

Three Rivers School District Board of Directors met for a special session, Tuesday, December 2, 2014 at the District Administrative Office, 8550 New Hope Road, Grants Pass, Josephine County, Oregon at 5:00 p.m.

PRESENT: Danny York, Board Chair, Zone II
Kate Dwyer, Member of the Board, Zone I PRESENT
Kara Olmo, Member of the Board, Zone III
Ron Crume, Member of the Board, Zone IV
David Holmes, Superintendent-Clerk
Debbie Breckner, Director of Human Resources
Dave Valenzuela, Director of K-8 Education & Technology
Casey Alderson, Director of Secondary Ed., Athletics & Alt. Ed.
Stephanie Allen-Hart, Director of Student Services

ABSENT: Ron Lengwin, Vice-Chair of the Board, Zone V ABSENT

Also Present: Lois Horan/Woodland Charter School Principal, Liz Dolantree, ALSO PRESENT
Brent Workley/Newbridge Principal, Patricia Krauss, Van
Grainger, Kari O'Brien, Wensdae Davis, Stacey Denton,
Richard Ziff, Dave Marks, Peri Wilson, Jeanine Buckman and
Shelly Quick/Recording Secretary.

Board Chair York called the meeting to order at 5:05 p.m. and led the audience in the Pledge of Allegiance. CALL TO ORDER

Member Olmo made a motion to approve the agenda as presented. Member Dwyer seconded and the motion passed unanimously (4-0, *member Lengwin absent*). APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Board Chair York presented the Consent Agenda. All items on the Consent Agenda may be approved by a single motion unless a member of the Board or the Superintendent requests that an item or items be removed and voted upon separately. Member Olmo made a motion to approve the Consent Agenda. Member Crume seconded and the motion passed unanimously. CONSENT AGENDA

Newbridge Principal Brent Workley explained that in 1996 a group of individuals named his school 'Newbridge' high school. He has been there for four years working with the students (prisoners). He would like to change the name because education can be a 'New Bridge' to a new future. He needs a motion, a second and a vote to support this change. He has papers that he needs to attach to the board minutes approving this name change for the State of Oregon to proceed forward with the process. Member Crume made a motion to change the name from 'Newbridge' to New Bridge' high school. Member Dwyer seconded the motion. Board Chair York asked how the staff feels about the name change? Mr. Workley said the responses have been mixed. Some are sort of entrenched with it. He is trying to create a vision for his kids. Board Chair York called for a vote and the motion passed unanimously. NEWBRIDGE NAME CHANGE

Superintendent David Holmes stated that at last month's board meeting the board received recommended language changes that Director Valenzuela put together. WOODLAND CHARTER SCHOOL

WOODLAND CHARTER
SCHOOL (CONTINUED)

Woodland Principal Lois Horan and her group have received the proposed changes as well. He and Ms. Horan talked and they don't have any concerns about the language changes. He then turned it over to Ms. Horan so that she could speak to Woodland's proposal for the increased ADM percentage. Member Olmo asked if they would be voting on the charter tonight. Mr. Holmes explained that it is scheduled to be on the agenda for approval at the December board meeting. Member Olmo asked if the final charter is approved at the next board meeting does that still open up the period where they can go in and negotiate the finer points? Mr. Holmes said they would still have the ninety day window, but does not see a need for any further language discussions. We are happy with where we're at on both sides. The only discussion right now is the money piece. Once that is approved by the board in December we are done.

Ms. Horan stated that they don't object to any of the language and the only thing that they are still requesting is that they add kindergarten and increase their ADM pass through from 80% to 85%. To reiterate, their reason for this request is that their school was not given building space in the startup phase. They have improved the leased land with significant improvements in order to situate their rented modular classrooms and office space. She provided the board with a document that tells how much it has cost for the rentals and the improvements they have put in over \$300,000. The rental money they see as throw away money. They are not investing in a property or permanent buildings. Currently their rental is around \$5,000 for buildings and ramps per month. An increase is going to be coming when they add more students next year. They will be adding a bigger building to accommodate that and a classroom. Currently they don't have a lot on their bottom line because they have done improvements and still paying rent. At 80% ADM pass-through they make it, but need that chunk more that will accommodate paying for the mortgage. She also presented some additional data to help inform their decision about the requested ADM increase. She explained Three Rivers School District, at 20% has received \$167,568 this year. She provided information on what it would look like next year if the district received 20% and then 15%. In 2015-16 at 15% the district would get \$151,858.50, in 2016-17 \$178,041 and then in 2017-18 \$204,223. This means that the amount at 15% for those three years would be \$534,123.

Ms. Horan then reviewed the yearly cost estimations/totals in 2014 (many are estimations and if unsure she made them higher in an effort to show what they cost the district):

• Special education assistant	\$16,000
• SOESD—training	10,000
• Safeschools	10,000
• Synergy	1,211
• Human Resources/TRSD	10,000
• ODE Reporting	10,000
• First Student	No extra cost
• Synrevoice	Do not use
• Accounting-ADM pass-through documentation	5,000
TOTAL	\$ 62,211

The 20% of the ADM received by the district this year was \$167,568. That still leaves the district with an excess of \$100,000 to work with. In the subsequent years, there will still be so much money there to work with. They are asking that money be passed on to the Woodland students. They need so many things for them, they don't even have a playground or a field to play on; buildings that are not rented.

Woodland Council member Wensdae Davis extended their appreciation for going through with their charter. She reiterated that when they started a big concern was whether the school was going to cost the district a lot of money, especially starting up. They did a lot of negotiating to get to the point where Woodland was not going to be costing the district

any money. She is happy to see on these numbers that they are now bringing to the abundance of the entire district. She again mentioned the numbers of how much they had had to spend to develop their site. It costs a lot to take a raw piece of land and bring it to a point where it's approachable, safe, meets fire standards, septic DEQ and all of these things they have had to take it from a raw piece of land. They have put a lot into it so far and it will continue. Ms. Davis left it with the picture of the extra 5% which would make a huge difference in what they could bring to their students. She asked them to consider what they still have to accomplish to continue to grow their school and make it successful.

WOODLAND CHARTER
SCHOOL
(CONTINUED)

Member Crume said they have come a long way and congratulated them on doing a good job.

Woodland Council Member Richard Ziff added that on the treasurer side on things they have hit all of their numbers. They have been able to exceed all of their numbers across the board with the amount of students coming in and what they have been able to do with the school. Things are really successful on that level. They are on their feet and it's that extra 5% that takes it to the place of playgrounds, safety and something more that they can offer something more to these students that are being well educated there. Mr. Ziff added they went to lunch with Mr. Lengwin and he commented that they have done well and he likes rewarding good behavior.

