

GRESHAM-BARLOW SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 10 JT.
Minutes of Regular Board Work Session

Wednesday, May 21, 2025

The Gresham-Barlow School District met in a regular session on Wednesday, May 21, 2025, in the Partnership Room at the Center for Advanced Learning (CAL) 1484 NW Civic Drive, Gresham, Oregon. A Zoom link was provided for virtual meeting attendance.

Board Members present:

Shawn Farrens, Mayra Gómez, Kris Howatt, David Ligatich, Holly Riegelmann

Cabinet Members present:

John Koch, Interim Superintendent
Dr. Tracy Klinger, Deputy Superintendent
Dr. Angela Freeman, Assistant Superintendent
Dr. Sara Deboy, Executive Director of K-12 Schools
Carla Gay, Executive Director of Innovation and Partnerships

Opening Items

1. Call to Order (6:00 p.m.)

The meeting was called to order at 6:00 p.m. by the board chair, Kris Howatt.

2. Roll Call (6:00 p.m.)

Director Petersen was absent from the meeting. A quorum of the board was in attendance. Position 3, Zone 2 on the school board is currently vacant.

3. Approve Meeting Agenda (6:01 p.m.)

MOTION 96: Move to approve the meeting agenda as presented. This motion, made by Mayra Gómez and seconded by David Ligatich, Carried.

Aye: Shawn Farrens, Mayra Gómez, Kris Howatt, David Ligatich, Holly Riegelmann

Absent: Blake Petersen

Aye: 5, No: 0, Absent: 1

Termination Hearing

4. Procedure and Opening of Termination Hearing (6:03 p.m.)

Chair Howatt opened the termination hearing for North Gresham Elementary School probationary teacher Natasha Green, and noted that Ms. Green had requested for the hearing to be held in a public session. She reviewed information included in the board agenda packet and noted that the procedure of the hearing would be as follows:

1. The Superintendent and/or his designee shall present to the Board the Superintendent's recommendation for the dismissal of probationary teacher Natasha Green. This presentation shall last no longer than twenty minutes.
2. Following the presentation of the Superintendent and his designee, Ms. Green and/or her representatives will have an opportunity to present any statement or documentary evidence that she wishes to have the Board consider prior to considering the dismissal recommendation. There will not be an opportunity to call witnesses or cross-examine District representatives. This presentation shall be limited to no more than twenty minutes.

3. Following Ms. Green's presentation, the Superintendent and his designee shall have up to ten minutes to present any rebuttal information or make any desired closing statement to the board.

4. Ms. Green or her representative shall then have up to ten minutes to make any desired closing statement to the Board.

Assistant Superintendent Angela Freeman presented the superintendent's recommendation for the dismissal of probationary teacher Natasha Green. She noted that Ms. Green is a temporary employee hired December 9, 2024, with her employment set to conclude on June 13, 2025. Regardless of the outcome of this hearing, her employment will terminate at the end of the school year. She is also a probationary employee, and any reason deemed in good faith is sufficient for termination. Only unlawful items would not support a termination recommendation. This status means the district has the highest level of flexibility in determining whether employment is terminated.

Dr. Freeman shared that there is good faith for termination due to instances of physical contact with students or students' clothing. This is not the way to correct student behavior. The employee attempts to exclude it, but video confirms the teacher placed hands on students. The teacher was advised on the importance of keeping their hands off students. There were instances where the teacher tugged on the back of the student's hood, pulled the student's arm, and the parent reported the teacher put hands on the student's forehead. Dr. Freeman shared information gathered during three investigative interviews, including that the teacher pulls the arm of students and scares students when she puts her hand on the desk. The student noted that the teacher puts her hand on their head all the time. In interviews with staff they shared that she seems overwhelmed with the class and has cried in front of the class. Part of the evidence is a video that clearly shows the teacher using physical contact with students. As a result of system limitations, the video is no longer available, however Ms. Green was allowed to view the video.

Dr. Freeman noted there are also claims that the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) was violated. This is not a grievance hearing, and the only entity that can file a grievance is the GBEA and ECBC. Ms. Green had association representation along the way, and they would have had knowledge and opportunity to submit a grievance. The district has not received any formal complaint from the teacher violating her rights. Dr. Freeman shared that the board will also hear that this is a difficult student and parent. The teacher repeatedly put hands on students in order to gain compliance even after instructed not to. The district cannot have teachers putting hands on students, even if they believe it is minor. This causes potential legal issues. This termination is for a good faith reason.

