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

May 9, 2018

The Board of Directors of School District No. 4J, Lane County, Eugene, Oregon, held a work session at 6:30 p.m. at the Education Center, 200 North Monroe Street, Eugene, Oregon. Notice of the meeting was mailed to the media and posted in the Education Center on May 4, 2018, and published in *The Register-Guard* on May 9, 2018.

ROLL CALL

BOARD MEMBERS:
Eileen Nittler, Chair
Alicia Hays, Vice Chair
Anne Marie Levis (excused)
Judy Newman
Evangelina Sundgrenz
Jim Torrey
Mary Walston

STAFF:
Gustavo Balderas, Superintendent of Schools
Charis McGaughy, Assistant Superintendent of Instruction
Kerry Delf, Associate Director of Communications
Brooke Wagner, Director of Elementary Education
BJ Blake, Director of Secondary Education
Cheryl Linder, Director of Educational Support Services
Cydney Vandercar, Assistant Superintendent for Administrative Services
Christine Nesbit, In-House Counsel
Harlan Coats, Director of Facilities Management
Steve Menachemson, Director of Technology
Oscar Loureiro, Director of Research and Planning
Lisa Fjordbeck, Executive Assistant / Board Secretary
Chris Ellison, Transportation Department Manager
Monica Brown, SSD Business Manager

MEDIA: KVRM

OTHER: LeRoy Landers, Mahlum Architects.

I. WORK SESSION: STANDARD SCHEDULE REVIEW

Chair Nittler called the work session to order at 6:35 p.m. She explained they would recap what happened during the community forum held prior to the work session.

Ms. Hays said it was great to have conversations with the community. She noted there were a lot of mixed preferences, especially for early release days. There was a lot of conversations around bussing options, as well. Ms. Hays appreciated the information, and knew staff would too. Mr. Torrey said he spoke with two eighth grade students from Kennedy Middle School; one of the students was concerned because he didn't want to wake up early. Another student was concerned students would be in school too long. He said they had a great discussion. In addition, he was taken by the difference in comments he heard from the public versus the staff he talked to that evening.

Ms. Newman spoke to many middle school teachers. They had a lot of passion, but many were concerned about the long hours and late end in the day. The kids who were walking to and from school and who had responsibilities in the home would be hurt more by the schedule, so she thought the district needed to look at equity given the population. Another concern of teachers was that behavior problems would accelerate, which the district was currently trying to help support and minimize.

Ms. Sundgrenz spoke with a parent that was representing her children and special behavioral needs children. They discussed specifically how bussing and the earlier elementary start time would affect those students in particular. Ms. Sundgrenz appreciated the discussion because it was a perspective not heard about often. It was a complex issue and it was important to hear and do what was best not only for all students, but for those who were underrepresented. Ms. Walston heard there were some issues with the middle school schedule and it was difficult for working parents. Parents were also concerned about children walking home alone during the winter time. Ms. Walston also heard it was easier for some working parents to get off work early on Friday afternoons for early release, rather than Wednesday.

Mr. Torrey heard there would be an impact to track and field due to bussing. He wondered if there was a way to deal with that issue. Dr. Balderas said high school athletes helped facilitate middle school track meets after their practices; he thought that was how it typically worked for track meets.

Chair Nittler said the latest medical or other appointment staff was able to get was 4:00 p.m. It was her understanding they would need a half-day sub if teachers had a medical appointment. She wondered if it was contractual and if there was any room to adjust. Ms. Vandercar said a teacher could take an hour off without taking the full day. Substitutes were for either four hours or eight hours. So, whether a teacher took of one or three hours, they would still pay for a four-hour sub; the sub might not work in the classroom but may help in the library for example. Ms.

Hays asked how late the district wellness center was open. She was told it was open until 6:00 p.m.

Chair Nittler noted there was a reduction in time for some middle schools. She wondered which schools would have a reduction in time with the proposed schedule. Ms. Delf said in 2017-2018, all schools had different amounts of instructional time. Arts and Technology Academy (ATA) and Spencer Butte Middle School provided the most, while Monroe Middle School provided the least in all middle schools. Mr. Torrey said his grandson went to Monroe Middle School the previous year, and three days a week were offered a half hour before school to meet with teachers. That time would still be offered, but he wondered how it would be different after school rather than before school. Ms. Delf said it was not considered instructional time, however, as it was optional. Ms. Delf said middle schools were more uniform in start times when compared to the elementary or high school level. She said office time for teachers would be a decision for school program staff to make, but it could be offered before or after.