Mr. York asked if the majority of ADM for Woodland Charter come from within Three Rivers, outside of Three Rivers? Mr. Valenzuela responded that they are capped at 30 TRSD kids. Stacey Denton explained that the cap is for existing TRSD students. There are students that live within the Three Rivers School District that weren't previously attending TRSD schools that have come to Woodland. Ms. Horan added that 65% of their population is previously home-schooled. So they live in the district, but they were previously home-schooled. They are actually capped at 35 but believes they are at like 28. Eleven of those were kindergarteners because they don't have kindergarten.

Ms. Olmo commented that one of her main concerns as the community was discussing the idea of Woodland Charter. How much would it pull and if Woodland wasn't here how many of those students would go back to one of our schools where we would be getting 100% of the ADM? As a parent there the real competition that she sees at Woodland is more home group communities coming, other home school collectives that are starting that are not a part of our district. That's where she hears conversations and people talk. She does not see as much competition with Woodland and Applegate and Williams and Madrona as she thought there would be. She thinks this is a way for Three Rivers to be actively involved in some alternative programming for kids and to keep these kids in our district—much more so that she ever imagined. Things like playgrounds a communal room where they can have assemblies and have that joint indoor experience that we value on our different campuses here in the future would dramatically benefit the school and the district and help it be competitive in the arena which Woodland's really having to compete.

Mr. Holmes added that he agrees with everything she just said. That is his observation too. Congratulations to Woodland because charter schools do not often see the success that they have had. Coming from the state of Washington and watching, particularly across the border in the Portland area, there are charters almost on a yearly basis and they last a year or two and they're gone. Woodland has done a very nice job of meeting the need, finding the niche and doing that well. He agreed with what they see as the competition piece. He has had the discussion with Darrell Erb, the principal at Applegate and Williams, about creating a home school cooperative in the Williams school that we can also have a piece of that pie. The competition doesn't concern him. From a business background, if they're taking our kids then we need to do a better job in our schools to keep our kids. Competition is a healthy piece. If they are doing something really, really well they are

WOODLAND CHARTER
SCHOOL (CONTINUED)

either serving a select piece of the audience that we can't or we need to do a better job of serving that same audience. Competition is healthy all of the way around. He does think that his only concern is from a budgetary perspective and looking at it from a budget management perspective what they are asking for is \$165,000 on the bottom line for three years. He doesn't have a sense of what our budget's going to look like in relationship to all of the other things on the plate. We have a pretty good feeling, based on we just saw the governor's budget come out yesterday. And he can assure them that almost every administrator in the state and every superintendent in the state has done nothing but read that budget in their spare time looking for all of the line details so we can get the perspective down the road of how that might impact us so we can get the earliest jump as possible on things. He can't give them a real sense of what that is going to look like because \$165,000 is a lot of money regardless. But, how is that going to impact our bottom line for the other projects on our plate that we have to get done? He has a hesitation around the full 5%, but it is the board's call. It's no different than when they approved the Long Range Facility Plan with all of the items and numbers in that they have to look at that and say it makes sense to them, it's something they value, that dollar figure makes sense based on the priority and what they value. His recommendation is that's what they need to look at—the \$165,000 and the bottom line. Is that an equitable request right now based on everything that we have going? He doesn't know if there are options, it hasn't been talked about previously, whether there is a slow rollup to that. Maybe 2% the first year, 3% the second year and 5% the third year. Maybe it's the other way around—5% the first year where they could get some money coming in and start some projects. He appreciates the work Ms. Horan did to try to put a value on the services provided. She did that in response to Ms. Cross' list that she provided. It's really hard to put a dollar value on what those are. He couldn't do that and Ms. Cross couldn't do that and he can ask the directors of all the pieces that they have responsibility for and for us to be able to tell them it's about \$2,345 or \$3,900—they just can't do that because of the ebb and flow and it comes and goes. Ms. Cross certainly was generous in the things she evaluated that she saw were impacts, but there are also a whole list of things that they do on a regular basis that's the big structure of the district that supports them similarly to what we support every other building and he can't put a value on it. He guessed it is somewhere in between. That the actual cost of all that stuff is somewhere in between. He is not opposed to the board granting them all 5% and he would feel much more comfortable with something less than that. Looking forward to all of the other things that he knows he has on his board right now it's about 97 things that are his projects that he is trying to get done that he is going to be coming to the Budget Committee to ask for. We don't know right now what that's going to look like.

Ms. Olmo commented that when she first saw the 5%, and it being a significant chunk and part of the district budget that we are happy to spend is if the district were to keep that 5% and keep it at the 80/20 could the district be doing something additional for Woodland to take some of these facility improvements or some of the goals that Woodland has off Woodland's plate and incorporate it into our facilities updates. As she started thinking about it and looking at the projects and having an idea of what it costs the district for us to do it our way versus what she has seen Woodland do with their community support and parent participation and called to volunteer the reality of it is that the 5% goes so much further if they give it to Woodland. It goes so much further than we could ever make that dollar go. She hears his caution and warning—thank you— she still feels strongly that Woodland would be a good steward of those funds.

Mr. Crume stated that he would be inclined to support them at the 5%. We made a decision to support them as a school and he thinks we need to come beside them and support them. It's the kids of our community that we're making a decision to support.

Ms. Dwyer said it seems to her that there's a lot of capture that the district would not otherwise have. So they are bringing those funds to the table to begin with. She

understands that there is a lot of things on the list, but she also thinks that so far what she has seen is that they are going to leverage that money and invest in the way that's going to benefit our kids. She would like them have the opportunity to do that.

WOODLAND CHARTER
SCHOOL (CONTINUED)

Mr. York said they are developing opportunities in our own community for the community to be a part of the process. He has a hard time finding fault with that.

Mr. Holmes responded that what he is hearing is that he would come back to them on December 16 with a charter with the new language changes that the district proposed two weeks ago, with a 5% ADM change as part of that charter for them to approve—is that the direction? The board agreed with that.

Mr. Holmes said that he took Ms. Olmo's input from the board meeting and provided a new copy of the resolution. Paragraph five he added "*WHEREAS, we support the development of a transportation funding formula that is weighted in a manner that it is EQUATABLE across all school districts in the state, particularly districts such as the Three Rivers School district in rural Josephine county.*" he added that based on Ms. Olmo's input from the previous meeting. He also looked for Ms. Olmo's notes about typos and language issues and not finding them he was open for suggestions. Ms. Olmo responded that it wasn't in the resolution, it was in the policies. With that change it is now in front of them. There has been a fair amount of press and conversation based on the governor's budget coming out and this activity and this initiative in the newspaper as of late. It is probably fairly good timing for us. We might get a little local press on it which might help. It's up for the board's approval whether they submit it or not.

RESOLUTION (#07) IN
SUPPORT OF THE
PROMISE OF OREGON

Member Olmo made a motion to approve the "Promise of Oregon" resolution. Member Dwyer seconded the motion.

