

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

Date: September 18, 2024

The Board of Directors (BOD) of School District No. 4J, Lane County, Oregon, held a work session at 6:00 p.m. in-person at the Education Center, 200 North Monroe Street in Eugene, Oregon, via live-stream and broadcast on KRVM. Notice of the meeting was emailed to the media and posted on the 4J website on September 13, 2024.

ROLL CALL

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:

Jenny Jonak, Chair
Tom Di Liberto, Vice Chair
Maya Rabasa
Judy Newman
Morgan Munro
Rick Hamilton (online)

BOARD MEMBERS ABSENT:

Ericka Thessen

STAFF:

Colt Gill, Interim Superintendent
Carmen Xiomara Urbina, Chief of Staff
Matt Brown, Director of Finance
Arthur Hart, Director of Transportation
Larry Williams, Assistant Superintendent of Instruction and Access
Sherry Moore, Executive Assistant to the Chief of Staff
Debbie McKim, Executive Assistant to the Interim Superintendent and Board

EMPLOYEE GROUPS:

Lisa Jenkins-Easton, Oregon School Employees Association (OSEA)

OTHER GUESTS:

Krista Parent, Executive Director of Coalition of School Administrators (COSA)
Kerri Frazee, Prevention Services Administrator
Shasta Quigley, MTSS Systems Specialist
Melissa Barbour, MTSS Systems Specialist

MEDIA:

KRVM

Register Guard

I. CALL TO ORDER, ROLL CALL

Chair Jenny Jonak called the work session to order at 6:00 p.m. She said the names of the board members who were present. Board member Ericka Thessen was absent.

II. AGENDA APPROVAL

The agenda was approved as amended.

III. COMMENTS BY EMPLOYEE GROUPS

There were none.

IV. CONSENT GROUP – ITEMS FOR ACTION

1. APPROVE BOARD WORK SESSION MINUTES FOR AUGUST 21, 2024

2. APPROVE THE PURCHASE OF TYLER TECHNOLOGY SCHOOL BUS TABLETS

3. APPROVE FIELD TRIP FOR CHURCHILL HIGH SCHOOL REPRESENTATIVE RACHEL CARSON ACADEMY TO OLYMPIC NATIONAL PARK, WASHINGTON

MOTION: Vice Chair Di Liberto moved to approve the consent group as presented. Ms. Munro seconded. **The motion passed unanimously, 6:0:0; Chair Jonak, Vice Chair Di Liberto, Ms. Newman, Ms. Rabasa, Ms. Munro, and Mr. Hamilton all voting in favor.**

V. ITEMS FOR ACTION

There were none.

VI. ITEMS FOR INFORMATION

1. BOARD COMMITTEE REPORTS

LEGISLATIVE BOARD COMMITTEE

Ms. Newman reported that the Legislative Board Committee met and discussed the process for setting legislative priorities for the year. They are targeting early January, 2025 for participating in the legislative breakfast. She referenced two examples (2021 and 2023 sessions) which were provided in the meeting packet. She explained that they do not have their own lobbyist, so they do not introduce legislation, however they do have priorities. At the next Board of Directors (BOD) meeting, the committee hopes to collect additional feedback regarding priorities. She added that the Oregon School Boards Association (OSBA) Legislative Road Show is scheduled for October 15, 2024.

COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT BOARD COMMITTEE

Mr. Hamilton updated the BOD about the Community Engagement Board Committee. He said at their last meeting, the committee discussed whether they should host a listening session or a less formal chat session. He described their main purpose as connecting with community members. He added that they are considering the possibility of hosting sessions at multiple locations and possibly more than one session occurring on a set date. He said the committee is seeking direction from the BOD.

Ms. Rabasa, who is also on the committee, added that they will be presenting multiple proposals and a recommendation for the structure of community engagement at the next BOD meeting.

STUDENT VOICE BOARD COMMITTEE

Vice Chair Di Liberto and Chief of Staff Carmen Xiomara Urbina reported on the Student Voice Board Committee. They referenced a summary of the proposal outlining the process for recruiting high school student board representatives. Vice Chair Di Liberto introduced a three-phase roll out over a three-year timeline. He said ultimately there will be a representative from each high school in the district.

Ms. Urbina described a brainstorming session with high school principals focused on the goal of activating student voice in a strategic way. Through their discussion, it was determined that the district should further refine the process for selecting student representatives and apply an equity lens.

Ms. Urbina summarized the plan/process:

Phase 1: Retain current student representatives who have one term year remaining; align with two-student policy (i.e. a student representative and a student representative elect); and develop Principal Advisory Committee(s).

Phase 2: Informed by the work of the Principal Advisory Committee(s), refine the selection process for next school year's student representatives.

Phase 3: Implement the selection process for student representatives.

Ms. Urbina referenced a detailed ten-page report available to the BOD.

Ms. Rabasa asked if there is a self-selection process during the current 2024-25 school year.

Ms. Urbina responded that while a student may put their name forward for consideration as a student representative, the district is seeking a student with the specific values outlined in the report.