Isabel Harris noted that her office was retained to represent Natasha Green, and she was speaking on her behalf. A packet of materials was distributed with an official statement for tonight's hearing and various statements of support from parents, colleagues, staff, and association. She thanked everyone in the room for standing up to the assumptions against Ms. Green. Ms. Harris thoroughly reviewed the situation, and shared that the district is attempting to terminate in an unlawful process. The allegations are unsubstantiated by any evidence other than by hearsay. The District didn't complete an overall investigation, video evidence never existed, and dates where the conduct happened were when Ms. Green was not on school grounds. Ms. Harris shared that the allegations came shortly after a parent made a comment about Ms. Green not being able to teach effectively due to her Christian faith. This is potential discrimination by the district, and they cannot terminate Ms. Green even if she is a probationary teacher. She has not engaged in any physical interactions.

Ms. Harris stated that the district violated the CBA including those articles for video surveillance and union representation. The district included 6 new allegations that were not made known to Ms. Green. This demonstrates the districts failure to conduct a reasonable, impartial investigation. They failed to provide policy violations that Ms. Green has violated. Ms. Green has rights afforded to her under the CBA as well as state and federal law. Ms. Sewell didn't complete an unbiased investigation, and they have not been provided with notes from any interviews held during the investigation. Ms. Sewell didn't identify the students or when the interviews occurred. Ms. Green denies pulling or

tugging on students in an aggressive manner on January 6th. Any contact, including high fives and fist bumps, has been positive in nature or for the safety of her students.

Ms. Harris noted that she wanted to raise several concerns about the investigation, which included missing documents, footage, and lack of substantive evidence. Ms. Green has not seen the video and it has been deleted from the server. For an investigation, the district would have taken steps to maintain the video. Ms. Sewell was not the one to meet with Ms. Green to show the video, and there are no records showing this meeting occurred. Ms. Harris also pointed out that two allegations purportedly occurred on March 30, 2025, but Ms. Green was on paid administrative leave since March 19, 2025. At best, this demonstrates carelessness in the investigation, and at worst it demonstrates false facts. The main complaint is from the parent who is known for submitting complaints to the district. This parent took issue with Ms. Green's Christian beliefs, and her legal counsel believes she may have been discriminated against by her religious beliefs.

If the board terminates Ms. Green tonight, it will make the district's thought that any form of hands-on contact will warrant investigation, whether positive or not. They would be developing a policy that a teacher may not ever engage in hands on contact. Ms. Harris then read statements from Katie Wardle and Hanna Grishkevich that were included in the handout packet.

Ms. Green denies all allegations of unprofessional behavior, and requests that the board vote to reinstate her to her position. She also requests a letter be placed in her personnel file dismissing the allegations against her. If the district terminates it will set a harmful precedent.

Following Ms. Harris remarks, Dr. Freeman provided rebuttal information. She began by providing correction regarding the March 30 letter. In the letter it stated incident, but it should have said investigation. There was a typo in the letter. She added that the teacher was not investigated for high fives or fist bumps. She was investigated for using her hands to physically move students for correction. To get students' attention, Ms. Green lightly tugged on students' shirt to talk to him, lightly grasped the student by the shirt to redirect them, and lightly tugged the students' hood. Another mentioned that her practice has been to redirect students by gently placing her hand on their back, head or shoulder. These are the kinds of things the district can't have happening in the district. She reminded the board that it is the district's right to dismiss a temporary, probationary employee for any reason deemed a good faith dismissal.

Following Dr. Freeman's rebuttal, Ms. Harris noted that on January 23rd Ms. Green lightly shook the students' hood because his eyes were covered and he could not walk safely. The intent was to ensure he and other students around him were safe.