Member Crume stated he is torn on it. The more he reads through it, the more he looks it over he believes it's a campaign to fund schools, which is good, and he agrees with almost everything in there. But he also believes it's a campaign to increase taxes and that's hard to swallow to an extent. If he has a chance to vote on the taxes himself, and know where they are going he would support them. But seeing a 13.7% increase in the governor's budget he has to wonder where is the money coming from. He thinks this is a resolution to butter us up to be used as an agenda and although he will probably vote no, he's not going to vote no to kids. He's just going to vote no to the Kitz reform. That's his concern. He agrees with the language.

Board Chair York stated that what he read briefly was that the governor's new budget wouldn't increase taxes at all to the spending level he is wanting to go to.

Mr. Holmes added not the governor's proposal—more money to the schools. To the base school fund, minimal increase outside of special funds that they are retrieving from other areas. It doesn't mean down the road that there won't be an initiative somehow to raise more money to fund more services.

Mr. Crume stated that from the representatives they have talked to their concern is that it will raise the taxes.

Mr. Holmes said they he met with representatives from the Southern Oregon districts two weeks ago at Southern Oregon ESD. Two of them by phone and three of them in person and it was a very enlightening and informative conversation and taxes never came up. It was more about what issues are on the plate around education and what needs funded. There was a lot of conversation about kindergarten; a lot of conversation around early childhood development preparation for kindergarten. Lots of conversation around the 40/40/20 that's in there and how is the state going to fund that piece? How is the state

RESOLUTION (#07) IN
SUPPORT OF THE PROM-
ISE OF OREGON
(CONTINUED)

going to fund the schools to achieve 40/40/20?

Ms. Dwyer commented that it seems that if there's an effort to raise or to shift taxes for school funding the School Boards Association and the other people that support this resolution are going to be in favor of that whether they are or not. She doesn't see it having an impact such that she would feel significantly used if that were there agenda because that's pretty much already their agenda is to move as much money towards schools.

Mr. Holmes said to some point the conversation he has heard—it was interesting to him when we are in the cocoon of education around educators and school board members and parents and kids and we are doing the business of education and funding education from his personal perspective it's like he's in this bubble of isolation and then all of the sudden he realizes yesterday when the governor's budget came out and then you hear all of the other special interest groups coming to the table, you get very quickly enlightened that we are not the only people asking for money. Transportation and health care and public safety, roads and it just keeps going. Almost all of them with the same message—that they are underfunded, they have projects that they can't complete, they need more money to do the things they need to do and to some degree that is always the nature of government. The government's really good at spending money because they will find projects—that's their job, they are a service organization to do things, and to do things you need money. As much money as you give them they will find things to do that with. That said, if we the people that support public education don't take the stance for publicizing our own concerns for own needs nobody else will and the people on the other side of the table with those other needs are going to get a bigger slice or a bigger share of that pie to the detriment of our kids and the job we're trying to do. That's his perspective on why he put the resolution in front of the board to start with. It's just another piece that we can do in support of our organization and education and doing what we do for our kids. Because there are people in the transportation department and there are people downtown right now probably at a board meeting on public safety having the same conversation about how are they going to rally the legislature to get more funding for more police officers; how are they going to get more funding for jails and those kinds of things. If we don't do our job supporting what we represent then he thinks we are neglectful in that manner and somebody else is going to do a better job and we'll have less resources to do what we're called to do.

Board Chair York called for a vote and the motion to approve the Promise of Oregon resolution passed 3-1 (member Crume opposing, member Lengwin absent).

FULL TIME KINDERGAR-
TEN 2015-16

Superintendent Holmes reported on the work he has done so far, what he found out and asked to get a little bit of direction around what kind of support they have for certain decisions. The governor's budget is including a specific line item for kindergarten. It's pretty certain that they can count on the funding for the FTE's for teachers to provide the service to our students. There is not any certainty right now that the budget will cover things like extra instructional materials; it certainly doesn't provide for the stress that will be placed on infrastructure. For example the idea of Madrona right now where we've got a huge number of students for the size of the building. Particularly the cafeteria, the gym and the play areas. By adding another classroom to that setting then you will put continued stress on those infrastructures. That budget we know is not going to provide for those kinds of things. He has had conversations with people in the Grants Pass School District and they are at a scramble right now to provide just classrooms. That said, with the work we have done so far we know we have classroom space at all of our elementary's right now particularly with the exception of Madrona and Fruitdale. Those are the two buildings where we have issues. We can solve the Madrona situation by moving a portion of our Lifeskills classes that are there to a site in North Valley, likely at Manzanita, maybe at Fleming. We have had conversations we don't know exactly that

yet. That is a win-win from the perspective that the students that would go to North Valley are North Valley students many of which are riding a long distance on busses which are some of our most medically fragile students. They are on busses way longer than they should be to be transported all the way to Madrona. By splitting that and creating that space over at either Manzanita or Fleming we are going to better serve students in a more timely manner. There will be about a \$40,000 cost savings for transportation that should cover all of the infrastructure improvements at Manzanita or Fleming. That should be a win-win. Ms. Olmo asked if we would still maintain the resource center at Madrona as well? Mr. Holmes said yes—it really kind of just splits it in half, which frees up classrooms. We would end up with two classrooms and out of that we can create our additional kindergarten classroom and we can also create another space that will probably be some kind of computer lab. He has had some conversations with Ms. Landon, the principal there, and that's still to be decided. But that is a solution that's a win-win at Madrona because we can serve our special needs Lifeskills class by doing that, we can save the district money and create better infrastructure for those other schools. He is comfortable with that piece and thinks it is a great solution. Fruitdale is another problem. Fruitdale is our flagship elementary—it's gorgeous, it's well-built, it's top-notch and it is stuffed! There is no space there. There are three possible solutions that he can see. One is not really on the table and that one would be to do something similar to what Grants Pass is doing, which is to go out and borrow the money to build a wing and use the increased ADM percentage to pay the mortgage on the loan to build the space. He roughed out those numbers but does not think that is a doable win-win solution. It's certainly not a solution for next year. There is no way you arrange the money, raise the funding, find the architect, do the design—it isn't happening. We would be lucky to do it the following year. So that's really not on the table. The remaining two solutions are: do we look at putting a portable there, which in his perspective has it's own drawbacks? Portables are not the preferred setting for any educational institution. They are acceptable, they work, but they are not preferable. It's like buying a brand new car and driving it off the lot, the depreciation goes way down. The infrastructure piece is that—bringing in the internet, bring in the water, bring in the electricity and those other kinds of things that provide the infrastructure to it will never be recouped and at some point is a loss leader because at some point you will build a wing probably where that sits and those things will all just be scrapped and new things will be put in place. The last alternative is to move enrollment boundaries which he will have Director Valenzuela describe to them what those will be because his understanding is that they have talked about this a number of times and this is possibly a win-win as well because we have seen declining enrollment at Williams, pretty substantially and we have some declining enrollment at Applegate as well. There is existing space in those two buildings and by shifting a couple of boundaries there and another one out on Riverbanks Road that is another possible solution. With that comes a number of political pieces with parents and those kinds of things. There is no easy win-win solution that he can see, but asked Mr. Valenzuela to describe the boundary pieces, the work that's been done there and what the impacts would be.

