

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

October 2, 2019

The Board of Directors of School District No. 4J, Lane County, Eugene, Oregon, held a listening session at 5:00 p.m. and a work session at 6:00 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 September 27, 2019, and published in *The Register-Guard* on October 2, 2019.

ROLL CALL

BOARD MEMBERS:

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

STAFF:

Dr. Gustavo Balderas, Superintendent of Schools
Charis McGaughy, Assistant Superintendent for Instruction
Kerry Delf, Chief of Staff
Brooke Wagner, Director of K-8 Education
Jeff Johnson, Director of K-8 Education
Andy Dey, Director of Secondary Education
Kat Lange, Director of Student 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

MEDIA: KRVM.

OTHER:

I. WORK SESSION

Vice Chair Mary Walston called the work session to order at 5:16 p.m.

1. 4J Assessment Update

Dr. Balderas explained the purpose of the work session's presentation was to explain current assessment practices for board members, to provide a baseline of knowledge. From there, further discussion around testing would happen.

Charis McGaughy, Jeff Johnson, and Oscar Loureiro presented a PowerPoint entitled, "*Eugene School District 4J: Balanced System of Assessment.*"

Ms. McGaughy provided a brief summary on what staff would cover and noted they would provide a "big picture" overview. She noted assessments was an essential part of high-quality instruction and learning.

What was covered within the slideshow:

- Elements of learning & teaching
- Balanced assessment system:
 - Formative assessment
 - Interim assessment
 - Summative assessment
- Questions and discussion
- Next Steps and Future Direction

Ms. McGaughy explained elements of learning and teaching. Student learning was at the heart of everything done within the district – teaching was the means to absolutely engage learners. Elements included standards, instruction, curriculum and assessments.

Ms. McGaughy stated the district strove to have a "balanced assessment system," and provided a definition. Balance included rigorous content standards, formative assessment practices, as well as interim and summative assessment practices. "Balance" didn't mean each area was focused on equally; the most important assessment practice to guide student learning was formative assessment.

Ms. McGaughy explained a comprehensive assessment system allowed educators to understand how to best support students. Formative assessments included minute by minute check-ins, asking students if there were questions, circulating the classroom, and using thumbs up/down to gauge whether students were absorbing the material.

Ms. McGaughy explained that within a comprehensive model, formative assessments provided the most information about individual student learning needs. Summative told more about overall systems and supports needed and provided teachers the ability to disaggregate data in order to understand how students were performing against state standards. It was a continuum along three areas of assessment.

Mr. Johnson discussed formative assessments in particular. He said formative assessments used to inform instruction in classroom. Essentially, it was a planned process that took place

continually throughout the year. It provided both teachers and students with feedback to close learning gaps. Students received individual feedback on where they were at, and teachers were able to see where gaps were for large groups of students. Then, they could adjust instruction to meet needs.

Ms. Newman arrived at 5:27 p.m.

Mr. Johnson added that formative assessments were very short, prescriptive and generally throughout lessons. For example, if a kindergarten teacher taught phonemic awareness to a class, they may ask students to repeat the first sound of a word. Some kids wouldn't be able to hear that sound and repeat it; so, the teacher would be able to identify those students and could provide additional opportunities for learning.

SLIDE 6 PROFESSIONAL LEARNING COMMUNITIES

Mr. Johnson introduced professional learning communities (PLC), which were active in grades kindergarten through 12th grade. There were three main focuses to PLC: student learning, creating a culture of collaboration, and results.

Additionally, there were four guiding questions teachers worked from:

1. What do we expect all students to know and be able to do?
2. How do we know they know and can do these things?
3. What do we do when they cannot, yet?
4. What do we do when they can?

Mr. Johnson explained that teachers selected their own formative and interim assessment inventories for each class. Teachers had a host of options at their fingertips which were included with all curriculum adoptions. Which items a teacher chose to assess students with were on an individual basis. Teachers also employed a host of individual assessments which helped in student placement and Tier II interventions.

Ms. McGaughy spoke about the interim assessment inventory. Ms. McGaughy explained interim assessments were done within periodic time frames and monitored student growth over time. Interim assessments included unit tests, quizzes, projects, essays, etc. to check whether students were learning educational standards and the content presented. Teachers could use an option from the assessment inventory, or they could choose to create their own assessment.

Ms. McGaughy noted the district utilized a multi-tiered system (MTSS) of support within schools. MTSS was chosen as a practice after staff conducted a deep dive into the idea. It was a framework and model that encouraged continuous student improvement through processes that met all students where they needed support. She clarified it was not a curriculum, but a process.

The process involved collecting data around students and their abilities (both academic and social/behavior). Data assisted in progress monitoring, which screened student growth overtime and helped teachers determine, holistically, which students may need additional support. Teams

in each school reviewed a host of data sets, including progress, behavior, attendance, etc. If the student demonstrated they were struggling, the team could discuss and identify what additional interventions a student might need to get back on track. Interventions could be at Tier II (small group instruction, or individualized one-on-one attention) or Tier III (intensive supports for a student in an alternate setting).

Ms. McGaughy stated that over the last year, the district put into place MTSS, ensured all schools had data teams, focused on Tier I instruction, and began to build out Tier II and Tier III interventions. She noted that what drove this process was progress monitoring data to make sure all students were captured. easyCBM was used in progress monitoring.

Ms. McGaughy shared that last year, the district chose to screen all eighth-grade students using easyCBM along with other measures such as grades and Smarter Balance scores. Previously, only about half of middle schools were screened and provided with intervention, while the other half were not. During the universal screen, the district found that 17% of eighth-graders were two years or below in reading levels. Prior, data wasn't available on reading skills because a universal screener hadn't been done. Since the screener, the district added portions of FTE in every middle school and some specifically dedicated to ninth-grade in every high school. The new staff members were charged with providing reading interventions. Ms. McGaughy concluded that use of universal screener helped prevent kids from falling through the cracks and could also increase graduation rates.

