahead, trusting that Mr. Wright has looked at the money and that there will be enough to complete the projects. Feedback is consistent and basically it is that the board is elected to make the decisions. The board needs to proceed in order to let the other things unfold. (Higgins)
- ♦ The board has four big decisions to make (Tier 1, open enrollment, Inavale, and the CHS plan, which implicates Franklin), which should be integrated as much as possible. Keep as much flexibility as possible in decision-making regarding the use of bond dollars. If the board's integrated decision-making requires spending money from Tier 2 just to move students into the programs the community favors, integrate that into the decision-making. Hold out Tier 2 dollars. (Donohue)

Director Rieck's motion died for lack of a second.

A vote was taken on Motion #40. Chair O'Malley and Directors Higgins, Rodman and Gelser voted in favor of the motion; Directors Donohue, Keim and Rieck voted in opposition. The motion carried by a vote of 4-3.

Director Donohue clarified that his vote was not against Tier 1, but about the lack of flexibility. Directors Keim and Rieck echoed that sentiment.

In response to concerns raised by Mr. Moore regarding the theater at CVHS, Mr. Wright stated that a temporary part-time theater manager position was recently developed. Retired CHS drama

teacher Rick Wallace is currently in that position and sent Mr. Wright a list of items that needs to be addressed immediately.

MOTION #42: It was moved by Director Rieck and seconded by Director Keim to take all remaining money after Tier 1 and Tier 2 and hold it until after the key decisions that the board will make by February 27, 2006. (See Supplemental Items IV-27 (Key Decisions) and VII-15 (Tier 1, 2, and 3 dollars) of the Official 2005-06 Board Minutes.)

The motion was voted on and passed unanimously.

Chair O'Malley temporarily recessed the meeting at 8:05 p.m. and reconvened it at 8:15 p.m.

Chair O'Malley acknowledged the nominations of student representatives Lynn Hector and Brayden Moore for Future First Citizen; Lynn Hector was given the award during the recent Celebrate Corvallis event.

IV. DISCUSSION ON SCHOOL BOARD POLICY JC – SCHOOL ATTENDANCE AREAS (COMMONLY REFERRED TO AS “OPEN ENROLLMENT”)

(See Supplemental Item #VII-16 of the Official 2005-06 Board Minutes “Open Enrollment, Background and Recommendations.”)

Superintendent Tarzian said the feedback she has received that has affected her the most concerns the need for continuing the district's focus for improving the quality of programs at all schools.

A summary of comments by Superintendent Tarzian regarding the work that is going on in that area:

- ♦ There is substantial alignment work going on at the high school level.
- ♦ She has recommended that state school fund grant money be used to address technology inequities between the two high schools.
- ♦ The high school leadership team has been working on aligning key areas such as:
 - ✓ driving permissions
 - ✓ fees
 - ✓ military recruiter opt-out forms and communication with recruiters and parents
 - ✓ courses offered at both high schools and how they are listed in course catalogs
 - ✓ how instructional time is used, including school day start and end times
 - ✓ advisory periods
 - ✓ numbers of classes that each grade can take
 - ✓ what the first day of school is like
 - ✓ conference schedules
- ♦ There is discussion underway regarding PE2 (credit alignment).
- ♦ There is alignment around the use of money that is set aside for Linn Benton Community College tuition.

- ♦ Continuous Improvement Plan for extended learning including Certificate of Advanced Mastery for graduation.
- ♦ She has heard some comments from the community that the quality of instruction/quality of staff needs to be high no matter which school students attend. The district has written guidelines so that all certified staff members are evaluated and goals are set accordingly to state law.
- ♦ The concept of principals as instructional leaders is really taking shape in terms of how administrators are making use of their time. They are getting training on how to read student achievement data. Principals facilitated October 2005 and January 2006 in-service training with their teachers regarding literacy and student assessment.
- ♦ She recently talked with the district's expulsion officer, who indicated that there is a noticeable reduction in the number of expulsion hearings and visible alignment between schools in terms of consequences.
- ♦ She has not seen this level of collaboration at the high school level since she began her work with the district. She cited a math courses example and said that if she can find the resources to do so, she will align textbooks.
- ♦ Work continues around crafting high school schedules that better meet the needs of students and respond to community input about things like unassigned time for kids and open periods, etc.
- ♦ She pointed out that every secondary school has had a new leader within the last two years.
- ♦ In the administrative ranks she is seeing new energy, a new focus on diversity, instructional expertise, and a real willingness to listen to parent input and challenge their staffs to improve and respond