Mr. Valenzuela explained the boundary shifts that they talked about in the past, unfortunately, they save us money in a lot of efficiencies but they don't impact Fruitdale where we need space. They impact Madrona and they free up a lot of space there by taking North Applegate Road and going out to Applegate School. That has been talked about at length. They have talked to a lot of the families that live on that route and there was a lot of support for that. The East Riverbanks Road solution is a huge cost savings that we have explored with First Student. They take students to Ft. Vannoy instead of bussing them back to Madrona and that allows them to do a circular route instead of a backtrack route. It saves us a lot of time and money. Honestly where Fruitdale is located, we can't do a lot of boundary shifting. If freed up enough space at Madrona maybe something off of Cloverlawn, but it would not save us the kind of space we are looking for at Fruitdale. It's a puzzle they have looked at from every angle in terms of space and how to shift some numbers and it's just not happening—and it's growing quite a bit.

FULL TIME KINDERGARTEN 2015-16
(CONTINUED)

Ms. Olmo asked what about having a kindergarten to serve Fruitdale off site? There are so many great preschools in that area. Could we have a facility like that? Rent it and turn it into an all day kindergarten for the short term until we have a long term solution.

Mr. York added that liability-wise, the infrastructure of those facilities would have to be what we would have. Mr. Holmes said you have challenges around playground equipment and how to serve them lunch—depending on the space you could find. It's a valid idea; it's not something he has looked in to and can look into that. Fruitdale is something that needs to be discussed further in terms of a long range facility plan. That school is going to continue to see the growth. In January he can provide an update on the Jerome Prairie situation. The question was asked about taking a look back—was that a good choice? What are we looking at in the future? What do those numbers look like? He doesn't see anything there as a solution either. The Madrona thing is a win-win based on the Lifeskills piece. That is a great idea. It saves those kids travel time and expanding the service piece. The growth at Madrona has slowed down. Madrona hasn't added any kids this month. We were seeing one or two a week for the first six or seven weeks and we were worried and didn't know why that was happening. But, over the last month it has stopped. We are pretty confident that we are okay now and moving into next year with that space. Fruitdale is a real issue.

Mr. Holmes asked for a little direction. Looking at the cost of a portable? He can look at some off site spaces and see if that is a valid opportunity. They did talk about doing some things like grade shifting. The idea of moving entire grade bands to different buildings so that they broke up the configuration of K-5 to something else at a couple buildings. But now they are back to the piece of perhaps putting kids on busses for longer periods of time, so that's not really an equitable solution either.

Mr. Crume said they should look at talking to the little church that is right next to Fruitdale. They have been very workable with Edgewater Christian Fellowship for their youth group on Wednesday nights and let them have their youth group there. It's within walking distance for lunches and the playground and he thinks they have room to expand on that lot.

Director Allen-Hart asked if renting a portable for the short term would be a possibility? Mr. Holmes responded that in his experience previous to this district it was always a purchase piece because looking at the investment long term it was better.

Mr. Holmes said he would look into some options and report back to the board in two weeks.

Ms. Olmo suggested that perhaps Jerome Prairie can be a part of the solution. If there is a solution that includes reopening Jerome Prairie potentially with some boundary changing, especially if there is an option to grandfather in some of our current families that have students at other schools. Mr. Holmes said he would look at that again. It has already been looked at pretty in depth and he doesn't think that is a solution but will look at that again because he is definitely for having that school come back to life. That's a win-win for everybody. But it also has to be equitable from a dollars and sense perspective and everything else involved. He has asked the question—is the participation of all day full day kindergarten mandatory next year? The answer he has gotten back is that no it's not mandatory. It's in the budget, we will be funded for it, but it is not mandatory. He doesn't think that's a good solution saying we will do all day kindergarten at all of our elementaries except for Fruitdale because we don't have the space. But it is his understanding that is an option.

Dave Marks stated that he saw a news release that the kindergarten money is tied to

buying a specific reading program but it gave no other details. He said he even forwarded Mr. Holmes the email about it. Mr. Marks doesn't know what reading program it was. Mr. Holmes said his response would be there is no way that would come off. It was requested that he forward the email to all of the board members.

FULL TIME KINDERGARTEN 2015-16
(CONTINUED)

Mr. Holmes clarified that Three Rivers offering kindergarten is optional. The district would receive money from the state based on ADM. Ms. Breckner added that if you offer full day kindergarten you are compensated at the full ADM. If you don't offer you are compensated at the half ADM. Compulsory education in Oregon starts at the age of seven. Whether the state legislature will change that in the upcoming session remains to be seen.

Member Dwyer stated that if we offer full day kindergarten then we would have a recruitment piece to do—an outreach. Ms. Breckner said we do, but honestly she sees full day kindergarten as a benefit to our families.

Mr. Crume asked if Ft. Vannoy still does full day kindergarten? Ms. Breckner responded that they don't. They quit two or three years ago. The district does it at the smaller schools because of the blended classrooms—to keep a full class size there. Mr. Holmes added that will be a win-win for the district too because right now we are only getting funded at .75% basically is the mix for K/1 in both Applegate and Williams and next year we will get funded at a full 1.0% based on the same service. That will be a win-win budgetarily. In the state of Washington they went through this process about five years ago going from half time to full time and they were getting about 90% of their enrollment in kindergarten that they saw in first grade. It was very popular.

Superintendent Holmes stated he does not know how the board would like to proceed with this. He got very little input from any board members concerning any changes or concerns of things that he could work on or prepare for them. The board has in front of them a change that Member Dwyer brought about due to a concern with the Expanded Options policy (IGBHE & AR1). They received a new letter that Director Alderson worked very hard on. Ms. Dwyer's concern was sending a 4-1/2 page letter to parents that is easily comprehensible and made sense that they could get through quickly and make a decision about was probably not what we were doing. Mr. Alderson put everything together on one page that described the process of the program and then with that is the application that would go with it. There will be a one page set of information and then the other piece of the AR would be the actual application they would submit if they wanted to partake. We do such a good job with our other dual credit options in this district that this program is really kind of a dinosaur in nature and the state actually offers a waiver for us to not have to have this AR, based on the fact that we do such a good job with our other option. We will likely be applying for that next year so that we don't even have to send these letters. We are focusing more on the other options that are more equitable for both the district and the student. Mr. Holmes said there were also some language changes in policies that he and Dave Marks talked about. He caught some stuff that made sense and one of them is on policy IGBBA (Identification of Talented and Gifted). Number three says *a nationally standardized academic achievement test for assistance in identifying academically talented students or Oregon Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (OAKS) or Smarter Balance*. The conversation they had was that OAKS is going away and we think Smarter Balance is coming, but are not positive about that. What we should do is change the language to say "or other identified statement assessment." So that whatever the state decides to finally have us partake of, this will qualify. Member Crume asked why it can't be eliminated all together? Mr. Holmes responded that it is another set of data that we use to identify students—this talented and gifted piece, it's a very challenging process because talented and gifted is such a wide spectrum of kids with certain talents and how they demonstrate those talents that we want to make sure that we have a number of standardized and mastery tests that we can have them use to qualify for services. This isn't a situation where we want to deny kids services. We are actually looking for kids to provide services