Mr. Loureiro said easyCBM was the main assessment system used within the district for many years; however, during that time, 4J educators became aware of significant limitations in the assessment. Specifically, there were issues with lack of alignment to Oregon standards (especially math). Additionally, easyCBM had a low score ceiling which meant it provided detailed information about students who struggled, but not much information about overall growth of all students. Because of those limitations, the district began a process to choose a replacement assessment. The adoption process would be similar to a curriculum adoption.

Mr. Loureiro introduced a slide entitled, "Assessment Pilot and Adoption":

- District Focus:
 - Promote better alignment between standards, curriculum, instruction, assessment, and intervention supports
 - Support teachers to improve their formative assessment practices
 - Continue to embed common local performance assessments and work samples in district courses
- Assessment Adoption Process:
 - Multi-year examination of the role and use of EasyCBM:
 - teacher-driven committee using adoption process. Developed rubric and selected pilot platforms last year for piloting this year. Pilot teachers use only the new platform (MAP or FAST) and do not also administer EasyCBM.

Mr. Loureiro noted there were many assessment models to choose from. One identified was Fast Bridge Learning: *“Conceived and developed by leading education researchers, and refined with input from real-world educators, FASTTM offers an industry first: Proven measures for formative assessment in one easy-to-use system.*

FAST combines Curriculum-Based Measures (CBM) and Computer-Adaptive Tests (CAT) for reading, math and behavior, and delivers accurate, actionable reports for screening, skill analysis, instructional planning, and more to ensure educators have the right tools and the right data to provide timely and targeted supports. And it does this in half the time as other assessments, so you spend less time testing and more time delivering data-driven instruction.”

Mr. Loureiro said there were many assessments used that were for particular purposes to diagnose needs of different students. There were at least 105 assessments used for student identification purposes related to special education and Talented and Gifted (TAG) services and placement. He shared a slide graphic providing specific information on the assessment inventory.

Mr. Loureiro explained that a summative assessment was an assessment of learning. It measured what students learned after instruction occurred. The state, district and school data were used for school accountability, program evaluation, and monitored progress on closing opportunity and achievement gaps.

Mr. Loureiro explained the purpose of assessments were to collect information about levels of student learning, and how close students were to reaching a mastery level. The information helped the district and board understand what areas resources should be allocated toward.

Mr. Loureiro stated that assessments were given to students for the following reasons:

- Information: Statewide summative assessments were only one measure of students' academic success, but they provided useful information on how students and schools progressed toward learning standards and where extra attention was needed.
- Equity: Disaggregated data identified opportunity and achievement gaps between groups of students, informing equity measures.
- Mandate: Federal and state law required all public schools to administer to all students' assessments measuring learning in specified subjects and grade levels. At least 95% of students must participate in testing.

Mr. Loureiro summarized the old OAKS test given to students, which was one example of a summative assessment.

Ms. McGaughy added by moving to Smarter Balance, the expectation was students would have access to the same level of rigor as students all over the country. Summative assessments provided an external reference point to calibrate teacher expectations around student learning, beyond a local perception.

Mr. Loureiro shared a table on state assessment results. Ms. Shabram clarified whether EasyCBM was administered three times a year, and if the length for testing was ten minutes in kindergarten. She was told yes.

Mr. Loureiro explained they were required to have an assessment system that allowed for progress monitoring.

Dr. Balderas added a new requirement for the district was to conduct dyslexia screenings for all students in kindergarten.

Mr. Loureiro shared a slide highlighting assessment times allotted for each EasyCBM component.

Ms. McGaughy explained the graphic on the slide, which separates each component by the time it took students to complete. Mr. Johnson clarified the table also illustrated administration time, because it included time for teachers to give direction. So, there were actually one-minute assessments where every two-minute assessments were indicated.

Mr. Lafer clarified that two minutes was not per class, but per student, meaning the total time would be one hour or more for a class of 30. He was told yes. Dr. Balderas added it was one on one screening.

Ms. Shabram asked what levels participated in one on one testing. Mr. Johnson said only kindergarten and first grade. Grades 2 through 8 began to assess reading and vocabulary comprehension, which were lengthier assessments.

Mr. Loureiro explained by law, every student in Oregon was required to take OAKS; however, families also had legal authority to opt out of state testing if they wished. If the district didn't do testing, it missed out on funding opportunities. He explained legal consequences for the district of not administering required summative assessments:

- OAR 581-022-2100(3): "School districts must administer Oregon Statewide Assessments in accordance with the Test Administration Manual and Test Schedule published by ODE." Parents have the legal authority in Oregon to opt out of state testing for their students. Districts and schools do not have legal authority to opt out of administering state tests.
- If the Oregon Department of Education determines that a district is out of compliance with a Division 22 standard, the district must submit a corrective action plan that is approved by the director.
 - Failure to submit a corrective action plan will result in the ineligibility of the district to receive further State School Fund moneys until a plan acceptable to the director is submitted.
 - Failure to complete the corrective action before the beginning of the next school year will result in ODE withholding 5% of all State School Fund moneys allocated to the district.

- States that do not comply with federally mandated assessments (ESSA–Every Student Succeeds Act) are subject to Title 1A administrative funds withholding (Section 1111(a)(7)). For Oregon, those federal fund withholdings would be expected to be between \$7.25 to \$29 million.

Mr. Lafer wondered 4J's share of state Title I funds. Mr. Johnson said just over \$5 million. Mr. Lafer also asked the percentage of state funds received. Ms. McGaughy responded generally about 2.5%.

