

Three Rivers School District Board of Directors met for a special session, Tuesday, April 7, 2015 at the District Administrative Office, 8550 New Hope Road, Grants Pass, Josephine County, Oregon at 5:00 p.m.

PRESENT: Danny York, Board Chair, Zone II
Kate Dwyer, Member of the Board, Zone I PRESENT
Kara Olmo, Member of the Board, Zone III
Ron Crume, Member of the Board, Zone IV
Ron Lengwin, Vice-Chair of the Board, Zone V
David Holmes, Superintendent-Clerk
Casey Alderson, Director of Secondary Ed., Athletics & Alt. Ed.

ABSENT: Dave Valenzuela, Director of K-8 Education & Technology ABSENT
Stephanie Allen-Hart, Director of Student Services
Debbie Breckner, Director of Human Resources

Also Present: Kari O'Brien, Van Grainger, Kaye Paulson, Penelope ALSO PRESENT
DiGennaro/Sunny Wolf Charter School Principal, Dave Marks
and Shelly Quick/Recording Secretary.

Board Chair Danny York called the meeting to order at 5:00 p.m. and led the audience in the Pledge of Allegiance. CALL TO ORDER

Board Member Lengwin made a motion to approve the agenda. Ron Crume seconded and the motion passed unanimously. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Board Chair York brought forward the Consent Agenda. Items in the consent agenda will be approved by a single motion unless a member of the Board or the Superintendent requests that an item or items be removed and voted upon separately. Member Olmo moved to approve the Consent Agenda as presented. Member Dwyer seconded and the motion passed unanimously. CONSENT AGENDA

Sunny Wolf Charter School Principal Penelope DiGennaro handed out the *Annual Report Sunny Wolf Charter School* to each of the board members. She reported that Sunny Wolf Charter School (SWCS) has made significant progress since the beginning of the school in September 2010. They started with 42 students and this year they have 79 students. Their latest OAKS test scores (2014) earned them a Model School ranking. They went from a Level 2 to a Level 5 school. They include art, PE and computers in their curriculum of Math, Language Arts, Reading, History and Science. The students perform community service by helping out at the Senior Center twice a week. Volunteers put in a school garden and the students plant and take care of it as part of their studies. Fresh vegetables from the garden get used on the kitchen where they have a Cook who plans and cooks a nutritious breakfast and lunch every day according to USDA guidelines. They also have a Fresh Fruits and Vegetables Program for snacks for the students. SUNNY WOLF CHARTER SCHOOL UPDATE

Ms. DiGennaro shared information on the curriculum, classroom make-ups and updated the board on renovations and improvements to the property. She shared the audited financial statements, proof of insurance as well as their current Profit and

SUNNY WOLF CHARTER
SCHOOL UPDATE
(CONTINUED)

Loss Budget vs. actual. She reported their finances are in good shape and every year they have a carryover from the budget which goes into reserves to be used in emergencies. She proudly reported that their students are happy and learning and the staff is exceptional and dedicated to all working together to provide the best possible education and environment for children and invited the board to come visit the school.

Member Lengwin asked if the Senior Center was local? Ms. DiGennaro responded that it was and the students walk there twice a week to help.

Member Olmo asked about their food service program and how they provide food? Ms. DiGennaro said that they do their own food and are able to provide free lunch for everyone because they have over the percentage that is required for free lunch. They are reimbursed by the state (USDA program).