"I" POLICIES

"I" POLICIES
(CONTINUED)

for. We want to identify as many as possible. In his former district they did have a number of students that will qualify on the state assessment at that level that didn't qualify on like the COG test or one of the other standardized tests. Aside from a political statement around whether we believe in the state testing at all or not, whatever the state has we are going to have to abide by and we are going to use the data since it is given to us. Mr. Crume said there is so much controversy around the Smarter Balance tests. All the testing, all the data mining and in these policies it's woven throughout it. Why would we voluntarily put that in there when we don't have to? Mr. Holmes responded because educationally we want to use that assessment. From his perspective as superintendent that's good policy that we want to be able to use that assessment to evaluate those students. Mr. York said so whether we actually state 'Smarter Balanced' or just say 'state test'. Mr. Holmes said we know there is all kinds of controversy around the various state assessments which are constantly changing. In Washington just about the time school districts and teachers got really good at knowing what to expect and getting kids lined up with curriculum that would be the day you would get an email from the state saying they are changing the assessment. Not saying that's the way it is in the state of Oregon but he knows we have gone through the SIM and the CAM and the OAKS and now we are talking about Smarter Balanced. There is going to be some kind of assessment at the state level that drives accountability for schools. Since we are going to be tied to some state assessment the idea of changing this language to say whatever the state assessment is identified as—so we are not naming it. Mr. Crume said that would be better. His other concern with this policy was where it says "talented and gifted students that wish to request reconsideration" - could we put "or opt out?" What if their parents want to opt them out? Mr. Holmes responded that is automatic—they just don't enroll them. Mr. Crume said that nobody ever says that and they don't know that. Mr. Holmes responded that they do on the form, it's an opt-in process and then explained the complete process.

Mr. Holmes suggested another change to policy IIAA-AR(2) to be '*Challenge of Instructional Materials*' which is simply a language piece. Throughout the policy the word 'complaint' was used and should be changed to 'challenge' to coincide with what the policy is—which is the challenge to those materials, not a complaint. Also, instead of "Curriculum Council" it needs to be changed to "a representative committee" equally composed of parents and teachers. Mr. Crume asked who is responsible for choosing that committee? Mr. Holmes said that would come out of Mr. Valenzuela's department. Mr. Crume suggested that be stated in the policy as it came up as a question for him—who determines it? It was agreed that could be added.

Mr. Holmes said in reviewing the policies again that was all he had for input. Mr. Crume asked who was the Library Media Specialist? Ms. Dwyer responded that it was the school librarian. Mr. Crume read "*all complaints shall be reported first to the Library Media Specialist.*" Ms. Dwyer said that if it were a complaint about something in that library, since we solve problems at the lowest level first, the first person to be made aware of it would be the person who runs the school library. Mr. Holmes added that is what our current policy is as well—it's supposed to go there first. If it is not solved there then it moves itself up the chain of command through the principal and eventually to Mr. Valenzuela and eventually to him then ultimately to the Board. Mr. Crume then said on #6 "*If findings of the local review committee are not satisfactory to the complainant, a written request may be made to the Superintendent. The complainant must make this written request. The Board will respond with a written statement of the findings and final decision.*" Is that saying that the Board will make the final decision? Mr. Holmes said that in #8 it says "*The decision of the Board shall be final.*" Ms. Olmo clarified that there was no #7 or #8 under 'Library Materials— just 'Instructional Materials'. Mr. Crume said he was talking about the library materials. It was suggested they add #7 to 'Library Materials' that is #8 under below under 'Instructional Materials'.

Ms. Olmo asked if there was a challenge at the school level and it's reviewed and there is a decision made to either pull the book or change the material, is there a way that information is shared with the other schools? She would hate to be going through the same process with the same material at all the different schools. Mr. Holmes said if a challenge would come to the board level then the decision would be communicated to all of the libraries that this particular book or piece of curriculum has already been challenged and the board has passed judgment on it and we're not going there again. He would be in a position to write a letter back to the challenger to say that the Board has already gone through this and has reviewed the findings of a previous review. But recommended that's a discussion that the board have to give him direction on because there are arguments on both sides. The school communities differ and so if there is a challenge of a particular book at say Illinois Valley High School and that committee at that level, based on this policy, decides to either keep a book or not keep a book—that decision might be different in North Valley with that same book. Ms. Olmo said the question is then should the decision then be enforced at the other schools? Mr. Holmes said that is worth discussing. Ms. Dwyer explained that our Library Media Specialists regularly make those decisions. Mr. York explained that you could open up Pandora's box by doing it one way in the valley and another way here. We are a school district and is should be governed that way—as a district. Ms. Olmo asked right now, if the finding of the Board was final, would the district think that would be in regards to the school where the challenge originated, or in regards to the district? Mr. Holmes responded that his perspective is that it would be district-wide.

"I" POLICIES
(CONTINUED)

Mr. Crume spoke in regards to policy IA (*Instructional Goals*). It talks about the 21st Century Schools Committee. Who are those committees and who sets those committees? Ms. Dwyer responded that they are Site Councils. Mr. Holmes said that they exist at the schools that have those grants. Mr. Valenzuela corrected him to report that Site Councils are at all of our schools. The statute refers to them as site-based school councils so we shortened it to Site Councils. After some discussion it was agreed that the policy would be updated with the reference to "*building Site Councils*."