After both presentations were completed, there was time for clarifying questions from the board. The board asked Dr. Freeman for a general overview of the grievance process. She shared that for probationary or temporary employees, if the supervisor gets a complaint or concern that reveals the teacher in a negative way, it would trigger a grievance or complaint process. The principal would start at Level 1 with a conversation to see if the employee knew something was happening or to let them know not to do something. If it happens again, it would be elevated to Level 2 with further conversation and possibly something more formal like a letter. If it continued then it elevates to Level 3. In the case of a temporary employee, the state gives the district the right to dismiss a temporary employee. Mr. Koch further clarified that for a grievance, if the union sees that the district has violated the contract, they have a timeline to report the grievance. In this case, at the pre-termination hearing Mr. Koch asked Bruce Scherer if he noticed a grievance that they needed to be aware of and he did not.

Board members noted that it was alleged that the video is nonexistent and asked if this was true. Dr. Freeman confirmed it is true. She noted that every so many days the video rewrites and records over itself, so they don't have it. The board confirmed that Ms. Green is a temporary employee so even if they don't uphold the termination then she

would still be employed for the next 6 weeks. There was additional conversation around video surveillance and the general practice for downloading recordings. Mr. Koch clarified that if it is a first-time occasion, they may not think to pull the video. Ms. Sewell added that the video was viewed because of an altercation between students. Ms. Green asked very appropriately to view it, and she viewed it with another administrator because Ms. Sewell was out of town. They could see that the student was pulling away, and Ms. Green responded very appropriately and said she would not put her hands on students.

Board members had questions about what would happen if Ms. Green stayed employed, and if it meant she would go back to the classroom. Mr. Koch said that it would need to be determined. If the board overturns the recommendation, one option could be that she would stay on paid administrative leave. Ms. Harris wanted to make sure that in order to use video surveillance for discipline there is a just cause standard. Mr. Koch clarified that at the time, the video wasn't used as discipline, it was used to view a fight and see the behavior. Chair Howatt referenced page 12 of the CBA where it discusses video surveillance.

Board members discussed the allegations of it being an illegitimate investigation and the parent complaint referencing religious affiliation. They noted that they don't want to set a precedence that parents can make allegations and drag teachers. The district administration clarified that this was the first time hearing the religious allegation today. The board asked if the comment made by the parent was documented in some way. Ms. Harris shared that they have recently come to the knowledge that this was happening in the background, and they are reserving the right to go after the district for discrimination. Mr. Koch clarified that the allegation had nothing to do with the investigation, and it is new knowledge for the district. Dr. Freeman added that Bruce Scherer was present where there would be disciplinary action taken, so she did have union representation available to her. The union does have 20 days from the time they are aware something might be wrong to initiate the grievance process.

Chair Howatt reminded the board that this is an action item. Mr. Koch read the official recommendation of termination from the superintendent.

MOTION 97: Move that the Board adopt the Superintendent's recommendation that Natasha Green be dismissed from employment with the District, effective today's date May 21st. This motion, made by Mayra Gómez and seconded by Kris Howatt, Carried.

Aye: Shawn Farrens, Mayra Gómez, Kris Howatt, Holly Riegelmann

No: David Ligatich

Absent: Blake Petersen

Aye: 4, No: 1, Absent: 1

Following the motion there was additional conversation by the board. Board members expressed concern that the video was not available to review. Others noted that there were numerous other times where there was physical contact in addition to the video. Mr. Koch noted that two different staff members and students shared instances of physical contact repeatedly in their statements. Some board members asked about having the documentation, while other noted that the information is included in the recommendation letter. Mr. Koch confirmed that the documentation is in their investigation notes, and the counsel and union has the right to ask for those notes. He also reminded the board that the district's legal counsel has reviewed the documentation. When they have an employee of this status, it is a very low bar to meet when it comes to termination. Even just the staff comments are enough.

Ms. Harris shared that in terms of notes, they have requested all the notes from all the meetings and they haven't received any notes of when the meeting to review the video occurred. She also noted that the district made several comments that it expends very little resources in investigating temporary employees. This will be in her personnel file with unsubstantiated issues and is a life altering decision for Ms. Green. Mr. Koch clarified that they did not say at any

time that they didn't expend resources. They spent a lot of time investigating this. They have union notes, and no rebuttal came from the union or employee. They could reduce this to one instance of the assistant principal expressing concerns, and that would be enough to move forward. The district provided more than one instance. He added that they have concerns and don't support when staff members put hands on students. Students must come to school feeling safe.