Ms. Hays wondered if there was more flexibility in teacher time for which they were getting compensated for in a shorter school day. Ms. Delf said yes; when students were at school longer, there was less time in the regular work day for teachers to plan or grade. Chair Nittler wondered if ATA and Spencer Butte Middle School did parent contact with longer days. Ms. Blake said having been a previous principal there, all teachers shared what days of the week they were available before school but that didn't preclude from meeting during lunch or after school.

Ms. Sundgrenz wondered about collaboration and professional development time. She was concerned about when there would be time for teachers at the middle school level; one teacher she spoke to was concerned the only time would be on weekends. Ms. Blake said with a 9:00 a.m. start time, building hours may be from 8:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. They might have collaboration from 8:00 a.m. to 8:45 a.m. Ms. Vandercar said staff meetings and professional development could be during early release days. Ms. Blake said those short blocks before school or after school blocks would be used more for checking in with the grade team, for example. Structured collaboration led by leadership would likely happen on early release times.

At the elementary level, Mr. Torrey wondered if teachers had flexibility to move students around if they seemed to be restless. Ms. Blake said teachers did that all the time – they called it "reading the classroom." For example, they might do a clapping song, have students walk around and ask each other three questions, or take a minute to run to the tree and back.

Chair Nittler told the board Ms. Nesbit and Dr. Balderas came up with a draft resolution. Dr. Balderas said next steps included staff taking feedback to create a final draft schedule. Part of the confusion during the process was based on staff versus the board's role in creating and adopting the schedule. Dr. Balderas said it was a new process for the system. Ms. Nesbit said in the district's collective bargaining agreement with EEA, the board would approve and adopt the standard schedule by level upon the superintendent's recommendation. They were not necessarily adopting bell times. The intent behind the language was to ensure there was an equality of instructional minutes at schools, and to make things reliable and consistent for families. Standardized start and end times would also attempt to meet the goal of aligned

professional development. The board was being asked to approve the number of instructional hours and the framework; then, they would allow Dr. Balderas, in consultation with the transportation department, to figure out exact start times. Ms. Nesbit said the drafted resolution was based on Schedule Draft II.

Ms. Hays said as a board, she believed they already set seat time in the EEA contract. She was told they had. Ms. Newman wondered if the contract included offsets. Ms. Nesbit explained the contract stated the standard schedule could not increase instructional time beyond a certain number of hours. It also identified the number of annual hours by level and outlined that any crediting of hours for recess would be determined by the board. Ms. Nesbit explained Draft II fell between the state law minimum and contractual maximum. Dr. Balderas clarified Draft II was created within the parameters already set by the board.

Mr. Torrey asked if the board would pass a resolution. Ms. Nesbit said the superintendent would recommend either a motion or a resolution specifically on instructional time and early release times. The resolution should contain parameters around what was a standard schedule. Mr. Torrey confirmed the superintendent would return with a resolution that described what he was asking of the board.

Chair Nittler confirmed everyone was comfortable with tentative next steps. Ms. Delf explained the open survey would close that evening and the board would receive survey results as soon as possible. They had received around 2,400 responses. Ms. Hays said given a lot of feedback heard was around the bell schedule, it was important to see the data. She confirmed next steps; the board would see a resolution on June 6, 2018 around instructional time. Dr. Balderas said staff would convene the next day to rehash the work session and return something to the board as soon as possible. Ms. Delf said she had partial results for the survey; there was a strong preference for Friday early release by families and a moderate preference for Friday over Wednesday by staff.

Ms. Hays confirmed Dr. Balderas would be creating the bell times. He responded yes and noted the schedule would be an Item for Information on June 6, 2018.

Chair Nittler closed the work session at 7:01 p.m.

II. WORK SESSION: LONG RANGE FACILITIES PLAN AND BOND PLANNING

Chair Nittler opened the work session at 7:06 p.m. Mahlum Architects would present where the they were in updating the Long Range Facilities Plan (LRFP) and the board would discuss some bond planning. Dr. Balderas said the LRFP would be presented as an Item for Action at the May 16, 2018 board meeting. The LRFP was due May 17, 2018 so it would be submitted to the state the morning after approval. Dr. Balderas explained it was a statutory document that guided future bond work within the district. It would also allow the district to be eligible for $8 million matching dollars from the state. Part of updating the LRFP was to plan projects for the future and create a list of items to focus on during the upcoming November 2018 bond.