SITING OF SECOND
PORTABLE AT FRUITDALE

Superintendent Holmes said the discussion around a possible second portable at Fruitdale came out of a discussion at last month's board meeting concerning the decision to go with one portable or two at Fruitdale for next year due to the increase in enrollment and the kindergarten piece. He explained that currently we have two kindergarten classes with 30 each. The teachers are doing a phenomenal job in providing an incredible learning environment—that said, those students are not getting the education they could be getting with a smaller class size. Those students are going to become first graders next year. Historically, the kindergarten class sizes have been 25 or 26. This is the first year where kindergarten has gone to 30. The theory statewide was a 10-15% increase in kindergarten enrollment when moving to an all day full time kindergarten. We very likely will be back at that same size of kindergarten classes again next year. It presents an obvious number of problems from a staffing perspective and funding perspective just to reduce those class sizes, but if we don't have space we don't have those options regardless. The current one portable that we are committed to will be designed to be filled with the current growth and existing classes that are there. That portable, which will be two classrooms, will house current students with current teachers with the one extra kindergarten classroom that gets created. There will not be any additional space on the one portable. We're already housing Camp Sunrise in a closet off of the office—it's not really a closet, more like a book storage space. It's about the size of the kitchen space off of the board room. It was remodeled very nicely by the maintenance crew. It is serving the 3-5 students that we currently have in the program. The Camp Sunrise group is a pretty needy group of students that when put in large numbers in close proximity of each other create quite a few problems. It also has no windows. It's not a very attractive and accommodating space. The second portable would be used, as he sees it, would be used for any additional space—whether we split the first grade class, which is the two 30's right now in kindergarten. We also have a very large fourth grade class at Fruitdale that could be split as well. Title also has no place to serve the students in the building. He just got a letter from the Housing Authority of Jackson County concerning a HUD housing development that they are putting in directly behind Fruitdale. They are breaking ground this summer on a 50 unit complex and will have the housing units filled by Fall of 2016. They are expecting 65 children under 18 years of age, 35 of which would be K-5. We need to do something more of a permanent solution at Fruitdale. The portables are just a short-term stop gap measure.

Member Olmo stated that we have looked at re-districting with Fruitdale and asked if we have ever had a conversation with Grants Pass? Is this a situation where we have to work with Grants Pass to redefine what's Three Rivers and what's Grants Pass? Part of the issue is we don't have enough schools close enough to Fruitdale to help us have options. We don't want to do something where we end up in a worse enrollment situation. Member Crume stated that we would have to work with the City of Grants Pass because it would be urban growth boundary lines—or the county. Ms. Olmo asked who decides

where the school district line is? Mr. Holmes said he doesn't know the answer to that. In the state of Washington it's OSPI which if that would follow lines in Oregon that would be ODE. Ms. Olmo said she wouldn't want to go down a path if it would be detrimental but we need to serve all of our kids in our community. Mr. Crume added that people in that area pay city taxes because they are in the urban growth boundary, but there kids go to the county schools. Mr. Holmes said having talked to John Higgins at length, they are in a situation where they have taken out a loan to add on classrooms to all of these elementaries because they are out of space as well. It doesn't mean there isn't a possibility they might raise their hand—probably not to help us out, but maybe if it helps them out. He would just need to get himself up to speed in the state of Oregon when it comes to boundaries. In the state of Oregon it is a very complicated process that involves petitions to the local ESD's then goes to ODE. It's not something that is taken lightly. It's a long, lengthy, drawn out process. Ms. Olmo said it might not be the solution anyways. When we look at redrawing our lines it's so complicated because the next school is so far away. Mr. Holmes said we have looked at those bus routes pretty thoroughly. Both between Ft. Vannoy and Madrona and Applegate to see if there was any way and there is not an efficient model that works. It costs us money and it's costs extra time on buses for kids so it's a lose-lose.

SITING OF SECOND
PORTABLE AT
FRUITDALE
(CONTINUED)

Mr. Crume asked if there was a site plan to show where these portables are going to go? Mr. Holmes explained they would go directly behind the building. One would go just to the south of the covered play area. The other one would go south of that. There is a hallway that goes out to the playground area on the southwest corner and that first portable would be placed there. There would still be sufficient playground area. The next step in the process would be to look at if we had the capacity as a district to look at something, whether it's a bond measure or a loan, that would enable us to put a permanent structure on the end of that building which would solve all of the problems. Enrollment does pay for a lot of space. Ms. Olmo wants to continue to support the gardening program, ahead of any changes happening that may effect it. She wants to ensure we work with the school to make sure programs like the gardening club are moved with support and that they get something bigger and better to keep and build that enthusiasm. She has heard only really positive things about that program and she would have for us to solve our problem at the expense of something really good at the school. Mr. Holmes agreed.