Dr. Balderas noted the dollars were dedicated to Title I schools, meaning those schools that qualified for free and reduced meals. The federal benchmark for allocation was anything above 35%, in terms of title status. Additionally, the district had discretion on where to move funds. 4J opted to fund kinder through eighth grade, while oftentimes other districts opted to only do kinder through fifth grade. Unfortunately, Title I funds were decreasing, so in the future, the district may want to discuss shifting of funds toward different grade levels.

Mr. Loureiro explained the different efforts it took to create a balanced system of assessment:

1. Time

- Students: OAKS is untimed, so testing time varies widely (average shown above)
- Students: EasyCBM is mostly timed, so testing time is less variable
- Schools: Total testing time = Lengthiest student testing times + makeup days from absences (now using guest teachers for make-ups)

2. Cost

- District pays \$0 for the statewide assessments
- State pays ~\$10.2 million for OAKS ELA and Math (\$1.8 million for test content and \$8.4 million for administration and scoring), \$ 0.5 million for ELPA21, \$ 0.6 million for the Oregon Extended Assessment, costs TBD for the new OAKS Science
- District pays \$1.80 a year per student taking EasyCBM (less if we pilot new EasyCBM features) plus some guest teacher/EA time during the one-to-one sessions
- Additional costs include: technology, school testing coordinator stipends, guest teachers for makeup OAKS testing, licensed and administrator time to plan for logistics, and central office staff providing training, monitoring,

3. Logistics

- Training test administrators, setting up testing space and schedule, familiarizing students with testing environment, and introducing the test
- Returning to regular instruction
 - Testing lab: Separate space and staff for students needing more time
 - 2018–19 pilot: Guest teachers provided to administer makeup testing

Would there be savings if a mandated assessment were replaced by a teacher-created assessment?

- Savings would depend on the cost of the teacher-created replacement
 - E.g. probably a teacher-created replacement for the EasyCBM Letter Names assessment would be very similar and the savings would be small

- A teacher-created replacement system needed for progress monitoring multiple times per year (which is required by law) would be

Ms. Walston asked whether the rules set by state were strict. Mr. Loureiro said yes, they were very strict.

Ms. Newman asked if the costs of Fastbridge were similar to EasyCBM. Mr. Loureiro said Fast Bridge was more expensive.

Ms. Walston asked for the per child cost of EasyCBM. Mr. Loureiro said it was negotiated down to \$7.25 per student per year. Full prices ranged from \$11.50 to \$14.50.

Ms. McGaughy shared a slide, highlighting a board goal around assessments:

- Address policies and practices on student assessments
 - Increase instructional time
 - Focus legislative relief for the essential skills tests for high school

Mr. Loureiro opened the floor for questions.

Ms. Newman asked about slide nine, and wondered if the district needed all the assessments listed. Ms. McGaughy said the state required assessments on essential skills, in order to ensure all students met them, but there were several testing options for teachers to choose from.

Mr. Lafer requested staff provide data on the amount of time dedicated toward testing preparation, as well as associated costs.

Mr. Lafer was curious which tests were designed to help teacher instruction, and which helped inform the district's overall strategy. If test results aided in strategy, he wanted to understand the changes that had occurred in order to measure improvement. Mr. Lafer also wanted evidence as to why one test would be better than the other (i.e. the change from SBAC to EasyCBM).

Finally, Mr. Lafer thought the presentation only focused on pros. He wanted to hear cons, too. He wondered if staff could look into what Los Angeles Unified School District was doing to cut testing by 50%.

Ms. Shabram struggled to understand how testing fit into class periods. She wondered how many days per school year featured a test, particularly substantive tests of 30 minutes and above.

Mr. Torrey was interested in knowing if there were things the district could do to shorten time dedicated to Smarter Balance tests, and whether it was something the legislator would need to approve.

Ms. Shabram hoped to hone into examples. She wanted to see examples of low to high range scores for different schools and grade levels, to help her understand the full picture of testing within the district.

Ms. Newman returned to her question regarding the number of assessments offered. She wondered if the district could be more targeted in its testing. Dr. Balderas said title programs required summative assessments. They allowed for data teams and teachers to collaborate, and helped teachers understand interventions needed for students. He concluded that any title school in Oregon would have the same requirements.

Mr. Lafer asked if board members could send questions to be answered. He was told yes.

Ms. Levis wrapped up discussion and stated leadership would consider dates for a second work session, so the board could discuss the topic further.

2. Orientation, Introduction of Student Board Representatives

Ms. Levis called the orientation session to order at 6:21 p.m. Those present introduced themselves.

Ms. Fjordbeck provided an orientation packet to each student. Ms. Walston covered roles, responsibilities, expectations, and a schedule of meetings. She also discussed policies and rules of the board.

Ms. Walston asked if Ms. Mitchell or Ms. Chilhorek wanted to offer advice to the new representatives, since they had prior experience. Ms. Mitchell thought honesty was very important when providing reports. The board wanted authentic student perspectives.

Ms. Chilhorek recommended meeting with their board buddy. She learned a lot about the community and the district by forming a connection with her previous board member.

Ms. Levis stated there were several issues in which the most important testimony provided was from students. Often, board members' minds were changed due to the student voice. She noted the board had discussed scheduled meeting times and would consider moving meetings to an earlier slot than 7 p.m.

Ms. Levis asked why students wanted to be a representative. Each student shared their "why."

Ms. Walston then introduced board members to their board buddy.

Board buddies and student representatives took the last five minutes of the work session to connect with one another and trade contact information.

Chair Levis closed the work session at 6:45 p.m.

I. Call to Order, Role Call, Flag Salute

Ms. Levis called the 4J district regular meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. and led the room in the Pledge of Allegiance.

