

**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING
OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS
SCHOOL DISTRICT 4J, LANE COUNTY, OREGON**

June 24, 2020

NOTICE: In light of current public health concerns related to coronavirus COVID-19, the meeting of the Eugene School District Board of Directors on Wednesday, June 24, 2020 will take place virtually. School board members will meet by phone Pursuant to ORS 192.670, the meeting will be open to the public via live broadcast on KRVM 1280-AM and via the internet at www.4j.lane.edu/stream

The Board of Directors of School District No. 4J, Lane County, Eugene, Oregon, held a regular meeting at 6 p.m. Notice of the meeting was mailed to the media and posted in the Education Center on June 19, 2020, and published in *The Register-Guard* on June 24, 2020.

ROLL CALL

BOARD MEMBERS:

Anne Marie Levis, Chair
Mary Walston, Vice Chair
Alicia Hays
Judy Newman
Gordon Lafer
Martina Shabram
Jim Torrey

STAFF:

Dr. Gustavo Balderas, outgoing Superintendent of Schools
Cydney Vandercar, incoming Superintendent of Schools
Kerry Delf, Chief of Staff
Brooke Wagner, Director of K-8 Education
Kat Lange, Director of Student Services
Kyle Tucker, Chief Operations Officer
Christine Nesbit, In-House Counsel
Ryan Spain, Director of Facilities Management
Oscar Loureiro, Director of Research and Planning
Jeffrey Johnson, Director of K-8 Education
Andrea Belz, Director of Financial Services
Karen Hardin, Director of Human Resources
Lisa Fjordbeck, Executive Assistant/Board Secretary

MEDIA: KEZI

OTHER:

I. CALL TO ORDER, ROLL CALL, FLAG SALUTE, LAND ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Board Chair Levis called the regular meeting to order at 6:05 p.m. She acknowledged the treaties of 1851 and 1854-1855 and the subsequent forced removal of Native peoples from Western Oregon. During that time some of the Kalapuuya tribe were moved to the Grand Ronde reservation and some to the Siletz reservation. At that time all of Lane County was an important trading and gathering area for Camas and other resources. During the restoration era (1977-1989) Lane County became a service area for the confederate tribes of the Coos, Lower Umqua, and Siuslaw Indians. Eugene 4J District wanted to take time to acknowledge the descendants of the original people of the land. There were still many descendants in their schools and community to that day. They thanked those original stewards of the land.

II. AGENDA REVIEW

There were no changes made to the agenda.

III. INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS AND SUPERINTENDENT'S REPORT

Dr. Balderas noted that this was his last meeting as the 4J Superintendent. He wanted to thank the Board and the community for their hard work over the years. Dr. Balderas emphasized that the staff had a lot to work on in the coming months, which he called the 4 B's: Back to School, Budget, Bonds, and Badges. He said that they did their best transitioning to emergency remote learning, but that it was not done well. They needed to stay focused on the 4 B's, since they would take a lot of time. Also, at the Board retreat he hoped they would reorganize and be able to work better together and with staff. Dr. Balderas emphasized that they were a team and needed to do what they could to work well together.

Ms. Vandercar thanked Dr. Balderas for his hard work and focus on equity. This last year had been their hardest yet, but they were able to transition and continue teaching their students. The crisis was not over, and they were now tasked with navigating how to teach in Fall 2020. Their priority would be the best interest and safety of their students and their families. She appealed to the Board to work more with staff.

IV. COMMENTS BY BOARD CHAIR

Ms. Levis thanked everyone for attending this last-minute meeting. Their focus this last year had been on figuring out how the Board could work together to help their students. They had to work through the beginning of COVID, the economic fall, the change in Superintendent, and the changes to the Student Success Act (SSA).

Ms. Levis said that they would be talking that night about their religious holiday policy. A subcommittee made up of three members of the Board, Ms. Levis, Mr. Lafer, and Ms. Newman, worked together to shape the policy. Ms. Nesbit worked tirelessly to help the Board through this policy change, and she thanked her for all her time and effort. Ms. Levis said that the work group was a new thing for the Board and had some pros and cons. She thought that there was too much confusion with how the policy was made, and they should have made it clearer to the community. They wanted to make sure that they created a policy that worked well for families, which took a lot of creativity from the staff.

Ms. Levis thanked Dr. Balderas for all his hard work and dedication to the community and staff.