Mr. Crume asked on policy IJ (*Student Guidance/Child Development Specialist Program*), it talks about Child Development Specialist. Who are the Child Development Specialists? Mr. Holmes said there are none and then deferred to Director Allen-Hart who responded that Applegate and Williams have a Child Development Specialist (counselor) once a week to support various needs in the building. They are seeing students with parent consent. Sometimes they pull social groups together. Mr. Crume said the superintendent answers one way and they get another answer—they are going to vote as a board to approve this and they don't even know who these Child Development Specialists are. Why are they agreeing on something that has not yet been established? Is it responsible? Ms. Breckner said we used to have one in every elementary school. Mr. Crume stated as he reads through it, it feels to him like they are trying to expand the roles of the counselors. There are a lot of things in the policy that a vague and open-ended and he thinks as a Board, to approve these policies—to him he is not comfortable because he doesn't understand them all. Ms. Dwyer clarified that the policy states that it *may* include a Child Development Specialist program. Mr. Holmes said the way he reads the policy is it's laying the tracks in front of the train for the idea of if you do bring those back and are going to have them then these are the guidelines. Ms. Olmo commented that she likes the language. She would hope that we would be striving to have the support in every building. Ms. Dwyer said to her it looks like a lot of these pieces are what guidance counselors in our high schools are doing as opposed to the child development piece. Mr. Holmes then referred to IJ-AR, if you look at what the additions are—those are specific to meet the new state rules around if you're going to have this you have to have a plan in place and you have to submit it to ODE for approval and those kinds of things. That why most of these policies are in front of the board. These are changes at the state level that are either recommended, required or optional. But there are ways to bring our policies more current with what the current laws of the state are and the way things are moving. The policy, particularly the AR piece, is

"I" POLICIES
(CONTINUED)

specific about if we are going to go that direction then we're going to have to create this plan and submit it to ODE and have it be approved and describe those things. He assumes that's a good thing from the Board perspective. Mr. Crume interjected that by doing this how many more jobs are we going to end up creating and how much more of a financial burden? Mr. Holmes responded that this does not create any jobs. Mr. Crume said he is not saying this one—he's just saying in general, as we go through these policies, those are some of his concerns. Mr. Holmes said from a job creation budgetary perspective he has the same concerns because this specific policy doesn't fall directly with his list of priorities coming up for the next year. He has some counseling priorities but they are more directed at the secondary level for career guidance around how to improve our graduation rates? How do we get our students prepared for that next step after high school and set some goals up for them and provide that kind of service more than he's concerned about right now. We are doing a pretty good job in our elementary schools. They are a really nice place to be. They are really positive. We don't have a lot of bullying and harassment going on in our buildings. We have got a lot of really good staff leading students to develop social acceptable norms. They work together, they play well together. This particular piece around creating this policy so that we all of the sudden create Child Development Specialist positions—that is not a goal of his anywhere near in the future based on all of the other things we are trying to address with the limited funds we have. He will have something in the Spring for the Board—an idea around pathways and a lot of other things that tie together with counseling and fifth year plans and ties to graduation.

Mr. Crume said then referred to policy IKFB—*Graduation Exercises*. He questions some of the stuff. It looks like this is a new policy? It is new. It talks about all speeches will be reviewed and approved in advance by the principal or designee. Ms. Olmo asked if that doesn't currently happen? It does. Mr. Crume stated he thinks it does, but they are just confirming and putting it in writing. They are giving the principals censorship, which could be a good thing. He's not saying it is necessarily a bad thing—he's just questioning it. Ms. Dwyer stated that she would like there to be an appeal process. Mr. Crume said that would be good. In this policy the board is saying it is okay to censor a speech but it's not okay to censor a book evidently—referring back to *Percepolis*. He sees these two things tied together in a way. He thinks there needs to be an appeals process or something added. Ms. Dwyer said she asked Mr. Misner about this at the last board meeting, because she was curious about did they currently review speeches? She was concerned that about the 'cheekiness' that kids might display at graduation might be squelched. She was really satisfied with his response. He said that he has worked with all of his graduates who had an opportunity at the podium to review their speeches. He has been able to work with them as a team, so that they wouldn't be repeating the same things. He has been able to strengthen their speeches and help them shorten them and make them more concise and keep them school appropriate. He personally is a big fan of the kids right to feel 'cheeky' in their speech but that he felt that he had not been faced with much that he would consider a move toward censorship. He did express that there could at some point be a principal who did engage in that and that's why she feels that maybe the board should have some kind of appeals process. She felt really satisfied that Mr. Misner had thought that through and it had been working to the benefit of everyone at his graduations. Mr. Crume said that he has been to Mr. Misner's graduations and loved every one them he has been to. He's probably got the stuff down as good as anybody but what happens when there is a problem? The board needs to be involved. There should be some kind of appeals process. Ms. Olmo said it would have to be real timely because of the time frame. Mr. Crume said they might have to expand their timeline a little bit and it wouldn't have to be timeliness on the Board's part. Mr. Holmes responded that from an experience point of view that he reviewed speeches for twelve years as a high school principal and his perspective is exactly as she described Mr. Misner's response which was getting in on the process on the front and having it be a learning experience for the students as opposed to some kind of conflict. It was always more of an educational

opportunity and working together to have them be successful and have them walk away with a really good experience. Mr. Crume said what happens when it does and there is nothing in place for it? Mr. Holmes said that's the piece where then they need to decide as a Board as part of this policy then where do they want that to go? Do they want the appeal to come to him, or do they want that to go to the Board? Because then we're in a position where the timeliness is an issue. His recommendation is that it would come to the superintendent. This is the board's primary job—to create policies. Ms. Dwyer said she would be comfortable with that. Mr. Crume said it could go both ways for the board if it went to the board. It could be good and it could be bad but that's why the board is here—to be local representation of our community. If one of our kids is being stifled for some reason then that's what they are elected to do. Mr. Holmes said that they are elected to hire him to do that job so when he takes direction from them. Mr. Crume said not necessarily—that's part of it. They are elected to represent their community. Ms. Olmo said she would support having the appeal go to the superintendent. Her concern with having it go to the Board would be if they could reasonably be expected to come together, have a hearing, have everyone appropriately represented, come to a decision in that graduation time frame. She asked Director Alderson if he had experience doing this? Mr. Alderson responded that the timeline at the end of the school year at a high school is very short, especially with your Valedictorian's and Salutatorian's which are your best and brightest kids. They are also readying for finals, college applications, preparing for moving on after and so getting a Valedictorian's speech in a timely manner can sometimes be a challenge. He echoed the same thing as Mr. Misner, while his experience at I.V. It was a great learning experience for them and the kids themselves because sometimes that's their first introduction to speaking in front of a large group. Most of the editing that happens is to help making it clear and concise and the length of their speech and being able to get it down to something that's manageable. In reference to the timeline question—it would be very tough to get a long process in place at the end of the school year. Ms. Olmo said you would then be talking about holding up graduation—that could potentially be very complicated. Mr. Alderson responded that he doesn't think you would want to hold up graduation. There are plans that are made months in advance by parents that are planning on coming in from all different areas of the world. Ms. Olmo said she like the idea of our graduates having some recourse if they disagree a point or a subject matter with the principal at a school on a graduation speech. Mr. Alderson said that having a process in place that would be timely was his recommendation. Ms. Dwyer asked how they would want to word that. She would tend toward just having it be something that the superintendent would look at. She would think that the most likely scenario would be that the superintendent was simply able to reassure the principal that that material was acceptable—or not. She doesn't think it would require a whole lot of debate. She thinks it's what they would call a second set of eyes when they edit things. Mr. Alderson believes that all three of the current building level principals share the same feeling as Mr. Misner and that it is a privilege to be able to speak in front of your peers and in front of your community at the graduation ceremony and that is something our Valedictorians and Salutatorians have taken to heart when they do create their speeches. We have had very little (none) that have come to his desk that he has had to take back to them and tell them to redo it—not appropriate. It's generally kids that want to express how their thirteen years of school have gone. Mr. York said from his viewpoint it would be nice, as a principal, if they did see something that was kind of borderline, they do have the option to contact the superintendent and send it to him for review. Mr. Alderson said that by having it in the policy he thinks that is great because it is something that they would do anyway—but it gives them the power to bring it to the superintendent with their questions about a speech. Ms. Olmo asked if they need to wordsmith it or can it just come back with new language? Mr. Holmes said we can wordsmith something that would relate to an appeal to the superintendent if there is a concern and he can run it by Mr. York next week when they meet for the agenda for the board meeting and get his feedback. Mr. Crume said hopefully he could get these proposed changes to all board members as quickly as possible so they can look them over. Mr. Holmes said the changes will be in the board packet when they