II. Agenda Review

Chair. Levis wanted to add in a spot for comments to be made by the student advisory panel members between employee group comments and individual board member comments.

III. Introduction of Guests and Superintendent's Report

Dr. Balderas invited Nick Clendenin, Noah Douglass, Zoe Chihorek, Hannah Mitchell, Kassidy Hampton, and Noa Ablow-Measelle to stand in front of the board and recite their oaths of office.

Dr. Balderas gave an update on the student investment account. They had met with members of the community and believed they had a good idea of where they wanted the funds to go. The district would continue to reach out and have listening sessions throughout November with select targeted groups. He hoped that board members would go to these sessions and engage in the smaller conversations happening. Dr. Balderas reminded board members that anything they do with the student investment account money must be done with the backing of data and equity, and should be focused on closing the achievement gap. Dr. Balderas stated that the three areas they needed to address the most were student mental/behavioral health needs, increase academic achievements, and reduced academic disparities for students in need or in minority groups. By reducing class size, giving a well rounded education, and establishing school safety, they can help eliminate those issues.

Dr. Balderas said that across 4J there are only a few classrooms left that have thirty or more students in them. He got more staff approved to join Howard and McCornack elementary schools earlier that day. Both of the schools generally have larger class sizes, and are in need of help.

Dr. Balderas mentioned that free menstrual products were being provided at middle schools and high schools across the district. He told board members to give clear instructions to him and staff if they wanted to go further with the implementation.

Dr. Balderas let the board know that starting October 15, 2019 a new 'public charge' law would be enacted that would allow members of their community to be removed if they are thought to be a 'public charge'. This will affect students across 4J who are a part of immigrant families. He stated that Oregon was currently in a lawsuit against the federal government fighting against it, so they hoped that no full implementation would take place. Dr. Balderas emphasized that this law is immoral and something that must be fought against in order to keep students, staff, and all members of the 4J community safe.

IV. Comments by Board Chair

Chair Levis thanked the student advisory panel for taking the time out of their schedules to show up and talk about their opinions. With the new school year underway, she stated that it would be the best time to start investing in their students. As a board they need to stay open to equity and change, and keep all students and families in mind when making decisions.

Chair Levis mentioned how excited she was for the Student Success Act (SSA) funds that would be coming into the 4J school district. With SSA, 4J would be able to add \$12 million dollars to its yearly budget. She hoped that they could add back programs that were cut out years ago, and focus on children in need. Ms. Levis said that they needed to be reasonable

when making money decisions, and that while \$12 million might seem like a lot, it cannot fix everything.

Chair Levis wanted to end her statement by saying that all students in 4J should feel safe both in and out of school.

V. Items Raise by the Audience

Ms. Levis read the policies related to speaking at meetings or filing complaints.

Deanna Chappell Belcher thanked the board for talking about excessive testing that happened in the district. She appreciated that they mentioned all the costs that go into testing (time cost in school, time cost of teachers having to learn how to give the test, cost of curriculum, etc.). Ms. Belcher emphasized that they cannot allow testing to dictate what is or is not important for students to learn. She ended her statement by saying that testing takes a huge mental toll on students because of the pressure it puts on them.

Tana Bailey, a teacher at Twin Oaks elementary, had been to board meetings in the past to campaign for more FTE counseling funds. She went in front of the board that evening to thank them for following through and granting them those funds.

Jenn Scott, a South Eugene High School English teacher, approached the board and thanked them for their service in helping the community. She acknowledged that the board makes a lot of decisions, and is too busy to see how their decisions impact the classroom. Ms. Scott talked about how by having smaller classrooms she has been more engaged with students on a deeper level, and has been able to give them more feedback on assignments. Personally, she stated, the change has decreased her stress. Ms. Scott told the board that some of her Advanced Placement (AP) classes are still big, and hoped to see them get smaller as time passed.

Bobbie Willis thanked Jenn Scott for speaking out about her experience. Ms. Willis stated that she would be coming in front of the board to speak on issues throughout the school year. She wanted to talk that evening about the 4J school schedule. She noted that the 4J school district moved to a trimester system and then to the bell system, which they are now utilizing. Ms. Willis believed that the new system damaged day-to-day interactions with students. She would continue talking on that issue at future meetings.

VI. Comments by Employee Groups

Sabrina Gordon, president of the Eugene Education Association (EEA), wanted to talk about the idea of the board undergoing assessments for initiatives they had passed. She thought that the board should track decisions they approved, and then assess if it was implemented well or needed to be looked at again. Ms. Gordon said that they could check in with teachers to see if they believe a change was positive. She mentioned that the bell schedule change could be looked at and assessed to see if it was the right move to make. Ms. Gordon also brought to the board a request. She asked if the Students First Alliance, a group made up of EEA teachers, parents, and community members, could have ten or fifteen minutes at their next board meeting to give a summary of SSA priorities generated from conversations with stakeholder groups.

VII. Comments by Student Advisory Panel Members

Board Chair Anne Marie Levis opened the floor to the student advisors to speak.

Ms. Chihorek, representing IHS, had served on the panel in the past and was excited to return. She stated that their student government was already hard at work, and had ten new members join. They had already gotten together once to talk about new projects (IHS Spring Olympics and the integration of an art gallery into the IHS celebration in May). All three IHS schools had come together for their welcome assembly, which was a presentation on IHS teachers, student passion projects, and who the student government leadership team was. The extended essay, a project for seniors, would be due in November, with the first draft due Monday October 7, 2019. Ms. Chihorek said that they had a new curriculum for freshman called Book Love, which would give students the first ten minutes of class to read any book of choice.