Dr. Balderas said they would not review all PowerPoint slides as there were over 100, but the board received it prior to the work session and wanted to know if there were questions. LeRoy

Landers from Mahlum was there to answer them. Ms. hays wanted to highlight areas of interest or concern and then move to questions. She was curious to hear what the professionals thought the board should focus on.

Ms. Brown said there were no major areas of concern for the draft LFRP. It encapsulated work the board and district had done for the past 15 months including the updated facilities assessment and the updated demographic study that led to awareness of problem areas. It also reflected community engagement and survey results. Ms. Brown said the LRFP was a high level document, and it would drive bond issues or discussions. Staff had reflected between the first draft and the final draft of the LRFP, and it mostly contained a lot of technical editing.

As a board member, Ms. Hays had been involved in every step and she appreciated staff and how the process allowed for board and community input along the way. When she looked at the LRFP, she saw a lot that needed to be done. Mr. Torrey wondered if the LRFP was expected to define areas in regard to Career Technical Education (CET) or Information Technology (IT) or just note general concern about the areas. Ms. Brown said technology referred more to bells and access points and those types related directly to facilities, rather than one on one student or classroom devices. Mr. Torrey had another question in regard to equity between races and ethnicities. Ms. Brown said the LRFP was not a policy document, so it did not address those issues. It talked about regional disparities of sizes and locations, but not from a social or policy impact; it discussed condition of facilities. There were no recommendations, but it gave options.

Ms. Walston was concerned about YG and Corridor schools. Dr. Balderas said if the board chose to rebuild North Eugene High School, the district could temporarily move YG to the Kelly Middle School site, and Corridor to the upper wing of the Willard site. They were the only two areas currently available. Dr. Balderas said staff could continue to look at the issue, but there would need to be displacement of at least a year; building a high school would take a year or two. Chair Nittler clarified a temporary displacement for two years. Ms. Walston said not necessarily for Corridor as they wouldn't return to the Silver Lee site. Dr. Balderas said it was a solution staff had worked on for a while. Unfortunately, there were no open campuses in the North Eugene area. Staff was considering Bailey Hill for the ECCO program, and Fox Hollow would then be occupied with special programs. Ms. Walston understood the discussion about facilities, but the Chinese immersion school and the family school were collocated, and she thought the district had proved those models did not work. She wanted the board to consider how to solve that problem in the future. Dr. Balderas absolutely agreed and said collocation had been done in a way where there were two separate but like programs at the same site, which was difficult because they were fighting for similar resources. A school within a school model may work more effectively.

Ms. Sundgrenz wondered if there was another option besides Willard. She did not think renovation would be the best use of funds. Dr. Balderas said they had to consider whether Corridor was still a viable program for consideration, but another model would be to look at other sites that could hold 200 students. Ms. Walston wanted a clear plan to make those decisions. Ms. Sundgrenz wondered if the district was still looking at building the Kinney Loop site. Dr. Balderas asked if the board could close the LRFP discussion prior to moving in that

direction. Ms. Newman wondered what the district would need to invest to update Willard. Chair Nittler said the board understood there were program issues that still needed to be resolved. She wondered if there were concerns around the LRFP document.

Ms. Sundgrenz clarified there was one more board meeting to approve the LRFP.

Dr. Balderas said staff had created a draft $375 million bond with project items listed they believed captured what the board had wanted. The goal was to answer clarifying questions based on each specific item. He explained the board needed to move forward in June 2018. The staff recommendation was to move YG to Kelly Middle School and corridor to Willard. Dr. Balderas led the board through each item listed within the draft bond list. Chair Nittler clarified process.

Ms. Hays said before saying yes and moving forward, she wondered if people needed answers such as exactly where YG and Corridor would go; or if board members were more comfortable saying they would replace North Eugene High School and then within the next six months that discussion around other programs would happen. She wanted to know the level of detail people were interested in. Ms. Walston didn't think the board needed to solve the issue that evening, but she wanted a plan within the next year. The district owed it to parents and to the community to have a clear plan in place. Ms. Hays wondered if they needed to do it before November 2018 because the board had bussing and a few other questions. Ms. Hays was comfortable moving forward, knowing there were many decisions that still needed clarity sooner rather than later.