Chair O'Malley said those are hopes that support the first draft of School Board Policy JC – School Attendance Areas. The draft precedes a reading and a vote and is a way to garner feedback from the board. Superintendent Tarzian pointed out that the draft language is a starting place, based on the board's discussion.

A summary of board comments:

- ♦ Staff did an excellent job of capturing the conversation from last week and reflecting it in the language. (Rieck)
- ♦ Would like time to reflect on the language before commenting on it. (Rodman)
- ♦ A lot of the feedback from the community surrounds a panic that open enrollment will not be available. After discussing it with community members, there was a lot of consensus around the need for consistent rules and enforcement of them. There will always be a chance to listen to any special circumstance. (Keim)

A summary of Superintendent Tarzian's responses to a question from Director Donohue regarding the process for voting on the policy change recommendation:

- ♦ This is not the level of urgency that would need a decision by February 27, 2006.
- ♦ The current policy allows her to implement the modifications she has recommended.
- ♦ The board could take time to make revisions to the policy and get input over the course of the spring.

- ♦ The policy could come back for a first reading in March or April and discussion could be scheduled for a meeting in between.
- ♦ The board is scheduled to provide feedback to her by February 27, 2006, but her changes would not run counter with the current policy.

A summary of comments by Director Gelsler:

- ♦ The following two sentences are being struck from the proposed draft but they represent a deeply-held value in the district: “The Board believes that there is not one best school for everyone. Students learn differently and therefore diversity in approach is preferable.” She suggested coupling that language with the sentence that was proposed in the draft, “...all schools in the district offer a rich educational experience....”
- ♦ She is concerned that not everyone understands:
 - ✓ The overarching vision is the policy, but the decision is the superintendent’s.
 - ✓ People do not fully recognize that these changes are radical for some of our students, especially for those at the secondary level. Some that have been on transfer since kindergarten and are now 8th graders will go to a high school without their cohort.
- ♦ She understands the reasons for the changes, but she also thinks it is important for the community to recognize that this is a very significant change.
- ♦ There will likely be no transfer requests for Linus Pauling Middle School or Corvallis High School next year.
- ♦ There has been a lot of input about phasing in the changes and making exceptions. It becomes very hard to pick some and not others, because it would shrink the cohort of kids moving to another school where they do not know others than their cohort.
- ♦ She appreciates the motivation and agrees that the imbalance at the secondary level is critical.
- ♦ She is concerned that the changes are radical and that changes are being made at the elementary level without having the same problem that exists at the secondary level.

Director Rieck urged the board’s focus to remain on the policy. She suggested folding in the work on this policy with the work of the board’s policy review work group to gather input from the rest of the board and develop draft language.

Superintendent Tarzian praised Director Rieck’s suggestion for the policy work group, stating that diverse input from the board was incorporated into the draft. She pointed out that there was some discussion at a recent planning meeting about possibly adding a forum for input on this topic in February. She asked for input from the board on her proposed changes to the administrative regulations and urged setting aside time for this purpose.

Director Rodman indicated his desire to participate in the policy work group.

Director Donohue expressed concern about possibly changing the policy in such a way that forces a change to the administrative regulations. Superintendent Tarzian replied that staff is working to provide the board with a process to meet the timeline the board set out a couple of meetings back. This is the staff support for the board to meet that timeline.

