

**MINUTES OF THE WORK SESSION
OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS
SCHOOL DISTRICT 4J, LANE COUNTY, OREGON**

October 24, 2018

The Board of Directors of School District No. 4J, Lane County, Eugene, Oregon, held a work session at 5:30 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 October 19, 2018, and published in *The Register-Guard* on October 24, 2018.

ROLL CALL

BOARD MEMBERS:

Alicia Hays, Chair
Anne Marie Levis, Vice Chair
Eileen Nittler
Judy Newman
Evangeline Sundgrenz
Jim Torrey
Mary Walston

STAFF:

Dr. Gustavo Balderas, Superintendent of Schools
Charis McGaughy, Assistant Superintendent of Instruction
Kerry Delf, Associate Director of Communications
Brooke Wagner, Director of Elementary Education
Andy Dey, Director of Secondary Education
Cheryl Linder, Director of Educational Support Services
Cydney Vandercar, Assistant Superintendent for Administrative Services
Christine Nesbit, In House Counsel
Ryan Spain, Director of Facilities Management
Steve Menachemson, Director of Technology
Oscar Loureiro, Director of Research and Planning
Lisa Fjordbeck, Executive Assistant / Board Secretary
Karen Pérez-Da Silva, Equity, Instruction & Partnerships Administrator

MEDIA: KVRM

OTHER: None

I. WORK SESSION

Board Chair Alicia Hays opened the work session at 5:30 p.m.

Chair Hays announced board leadership would arrange lunch meetings with Eugene Education Association (EEA) and the classified union. She would assign board members to each event.

[Type here]

1. Program Moves

Ms. Delf explained there would be a variety of program moves. Some were happening regardless of other decisions, and others would depend on the outcome of the November 6, 2018 election.

ECCO needed to move as its lease at Lane Community College (LCC) was expiring and would not renew. Last year, it was decided ECCO would move to Bailey Hill, and the Natives Program would remain at Bailey Hill. Smaller offices (i.e. the EWEB program and storage) moved to Kennedy Middle School.

The district also provided space for the Eugene Springfield Youth Orchestra. The program relocated to the River Road house and the move was complete. Additionally, the Chinese Immersion School was growing and needed additional space. It was rapidly outgrowing the Crest Drive site, where it was co-located with Family School. Possibilities under consideration were to continue having younger grades at Crest Drive and move upper grades to Kennedy Middle School; or simply move whole program to co-locate at the Kennedy site.

As previously discussed, many program moves were contingent on the outcome of the November 6, 2018 election. If the bond measure passed, North Eugene High School would be rebuilt. The new building would be on the west end of the site, where the current Silver Lee building sat. Corridor and Yujin Gakuen (YG) were currently located there. If the bond measure passed, those programs would need a new home. During the short term, Corridor could co-locate at North Eugene High School in a separate wing. YG could relocate to Kelly Middle School for the duration of construction.

Ms. Delf said upon the completion of construction, North Eugene High School students would move to the new building, and the old building could be a home for those two or three programs. Final decisions about configuration/co-locations would be made after students lived with it and after discussions with the school community and staff. Architects would help with reconfiguration of buildings for programs.

If the bond measure passed, construction wouldn't happen immediately. The district needed input from the community on school design, so the process was several years out.

Ms. Nittler asked for the capacities of Crest Elementary School and Kennedy Middle School. Ms. Delf responded capacities for Crest and Kennedy were 216 and 663, respectively.

Ms. Walston asked what would happen to the Family School. Ms. Delf said It would stay at Crest Elementary School. Ms. Walston followed up by asking what would happen if the program grew. Ms. Delf said the program was growing one grade each year, so students grew with the program. It would need more space eventually. If the Chinese Immersion School moved to Kennedy Middle School, there would be additional space.

Dr. Balderas clarified there were 160 kids in family school.