V. ITEMS RAISED BY THE COMMUNITY – WRITTEN COMMENTS ONLY

Ms. Levis noted that they received a lot of written comments and she had worked hard to respond to as many as she could. She thanked incoming Board President Mary Walston for stepping in to help her respond.

VI. COMMENTS BY EMPLOYEE GROUPS

There were no comments made.

VII. COMMENTS AND COMMITTEE REPORTS BY INDIVIDUAL BOARD MEMBERS

Mr. Lafer wanted to give thanks for the time, effort, and thoughtfulness that Ms. Nesbit, Ms. Vandercar, Dr. Balderas, Ms. Newman, and Ms. Levis gave while working on the policy for religious holidays. He noted that they started the conversation when the District was trying to figure out how to conduct emergency remote learning, and yet everyone still made time to talk about the policy, which he deeply appreciated. Mr. Lafer shared a statement from a professor at the University of Ottawa concerning returning to education in the Fall.

Ms. Shabram was inspired by the activism and leadership from the community in the last month. She said that change would always be hard, but those in charge needed make changes for the better. Ms. Shabram hoped that 4J, and other schools, would work to push their community forward. She wanted to create a school system where all students could feel safe from both inside and outside the system. The community had asked how they could achieve this goal without having officers in the school. Ms. Shabram understood that this idea was the model of safety used in most places, however she did not believe that that was the only option. She had faith that they could communicate with those in the community about how to create safe environments. There had also been frustration about keeping their contract with EPD until the end of the year. Ms. Shabram understood this anger and agreed that change needed to be made, but they needed time to put in a new system.

Ms. Walston stated that their number one job right now was to open their school safely within sixty days. She thought everyone should read the Oregon Department of Education (ODE) guide that was sent out to schools. It would be tough to work getting through it, but she believed with hard work it could happen. They also needed to address the current and future budgets, the institutional racism in some 4J policies, and hire a permanent Superintendent. Ms. Walston shared that originally, they were supposed to share the outline for their reopening plan on August 5, 2020, but that it would be pushed back to August 19, 2020. She thanked Dr. Balderas for his hard work at 4J.

Mr. Torrey thanked Dr. Balderas for great work in making the District better. He also thanked Ms. Levis, Ms. Walston, and all 4J staff for their time and dedication to getting work done. Mr. Torrey was concerned with the liability impact they could face with COVID-19. There used to be a Risk Management position in the district which he thought they should bring back, so it was not all on Ms. Nesbit. Also, he hoped that their conversation on having officers in school would include all voices, both for and against. Mr. Torrey brought up Robert's Rules of Order, which would help them be clear during meetings, so the community, and Board members, were not confused. He appreciated that Dr. Balderas had left them with the four B's to focus on moving forward.

Ms. Newman was delighted that everyone had agreed to a special session to talk about the religious holidays policy. She thanked Dr. Balderas and his leadership in getting their graduation rates higher and helping with the budget. Ms. Newman also thanked the staff for all the adjustments they made when things changed. As a Board they needed to enter conversations with openness and be prepared to learn based on data. She informed everyone that the legislative special session was currently underway, and that another one might be happening soon. The special session group, made up of Ms. Newman, Mr. Lafer, and Ms. Shabram, would be meeting to talk about their priorities and figure out how they wanted to reach out to their legislatures.

Ms. Hays had enjoyed Dr. Balderas' work and was sad to see him go. She thanked Ms. Levis for all her hard work during this tough year. Ms. Hays was glad to hear Ms. Walston's goals for the Board in the coming year and was looking forward to discussing them at their retreat. She hoped that the community would continue to hold them accountable, share their ideas, and ask for clarification when there is confusion.

VIII. CONSENT GROUP – ITEMS FOR ACTION

There was no consent group.

IX. ITEMS FOR INFORMATION

There were no items for information

X. ITEMS FOR ACTION

- 1. Approve Board Resolution 2020-07 Affirming the Board's Commitment to Anti-Racism and Equity**

Ms. Levis thanked Ms. Newman and Ms. Shabram for the work they had done around this resolution.

Ms. Newman stated that School Board needed to work to help eliminate racism and promote equity in schools. This was just the first step they needed to make. The resolution documented how they would be committing to anti-racism and equity in 4J. She thanked Ms. Nesbit and Ms. Delf for reviewing the document and making it sound professional. Most edits made were around wording and format, so the content stayed the same.