The board noted that Ms. Green's legal counsel expressed concern about this ruining her career. Mr. Koch shared that they offered multiple settlements to make this go away and those were denied. They don't want to damage somebody. Board members noted that the teacher will continue in this field when the board knows kids were placed at harm. It wasn't one conversation, there were multiple. Credible people had conversations with this person. Mr. Koch added that they do have a standardized process for complaints, and they go through the same process each time.

During the conversation, board members asked several times if Ms. Green wanted a moment to consider the resignation offer with her legal counsel. Ms. Harris noted that they did receive another offer of resignation which agreed to pay Ms. Green through today, and she would have to concede and waive any claim against the district. There was no benefit to Ms. Green, and the district was not interested in negotiating. Mr. Koch noted that they believed that the settlement reached what the teacher wanted, and the legal statement is standard boiler plate information. Ms. Harris noted that they requested to delay the hearing for no longer than a week, and they didn't receive any negotiation. The district noted that there was a lot of time to talk about a resignation agreement before today. Mr. Koch noted that they hold employees to a high standard, and they did want to put the employee's interest at heart, but that wasn't accepted. From the beginning to the end they have a different story, from unequivocally that it didn't happen to that it did. Legal counsel in attendance noted that it affects her future. Mr. Koch shared that he disagrees noting that they didn't want to submit this in public for review, and they have offered twice a way out of this. Legal counsel noted that resigning has certain implications for her future. Ms. Harris stated that the resignation offer supplied to her offers nothing in terms of compensation or otherwise. It benefits the district and waives Ms. Green's rights. Dr. Freeman countered that a termination in a personnel file is much more damaging than a resignation. The district agreed to a neutral reference, and there were parts in the agreement that would protect her.

Following the board's vote on the action, Chair Howatt asked for clarification on next steps. Dr. Freeman confirmed that the termination will be effective today, and the district will cut a final pay check. The board secretary will send a final letter that determines the decision.

5. Closure of Termination Hearing (7:14 p.m.)

Chair Howatt closed the termination hearing at 7:14 p.m. The board then took a recess.

Recess/Reconvene

Board Recess (7:14 p.m.)

The meeting was recessed at 7:14 p.m. and reconvened at 7:32 p.m.

Action Items

6. Policy Review: First Reading (8:27 p.m.)

This item was moved down on the agenda for discussion later in the meeting. Dr. Klinger reviewed the policy changes noting that a lot of them were deletions. She clarified that on the agenda item there is a packet for the policies, which are what the board needs to adopt. The packet of ARs is for reference for the board.

Bidding Requirements is a delete and replace policy, which is something OSBA has been doing. As part of the new policy, they embedded personal service contracts into it and the personal service contracts policy is one to delete. The facilities

naming policy is on the agenda for discussion later in the meeting. The staff HIV AIDS policy is deleted because of legislative changes.

For instructional materials, it can be a broad umbrella including library books in the library, books on a teacher's shelf in the classroom, and curriculum the board adopts. It differentiates the different types of materials, and all of the ARs share processes if people have concerns. It makes the process clear for what they need to do. Dr. Klinger noted that the board will see references to six ARs connected to this one policy.

Graduation Requirements are looked at every year. This year there is a change from having an alternative certificate to now renaming it a certificate of attendance. They also updated language around personal finance and career pathways. Board members noted that there is a change from "the board will review this policy" to "the district will review this policy." The implication is that the district would review it annually, and if there are changes then the board would approve it. Committee members shared that a question came up about weighted GPA. Dr. Klinger confirmed this surfaced as a question, but not as a part of this policy. They will add this to the agenda topics request worksheet.

The Section 504 student policy had a little bit of cleanup. The policy for Compulsory Attendance references that they can cite parents if their students aren't showing up enough. That is not something the district has used for a long time. Mr. Koch noted that in the past they just penalized parents and it didn't work. Dr. Klinger added that the District Attorney and courts don't support it either. The policy says they may do that, but the practice is that they don't. In the event they did, in the AR packet is the process for how they would do that. The immunizations policy also had some clean up things that were pretty straightforward. These policies will come back for approval on the consent agenda at the business meeting.

7. K-12 Transformative Social Emotional Learning Adoption (7:44 p.m.)

This item was moved up on the agenda for discussion earlier in the meeting. Ms. Gay shared that they have begun to put together a new set of materials to support Transformative Social Emotional Learning (T-SEL). This year the committee spent multiple sessions evaluating curricula, and two were piloted at each level. If authorized to move forward they will be implemented in the fall.