Ms. Ablow-Measelle, representing South Eugene High School, stated that she was new to the panel. She announced that they had their homecoming pep rally and class competitions (hall decorating, costume days, etc.) that week as a way to help boost school spirit. Their homecoming football game and dance were the weekend before, and they had a good turnout. Ms. Ablow-Measelle talked about how students at South Eugene High School had pushed to try and get rid of plastic utensils in the cafeteria and replace them with metal. Students had also met at the beginning of September and discussed what they wanted to see from SSA funding.

Ms. Mitchell, representing North Eugene High School, announced that their homecoming dance and football game would happen October 19, 2019. Since FASFA application had opened up, North Eugene High School had a FASFA night on October 2, 2019 to help students fill out applications.

Mr. Clendenen, representing Churchill High School, said that he was new to the panel and had not brought anything to talk about.

Ms. Hampton, representing Sheldon High School, mentioned that she had spoken with Mr. Torrey before the meeting about getting more money for extracurricular activities. She did not know if SSA funding would be the right place to get the money, but just wanted to advocate for art extracurricular, since they are often underfunded. Ms. Hampton also said that Sheldon High School's homecoming would be the following week.

Mr. Douglass, representing ECCO, stated that it was his first meeting on the panel and had been prepared to just watch and learn. ECCO's student leadership's focus during the year would be on building a culture and identity between the school and the community. As a way to start the project the school was making an art wall for student expression. Mr. Douglass ended his statement by thanking the board and taxpayers for the new ECCO School.

VIII. Comments and Committee Reports by Individual Board Members

Ms. Shabram acknowledged the indigenous land that they are on, and wanted to make the acknowledgement an official practice they did at every meeting. She was excited for the students to be back on the panel, since the board knows a lot, but they have no way of knowing what it is like to currently be a student in school. Ms. Shabram let the students know that they should urge others in their schools to come and speak at board meetings. She thought that Ms. Gordon's idea of self-assessing was a good idea.

Mr. Torrey announced that the audit and finance committee had its first meeting that night before the board meeting. The committee is going through and finding out where all their money is being spent, and making sure that they are meeting federal goals. Mr. Torrey recognized Andrea Belz and staff for their outstanding financial reporting. The staff had been recognized for

being a certificate holder for excellence in financial reporting for the thirty-second consecutive year. He said that the auditor remarked on how the finance department did a great job.

Ms. Newman welcomed the student panel to the board meeting, and remarked on how she missed their energy. She stated that the Eugene Education Foundation (EEF) had its first board meeting, and they talked about how they wanted to focus on early literacy for the year. Ms. Newman also went to the first legislative committee, and that their deadline for new bills would be in November. She said that she would email the school board at the latest by Friday October 4, 2019 to get their feedback on what their individual priorities for the legislative session would be. The legislative committee would be meeting with legislatures in early January.

Mr. Lafer stated that it was nice to serve on the audit and finance committee with Mr. Torrey because of his experience on the subject. Mr. Lafer mentioned to the board that every Oregon teacher spends around \$460 a year, out of their own pocket, on school supplies that funding does not cover. The education system, he said, runs on the idea that staff will go above and beyond to get things done. Mr. Lafer thought that the SSA meetings and listening sessions had been frustrating to attend. He said that getting public input seemed useless, since there was no way for them to fund everything. When it comes down to the actual budget it would be the administrative staff that made most of the choices. Mr. Lafer wanted to focus on targeted small funding that they could fund a lot of, instead of huge projects where they could only choose one.

Ms. Walston welcomed the student advisors to the board meeting. She agreed with Dr. Balderas that the 'public charge' law that would go into action in October had to be stopped, and the board needed to do whatever they could to help. Ms. Walston said that she had gone to a few of the SSA meetings, and had found them to be very helpful. She told Mr. Lafer that they were required to have community listening sessions, whether they ended up being helpful or not. Lastly, Ms. Walston wanted to mention that a new census would be out April 1, 2020 and that it would have big effects on the community and 4J's future funding.

Ms. Hays thanked Dr. Balderas for speaking up for those who cannot and being dedicated to supporting all students in their district. She looked forward to talking about what the board could do to help.

IX. Consent Group – Items for Action

- 1. Approve Personal Actions**
- 2. Approve Naviance Software License**
- 3. Approve Minutes from the Work Session on August 8, 2019**
- 4. Approve Minutes from the Work Session on August 28, 2019**
- 5. Ratify Awards for Capital Improvement Program (CIP) Bond Funded**

MOTION: Mr. Lafer moved, seconded by Ms. Levis, to pull "approve Naviance software license" from the consent group. The motion passed unanimously

Mr. Lafer wanted to get information on Naviance and what it did. He had heard that some counselors did not like it, and since it costs \$150,000 he wanted to make sure they made the right decision.

MOTION: Ms. Walston moved, seconded by Mr. Torrey, to approve the consent group as amended. The motion passed unanimously.

Dr. Balderas stated that the Naviance program is supposed to help counselors with keeping track of student career planning. Mr. Dey explained that the program presents a systematic way to create a five year plan that helps counselors be better prepared to help and guide students. As of right now, he said, the program is not used everywhere because it is new. Naviance is supposed to help with college applications, since it helps give students a space to keep letters of recommendation and a list of the colleges they are looking at. It also gives students the opportunity to look at what they might want to study or where they might want to work. Ms. Vandercar added that the \$150,000 gives the district three years with the program.

Mr. Lafer asked if Naviance is new to the district, or if it is something they had bought before. He also inquired into if counselors like it. Mr. Dey responded that, if approved, this would be their second time having a three year contract. He also said that counselors were involved in the initial decision to get the program, and that schools can request to use CIS if they wanted to instead. Dr. Balderas interjected to say that he had been walked through the program and how it works, and heard first hand from counselors that they find it helpful in keeping track of their students.

MOTION: Mary moved, seconded by Ms. Newman, to approve the Naviance software license. The motion passed unanimously.