Ms. Newman wanted to point out some differences from the original draft before they voted. In the 'Whereas' section there was some wording change, in the 'So It Be Resolved' section they moved their agreement that Black Lives Mattered up. In the numbered section point five was reworded because they agreed to change their system. Point six talked about accountability and reporting back on their new plan before it was implemented, as well as collecting data on the schoolwide climate surrounding disciplinary actions.

Ms. Shabram noted that under the fifth point it said that they would conduct a thorough study of officers in their school and understanding the role of school resource officers (SROs). She stated that understanding the role was very important so when they evaluated the roles later, they could figure out what type of job would be fit for them.

MOTION: Ms. Shabram moved, seconded by Ms. Newman, to approve Board Resolution 2020-07 affirming the Board's commitment to anti-racism and equity.

Ms. Hays said that they had a robust discussion last week about the resolution and she was happy to see it moving forward. She thanked Ms. Newman, Ms. Shabram, and staff for their work on making the resolution. Mr. Lafer agreed and was happy to see the Board taking a stance alongside Black Lives Matter and making change within their schools.

Ms. Walston noted that most of this work would have to happen quickly and soon. She hoped that the community would be patient with them while they worked through it.

VOTE: The motion passed – 7:0.

XI. ITEMS FOR ACTION AT A FUTURE MEETING

1. Consider Revisions to Board Policies:

JED – Student Absences and Excuses

JEF – Release Time for Religious Instruction

Ms. Nesbit said that the proposed changes to policy JED were rather straight forward. It was their basic policy around student absences. The revision would expand the reasons for excused absences to include the mental health needs for students in circumstances where the student was a dependent of someone in the armed forces. This change was

mandated through a change in State law. This revision would also include absences because of religious holidays and reflected the current process and the law.

Ms. Nesbit said that policy JEF covered release time for religious instruction. In February 2020, the Board began a conversation about how school policy could be strengthened to accommodate for students. The current policy described the instructional accommodations for such absences, mainly that they would be excused and that tests given on those days would be given at another time. The Board currently did not have a policy around general religious accommodation. The revisions would also change the title of the policy to “Release Time for Religious Instruction and Observance”. It would identify the process for students when requesting accommodations and increase existing language that students would not have to have missed work completed by the next school day. Schools would also not schedule major events on religious holidays. Parents were urged to communicate any accommodations they had so the school could meet them. The revisions also made it so school staff was informed at least twice a year about major religious holidays. Parents would also be reminded at least once a year to contact the school about any accommodations that would need to be made.

Ms. Nesbit wanted to go over the legal standards behind the policy. Under the United States Constitution students had the right to exercise religion without interference. The district was obligated to help those students in not getting penalized. She stated that one religion could not be favored over another when scheduling events. An inclusive religious holiday calendar would have to be created. Not all religions in the world must be included, but the calendar should reflect the community.

Ms. Nesbit mentioned that nationally there were some religions that a lot of children took off for and those absences sometimes obstruct operations, and therefore those religious holidays had been given special treatment. In Eugene, however, they have not seen holidays obstruct operations and therefore all religions should be treated equally. She noted that 4J was not qualified to differentiate between major and minor holidays and would need to work with a professional in their next steps. Calendars created by other schools accounted for twenty to thirty observed days of religious holidays. This could greatly impact the amount of schoolwork that got done every year. Ms. Nesbit stated that this policy might not be maintainable long term.

The Board wanted to consider the legitimate concerns of the community. The policy could work against some students and programming concerning scheduling. Ms. Nesbit offered a two-tier plan to scheduling. The first part dealt with the scheduling of important school wide or grade level events (picture day, prom, open house, graduation, etc.) not on religious holidays. The second tier would deal with classroom level (class field trip, try-outs, etc.) event which would be given advanced notice to families to accommodate any conflicts.

When developing guidelines, they wanted to cultivate staff awareness and create a calendar that would make it easier to avoid big events on religious holidays. The

practical concern was that this would not allow for flexibility in scheduling. Since the calendar has not been created yet the Board should be precise about what kinds of days should be off limits for scheduling. Ms. Nesbit said that it would be easier to add things later then move them. The District was aware that when students missed schools for religious holidays they experienced a burden.