When starting the adoption process, they first created a shared mission and vision in Spanish and English for TSEL. Ms. Gay reviewed the differences between Social Emotional Learning (SEL) and TSEL, highlighting what makes it transformative. When things live in isolation they don't always transfer to additional settings. She shared how they have traditionally thought of SEL, which hasn't included their identities and experiences.

Ms. Gay reviewed the timeline for the adoption, noting they began piloting one set of curriculum at all levels in February, then piloted a second set at the end of March to the beginning of May. They looked at Wayfinder for K-12, another called Harmony Academy for elementary, and We Do it 4 the Culture at middle and high school. There was lots of opportunity for feedback in person and in writing. The elementary level chose Wayfinder. Students were given a lot of opportunity to use it and were very engaged. Student feedback on the key elements said that they get to talk about their feelings and it taught them about community. Middle school also chose Wayfinder with teacher feedback saying it is accessible, comprehensive, and easy to use. Student feedback for middle school said sometimes it was fun and sometimes it wasn't. It highlights real characteristics and pulls from what resonates with students now, making sure they are keeping it relevant.

Ms. Gay shared that at the high school level, they are not adopting curriculum at all. They are going to leverage with Multnomah ESD (MESD) to provide professional learning to push into the high schools. They are looking at how standards and behaviors show up in other content. The older students get, the more important it is for them to see it in other content areas that are relevant to them. The only place in the high school schedule where it would work is advisory, and they didn't want to push something that is supposed to be about enriching and helping students develop their SEL skills into a space they already have a negative association with. Instead, they are going to focus on adults for

SEL, where they are seeing these standards show up, and taking a moment to illustrate it with students. Dr. Collins added that every new standard will have TSEL standards embedded in them.

Ms. Gay shared that they went with Wayfinder because it is really easy for teachers, it is accessible and adaptable, and it is available in other languages. At the middle school it will be through advisory because it happens four times a week. At elementary it will be in their morning circle times. Wayfinder will provide both in person training and a series of online trainings. They are in the process of negotiating with them on what those trainings look like and cost. For high school, they will leverage their relationship with MESD. They may be purchasing some staff books to support SEL into content. That is more like professional development for teachers, and there will also be ongoing modeling. MESD is already working with the district on where the standard shows up in content. MESD will come to them, and the district will use their materials for their administrators retreat in August to help build knowledge around how to integrate it in their professional development they lead as well.

8. Tuition & Fees for the 2025-2026 School Year (7:33 p.m.)

This item was moved up on the agenda for discussion earlier in the meeting. Dr. Deboy shared that over the last several years they have used ESSER funds to cover fees so families wouldn't have to pay most fees. They are looking at reinstating some fees they have had in the past. They will not be reinstating any course fees. Instead, they will use appropriate funding, some of it from grants, to support those programs. Almost all of these fees, with the exception of a few, are flat from what they were prior to the pandemic. Even though the district's prices have gone up, fees have stayed flat because this is a change from the last few years.

Family passes for athletics had a small increase of \$10, and there was also a small increase for instrument rentals in band. The proposals were included in the board agenda packet. Other changes include no longer requiring the AP exam, but they are still offering the AP exam. They no longer have a PE fee, and Dr. Deboy noted things that are obsolete have been removed. They focused on what is really needed at this time. Athletic fees offset their costs, but they do not cover costs fully. This is a fund they can use to replace equipment and other things that are needed. They will still be putting in their own funding.

Dr. Deboy noted that they have the option for reduced fees or waivers built into these fee schedules. Even though they don't do free and reduced lunch, any request that is brought forward or if a coach has a suspicion, the district helps people have the form to request a reduced fee or waiver. They want all students who want to participate to be able to do so. The board asked for clarification on the student body fee, and Dr. Deboy shared that it helps to pay for activities throughout the year. It offsets activities like a speaker at career day. It also gets students into sports games.

The board discussed having this as a first reading and bringing it back for approval at the business meeting. They talked about separating it into two motions, one for the fees and one for the in-district tuition.