X. Items for Information

1. Update on Implementation of Board Resolution in Support of Students and Families Regardless of Immigration Status

Karen Perez, Cydney Vandercar, and Christine Nesbit approached the board to present. Ms. Vandercar noted that on February 15, 2017 the board made a resolution that 4J schools would not ask about or document immigration status, nor would they disclose education records, nor permit law enforcement to access schools for any immigration law enforcement reason. The resolution would also require legal authorities to go to the superintendent office and contact the designated emergency contacts in the event that they are needed.

Ms. Nesbit reviewed that from February to June in 2017 they created a FAQ, changed and reviewed policies regarding their new resolution. They also continued their "Know Your Rights" trainings for school staff, so they knew how to deal with situations regarding how to not give away information. They also added in part-time translation and interpretation coordinators to help get rid of any possible miscommunications.

Ms. Nesbit moved to talk about what happened during the 2017/2018 school year. The district trained their administrators on the first amendment and bullying/harassment prevention. Near the end of the school year they updated their FAQ and reviewed the Migrant Education Procedures and Dual Language Program Practices. Ms. Nesbit stated that substitute teachers were not all trained, but that they were all at least emailed training information. The district also focused on limiting access outsiders would have to schools, as well as ways to heal the community after a crisis.

Ms. Perez continued to talk about the what they did at the end of the 2018 school year. A lot of policies and procedures were put into practice, and they worked with local community agencies to do so. The district also wanted to help get families prepared for any potential situations that might happen. This entailed letting families know what documents they would need to have, and what their legal rights are.

Ms. Nesbit stated that in the 2018/2019 school year the district continued training their staff, and added equity forums. The district also raised awareness for the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) and letting families know what documents to not turn over to authorities. Ms. Perez added that that year they changed enrollment forms so they did not ask questions about where families are from, or anything else that would potentially make families uncomfortable.

Ms. Perez announced that October 3, 2019 would be the districts first full Spanish equity forum. The forum would focus on how to fill out FASFA forms.

Ms. Perez said that they are still working to implement the boards resolution, and their next step is the Emergent Bilingual (ELL) development plan and to continue working with their community partnerships (LatinX Alliance, Immigration Network, Catholic Charities, etc.) to help figure out how to make all families feel welcome.

Chair Levis thanked Ms. Perez, Ms. Nesbit, and Ms. Vandercar for their presentation and hard work on implementing the resolution. She stated that they did a great job taking what the board wanted from the resolution, and making it a reality. Ms. Levis wanted to know if there was anything else they should be thinking about in regards to the resolution and its implementation. Dr. Balderas let her know that they were focused on hiring additional staff, since they now have more ELL students. Ms. Perez added that they have been comparing old and new ELL numbers, and they hope to have more diverse language staff because they have students that speak many different languages. 4J has 19 Saudi speakers, some unaccompanied minors, and some students that just got released from detention centers. Ms. Perez emphasized that families all look different, and they have to be prepared to help them in whatever way they can.

Ms. Newman commented on how much work the staff was able to get done in the last two years, and that she had never seen a resolution brought up in such a thorough way. She emphasized that this issue has only become more important in light of recent events.

Mr. Lafer thanked the staff for their effort and hard work. He mentioned that in Portland school districts treated ICE officers as active shooters, and had staff to help immigrants and students with undocumented family with trauma. Dr. Balderas thought that they could always do more training if they find it necessary.

Ms. Shabram talked about some examples in the 4J community that she had heard about recently where minors were approached by law enforcement with no parent or adult present. She wanted to know if the resolution policies could go farther in who they allow on campuses. Ms. Walston interjected that they tried to be strict on who could be on school grounds, but they got pushback from their attorneys. Dr. Balderas added that school staff is trained to reach out to parents whenever they think they should, but that police do not follow school rules if they think there is a threat.

Ms. Newman said that they should continue to add programs and partner with local agencies, but that they should not have to reorganize everything in the district to reach that goal. Ms. Perez agreed with her, and said that in 4J they believe in caring for children inside and outside of school.

Mr. Torrey remembered when the resolution was passed and the board room was full of community members asking the board to approve it. He said that they needed to continue to help students and their families in anyway they could.

2. Receive A Report on the 2019 OAKS (Oregon Assessment of Knowledge and Skills) Scores

Charis McGaughy and Oscar Louriero approached the board to present. Mr. Louriero told the board that the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) mandates annual assessments in English, math, and science. In 4J there was a big increase in test scores for the 2017/2018 school year, with a drop in the 2018/2019 school year. Mr. Louriero said that 4J's participation rates, however, went up in 2019 in both EL and math. He stated that 4J has the fourth highest proficiency rate when ranked against other districts in the state.

Ms. McGaughy said that they wanted to continue to improve their OAKS scores. One of the ways they would do that is through the vision 20/20 strategic plan. They would implement Professional Learning Communities (PLC) which would focus on individual student learning. They would also strengthen their Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS). Ms. McGaughy stated that 4J would continue to deepen their High School Success work, and strengthen their 9th grade on track systems of support and CTE programming.

Ms. Walston mentioned that the *Register Guard* had been critical of the 4J test scores. She wanted to know if there was anything they could do to improve them, or if either Mr. Louriero or Ms. McGaughy had any other thoughts on the scores. Mr. Louriero said that the drops in scores were across the state, and that 4J did not have any reason to not be happy with their scores.

3. Bond Update: School Construction and Program Moves

Kerry Delf, Kyle Tucker, and Ryan Spain approached the board to present. Ms. Delf said she would walk through the construction or relocation for Corridor Elementary, Yujin Gakuen Elementary, North Eugene High School, Willard Elementary, and Edison Elementary.