Chair Jonak requested that the report be made available online for public viewing.

Staff responded affirmatively.

SUPERINTENDENT SEARCH AD HOC BOARD COMMITTEE

Ms. Newman reported on the Superintendent Search Ad Hoc Board Committee. They are in the process of selecting a search firm for the superintendent search. The Request for Proposals (RFP) closed on September 23, 2024. The committee is hopeful that they will receive up to six applications. The screening process will occur September 24 through September 30, 2024. The approval of finalists will occur on October 9 and virtual interviews are scheduled for October 16, 2024. The final selection of the search firm will occur by October 23, 2024.

2. RECEIVE INFORMATION ABOUT 4J STUDENT SUPPORT MATRIX

Assistant Superintendent of Instruction and Access Larry Williams, Prevention Services Administrator Kerri Frazee, MTSS Systems Specialist Shasta Quigley, and MTSS Systems Specialist Melissa Barbour presented information about the student support matrix via PowerPoint presentation.

Mr. Williams spoke of the need to correct the district's disproportionate disciplinary practices. He said the trend aligns with national data.

He said the goal was to provide a transparent tool for students, families, staff, and the community. He explained that it is currently difficult for families when an incident occurs because the district cannot share information. Their hope is that the student support matrix will lend to a greater understanding regarding disciplinary action.

Ms. Barbour elaborated by stating that historically, the district's disciplinary practices have varied across schools, and suspension data has shown disproportionate discipline occurring for students of color and students with disabilities. In their review process, staff examined matrices from different districts. She referenced Oakland Unified School District and highlighted certain aspects of their comprehensive plan and tools, such as restorative practices, prevention, and supportive rather than punitive approaches.

She reiterated that state and national data reveal a trend that students of color, with disabilities, in poverty, and who are struggling academically are more likely to receive exclusionary discipline such as out-of-school suspensions and expulsion. Eugene School District 4J data also follows the trend as it relates to higher rates of exclusionary discipline for students of color.

Ms. Quigley added that randomly selected district data reveals that over penalizing students of color begins at the elementary level and continues through middle and high school. As just one example, she cited vastly disproportionate rates of detention for tardiness for white students (lower) versus students of color (higher). She said the district

is looking beyond the student support matrix to consider preventative measures and instill best practices.

Ms. Quigley provided a timeline of the student support matrix, which began in 2022. She summarized a soft rollout in year one, with a focus on establishing consistency school to school, and using the matrix to ensure more equitable and consistent discipline practices. She referenced the Student Support Flow Chart (formerly the Discipline Matrix) which is a quick reference guide for school administrators.

Ms. Barbour provided several examples of year 1 resources, including various quick reference guides intended to, among other things, engage students, inform families, and provide restoration. She emphasized a suspension consideration tool intended to encourage administrators to “pause” before hastily initiating an exclusionary disciplinary action.

Ms. Quigley described year 2 highlights, including changes to the student support matrix informed by administrator feedback, examining mitigating factors, and addressing new issues, such as major technology violations.

Ms. Barbour introduced future steps for year 3 including implementing a site-specific Student Support Flowchart for Teachers, greater access for community/families, a system to field concerns about potentially harmful interventions, and providing more explicit linkage to resources.

Mr. Williams opened up the floor for discussion.

Vice Chair Di Liberto asked about the status of restorative practices training for 4J staff.

Mr. Williams responded that two years ago the district began training staff with an emphasis on applying a restorative mindset to disciplinary action.

Mr. Hamilton questioned the necessity of the intricate nature of the Student Support Matrix.

Mr. Williams responded that it is so intricate due to the vast amount of information that must be included.

Ms. Newman asked what kind of reaction they have received from administrators and teachers.

Mr. Williams described staff reaction as overall positive.

Chair Jonak asked if input from interested parties included students and family members.

Mr. Williams responded that they spoke with student affinity groups, but they have not yet received input from families.

Ms. Rabasa inquired about support for educators, for example, what the district is doing to support shared definitions of the 3 Ds: defiance, disruption, and disrespect.

Ms. Quigley responded that they hold discussions centered around the concept of respect and examine how definitions might differ if you are a student v an educator.

Ms. Barbour described a tool for educators to use in the classroom called a Respect Agreement Lesson Plan which supports the development of community agreements. She explained that if educators want restoration, they must have something to restore to.

Ms. Quigley added that part of the goal is that the matrix is safe and accessible for educators as well as students.

Ms. Rabasa responded that the community agreements appeal to her because public education can sometimes be a possible mechanism for diluting one's culture and replacing it with the dominant culture.

Ms. Munro spoke to the prevention piece, stating that she is excited staff are being trained to the extent that the Student Support Matrix becomes less necessary. She asked how the district is including the intentional supported learning necessary for [disciplined] students while ensuring the safety of the students, peers and staff.

Ms. Frazee responded that tier 2 and tier 3 strategies support that, and the district is working to infuse more into those strategies in order to support students.

Mr. Williams added that with sound tier 1 interventions, there will be less need for tier 2 and tier 3 interventions.