Ms. Nittler asked if it made sense to keep the Chinese Immersion School at Crest and then move the Family School. Ms. Delf said kindergarten through fifth was the model for a standalone immersion programs; it was difficult to maintain a strong program at the middle levels but having the program at Kennedy Middle School wouldn't displace any current classes. Crest Drive was a small building and more suitable for Family School. Dr. Balderas said the option would be part of the larger, future discussion.

Mr. Torrey asked where Corridor students would eat lunch. Ms. Delf wasn't exactly sure as the configuration hadn't been made. Students would not go to the cafeteria at the same time as high school students. There were possibilities to eat in different locations.

Mr. Torrey asked about playground locations at Kennedy. Ms. Delf responded there was space for playground equipment close to the area used by the Chinese Immersion Program. A precise location would be decided upon later. There were also two gyms, and those would need to be shared by elementary and middle grades for daily and weekly use. A schedule that worked for both would be created.

Ms. Sundgrenz asked if Kennedy Middle School was in between Churchill High School and Bailey Hill. She was told yes.

Ms. Nittler clarified there would not be a standalone kindergarten through 8th Chinese Immersion School. Dr. Balderas responded nothing had been decided. He explained what a kindergarten through 8th grade program looked like when it was small; there was minimal programming for upper grades. Dr. Balderas said everything was up for discussion.

Chair Hays thought it was intriguing to think about the possibilities. There could be a hybrid kindergarten through 8th that allowed students to stay with their cohort while also taking other classes, for example. It was a chance to consider what was best for students and for growth of language. Dr. Balderas came from larger districts in the past; he explained he generally wanted bigger schools because that meant more options and opportunities for placement and movement. If there was a large elementary school, it could have a variety of class sections based on students. Smaller elementary schools were forced into certain class sections.

Mr. Torrey wondered what the Career Technical Education (CTE) curriculum would look like, once ECCO was at Bailey Hill. Currently, ECCO students had access to many CTE options, due to its connection with LCC. Dr. Balderas said the district might be able to align programming, and transport kids to Churchill High School for shared programming. Mr. Andy Dey was in communication with principals of both schools.

Mr. Torrey asked how to help mothers and fathers get from West 11th Avenue to Bailey Hill and meet their needs. Students would have to use Lane Transit District (LTD) buses. Ms. Delf recalled the nearest bus stop was only a half mile away, so it was walkable. Staff could approach LTD to discuss possible routes.

Dr. Balderas expected to have some sort of van transportation for ECCO. The district would also work with LTD to ensure there was some routing. The district didn't want kids to walk a half

mile, plus there was a steep incline. Staff would work to get transport to the school. It was a district and board expectation.

Ms. Levis heard the board was at a stage of considering possibilities, although they were a little dependent on what happened in November 2018. She was happy to hear from Ms. Delf and staff that they would involve the students and families when thinking through changes. Ms. Levis added some of the best ideas came from the community.

Ms. Sundgrenz asked how Bailey Hill would be restructured with both ECCO and the Natives Program there. Dr. Balderas said the space was currently in an “L” formation. The district would look at one wing being designated for ECCO and one being for the Natives Program. Ms. Sundgrenz posited the pods quite large. Dr. Balderas said yes, and added staff could separate the space into a few classrooms. There were some ADA issues to improve, however.

Ms. Sundgrenz was happy to hear about van transport as a potential transit option, for all students but especially those walking with young kids.

Ms. Walston asked about storage space for the Natives Program. Dr. Balderas said a district goal was to provide a storage area at the Bailey Hill site; unfortunately, the district was short on storage space over the entire district.

Ms. Walston wondered whether YG and Corridor would stay at the Silver Lee site if the bond didn't pass. Dr. Balderas responded yes, as of right now. The district's ultimate goal was to meet the needs of all schools. YG wanted to grow, but it was impacted due to co-location; that needed to be addressed, whether or not the bond passed. Additionally, the district needed to determine how to articulate the program into North Eugene High School. Ms. Delf said without further decisions, they would remain in the building.