Ms. Delf said that they would be moving Corridor Elementary into the neighboring North Eugene High School while they do construction on a new high school and softball field. The move would start in the Summer of 2020. Ms. Delf mentioned that by the end of Summer 2020 they hoped to have a detailed site plan. She also said that by the end of October 2019 they would have made a final building location decision for where the Corridor kids would be inside of North Eugene. As of right now they are between two plans: having the elementary kids in the South East wing, or having them in a more central location.

Ms. Delf stated that Yujin Gakuen would have a very similar time line, and would move into Kelly Middle School in Summer 2020. They would also have their building plan ready by the end of October. They were trying to decide between putting the elementary school kids in the east or west wing of Kelly Middle School.

Ms. Delf ran through the plan for the North Eugene High School construction. They would begin site prep in Summer 2020, start construction in 2021, and move back into the school in 2023. Mr. Tucker mentioned that they were currently in the designing process. He stated that they had done a Geotech study and a survey to try and figure out what kind of design they should do. They started looking at contracts for the work recently, and would present their selection to the board at a later date.

Ms. Delf said that a new softball field would also be built at the North Eugene site. Construction on it would begin in 2020. Mr. Spain said that they are about ready to submit their design for the project. Ms. Delf added that there would be bidding in the Spring for the 2020 construction. Mr.

Spain mentioned that since the softball field would face out into a neighborhood they have to be aware of how they place netting and lighting.

Ms. Delf talked about the swing school that would be placed at the Willard Elementary site. They would use the gym that is currently at the site, but build new structures for classrooms. Edison Elementary would move in during Summer 2020 and move out in Summer 2022. Camas Elementary would move in right after Edison moved out during the Summer of 2022. Camas would then move out and into their new school in Summer 2024. Mr. Spain informed the board that they were looking into design and who would contract for the site, and would present for them soon.

Ms. Walston thanked staff for their hard work, and voters for getting the bond passed. She wondered how the school day would work at North Eugene High School with the Corridor Elementary children in the same building. Ms. Delf responded that since Corridor did not have bus drop off, there would be no issues with transportation. Also, the elementary and high school students would be separated physically by having different front doors/offices. There would also be different start and end class times. Ms. Delf let her know that more details on that process would be given to the board once they were worked out.

Chair Levis said that there was a long facilities meeting the week before, and that they gave good input on the plans that were just presented.

4. Receive an Update on the Student Success Act (SSA) Plan

Kerry Delf and Chair McGaughy approached the board to present. Ms. Delf reported that Oregon would receive \$1 billion a year across the state, with half going to the Student Investment Plan. She said that 4J would receive \$12 million a year that would go towards providing support for students in need. Over the past month they focused on five priority areas (academic disparities, behavioral & mental health, equitable access to courses, teacher & staff collaboration, and partnerships) and heard a lot of good input from the community. The next stage of the process would be developing a plan for the investments.

Ms. Delf reported that in September they had a lot of forums for staff, stakeholders, and community members to voice their thoughts and opinions on what 4J should do with the SSA money. Ms. McGaughy told the board that their biggest stakeholder turn out had been from students. They also sent out a survey, which received 727 responses. Since the survey was all open-ended questions, they were able to gather a lot of information. Ms. Delf said that they would have another online survey running through all of November.

Ms. Newman said that she had attended some of the forums and that she thought staff did a good job of framing the money and what it was meant to be spent on. She talked about how, for decades, the school board has had to cut programming, and because of that so many people in the community are coming forward with ideas and requests on what should be brought back. Ms. Newman told staff that they were doing a good job with that was being thrown at them.

Mr. Lafer mentioned that the SSA money outside of normal funding (\$2 million of CTE) was also important to focus on, and wanted more information to be made public on it. Ms. Newman said that over the last two years the board had seen several presentations on CTE funding plans, but since Mr. Lafer was new to the board he had not seen any. She thought they should find the presentations and share them with him.

Chair Levis appreciated the openness that they have had with the community, and talked about the many good conversations that she has had with community members at the forums.

Ms. Shabram had attended a forum the week prior and worried that they were setting the community up to be let down. They are talking about so many ideas at the meetings, and while they are all good, there is no way for them to fund everything. Ms. Shabram talked to many community members about how she loved their ideas, but in reality had no idea how much they would cost to go through with. When they present the final budget, she thought that the community might feel like they were not heard. Ms. Delf told her that they were working to make a list of costs based on what the community has asked for. They would present those numbers at future forums.

Mr. Torrey mentioned a conversation he had with ex-high school teachers about funding. He had asked them where they thought the money should go and was surprised to hear them say it should go towards K-4 education. They said that since it is during those years that students learn the basics that the rest of their education is built upon and that is where the money should go.

Dr. Balderas told the board that next week they would have more focused groups, and he hoped that board members would go to those.

Ms. Walston said that she was on the budget committee for a really long time, and cut \$2.5 million out of the budget over the course of five years. She stated that there is no way for them to make up all that with just \$12 million, and that they should invest in the long term programs.

XI. Items for Action at Future Meeting

1. Board Working Agreements

Ms. Walston assumed that the agreements were approved since no one emailed her back about revisions. Mr. Lafer was confused on what version of the agreement they were talking about. He remembered there was one that just had suggestions from every board member. Ms. Walston replied that she had gotten clarification on what board members said from that version, and that she was talking about the version after that which had all the agreements written out.

Mr. Lafer wanted to wait to talk about the agreements until next meeting. Ms. Levis told him that they would wait and that they were just looking for any more revisions on what Ms. Walston had written so far. She told the board to look over the document and email Ms. Walston if they had any changes they wanted made.

2. Consider for Approval the Adoption, Revisions to, and Deletions of Board Policies

Christine Nesbit approached the board to do a first read of several board policies that would be adopted, revised, and deleted. In the interest of time she would not go into detail on the policies, but urged the board to look in their packets and read over the changes.