Fruitdale Title One teacher Kaye Paulson reiterated what Mr. Holmes said. She sees the portables as solving the immediate problem. Camp Sunrise with it being in the book room creates it's own problems because those are the kids that need more space. They are also right across from the kindergarten class, which is not an ideal spot for them. They also have to now search through boxes to try and find things because they are out of space. She explained how the groups work and the issues that the lack of space causes. She feels that adding the extra portable would be very important. It would definitely be used.

Ms. Olmo expressed concern over the Camp Sunrise situation. The space they are located in is not conducive on learning. Is there any options for this right now? Even moving them to a different school or a mobile building? Ms. Holmes responded that they have had those discussions and he wanted to assure them that the students are not receiving a poor education or are not getting what they need. He believes it is a serviceable location right now but its not ideal. They discussed the possibility of moving the program to another school but the decision was made that the current facility that they are in right now is the best we can offer them right now. He would love to be able to solve that problem more long term with them. He encouraged them to come by and take a look at the room. It is not unattractive. They put new carpeting and painted all of the walls, has great lighting. Ms. Paulson added that sometimes the Camp Sunrise students join other classes.

SITING OF SECOND
PORTABLE AT FRUITDALE
(CONTINUED)

Mr. Holmes stated that the costs are covered under CET funds. What he needs from the board is a go-ahead to do the second portable as opposed to doing just the one. His recommendation is to do the second portable. When there was discussion about this last month there was a desire to make sure that it got on an agenda and that anybody that wanted to show up to say something or have concerns one way or the other would be able to do that.

Mr. Crume agreed that it does need to go on the agenda because he has questions right away. He wants to see a site plan, a budget for it—do we have a budget for it? He knows what we ran in to at Madrona putting those portables, with the electronics and everything. Mr. Holmes responded that the cost would be \$100,000. He has the budget done for the first one, about \$74,000 for the actual portable and then you add on the ramp, permits, etc. Mr. Crume would like to see some accountability. He wants to see the budget and who is in charge of putting a budget together. He would like to vote on it to approve that so they can see where they wind up with our budget after it's done. Ms. Olmo stated that although it is on the agenda for today, it is only on as a discussion item. So going ahead and just approving it without those items when it wasn't put on as an action item—unless this is an emergency. It is a little bit of a stretch.

Mr. Holmes responded that he doesn't know how to answer that because it's who do you believe when you talk to the representatives, the salesman, the County, etc. Everybody has a job to do in terms of the process. The particular hold up is getting the okay to the manufacturer who creates the portable. Ms. Olmo asked if it would be possible to do a motion to approve the intent to move forward two to put everything in motion and then get real numbers back and then vote on moving forward? Mr. Holmes said that would be fine. Ms. Olmo said they all have the same intention and want to do what's best for the district and our kids but she would like to see. Mr. Crume said the other questions he has are we going to subcontract this stuff out and do we have bids on it? Hard numbers? He thinks about all the problems that happened with the Madrona thing—subcontracting it out and over budget things that happened. As he said at the Fleming meeting, he is concerned with the financial things that are going on right now with our district. Mr. Holmes responded that he has the real numbers on the first one. To answer Mr. Crume's question the bids are done through the state bids. The manufacturer's are approved on a state bid so those numbers are available online. He then explained how the state bid process works. Mr. Crume responded that was not so much his concern. The fiasco at Madrona—the portables came from within the district. The fiasco was the electronics, the fire alarm, the wireless stuff, the decks, the walkways. It was out of control. Are we going to do that stuff in house, are we going to subcontract it out? If we are going to subcontract it out do we have bids for it? Mr. Holmes responded no, we are not subcontracting. We will do almost all of that stuff in house. We will not run the power—we will bid the power out. The installation of the portable, the ramps—all of those things are provided by the modular company as part of the package. They set them up. Mr. Crume asked then we are not going to sub out anything except the electrical? Mr. Holmes said that is about what he sees right now. We have a few other expenses like the permits and stuff. There just isn't anything else in this case to do to bid out. It's a turn-key process. Mr. Holmes added that he has a fair amount of experience with portables because in the state of Washington you cannot build a permanent structure unless you can prove unhoused students. You utilize used portables and start placing them and then when you can show you have a number of unhoused students by all of these classrooms then you can run a bond and apply for state matching funds. Every district in the entire state of Washington that builds a new school has portables on their site before they ever build a building. It's one of the things they don't do well up there. Nobody buys new portables in the state of Washington.