A summary of comments by Director Higgins:

- ♦ The real issue that started the work of the PR2 Committee and the work on open enrollment and boundaries is that the district is experiencing declined enrollment at the elementary level.
- ♦ The district is currently facing the excess capacity issue at the elementary level and it will hit the secondary level in two years.
- ♦ She sees this as a little housework; the caps are addressing that, but the superintendent has a much larger district-wide issue with which she has to deal.
- ♦ The superintendent has captured the essence of the conversations that she has heard from the board and the input that has occurred.
- ♦ She encouraged the superintendent to clean up the “how” of board policies.
- ♦ Dramatic reconfiguration shifting will be required.
- ♦ This policy is an entry step to the hard work the board is going to have to do.

A summary of discussion:

- ♦ Aligning curriculum and equity are part of the solution to the question “why are people transferring?” (O’Malley)
- ♦ Will the new league rules that will be implemented next year affect the district when it comes to these decisions? (Moore) Response: no, we will stay in the same league. We are both 5A schools. (Keim)
- ♦ Would it be possible to work with the committee to be ready for a second reading of this policy on February 27? (Rieck) Response: yes. (Tarzian)
- ♦ Then it would be possible to address Director Donohue’s concerns and make sure the administrative regulations match the policy. (Rieck)

A summary of comments by Director Gelser:

- ♦ She is concerned that the board will not have the opportunity to deliberate on the open enrollment issue.
- ♦ The only discussion the board has had about open enrollment was about a flowchart the board was given at the January 9, 2006 meeting. The board never got a chance to agree/disagree with the pros/cons on the chart. She trusts where the superintendent is taking the matter, but feels something has been missed by not deliberating on the values in the policy. She asked when that would happen.
- ♦ Doing a policy to match administrative regulations is backward. The board should make the policy change and have the administrative regulations follow.
- ♦ She was not able to participate in the PR2 Committee discussion.

A summary of Director Rieck’s responses to Director Gelser’s comments:

- ♦ This discussion was not part of the work of the PR2 Committee.
- ♦ Feedback from parents and the community has been consistent on this issue.
- ♦ The board engaged in extensive discussion at its last meeting, prompting this draft policy.
- ♦ The board has had the opportunity to express concerns.
- ♦ The board needs to continue moving forward and not backslide to the same conversation each week.

Director Rodman agreed with Director Gelser's sentiments. He would like to talk about the value of open enrollment and modifying the administrative regulations. The issue moved up rapidly because it was on a list of PR2 Committee issues to be addressed by the board (K-8, open enrollment, etc. See Pages 111-112 of Supplemental Item #VII-7 of the Official 2005-06 Board Minutes.) That is how it suddenly emerged on the scene.

A summary of comments by Superintendent Tarzian:

- ♦ The discussion by the PR2 Committee regarding closing a number of schools to fill all schools to capacity raised for her the question about what value open enrollment has in this district. Would not a district that valued open enrollment leave space in its schools to create the option for families to go in different directions?
- ♦ Neither she nor any board or PR2 Committee member is looking to limit choice or close schools to eliminate open enrollment.
- ♦ The reason we are engaged in this discussion has to do with resources. The existing policy refers to following the concept of neighborhood schools whenever possible, consistent with the most effective use of district resources.
- ♦ She raised this change in the interest of preserving resources to educate our children in the next 10 years.
- ♦ The 33% that are going to different schools have traded schools.
- ♦ A lot of families want their kids to be together in a school – it is not possible to support all the kids in different schools.
- ♦ She is glad that Director Gelser highlighted the dramatic nature of the change because it cannot be softened. It weighs heavy on Superintendent Tarzian.
- ♦ This is a resource issue, not a philosophical one.
- ♦ The board is looking at every way to make this system run as efficiently as possible and to maintain as much quality as possible.
- ♦ That is the reason for the policy change.
- ♦ It is a highly held value and she appreciates getting feedback on it; if there are ways to implement it that have less of a profound input on implementing it, she welcomes them.

Director Rodman said he has a feeling that by having it have a less profound effect, it will create less profound effect on the changes that you want.