Mr. Torrey agreed with Ms. Hays. He was inclined to look at the bond document and the dollars assigned to each area and understand a lot of questions would be asked. He didn't think they could dive in to each item that night. Assuming the bond passed for certain projects such as school rebuilds, there would be intense community discussions and then the community would make the determination on how to spend money for the project. Ms. Walston thought having a plan by June 2019 would be a good goal.

Chair Nittler introduced the first item, replacement of North Eugene High School. Dr. Balderas explained the draft bond item list included a rebuild of the school at a price of $150 million at the current Silver Lee site. The assumption would affect YG and Corridor, since those programs were currently housed there.

The next project was to build a new elementary school in the Sheldon region, to relieve overcrowding and Dr. Balderas recapped the three largest elementary schools were Gilham, Holt and Willagillespie elementary schools, all in the Sheldon region. The Kinney loop site included 31 acres in the Costco area off Coburg Road. Dr. Balderas explained the school would be built for 688 student capacity, and it would lead to some boundary adjustments in the future. Ms. Newman said one vision the district had was to include two early childhood classrooms. She was unclear if that was part of the design discussion for schools, or part of a longer term plan. She wanted to discuss it as a board. Dr. Balderas said the dollar amounts included in the draft included 450 schools; they could add the classrooms for early childhood, but it would reduce the capacity of the building. Ms. Newman thought the board should include preschool programs as part of long term planning.

Mr. Torrey asked Ms. Newman if she was suggesting adding another $1 million or so into the budget to address the classrooms separately, without identifying where they would go. He was interested if she would be willing to drop other items from the draft list, in order to include the classrooms. Ms. Newman said she had not thought that far. Mr. Torrey was unsure how to include those classrooms without budgeting for them. Ms. Walston asked if Ms. Newman's preference was to add those into the new schools. Ms. Newman said yes, she thought for every new school built the board and district should have the foresight to build them later on. She noted that often school districts reused older buildings for early education. Dr. Balderas said staff could look at the design of preschool classrooms, to see if they were much different than kindergarten classrooms and could be used for both.

Ms. Hays knew it was a rough budget and thought the boarded needed to have the conversation around preschools and to create a plan within the next year. Mr. Torrey said Ms. Newman made a strong point when asking about other facilities in community. He noted lots of churches were selling and they sometimes had preschool facilities. He said the district had the opportunity to look at all sorts of options if they had the state funding. Ms. Newman said there was state funding, it just didn't go to 4J for preschool.

Chair Nittler moved onto replacement of Edison Elementary School. Dr. Balderas said the school was designed for 450 students at $45 million and on 2.5 acres. There was a slight increase in cost because the building was historic, and they wanted to have cushion to respect the historical design or in case another issue came up. Ms. Walston wondered if the district needed to double check the historic register. It was confirmed the building was not.

Dr. Balderas said they would need a swing school for Edison Elementary School. Due to space limitations, a swing school could not be built at the Edison site. Part of the conversation had been to design Camas Ridge Elementary at 450 students at $42.3 million; then, a new Camas Ridge building could be built first, so Edison Elementary students could use the old building as a swing school while the new Edison building was rebuilt. Concerns included having two elementary schools on the same school site, for bussing, parental drop offs, parking, traffic issues, and recess locations. Ms. Delf said in response to questions around the school bus system, the transit time from Edison to Kinney Loop was about 18 minutes to 20 minutes. From Camas to Kinney Lloop was 17 to 18 minutes.

Chair Nittler wondered what staff recommended. Dr. Balderas said it was recommended to have the new building at Kinney Loop be the swing school because there was nothing currently on site. The concern for Camas Ridge Elementary School was the best area for the new building; its current location could be the best spot. Ms. Newman thought considering the Willard site for the new Camas Ridge Elementary site could be interesting. Dr. Balderas agreed, and noted Willard was in the poorest shape of all schools. Camas Ridge Elementary was in better shape, and it could then be used for other programming as it was in better shape than Willard for programming purposes. Ms. Walston said if the Camas site only allowed for building at its current location, they ran into the same issues of where to put kids. Dr. Balderas said there were some architectural mock ups, but the main concern was the location of playgrounds and playfields.

Chair Nittler said she participated in the El Camino del Rio Elementary School design and building while school was in session caused there to be some limitations and some flaws due to working in that tight space. If there was the opportunity, she would prefer to build Kinney Loop as the swing. Mr. Torrey said the board was only just beginning to discuss options; he wanted to see if the district and the public were prepared to spend $43.2 million to rebuild Camas Ridge Elementary School, regardless of where it was built.