9. Secondary Health Materials Adoption (*added May 21, 2025*) (8:00 p.m.)

Dr. Collins reviewed the information included in the board agenda packet. He shared that when they reached out to the publishers to let them know they would be working with Northwest Textbook Depository, they were told they couldn't do that. If they did, the district would have to pay to ship the pilot materials back, then pay for NW Textbook to ship them back. The other option is for the district to purchase the piloted materials directly from the publisher. The dollar amount does not change, it just changes the manner of who the district purchases from. Because the health adoption is so much smaller, they have almost all of the materials they need.

MOTION 98: Move to amend the previous motion on the purchase of curriculum approved by the board at its meeting May 7, 2025 to read as follows, move to approve the selection of G-W Publishers Comprehensive Health Skills for Middle School curriculum, and Human Kinetics Live Well Comprehensive High School Health curriculum for a not-to-exceed amount of \$244,255 through Northwest Textbook Depository and

currently piloted materials directly from the publishers. This motion, made by Holly Riegelmann and seconded by David Ligatich, Carried.

Aye: Shawn Farrens, Mayra Gómez, Kris Howatt, David Ligatich, Holly Riegelmann

Absent: Blake Petersen

Aye: 5, No: 0, Absent: 1

Information Items

10. SB 3 Implementation Update (8:05 p.m.)

Dr. Collins provided an update to the board on the SB 3 implementation plan, and the implications of a waiver versus no waiver. They talked with principals and created a plan for if they move forward without a waiver, and also looked at what the plan would look like with a waiver. He provided an overview of the Implementation Planning sheet and discussed what the curriculum would look like. They still need to identify the personal finance curriculum to use, and they are already getting interest from publishers.

Dr. Collins reviewed what it would look like if they have to implement next year with juniors. When looking at curriculum and content, they started with advisory because that would have a limited impact on the schedule. The more they looked at it, it was too much of a challenge. Their first option would be to implement it in the master schedule. This means changes would be pretty drastic. They would have to rebuild the master schedule and FTE would come from Measure 98. At Gresham High, there are about 250 9th graders that would have to be collapsed and reallocated to different elective classes. Barlow has a smaller number with only about 40 students to collapse. They would be taking FTE from a 9th grade course and moving it to 11th grade. It would require a full rebuild of the master schedule between now and August.

Dr. Collins shared that the feedback they received from both Gresham and Barlow's staff was that advisory is not the place for this. The other piece is they are trying to track requirements of what students cover. For students at CAL, their pathways already have a postsecondary course built in so students at CAL would not necessarily be impacted. For students in AVID, the curriculum matches with the postsecondary requirements. Mr. Koch asked how many students from Gresham and Barlow attend CAL and would be able to obtain this credit. Ms. Gay shared that it is about 200 to 250 total. Dr. Collins added that the number is out of a class size of 750. The waiver versus no waiver only impacts the post-secondary pathways piece. As they developed the plan, they looked at implementing the personal finance piece in the same track as before. The plan is to move forward with the personal finance curriculum adopted in the middle of next school year. The FTE is being repurposed out of Measure 98.

Board members asked how much time they have to apply for a waiver. Dr. Collins noted that they have colleagues who have applied and haven't heard back yet. He reached out to ODE and they are developing a rubric for waiver approvals. Ms. Gay shared that their preference would be to go with Plan A by having a waiver. It would allow them to repurpose measure 98 FTE, and also leverage retirements and vacancies in a different way. They don't want to inadvertently impact their 9th graders to work this in. Dr. Collins noted that the waiver can be applied anytime from now until June of 2026.

MOTION 99: Move to implement the 2026-27 with waiver plan A. This motion, made by David Ligatich and seconded by Mayra Gómez, Failed.

No: Shawn Farrens, Mayra Gómez, Kris Howatt, David Ligatich, Holly Riegelmann

Absent: Blake Petersen

Aye: 0, No: 5, Absent: 1

MOTION 100: Move to approve the district staff to submit to ODE a waiver request to postpone implementation of SB 3. This motion, made by David Ligatich and seconded by Holly Riegelmann, Carried.