One issue that this policy could face was putting the District in the position for people to say they were elevating religious exercise over education. Also, In the proposed policy there was no wording about exams or exam reviews. Final exams have always been done two days before the grading days and the reviews two days before exams. Ms. Nesbit noted that grading day was a day set by the Board and therefore staff wanted to rely on the Board to make sure there was no conflict. She believed that a restriction on exams would only burden students and staff.

Ms. Levis said that the work group, at her request, looked at a lot of different language. She asked what a co-curricular instruction was. Ms. Nesbit gave the example of Model UN. Dr. Balderas added that any clubs fell under that definition and the issue was that there was usually something happening every day at a High School.

Mr. Torrey asked if they knew how many religious holiday days they would have to accommodate. Ms. Nesbit was unsure but felt that the number was around ten but did not expect it to be more than thirty. They needed to work with an expert in order to get an exact number. Mr. Torrey noted that there are some big events (SAT, ACT, other national tests) that they were not in charge of scheduling. He asked if they had any responsibility over those events. Ms. Nesbit replied that those were not listed in the policy since they had no way to move those. Sports event were also not included for the same reason. Mr. Torrey asked how they could make sure they heard from their employee groups and staff about how this would impact their work. Ms. Nesbit responded that they got a lot of feedback from staff while creating the policy.

Mr. Lafer stated that this was an issue of equity and it was their job to deal with it. Whether intended or not, they needed to make sure that they were not being discriminatory. There were many people who were lucky enough to celebrate holidays that were already around days off (Christmas, Easter Sunday) and got to spend time with family without a thought towards missing school. As Christianity made up a majority of 4J students, as well as the United States population, it made sense that the calendar was scheduled to allow for Christian religious observance. Families gathered in mass from around the country every year to celebrate Christmas, Mr. Lafer emphasized that that was how it should be. He felt that the District needed to do what they could to make sure that all their students got to experience family bonding during their religious holidays.

Mr. Lafer noted that the calendar they would be putting forward with this new policy mirrored those made in cities like Ann Arbor, Michigan, which has a similar make up to Eugene. Ann Arbor, along with other cities who had taken up a similar policy, had not yet received any legal ramifications from the changes they made.

Mr. Lafer noted that the policy focused on major holidays of all religions and allowed for school days on minor ones. Also, it allowed for events of major holidays if moving the event would interfere with school observation or burden students. What the Board needed to figure out was what school events could not be scheduled on major holidays. Mr. Lafer believed that events that could not be made up (try-outs, exam reviews, etc.) should be their focus. Over twenty years parents had asked for considerations on major holidays, but when staff was busy it was easy for those considerations to be lost. By making this a policy it would mean that these issues would be looked at before the school year, not the week of.

MOTION: Mr. Lafer moved, seconded by Ms. Shabram, to move the Religious Holiday Policy agenda item from Items for Action at Future Meeting to Item for Action at that night's meeting and approve the policy.

Ms. Hays noted that she had served on the Board for around fourteen years and shared that they needed to stay consistent. Usually if there was a subcommittee they would be working with staff and staff would put forward a policy. She was confused when she received information that the subcommittee wrote. Ms. Hays did not feel comfortable accepting the policy yet since this was all new information to her. She had heard from their attorney that there were possible legal ramifications. Ms. Hays emphasized that she believed in equity and that they needed to focus on what was important at this moment.

MOTION: Mr. Torrey moved, Ms. Newman seconded, to divide Mr. Lafer's motion so that they could vote on each motion individually.

VOTE: The motion passed – 5:2, with Mr. Lafer and Ms. Shabram voting against.

Ms. Levis said that they would first discuss and then vote on moving the religious holidays policy agenda item from Items for Action at Future Meeting to Items for Action at that night's meeting.

Ms. Newman emphasized that they needed to listen to each other and she had a lot of experience in this field. While her and the rest of the subcommittee might understand the policy, the rest of the Board needed time to ask questions and get clarification. She thought that they should add this as an Action Item at their next meeting.

Ms. Walston had read all the emails that had come in about this topic. Many in the community wanted to find a solution and help the Board preform their roles as public educators to all students. If they all listened to each other with respect and understanding they could find balance. She emphasized that they should not be dismissing their legal counsel, and she found it irritating and disrespectful to staff. Ms. Walston thought that they should wait until their next meeting to make a motion on the policy.