Ms. Quigley emphasized the importance of having strategies that feel supportive to educators, she explained that a good behavior plan is often about helping the adults feel predictability and safety. Strategies (such as flow charts) help educators feel confident that they are responding in a way that everybody has agreed is in the best interest of the student, as opposed to having to make decisions throughout the day.

Oregon School Employees Association (OSEA) President Lisa Jenkins-Easton provided her comments, stating that she has had the job of entering hundreds of discipline incidents in her role at Sheldon High School. She expressed appreciation that the topic is being addressed. She cited discrepancies in reporting across the district. She questioned if classified staff were engaged during the development of the matrix and recommended improving the form being used for reporting. Ms. Jenkins-Easton added that often when a student is sent from a classroom it is with classified staff. She offered that restorative practices are not just for the student and the teacher but all the educators.

Ms. Quigley validated Ms. Jenkins-Easton's comments, stating that the district is working on improving the reporting form.

Ms. Newman left the work session at 7:45 p.m.

3. DEVELOP A MECHANISM FOR TIMELY FEEDBACK EMBEDDED THROUGHOUT THE YEAR, AS A COMPONENT OF THE SUPERINTENDENT EVALUATION

Executive Director of Coalition of Oregon School Administrators (COSA) Krista Parent presented developing a mechanism for timely feedback embedded throughout the year as a component of the superintendent evaluation via PowerPoint presentation, i.e. a superintendent evaluation and feedback process.

Ms. Parent mentioned historically the Oregon School Board Association (OSBA) ran the process for the state, guiding how superintendent evaluations were conducted. COSA became involved seven years ago and they collaborated on developing a manual.

Ms. Parent initiated a discussion about why a superintendent evaluation is important, aside from the legal requirements. She provided examples, such as from the school board's perspective it is important to celebrate and highlight the accomplishments of the district, led by the superintendent. And from the superintendent's perspective it is important to get direction and help to prioritize the work of the district for the next year.

Interim Superintendent Gill commented that superintendents are always seeking clarity, hearing individual comments are valuable, and the collaboration between superintendent and school board is stronger when there is open dialogue and information sharing.

Members of the BOD provided their comments about why they think a superintendent evaluation is important.

Ms. Parent outlined components that govern and direct the superintendent evaluation:

1. Superintendent contract
2. School board policy and administrative regulations
3. Superintendent standards
4. Superintendent job description
5. Superintendent goals

She explained that they recommend the superintendent provide performance standard reports monthly. The report can be provided during executive session.

Regarding the final evaluation, she said those typically occur before June. She suggested determining which set of standards the BOD is going to use. Ms. Parent offered a list of several standards, and recommended the set co-designed by COSA/OSBA and modeled after the National Education Leadership Preparation (NELP) standards. She noted that establishing performance goals for the superintendent's evaluation *must* be developed and approved in a board meeting open to the public.

Ms. Parent provided a handout for review titled 2021-22 Superintendent Evaluation Report for reference.

Ms. Parent offered a review of current 4J superintendent goals:

1. 4J as a gem
2. Mentor and affirm the team
3. Grow community and staff trust and partnership
4. Secure 4J's future

She offered that when considering consensus ratings v average ratings, COSA and OSBA recommend consensus ratings. They also recommend, after the evaluation is conducted, providing a statement by the board in a public meeting (a sample is available in the handout).

Ms. Parent detailed eight action items for the superintendent evaluation and feedback process.

1. Identify superintendent goals
2. Fine tune process, determine standards, and if there will be solicitation of any other input
3. Mid-year, ideally monthly, report
4. Self-evaluation presented to the board
5. Individual board member ratings of the superintendent
6. Board member ratings compiled by consultant and a consensus rating and report given to the board
7. Board meets with superintendent in executive session to review performance
8. A written summary of the superintendent's evaluation shall be provided to the superintendent and placed in the superintendent's file

She advised that the BOD must provide written notice of the renewal or nonrenewal of an administrator contract for the following year by March 15 if the individual is not going to be renewed. She noted that the superintendent evaluation does not need to be completed by March 15, only the written notice does.

Ms. Parent responded to questions from the BOD.

In response to a question posed by Ms. Munro, Ms. Parent explained that one of the biggest questions that both the superintendent and the BOD will want to explore is "Which of these standards and goals do we not have an idea about?"

Chair Jonak asked if there is any guidance about how to evaluate the superintendent separate from the district.

Ms. Parent recommended establishing a baseline so the BOD can determine a superintendent's growth.

Interim Superintendent Gill questioned how the evaluation process might differ in different sized districts.

Ms. Parent responded that there are differences. It is typically a more formal process in a bigger district yet receiving additional input, and targeted feedback, is more challenging.

Ms. Parent concluded her presentation by stating that when COSA receives updates on standards they will report them back to School District 4J.

VII. ADJORN

Chair Jonak adjourned the work session at 9:00 p.m.



Colt Gill
District Clerk



Jenny Jonak
Board Chair

(Recorded by LCOG)
Approved on 11/06/2024