"I" POLICIES
(CONTINUED)

"I" POLICIES
(CONTINUED)

are mailed out next Wednesday.

Ms. Olmo said that she had a question in regard to policy IMB- *Student Achievement Program*. She asked some questions and they were answered but the overarching question was that she doesn't know what half of the things listed mean. She doesn't understand what 'universal supports' are; 'adequate intensity' or 'unambiguous instruction/precision teaching'. It is just code for ? She doesn't like, in general, that they are putting these things into policy that parents can't understand.

Mr. Crume commented that not only can they not understand, they are saying that they are supporting universal screening and collecting information two to four times a year. Ms. Olmo added that when she was asking specific questions about it, all of her questions were answered and these words are used commonly in different areas and people knew exactly what it meant. Mr. Crume said collecting information, the use of data for decision making, fidelity monitoring—what is fidelity monitoring? Ms. Dwyer responded that fidelity monitoring is if you have a particular program that you are using that you stick to that program or report the ways in which you've deferred from that program. The state has a huge emphasis on evidence based stuff, which means that in some way it's been proven by data to be an effective method. There are lots of effective methods. Many of them have not passed evidence based standards because they haven't been subject to the kind of testing that the state is looking for. She thinks that in the zero to 24 month early literacy stuff that she deals with all the time and has evidence based requirements, it's because there is a limited amount of money to go around and they want to be sure that they are leveraging projects that actually have outcomes.

Ms. Olmo said that as a parent, a constituent and a school board member when she came to understand what they meant and that it is appropriate language if you support these ideas should there be some sort of deciphering guide.

Mr. Crume said that this policy is so vague—why would they even adopt it? It's totally optional. It is not necessary to adopt it. It talks about things—*information is collected on office discipline referrals, suspensions and expulsions. This information is available to and used by the administrators, related services personnel, behavior support team and staff on a regular basis.* That's pretty vague because it seems they had an instance not long ago where a minor student was facing an expulsion and they asked questions about that and they were assured that expulsion documentation would not go any farther because he was elementary school age.

Ms. Dwyer said she thinks there is a big difference between collecting data and collecting data that has a name attached to it. Maybe they need some more clarification about that.

Mr. Holmes responded that this policy is specifically is the idea that, and we are already do this regularly because we are evaluating our PBIS program. The idea is how many referrals did we get last month, how many did we get last semester and how many did we get last year? How does that compare to the previous year? What was the severity of those disciplines? And connected with that how many days of suspensions went with that set of referrals. The idea being that we can monitor progress of reducing referrals, reducing numbers of suspensions in school and out of school and whether or not the current processes that we have in place or the current programs that we have in place are being impactful for our students to make it better. This is already being done as good practice. In his former district they did this religiously and that is how they made decisions about what was working well and what was not, and where they need to make changes. This is not specific to any kind of people's names. This is umbrella data around total numbers of things.

Mr. Crume said there are a lot of things here open for question. He does like the

evidence-based curriculum. Does that mean we can get rid of Common Core? As far as he knows that wasn't evidence based at all. He then asked if we could use the Bible to teach out of because that is evidence based and then could we go back to primary source documents—those are evidence based. Maybe we could go back to the writings of Washington and Jefferson and teach from those. Those are evidence based.

"I" POLICIES
(CONTINUED)

Mr. Holmes responded that the reason these policies are in front of them is that the board tabled them until he got here so that he could review and see if he saw anything that he had concerns about. They are in front of them because they are the policies that he has reviewed and has no concerns about, with some minor changes.

Mr. Crume responded that he would let him pull every tooth in his head before he would vote on this. His point is there is no way on God's green earth that he is going to vote on this policy.

Ms. Olmo asked if this was a policy that, as a superintendent, he believes is in the best interest of our district to have in place it would help her vote to support it if they had some code or additional information so that it was very easy and clear as to what they were supporting when they say that they have a policy that says they support *universal supports*.

Mr. Holmes responded that what he is hearing from them is that they would like him to take a different approach to what he perceived as his charge originally back in July. The approach to that would be is that he would go through this set of policies, with the exceptions of the ones that are required, because there are a number that are in the stack that have come that are required by state law. Mr. Crume said to argue that as he spent quite a bit of time on the phone with the OSBA attorney, Meg Rowe. She clarified to him that although there are ORS's and AR's, the board has the authority to change the language. They don't have to adopt it the way it is. She said specifically that it was set up that way to maintain local control. That was her words. He has felt in the past that the policies are laid in front of them and they have to adopt. It's required by the state. They are pressured into voting on something—but it is really not required. They can write those words the way that they want to write it—to an extent.

Mr. Holmes said yes, to some extent, as long as they have reviewed the ORS that goes with it and the language complies with that. He said again that if the board wants him to go back and take a different approach to this because the message he got and the approach he took was to go through the policies that were tabled and take a look at them. The board did not want to pass them the second reading and put them into policy until he had a chance to look at them and inform them as to whether he had an issue with any of them. That was the approach that he took. If what he is hearing is to take a different approach and go back and review the policies and look at the ones, particularly the ones that are optional, and look at them from the perspective and does he support them personally for a specific outcome that we need them and bring those policies back to the board in that manner? He can do that. That is a different process because the first thing he has to do is go back and connect these with what's already on the books in some cases. He has to make the comparison and the contrast to what will this new one accomplish or not accomplish because again getting back to the basic objective of the board to set policy gives him specific direction of how he runs the district. These are his guidelines and his rules. We would probably go through the ones that are required and they will have to have a conversation around is the board going to adopt them as they are written, or are there going to be language changes and go through that process. He has some real concerns about the manpower and time involved based on the things on his board which has his organizational scheme with what he is trying to get done. This is a huge amount of manpower and not just for him. He needs input from a lot of people.