Aye: Shawn Farrens, Mayra Gómez, Kris Howatt, David Ligatich, Holly Riegelmann

Absent: Blake Petersen

Aye: 5, No: 0, Absent: 1

11. Economic Forecast Update (8:52 p.m.)

This item was moved down on the agenda for discussion later in the meeting. Mr. Koch shared that the recent forecast was less than the March forecast which impacts discretionary money available for the state. To get back to the \$11.36 billion proposed for the budget, they need to come up with additional funds. COSA is confident they will come up with that. They don't see other things, such as bills that require financial support, coming through. The district was hoping for that money, but they didn't budget on it. Mr. Koch wanted the board to know that right now they think they are going to be at their budget, and they don't think they will get any additional revenue. They also still have the federal uncertainty that may change some things.

12. Safety Update (*added May 19, 2025*) (8:22 p.m.)

This item was moved up on the agenda for discussion earlier in the meeting. Mr. Koch shared that they planned to give this update at the business meeting in June, but since this system is up and running, they wanted to give the update now so it can be shared with the community. Mr. Koch reviewed the information included in the board agenda packet. The district started installing ZeroEyes back in January and the system is up and running, and it is running effectively. It is designed to look at silhouettes of a gun and alert staff in real time. He shared an example of students on campus playing with Nerf toys and how within 10 seconds it went to the system. The system determined it was a toy gun, but ZeroEyes still notified staff that the toy gun was detected and determined to not be real. They knew very rapidly that kids were playing, and they knew that kind of toy gun was on campus so they can address it with kids.

Board members asked if this is in all buildings. Mr. Koch confirmed it is in all of the secondary buildings. There are 100 cameras that it is installed on for middle and high school. They have watched the tests, and have had police come into the building and pull weapons to test the system. If they can get a response in 10 seconds the ability to lock down the building is fast.

Discussion Items

13. Date, Time, and Place of 2025-26 Board Meetings (8:54 p.m.)

Due to time constraints, Chair Howatt asked board members to read through the calendar worksheet and be ready to discuss at the June 4th meeting. The board's calendar schedule will come forward for adoption in July.

14. Policy Committee Request - Naming of Facilities (8:36 p.m.)

This item was moved up on the agenda for discussion earlier in the meeting. Dr. Klinger shared that this was a policy the board requested to bring forward for review. Questions have come up about how spaces get names, how buildings get names, and when a plaque can go up. They would like to get additional input from the board on what they are hoping to accomplish from the policy. Some things to think about with this policy are that there are a variety of spaces like physical buildings and facilities, and they also have different spaces like gyms, libraries, and counseling office. Some spaces that were previously named after someone have been torn down and rebuilt, but are no longer named after that person. Some spaces have been named after people who are deceased while others have not. There is currently no consistency on how they are naming spaces, or how long those names stay. The questions were focused more around names of spaces than buildings.

Some board members expressed concerns that a space can't be named for someone until they are deceased and felt that should be changed to allow for naming spaces after a living person. They also felt there needs to be a stipulation in case something comes up in regards to a person's actions so they could remove their name. They think it would be nice for someone to be recognized when they are alive. Other questions that came up during discussion included how long they leave something named, who is naming it (i.e. the board, principal, community), and what the approval process looks like. They discussed timing and whether a space's name should be re-evaluated every five years, ten years, or if it

stays forever. Many don't know the history of current spaces and why they were named for certain people. Staff noted that the naming criteria would need to be specific, and if was being names after a living person they would need to approve the use of their name.

The board discussed looking at policies from other districts for reference. If a space is remodeled there should be a process to choose to rename it or not. The Policy Committee will pull policies and bring them back to a work session to share thoughts.

15. Future Board Agenda Topics (8:55 p.m.)

Chair Howatt noted that they are mostly up to date on their spreadsheet, and they will add weighted GPAs for a future board discussion.

Closing Items

16. Announcements (8:56 p.m.)

Chair Howatt reviewed the announcements included in the board agenda packet. A Zoom link for virtual meeting attendance will be provided for upcoming meetings.

June 4, 2025: Budget Hearing - 6:45 p.m.

Council Chambers

Public Safety and Schools Building

June 4, 2025: Regular Board Business Meeting - 7 p.m.

Council Chambers

Public Safety and Schools Building

17. Adjournment (8:57 p.m.)

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 8:57 p.m.

Submitted by: _____

Sarah Avery

Executive Assistant to the Superintendent and
Board of Directors

Note: These minutes were approved by the board on _____:sa