Ms. Walston still had concerns about bussing kids across town to different sites. She was concerned about parents picking up kids; it was a long drive across town. She thought it might lower morale. Ms. Newman added Edison Elementary School had a strong walking and biking culture. Ms. Sundgrenz saw that too but noted they would be getting a new school, so it was a sacrifice for a year. She thought it needed to be handled well but saw it as a good trade off. Chair Nittler rode the bus growing up and it was much longer than 20 minutes; it wasn't something she wanted students to have to do every year, but she was not worried.

Dr. Balderas moved onto critical maintenance and repair items. They maintained day to day operations of buildings. He explained the bond was a tax rate that would carry them through 2031. There was a tremendous need to continue to maintain and support current schools, so they didn't need to build new schools later on. Ms. Hays understood the proposed budget for critical maintenance and repairs was $31 million, but she asked if that was a low number that didn't cover all needs. Dr. Balderas said it was very low, when considering the next 16 years. Ms. Sundgrenz clarified $31 million was not the end price. Dr. Balderas said no, that amount could be spent within three years on maintenance. It was very low for a 16 year bond. Then, there was an upcoming local levy of $15 million to help, but it would still be a stretch for facilities. Mr. Torrey asked if the price considered maintenance of the current North Eugene High School and Edison Elementary School. Dr. Balderas said they were considered as new schools within the budget.

Dr. Balderas explained school security and seismic upgrades. The budget was $16 million and included securing school entries with vestibules, as fifteen schools currently did not have vestibules. He added security fencing and technology was also included, as well as resiliency in new schools for earthquakes and other disasters. Resiliency upgrades were not considered for entire schools but for specific areas. Finally, the district wanted to dedicate funds toward safe routes to bike and walk to school. Chair Nittler asked if the study of seismic was bondable. Dr. Balderas said it was not; it was difficult to know what would be. Mr. Coats said Mahlum provided a rough estimate. The district would conduct a study and rank buildings on a scale of priority I, II, and III for seismic work. With a small budget, the district would focus on priority I. Then, the study would possibly be available for future bonds.

There was a proposed $12 million set aside for access, equity, and health. Dr. Balderas explained equity in facilities would be looked at, and a plan would be presented to the board. Creating special education facilities and equipment would require retrofits to buildings which the district was prepared to support. Dr. Balderas said nutritional facilities and equipment would focus on new schools to provide a stronger kitchen facility for the region's community and be more operational. Chair Nittler asked if one would be in the Churchill region. Dr. Balderas

responded it could be. Ms. Newman asked if Churchill High School was a resiliency site. Dr. Balderas said they were considering the proposed new North Eugene High School, the Kinney Loop site, and the two new South Eugene schools. The one area missing was the Churchill region, and it was for the board's consideration. Ms. Newman asked when they said "upgrade kitchens" if that meant upgrading to create scratch kitchens. Dr. Balderas said yes, the kitchens would be more operational.

Dr. Balderas discussed CTE. The district currently received $2.5 million from Measure 98, which was half of the approved amount. He said the governor felt strongly about school districts receiving full funding. He said the district was doing an incredible job under Dr. McGaughy to improve programming at all four high schools. They were aligning work with Elevated Lane County and involving the business community to create local work.

Mr. Torrey said there was an efficiency of scale within the community. The district was removing ECCO from LCC; at the same time, there were strong programs at LCC like welding and mechanics, which could allow the district to take students to the LCC facility on certain days, rather than put costly equipment and buildings at each high school site. Dr. Balderas said they had considered those options. Mr. Torrey said he didn't want to promise something to the community they couldn't deliver. Dr. Balderas said the board had a solid track record in the district over transparency and bond oversight. As a county, there had been multiple conversations around CTE regarding the creation of a regional hub and providing auxiliary hubs for other districts. He felt they were close to coming up with a countywide plan that would benefit the district.

Ms. Hays said work by Elevated Lane County was key in accomplishing CTE goals. There were better sites to provide CTE than the high schools. Ensuring there was space and equipment did not mean all high schools would have the same offering. Dr. Balderas explained there was a similar model in Salem where all students had access to different CTE courses, and their district used an AB block schedule. Ms. Newman thought they could make great strides in CTE given all these synergies, plus their own investments. She added they were potentially building a new North Eugene High School and she thought that would include CTE and could make huge progress. Dr. Balderas said staff was excited about the possibility of creating a school-based health occupations site at North Eugene High School.