A summary of comments by Superintendent Tarzian:

- ♦ What she knows from her years in this district, but what staff did not tell the board in their feedback, is that the level of commitment to providing high quality education is very high. It is so high that sometimes she worries.
- ♦ She watched staff get moved from other district schools out to Inavale almost in entirety and without missing a beat, and provide a program and build relationships with those families.
- ♦ Those teachers came from other schools in this district – that is who is working here.
- ♦ She knows they did not take lightly the input they gave the board and it is in partnership with them that she feels like she can even go here, because she believes that their commitment to making this work for kids is that deep.
- ♦ She feels like it is a chance to really make some programs work where they have not been working.

A summary of comments by Director Donohue:

- ♦ The board has not engaged in a values discussion.
- ♦ Public input will be important to obtain.
- ♦ He agrees with the superintendent, but is torn.
- ♦ He likes choice but there has to be equal opportunity of choice, which does not currently exist.
- ♦ He visited CHS recently; the staff is outstanding but they are stretched to the breaking point.
- ♦ The transfer policy is a resource issue. It is one of the steps in the board's decision-making to set up the district to utilize its resources more effectively.
- ♦ The question the board must ask is, "Do we want to maintain the current high quality education in the face of declining resources?" He believes this policy is a way to do that.

The board reached consensus that its policy work group will help draft the policy.

Director Gelser asked Superintendent Tarzian regarding her recommendation to keep the difference of enrollment between schools at no more than 7%. Following is a summary of Ms. Tarzian's responses:

- ♦ The current gap is 10%, so she does not anticipate approving many transfers.
- ♦ There will be one-for-one transfers approved after the gap has returned to 7%.
- ♦ The input she has received favors keeping the freshman classes a little more balanced. She is still researching it.
- ♦ She has received feedback about where the Ashbrook K-8 cohort should go.
- ♦ Her interest in putting out her recommendations was to get feedback; it has been helpful.
- ♦ She anticipates telling the board on February 27, 2006 what she proposes to do so the community can know.

V. BOARD COMMUNITY RELATIONS PROCESS

Chair O'Malley explained that communication and engagement is one of the board's goals but the process has not been solidified.

She referred to a handout listing ways the community could provide input to the board.

A summary of comments by Director Donohue:

- ♦ The City Council's Government Comment Corner happens most Saturdays at the public library.
- ♦ The Council has been gracious to allow the board to use some of its slots.
- ♦ There will be at least one board member at the public library on the dates listed on the handout, including three dates in February. That was planned because of the heavy decisions the board is facing.
- ♦ He anticipates that board members will provide brief reports about their experiences at these Comment Corners to the rest of the board.

A summary of discussion regarding timing of the board's responses to communications:

- ♦ Board members will log the topic of telephone calls and the names of the callers.
- ♦ The board's working agreement sets forth the timing of the board chair's responses to emails to happen within 36 hours. It will be changed to about 48 hours during the week, and weekends off.
- ♦ Liability issues would have to be worked out before the student representatives would be able to receive email from the community.

A summary of Director Donohue's comments:

- ♦ Have a forum for community input on the CHS master plan, open enrollment, Franklin K-8 and Inavale K-8 schools.
- ♦ Obtain community input about what should be preserved in the district and what that is worth.
- ♦ Have it in a style akin to that of the PR2 Committee forums.
- ♦ Provide the opportunity to look at a broad variety of issues and solicit commentary.
- ♦ It would provide a much better picture of where people are on the issues.