Ms. Hays agreed with what Ms. Walston said. She had worked as a staff member for a Board in the past and knew how much work they did to get stuff done. Ms. Hays stated that they needed to be clear with each other and with staff in order to be efficient. She was interested in hearing more about what the subcommittee had done and what changes they wanted to make about what staff had presented to them. She also felt that they should go through general procedure and vote on the policy at their next meeting.

Ms. Levis was pleased to see where they had gotten regarding the religious holiday policy. When they had first started the conversation some members of the Board were unaware of how important it was to the community. She did not want to move the item to an Item for Action at their meeting that night. Ms. Levis wanted to give members of the community time to react to the policy and give them feedback.

Mr. Lafer emphasized that his comments were only meant to be respectful. He did not want the community to feel like they just had to trust that the Board had done good work without proof, but believed they were at a point with the policy where they could move forward. All Board members had been given the policy draft before the meeting and had time to read through it. The subcommittee had worked in good faith to create policy to bring to the Board with faith in those members on the subcommittee that they had gone into all the detail they needed to. Mr. Lafer pointed out that disagreement did not mean dismissal. He disagreed with some of what staff had said that night and some in the community agreed with him. There was still room for respect in disagreeing. Mr. Lafer thought that they could debate the differences between staff and subcommittee policy and then vote on one of them that night.

Ms. Newman clarified that she wanted this to be voted on at their next meeting. She understood the frustration in the community and that they wanted to get the policy approved. Ms. Newman felt that the subcommittee made a lot of changes quickly and did not give Ms. Nesbit enough time to respond. She did not want the Board to rush into a decision, but instead get information and have time to think about it before voting.

Ms. Walston stated that this was a communication issue. The Board would have to rely on administration and teachers to implement the policy, and they had not heard from them yet. Also, they had heard a lot of feedback from the Jewish population, but not from the Muslim population or other religions. She heard that the Eugene Education Association (EEA) had responded but had not seen the feedback they gave.

Ms. Levis believed that there was a policy already in place that made it so the Board had to have a reading of a proposed policy twice before taking action on it. Ms. Nesbit said that was policy BFC.

Mr. Torrey said that there was a reason that subcommittees were limited to three people. If more, there would be a quorum of the Board on the subcommittee. He would like to see more conversation about the purpose of subcommittees soon. Mr. Torrey noted that August 5, 2020 was a whole month before school began, so there was

enough time to get the schedule in place. He mentioned that while the subcommittee did a good job, those not on it did not have enough time to read over the information.

Ms. Levis wanted to go ahead and vote on the motion.

Vote: The motion failed – 0:7.

Ms. Levis now wanted to vote on the second part of the motion, which was to replace the staff policy with the subcommittee created policy. She was uncomfortable replacing the staff policy, but instead wanted to go through and talk about the differences between the policies and get more information from Ms. Nesbit.

Mr. Lafer noted that they voted against moving it the policy to an Item for Action so they no longer had to deal with the second part of his motion. However, he thought that they should inform Board members about what they had talked about in the subcommittee. He said that they received feedback from EEA a couple of times and felt that they did not need to get feedback from every community in order to move forward. The Muslim community had gone through a lot, with their Mosque having to be shut down due to threats and rocks being thrown through their windows during Ramadan. They had to be aware that some communities might not feel comfortable speaking out.

Mr. Lafer noted that the differences between subcommittee and staff policy were in the scheduling and communication sections, and that they were otherwise identical. The conflict was in what was included in events that should not be scheduled on major holidays. Homework was one of those things the subcommittee had talked about. He said that it was a big issue for families since missing a day of school accumulated more work than if they had gone. Therefore, he wanted to have teachers consider lessening homework on those days.

Ms. Newman was confused on what they were currently voting on. Ms. Levis said that they were voting to replace the staff policy with the subcommittee created policy. She stressed that changes could still be made to either. Ms. Newman wanted to hear more from Board members that were not on the subcommittee.

Ms. Shabram wanted to hear the differences between the two policies and the possible legal ramifications.

Ms. Walston thought that they needed to stay on track with their process by listening to what legal counsel said and then asking questions.

MOTION: Ms. Hays moved, seconded by Mr. Torrey, to call the question.

VOTE: The motion passed 5:2 – With Mr. Lafer and Ms. Shabram voting against.

Ms. Levis noted that the question was to replace the staff policy with the subcommittee policy.