Dr. Balderas provided an update on curriculum. He said the district had been behind for many years and there was a sense of professional development overload by some staff. It was because there had not been any adoptions for years. The people who were impacted most were elementary level teachers because they had to go through every single adoption, rather than only a subject adoption. He added adoptions were expensive; a new math curriculum could cost $2 million to $3 million dollars. A core curriculum were many subjects. Dr. Balderas explained they had been exploring options such as online curriculums too. Ms. Newman said her expectation would be that online curriculum costs should go down. Dr. McGaughy said the district did not purchase textbooks for online courses but were still charged for licensing fees. Then, there was the technology component; they needed a device able to run whatever the program was. There was also the consumable aspect, because the district also made sure they

provided workbooks for students to use. Dr. McGaughy explained those cost drivers were proving to be less expensive than purchasing textbooks. She pointed out if there was a seven year curriculum cycle; the bond was for 13 years.

Dr. Balderas said there was some amount of funding dedicated to refresh technology but not nearly enough to match the need. Mr. Menachemson said it cost $1.8 million to refresh technology annually.

Dr. Balderas said the district was partially reimbursed for transportation and busses. He said the $4.8 million listed would allow the district to upkeep their fleet and replace busses. Mr. Torrey wondered if $4.8 million would increase the number of busses or replace them. Dr. Balderas said replace. Ms. Sundgrenz asked how many replacements. Dr. Balderas was unsure and would provide an answer in the board's Friday update. Dr. Balderas added the district purchased additional vans to offset some larger busses for long distance transportation. Mr. Torrey said it was evident looking at the draft bond document why the objective was $475 million. He hoped the public understood that they heard and felt their pressure but from his perspective, the district needed to stay ahead of the game or it would pay more in the future.

Ms. Sundgrenz said with curriculum, they would be at the same point they were before updating everything. There was not enough money set aside. She said the board was being mindful of what they could do but it put restraints on the school district. Dr. Balderas agreed the district could spend much more, but it was very grateful for what they had and the support they had from the community. He knew they were very fortunate for the opportunities they did have. Ms. Newman said the board knew $375 million was a high number, but she thought the board could make a strong case for why the public should support the bond. Ms. Walston agreed; it would never be enough money, but she remembered in May 2019 the district would need to pass a local level to support the operational budget and they needed to be mindful.

Dr. Balderas said next steps included returning to the board in June 2018. He thought it was clear the direction the board wanted to move forward but acknowledged there were still a lot of unknowns. Ms. Brown said on May 16, 2018 the board would adopt the LRFP. On June 6, 2018 the board would have a first read of the resolution and the district would schedule a public hearing. June 20, 2018 was tentatively set for approval. Ms. Hays knew at public hearings people talked at them and received little response; she said the board did well with face to face. She wondered if an open house could be a possibility. Dr. Balderas said the board could consider a couple of dates for an open house. He said the recent sessions had been very well received. Ms. Delf said the board could have a community forum on Tuesday, May 22, 2018 or Wednesday, May 30, 2018. The board chose May 30, 2018 for the community forum.

Ms. Walston was cognizant that employees were limited once the resolution passed; she wondered if it kicked in June 20, 2018 or when the bond was filed. Ms. Brown would have to talk to the bond council. She suspected filing, but she needed to clarify.

Ms. Newman wondered if there was a protocol for the upcoming forum and noted it would be before the first read. She liked the stations used last time. Ms. Hays also thought smaller groups and doing a rotation would be helpful. Ms. Sundgrenz clarified there would be only one

community forum. Ms. Delf confirmed the proposal was for one community forum, however, a public hearing would be scheduled for June 6, 2018. Ms. Sundgrenz wondered if another place in the community would be more accessible to parents than the 4J District Offices. Ms. Delf said they did that at community forums specific to schools, but the district office was centrally located. Dr. Balderas said once the bond was formalized, the board and district staff would be out in different regions.

Mr. Torrey clarified after June 20, 2018 teachers could not lobby for or against and could only describe what the bond measure entailed. It was confirmed that was correct.

Chair Nittler adjourned the work session of the board at 8:17 p.m.

(Recorded by Marina Brassfield)

_____	_____
Dr. Gustavo Balderas	Eileen Nittler
District Clerk	Board Chair