Ms. Walston clarified the capacity was 216 at Crest Elementary School. She noted the site was almost at capacity with 160 in Family School and 50 in the Chinese Immersion Program. Ms. Delf said yes, they considered it at capacity, although there was an additional modular classroom not counted in the 216

Ms. Walston thought it was problematic to be co-located. Dr. Balderas said co-location could be sometimes, and the district would need to address it. Ms. Levis thought co-location was short term, as a bridge to a more permanent location. Chair Hays thought the board previously focused on alternative and neighborhood schools co-locating, not necessarily two alternative schools. Ms. Levis thought the same issues applied.

Chair Hays reiterated the district and board needed immediate community meetings on next steps.

2. Equity Lens

Ms. Charis McGaughy and Ms. Karen Perez da Silva presented a PowerPoint entitled, “Equity Decision Tool.” Both were involved with the equity committee.

Dr. Balderas explained staff wanted to provide a high-level overview of the tool. The district was still working to engrain the tool across the district as a standard operating procedure. 4J was one of the lead districts to use the tool within the State of Oregon. Dr. Balderas used the tool as a guide, to help inform his decision making. It helped him understand where impacts were, and helped him work with staff.

Ms. McGaughy provided a brief history. When she first started in 2015, the equity committee was working to develop the tool. It was an extensive process that was research based. Much of the information came from the applied research center. There was a longer detailed version, as well as a pocket version which was handy to reference during meetings and other situations. The tool considered positive and negative impacts, unintended consequences, and whose voice was at the table.

Since then, the tool was used in various ways and consistently by many staff and departments, such as the instructional leadership team in selecting curriculum. The question was how to broaden and expand use of the tool.

Ms. McGaughy added the former equity director of the district worked for Oregon Department of Education (ODE) and brought the tool along, so the state now used its own. Chair Hays said the Early Learning Alliance used one as well.

Ms. Perez da Silva introduced the equity lens tool. There were eight pieces within the tool. Most people thought about the eight criteria, however, the tool was designed to make the user think more critically and intentionally. The purpose was to focus on equity and the impact to all students and families. The tool considered who were the stakeholders affected, the purpose of decision, inequities addressed or caused, negative effects, positive effects, root causes, sustainability of the decision, and how to evaluate it once made.

Ms. Perez da Silva explained the tool was somewhat tricky because everyone had their own lens. One piece newly implemented was for each group participant to name intersectionalities of each lens. Things considered were gender, age, race, ethnicity, immigration status, concepts of family, etc. When coming into a space where a decision was made, people needed to understand the views at the table, including biases, assets, and barriers. The board might want to bring in different experts to help in decision making.

Ms. Perez da Silva explained the process for assigning the eight questions to a group. At least two people would have the same question, and they would have a conversation about it. She thought it was a meaningful way to discuss the decision purpose and then inequities surrounding that question (i.e. stakeholders).

Ms. Perez da Silva introduced a new monthly event the district would host, called community equity forums. On the first Thursday of every month, an elder, from a community who felt they were being left out of the decision-making process or district spaces, shared their history. The purpose was to communicate to all stakeholders that history impacted students and families.

A negative effect from the forum was that there were only eight or nine months the district could host them. That meant some communities would be excluded. Ms. Perez da Silva wanted the

program to be sustainable so those they didn't reach could be heard. There were not many costs associated with the forums.

Ms. Sundgrenz asked which groups wouldn't fit into the time frame. Ms. Perez da Silva responded the district started with birth right to citizenship and watched a film called "14," which looked at African American, Asian American, and Latino histories within the area, and how the histories impacted the classroom. The next one planned was First Nation peoples. The community decided to discuss boarding schools and the impact in current classrooms. Ms. Perez da Silva said everything was planned to be culturally appropriate. The third forum would be African American history in Eugene including the Mims family and others.

The district planned to host forums on normalizing gender, abilities, and the Pacific Islander community. Ms. Perez da Silva might exclude some religious communities the first year, however, each year she wanted to build the program and include more and more groups. She also hoped people would approach her to participate.