Ms. Nesbit listed out the new policies that would be added: CPA (Layoff/Recall of Licensed Administrative Staff) and IBDJA (Homeschooled Students).

Ms. Nesbit recited the policies that would be revised: BA (Board Goals), BBA (Board Powers and Duties), BCF (Advisory Committee), ECAB (Vandalism/Malicious Mischief/Theft), GBDA (Milk Expression), JECB (Admission of Nonresident Students), JFC (Student Conduct), and JGAB (Restraint or Seclusion).

Ms. Nesbit informed the board on what policies would be deleted: JHFDA (Suspension of Student Driving Privileges).

Chair Levis asked if JGAB (Restraint or Seclusion) would go through another round of revisions. Ms. Nesbit said that it was possible and that it just depends on the update they receive. She told the board that right now they are just making sure that all their policies match up with the law.

Ms. Walston thanked Ms. Nesbit for an update and clarification on GBDA (Milk Expression).

3. Initiate Process for 6-8 Mathematics Curriculum Adoption

Charis McGaughy approached the board and stated that she would be filling in for Sue Wilson who was sick.

Ms. McGaughy said that they had initiated the process for the new 6-8 Mathematics curriculum. In 2012 4J purchased the college preparatory math curriculum, which would expire at the end of the 2019/2020 school year. She stated that there were no big changes at the middle school level, but there were some at the high school level. Ms. McGaughy told the board that middle school Math teachers saw gaps in the their curriculum and wanted to adopt the process immediately. The current issue with that is they do not have the information for the high school program, however they could adopt middle school and go back and approve high school standards when they come out.

Ms. Walston inquired into if board members on the structural policy committee would be involved in the process of adopting the new curriculum. Ms. McGaughy replied that they were and it would be brought in front of them soon.

Mr. Lafer said that CPM was opposed by math teachers but was adopted anyways. He wanted to make sure that whatever process they adopt next is approved by teachers, since they are the people that are in charge of teaching the curriculum. Mr. Lafer thought it might be a good idea to give teachers some sort of veto power. Ms. Levis informed Mr. Lafer that he would hear all about the curriculum break down and what teachers think at the structural committee meeting. She added that CPM did not go through a process, since they did not have one at the time. The process they use now was created because CPM did not go through one.

XII. Suggestions by the Board for Consideration of Items at a Future Meeting

1. Meeting Dates:

October 16, 2019 – Work Session and Regular Board Meeting

October 23, 2019 – Work Session

November 6, 2019 – Work Session and Regular Board Meeting

November 20, 2019 – Regular Board Meeting

Chair Levis called for board members to put forward any potential agenda items for future meetings.

Ms. Newman wanted them to vote on what legislative priorities they wanted to focus on. She hoped to have all ideas in and ready to be voted on by November 6, 2019. Ms. Newman asked if they could have it as an item for information at their October 16, 2019 meeting, and then give a final presentation on it afterwards.

Mr. Lafer wanted to go back to what Sabrina Gordon from EEA requested at the beginning of the meeting. He thought that they should give the Students First Alliance time to talk at their

next meeting. Ms. Levis agreed, and thought that they should just give them more time to talk than usual during employee group comments. All board members agreed with that course of action.

Mr. Lafer also wanted to talk about his potential policy on free pads and tampons in all middle school and high school bathrooms. While it was not a pressing issue, he hoped to talk about it whenever they had time. Ms. Levis told him that since he had already sent out his ideas for the policy, he should make a pitch to see if the board supported it.

Mr. Lafer told the board that the policy dealt with equity and attendance issues. He wanted to make the idea policy so that it would not be possible to cut funding for it in the future. Mr. Lafer informed the board that his policy is different than the one already in action because it specifically says that the menstrual products should be given out in a discrete location where no one would be potentially embarrassed.

Ms. Newman said that she supported the idea Mr. Lafer had, but did not believe that everything needed to be made into policy. She wanted to explore what other options they had available.

Ms. Walston agreed, especially because they were already giving free menstrual products away at middle schools and high schools. She thought that adding policy was not the right action. If anything, Ms. Walston thought that they could modify existing policy. She mentioned that it would fit in well with the student health policy.

Mr. Torrey agreed that policy might not be the right course of action. He said he was worried what would happen if they started to make everything policy.

Chair Levis said she liked the idea but thought they should look into adding to the student health policy.

Mr. Lafer understood where board members were coming from concerning policy, and thought they should look into adding to the student health policy.

Mr. Torrey said that they should get things moving and have staff create a policy write up and that way the board would have a better understanding of what they were talking about. Ms. Levis agreed, and asked staff to have a presentation available at the next possible meeting. Mr. Lafer said that at the next meeting he just hoped to have a more in-depth conversation on options.

Mr. Lafer said that he also wanted to talk about policy on religious holidays. He stated that students who take time off for religious holidays during the school year get piled up with homework, tests, quizzes, and projects. Dr. Balderas informed Mr. Lafer that this is already an item for information on their current policy. Ms. Shabram agreed that it would be a good thing to look into. As a student she faced issues of falling behind when taking time off for religious holidays. Ms. Levis said that they would put it on the agenda under items for information.

Ms. Shabram wanted to talk about what 4J's policy on walk outs was. Ms. Levis said that they would put it on their agenda for future meetings.

Ms. Walston thought they should end the list there, since they do not want to overburden their staff with work.

XIII. Adjourn

Chair. Levis adjourned the board meeting at 10:16 p.m.

(Work Session Minutes Recorded by Marina Brassfield)

(Regular Board Meeting Minutes recorded by Lydia Dysart)

Dr. Gustavo Balderas
District Clerk

Anne Marie Levis
Board Chair