Mr. Crume agreed that it is a big job, but why? If it's not broke don't fix it. We have all of

"I" POLICIES
(CONTINUED)

these policies and we are changing them all. He asked if Mr. Holmes can sit there and tell him that he supports this policy? Mr. Holmes said yes, he supports policy IMB and used the Journey's curriculum as an example, which was an evidence-based curriculum that had been successful in other districts and time tested in other districts for student outcomes. Mr. Crume had brought up Common Core and Common Core is not a curriculum. Common Core is a set of learning objectives. We adopt curriculum and instructional materials to support our teachers in having students learn student outcomes, which is Common Core. The idea of having something in place that guides him to make sure that we adopt things that are evidence based so that we don't just go out and purchase something from the first textbook salesman we see. What's the evidence based research behind this that shows that this has been used and tested and will produce the outcomes that we want? We want to make sure whatever we are purchasing and putting in front of students is going to have a positive impact and move our students from point 'A' to point 'B'. The Journey's purchase was done with fidelity. In policy to say that we are going to do things with fidelity is a good thing because we need—going back to collecting data, we want to make sure that the data is based on a system that provides us with quality data to make those decisions. If what we are collecting the data from is coming from a system that isn't being worked with fidelity the data doesn't mean anything.

Mr. York stated that his question with that is—if we are monitoring the fidelity of it, in turn, how are we getting the teachers professional latitude? Mr. Holmes responded that is a whole different conversation. The idea being is that we can give them that latitude, but we want to make sure it is with fidelity across everybody and not just in a specific building or grade level. We want to ensure fidelity of the adoption across the board. We can make any changes we want, but whatever changes we make we want to make consistently across the board for everybody so that everybody is doing the same thing in the same manner so that we get the same results and we can count on that data. Mr. York said that if he were a teacher he would have to trust that his administrator is listening to his concern and communicating it. He can see this as a great learning tool for everyone and can see it as a huge blowback where there are complaints about things not working. Mr. Holmes reported that now that we are four months in he hears almost on a daily basis from teachers talking about what they have learned about reading because of this new adoption and the things that they are doing. There are still concerns out there about the workload and everything involved but we are working through them. He thinks it is going to get better and better.

Mr. Holmes then went back to the original question that Mr. Crume asking if he supports this? He responded that he can support this and it make sense to him. Ms. Olmo said that once it was explained to her that she has no gray. She is supportive and would be happy to vote for it but as a parent and member of the community without any explanation it was code and how many of our parents or constituents would actually ask for it to be explained? She likes the idea of language.

Teacher Kari O'Brien asked to speak and commented that in her first read through of the policy it made her think that it was written to accommodate a grant. The other facet is that teachers are very concerned about this policy. She expressed appreciation about the conversations they were having about it.

Mr. York asked if that was in regards to the fidelity of it or ? Ms. O'Brien said it was in regards to all of it. They think you could have the first full sentence and leave off the rest.

Mr. Crume said the truth of the matter is that it feels scary to him. It feels uncomfortable.

Ms. Dwyer said that her concern is that she is not sure that all of it is required in policy. It looks more like these are facets of a work plan. These would be part of how they are implementing that top sentence at this time. She like things such as under Section 21 that

will ensure a *district wide program for student achievement improvement that engages district stakeholders in continuous improvement planning*. That's really good and something the board talks about doing—engaging stakeholders in that process. She is not opposed to this as she is aware of where this came from and she is aware of how it is being implemented and she is aware of how it reflects different initiatives but she is not quite sure it needs to be a policy rather than a work plan.

"I" POLICIES
(CONTINUED)

Director Allen-Hart said she noticed the policy was all greyed out and asked if it came directly from OSBA and this is exactly it or ? Board Secretary Quick clarified that if something is gray that means it is changed and new. Mr. York said this policy is from OSBA? Ms. Quick responded yes and no. Last year there was a committee formed for each section of the policy reviews. The front page of the policy review indicates the committee members which typically included Jann Taylor, a director, a board member and one or two administrators. They met and reviewed all of the OSBA recommendations. They took those recommendations and either said no they didn't want to adopt them or added changes—in some cases if they were optional. The gray is the changes from either the previous policy or in this case it's a completely new policy.

Ms. Olmo stated that in looking ahead and the best use of time and resources she would like to spend their time on either policies that are required and/or if they have any current policies that are in conflict with what they are currently doing or what the current law is. If there are any that are creating any liability for us. She would love to see the board spending this amount of time and energy on those and once they get through those there are some policies that may be good for our district, but shouldn't spend a bunch of time and energy on.

Mr. Crume said that what he thinks he is hearing her say is to go back through all of them and take the required ones first and let's work on those. Ms. Olmo said required ones and/or if we have ones that we are out of compliance with. Meaning if we have a policy and we know that we are doing things differently, because she believes that could create some liability with the district. Ms. Dwyer added that it also fails to support people who have to enact these policies at their building so we want to make sure that our policies are reflecting the best practices that our administrators are following. Mr. Crume said he thinks that is a great idea. Mr. Holmes responded that we are already seeing changes to the changes. It is accurate to say that the ones we really need to be concerned about are the ones that are required so that we are not in conflict with the state law.

Mr. Crume said of the 17 on the list there are only two that are required. Mr. York said that they have spend this much time on this set. They can table policy IMB. He asked if there were any others that they haven't been able to wordsmith. Mr. Crume said he like Ms. Olmo's idea and scratch them all except the required ones. Ms. Dwyer asked if there was anything in there that they all agree that is fine and they can just past it? For instance, policy ING—*Animals in District Facilities*. Does the board have any issues with that? It looks to her like it protects the district from liabilities, supports what we are already doing and has adequate exceptions for service dogs. Mr. Crume said even if we did we will vote on it at the next board meeting. Mr. York said that we have made modifications to some policies and it was agreed that time was spent on them and they should bring them forward for the second reading at the next board meeting. Mr. Holmes asked if they would take the opposite approach and asked which policies the board wanted to pull? Members of the board asked to pull policy *IMB—Student Achievement*.

Mr. Holmes said that he will start a new review looking at required policies first, and do the best he can to keep local control around language pieces and see if we can't find a way to maybe provide some of the background information.

Board Chair York recessed the meeting to Executive Session at 7:08 PM.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Board Chair York called the meeting into Executive Session under ORS 192.660(2)(d) "Bargaining". At 7:15 PM.

The Board returned to open session and Board Chair York adjourned the meeting at 7:55 PM.

Danny York
Chairperson of the Board

David Holmes
Superintendent-Clerk