Ms. Perez da Silva worked with the UO to have cards advertising the forums at tables at the university's First Friday events.

Ms. Perez da Silva explained administration of the district was considering how to roll out the equity tool, and to successfully provide trainings and practice for teaching staff. The goal was to eventually have it embedded in all work.

Additionally, Teachers on Special Assignment (TOSA) were helping train staff and the district was doing anti-bias work with Courageous Conversations.

Ms. McGaughy expanded on Ms. Perez da Silva's comment and said the instructional leadership team was modeling the tool and trying different protocols. So far, refinements had already been made. The team would be familiar with using it, and would then roll it out to other administrators during meetings.

Ms. Perez da Silva spoke with ODE, and all districts within the state were required to implement Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) accountability improvement process. The district was on a pilot program, and was working with ODE to embed equity tool questions into the pilot. Everyone would become experts.

Ms. Levis recognized how much equity work had not been done with the board, and she recognized the board did not reflect the whole community. She thought they could improve, and use the tool to go beyond their own lenses. She wondered how the board could be involved in trainings; although she sat through previous presentations on the tool, she still felt unsure about how exactly to use it. Ms. Levis wanted to make better decisions for those not represented.

Dr. Balderas said the board had three main charges: policy and procedure, budgets, and hiring a superintendent. However, the district vision superseded all. He thought the board should use the tool in considering plans, such as the 2020 plan, and in asking questions to ensure district work was meaningful and provided a balanced approach for the entire community.

Ms. Levis asked how the board could reflect the community if they couldn't represent or understand sectors of the community. Sometimes, board members were the only ones present at discussions. She wanted tools to help in asking right questions, and also for it to be embedded into training and future work.

Ms. Walston thought Ms. Levis had excellent points. She struggled with the same issues; she was white middle class and wondered how to make the tool work. She thought a good starting place would be to use the tool in the program moves discussion. It was hard to see other perspectives at times.

Chair Hays said the tool was helpful in breaking down questions; people didn't know what they didn't know. It helped the board understand things they hadn't experienced. Chair Hays noted board members could ask staff during presentations what happened when they used the equity tool. She would expect them to answer it and hoped anyone who brought any decision forward would be using it.

Ms. Perez da Silva agreed it was something the district should work toward. She was new to the tool last year, so it took practice for her. Learning the tool could be bumpy, but it was very beneficial.

Ms. Sundgrenz often had the equity tool open during meetings. She thought it should be looked at every level, but wondered how to better utilize it during meetings. She thought board members asking for findings from the tool could be effective.

Chair Hays wouldn't want to call staff out, but she thought if they knew they'd likely be asked about the tool, they'd use it. It was about staff slowing down and thinking about things critically. Dr. Balderas agreed, it was about being mindful and understanding impacts. Having dialogue and taking time helped minimize unintended consequences.

Ms. Levis knew the district had a small budget, but she hoped the board could have an opportunity to be involved in ones that were already going on. They only benefitted as a community by the board being uncomfortable in their privilege and asking questions. She saw how many blind spots she had, and she thought they could learn more as a board and continue to improve. As the world changed, board members needed to think differently.

Dr. Balderas agreed with Ms. Levis. That evening's goal was to provide a broad overview, but the ultimate goal was to dive deeper into equity work. There were four board seats up that year, so there would be continual training. Everyone lived in different worlds; it was about how to use trainings to expand on knowledge and understand all impacts to all demographics.

Ms. Levis came back to intent versus impact. She challenged board members to keep moving forward and improving. Dr. Balderas said staff could recommend trainings.

Chair Hays appreciated the conversation; it was impossible to completely understand another person's perspective. Her job was to know that she couldn't, and to stop and seek out the perspective. It was also important to understand, then believe what the person said was important. She thought the equity tool could be a spring retreat agenda item.