A summary of responses:

- ♦ Give specific information at the beginning of each forum on each of the 4 issues. (Keim)
- ♦ What will we do to get the underrepresented groups to come to our forums? (O'Malley)
- ♦ Target working people by holding brown bag lunches at Hewlett Packard, Good Samaritan Hospital, Oregon State University, etc. (Higgins)
- ♦ Those are also the people who are more likely to communicate with the board via email. Reach out to those who have trouble getting transportation to north Corvallis or communicating via email. (Gelser)
- ♦ Have a community discussion regarding a local option levy. There are groups that are not reached, such as retirement communities. Having some presentations at community centers in the evenings for people to travel a short distance, such as Tunison Center. (Donohue)
- ♦ Ensure that each audience is interested in what is discussed. (She referenced the Continuous Improvement Plan). Ensure the board is tying in the appropriate pieces and who is assigned to work on them to keep it whole. (Rieck)
- ♦ Have one or two board members meet in a small community center with 10 or so community members to have more of a conversation. (Donohue)
- ♦ Perhaps add one hour (early start) to an upcoming board meeting to allow testimony versus having a forum on a separate night. (Gelser)

A summary of comments by Superintendent Tarzian:

- ♦ She will send a letter to all families in the district in English and Spanish so that, at a minimum, no one is surprised by the changes.
- ♦ She referred to the discussion about a public forum and likes the idea of attaching it to a public meeting so they can all hear firsthand.
- ♦ To the extent the board feels it can manage gathering smaller community groups she would encourage using that time as a way to speak to the community as well as to hear from the community.

- ♦ The reasons why changes are being proposed are not reasons the board has a lot of control over.
- ♦ Take opportunities to talk to the community about the hard decisions that the board is facing. They are not isolated decisions for the board – the board must bring the district into alignment with resources.
- ♦ If the board gets input from different community members on each one, it makes it difficult for the board to use the feedback to prioritize what is most important in terms of what to do.
- ♦ She likes the idea of having the board deliberate on the issues together and having them hear it firsthand.

A summary of comments by Director Rieck regarding the purpose of community forums:

- ♦ The board is facing four decisions.
- ♦ The board has already addressed one of them, regarding Tier 1 and Tier 2; the decision regarding Tier 3 will be made later.
- ♦ The next decision is regarding the open enrollment policy and we are also seeking feedback about the superintendent's recommended changes to the administrative regulations.
- ♦ One decision relates to Inavale.
- ♦ One decision relates to the CHS master site plan, which does not necessarily mean making a decision until after February 27.
- ♦ What is the purpose of a forum? What pieces is the board really after and is a forum the appropriate setting to be asking that many questions at once?

Director Donohue agreed with taking public comment during a board meeting. The (open enrollment) policy and Inavale K-8 are discreet issues, which can be posed to the community. The CHS master plan issue could be posed for comments in a PR2 Committee-style forum. Those are discreet issue-driven questions like the PR2 Committee had. The board can solicit public comment on all three at one time and the community would appreciate it versus having three different forums.

Director Keim said in order for her to piece all of this together, she would like a more formal, written process to solicit feedback about how many parents want K-8 and whether it is site-related. It is an area that will impact what recommendation she makes about whether to move Franklin K-8 and, if so, where to move it.

Director Gelser said that the board has already developed a process for making decisions. She discouraged the board from adding extra meetings to discuss the process for making a decision. She feels the board is at the point of deliberating on open enrollment, Inavale K-8, etc.

Superintendent Tarzian pointed out the agenda for the February 6 board meeting, the bulk of which deals with Inavale K-8, will include her recommendation and a long-term viability study.

Director Rodman said the input he will receive from the February 6 meeting would be sufficient for him.

Director Higgins cautioned the board to be conscious about what discussion it will engage the community in. The board has been very visible and has gotten diverse input. The board needs to decide on what it is trying to solicit feedback. The PR2 Committee forums were great for brainstorming but the board is not brainstorming and it would not be sincere to bill community forums as that.

VI. EXECUTIVE SESSION

The Board met in Executive Session under ORS 192.660(2)(i) – Superintendent’s Evaluation just prior to this meeting.

VII. ADJOURNMENT

Being no further business before the board, Chair O’Malley adjourned the meeting at 9:35 p.m.

Nell O’Malley, Chair

Dawn Tarzian, Superintendent

Prepared by Julie Catala
Edited by Jolene Shute
(s:\super\julie\board\minutes\2006\jan 30..doc)