VOTE: The motion failed 1:6 – With Mr. Lafer voting for.

Ms. Levis was worried about putting this item on the August 5, 2020 agenda since it was their first meeting back from break. She wanted there to be time for the community to give feedback and for them to hear it before they voted. Ms. Levis wanted to go through the policy section by section to detail what was different than the subcommittee version.

There were a couple differences on the second page. Board members were trying to simplify some of the information which Ms. Nesbit had already discussed (the tiered levels to scheduling). Ms. Newman thought that saying staff would make a “meaningful effort” to not schedule major events on holidays was a confusing statement. She questioned what that really meant and felt that the language was unnecessary since staff would just be avoiding scheduling events on holidays unless it created a burden on the students. Ms. Shabram asked if “meaningful effort” was a legal term or if there was a reason for the phrasing. Ms. Nesbit replied that there was no meaning behind it and was unaware that the subcommittee had an issue around the wording. She stated that they would remove and rewrite the sentence. Ms. Nesbit liked that the subcommittee added language around how some scheduling was outside of the hands of staff.

Ms. Nesbit said that the next difference was in the fieldtrips, try-outs, and club tier. She thought that each of those had different issues they had to talk about. Ms. Newman stated that they collapsed the two-tier system because it was hard to differentiate between them and instead identified which events should be scheduled around. Ms. Nesbit was concerned that fieldtrips were treated the same as prom and that they were not the same type of event. Fieldtrips happened a lot and had a higher chance of causing burden on the students. She felt that it was a broad approach that would put staff on the defensive when scheduling events. Ms. Vandercar shared that as a principal she saw a lot of different religions that people celebrated. She understood that it was difficult to miss something, but they had so many religions to accommodate for and it would start to cause a lot of scheduling conflicts at the classroom level. Mr. Lafer hoped that the schools and teachers could work with families to try and make schedules that made sense for each classroom, at least concerning fieldtrips. Ms. Shabram understood that some scheduling was outside of their control and could be excused. This issue was more than just missing out, but the feeling of students not being included. For younger students fieldtrips might be harder to miss, since those are bonding events. Ms. Hays agreed that missing out on fieldtrips can be difficult, but it would be hard to plan around everyone in their community. Students might start to get singled out based on how many people in the community identify with their religious beliefs. That way they would be leaving some people behind by not including their holidays. Mr. Lafer informed the Board that the subcommittee talked a lot about self-identifying. These were issues they would have to keep in mind while scheduling events each term.

Ms. Levis asked Ms. Nesbit if she still recommended the tier system she had written. Ms. Nesbit recommended the tiers because they were currently unsure how many days

would end up on the list. If there were thirty days, it would be hard for the District to accommodate all of those.

Ms. Levis pointed out another difference under communication. The subcommittee had written that families should be asked at the start of each term, not the beginning of the year, which days are significant to them.

Ms. Walston emphasized that they needed to trust staff since they knew how to write policy. Ms. Hays thought that they should go through the changes and ask Ms. Nesbit to go over those points and come back to them with information on how they could get those changes done.

Ms. Levis noted that Mr. Lafer wanted to include language around homework, but the rest of the subcommittee could not agree on it. Mr. Lafer thought that it could be a separate amendment. He had heard from families that there was a lot of homework for high school students and he just wanted teachers to think about lessening workloads on holidays.

Ms. Hays asked how the subcommittee policy was given to the community before it was given to the Board. Ms. Levis was also confused on that and had reached out to members of the community to figure out where they got information.

Ms. Levis felt that it was crucial for the moving forward to know how many holidays they would be working around. She asked the Superintendent to do outreach to teachers and administrators so the Board could understand what was possible. Ms. Walston was concerned with the turnaround for August 5, 2020. Dr. Balderas responded that staff would be able to come back by August 19, 2020.

XII. SUGGESTIONS BY THE BOARD FOR CONSIDERATION OF ITEMS AT A FUTURE MEETING

- 1. Next Board Meeting Dates:**
August 5, 2020
August 19, 2020

Ms. Hays pointed out that this year would be fifty years of Pride. Looking at the violence going on in the country they should not overlook the violence that Black Transgender people faced in the country.

XIII. ADJOURNMENT

Ms. Levis adjourned the meeting at 9:07 p.m.
(Minutes recorded by Lydia Dysart)

Cydney Vandercar
District Clerk

Mary Walston
Board Chair