Chair Hays also asked the district to put “sign language interpreters available” on posters.

3. Superintendent Evaluation Tool

Chair Hays introduced the superintendent evaluation tool. A small group including Ms. Walston, Ms. Newman, and Ms. Levis worked on the updated evaluation. Members were provided with the draft form, which aligned to expectations of the 2020 plan. Dr. Balderas explained the goal was to review the content and process. Staff would revise and later bring back to the board for consideration during a regular meeting.

Dr. Balderas said key changes included eliminating number rankings, and adding more discussion. A timeframe still needed to be redone. Dr. Balderas wanted the board to look at areas of responsibility, and consider the narrative format under each area of responsibility. His hope was during evaluation, board members would be able to have more open-ended conversation.

Chair Hays wanted the board to decide on how they came to consensus on statements for the evaluation narrative. Ms. Nittler clarified whether it was the chair’s decision on how to fit all the statements together. Chair Hays thought only if the group gave the chair that power, otherwise majority ruled.

Mr. Torrey was frustrated because there were situations taking place within the district where people with authority were not getting the job done. He wondered how to communicate those concerns without breaking bridges.

Chair Hays thought Mr. Torrey’s concern fit under area number two. The superintendent was accountable for the staff he supervised. Hypothetically, if the board was concerned about quality, they were holding him responsible. Mr. Torrey clarified whether he would be breaking a rule if he brought up a concern to Dr. Balderas. Mr. Walston thought discussing concerns one on one with Dr. Balderas was appropriate. She did think concerns should be addressed.

Mr. Torrey was concerned from a legal standpoint. Dr. Balderas agreed, it was also a fairness issue as sometime complaints got into personnel. He would want a conversation; then he would address the situation.

Chair Hays preferred that during an evaluation, the board work toward consensus. She was not inclined to put a one-off comment into an evaluation, but those comments needed to be discussed.

Ms. Levis said they were discussing the process. She wanted to make sure they didn’t miss anything important within the tool to help evaluations.

Ms. Sundgrenz liked the changes. She thought it included more discussion; however, she didn’t see an executive staff survey listed. She was told the survey was no longer happening.

Ms. Walston understood the superintendent would consult with staff and would include comments as part of his self-evaluation. Dr. Balderas explained the goal of surveying was to be able and have the information in front of board, and include it as part of his work plan.

Ms. Sundgrenz wondered a timeline for the evaluation. Chair Hays said they could take as long as needed. She thought at least a few hours.

Ms. Nittler asked Dr. Balderas if he read the tool and if he thought it was useful. She wondered if he needed anything else from the board in order to get better feedback. Dr. Balderas said it was more about process determined by the board. It had to be clearly spelled out because boards changed. He wondered what the mechanism was for reporting back to the community.

Chair Hays asked if the small group wanted to get back together and update the evaluation, or if leadership should. The board decided the small group would review the evaluation tool again.

Ms. Walston said the small group tried to include items directly from the 2020 vision board.

Ms. Levis wanted Dr. Balderas to review the tool. She felt like something was missing.

Dr. Balderas could provide input for the subcommittee to consider and bring back to board leadership. Chair Hays set dates. The board wanted comments submitted to the subcommittee by November 9, 2018. Then, the subcommittee would discuss and submit the evaluation prior to November 23, 2018 for the November 26, 2018 leadership meeting.

Chair Hays requested Dr. Balderas and staff review the timeline. Ms. Walston said the subcommittee could offer a draft timeline. She wondered how to format the evaluation. They preferred a single page. Dr. Balderas thought more clarity in the document would be better for the future as new board members cycled in.

The board hoped to strive toward consensus during the evaluation. Majority would rule when including comments within the evaluation.

The item would be on the December 19, 2018 agenda for action.

II. ADJOURN

Chair Hays adjourned the work session at 7:12 p.m.

(Recorded by Marina Brassfield)

Dr. Gustavo Balderas
District Clerk

Alicia Hays
Board Chair