Kari O'Brien stated that the board was talking about shifting boundaries—from Three

Rivers to Grants Pass those are difficult boundary shifts but what if other things were shifted? We have a facility—Jerome Prairie. Is that not a viable option at all for classrooms? Is it okay to spend more money instead of using what we have? Mr. Holmes responded that it's a geographical problem with Jerome Prairie and the student population that's at Fruitdale. Ms. O'Brien said you wouldn't move those students from Fruitdale to Jerome Prairie, but you would shift accordingly to put the students back in Jerome Prairie. Mr. Holmes said that's one of his longer term goals—is that Jerome Prairie be opened back up. Those are neighborhood schools that mean things to neighborhoods. But it has to be both economically advantageous and educationally attractive at the same time. We can move a few boundaries in a few cases and get a few kids going this direction but to do it in significant numbers to open up a whole school—this isn't the solution right now. Mr. Crume said he was thinking about the same thing—it he remembers right, there was a lot of kids that went to Madrona from Jerome Prairie—but didn't some of them go to Fruitdale as well? Mr. Holmes said he did not know. Mr. Crume said if you were ever to be able to open up Jerome Prairie and those kids left Madrona and some of the kids on that upper end of the boundary that are going to Fruitdale transferred to Madrona it would alleviate the population at Fruitdale and that whole shift could possibly go around that way. Ms. Olmo stated that having Jerome Prairie open is good for this district. Mr. York asked if we have looked at that? Mr. Holmes responded that he and Director Alderson will look at it. They can gather information from First Student and take a look at the geographical map and have them evaluate ride times and look at numbers. We will take a look and part of that process that he will bring back in two weeks is he will bring a more detailed list of costs. He will also have information on potential boundary shifts. Mr. York asked for him to also have the information on how many kids it would take to be able to reopen Jerome Prairie? He explained how the numbers right now are not where they need to be to reopen the school. The numbers are still less that when the district closed the school. They also discussed how to potentially add new programs that would attract more students to the district.

SITING OF SECOND
PORTABLE AT
FRUITDALE
(CONTINUED)

Director Alderson asked for approval for an update to board policy KG-AR(3) *Fee Charges for Use of District Facilities*. There is a need to bring it up to date to specifically address the turf fields at Hidden Valley and the soccer fields at the District Office. These fees are similar to what you would see in District 7 for the community teams, youth soccer clubs, etc. that use the facilities. We have had quite an influx of requests from different community organizations to use the fields and this puts the district right in line with everybody else in the region, as far as costs associated with the fields. There are costs that go along with maintaining our new investment that we have at Hidden Valley and these fees would help offset some of the cost associated with that. Mr. York asked about the soccer fields at the District Office—we haven't charged for that in the past? Mr. Alderson said we have, but it has been in with the football fields and baseball fields. This pulls it out of that category and creates a new line item for it because it is not the same cost. There is also a flat rate if the lights need to be turned on. Mr. Crume asked how much the fees have gone up? Mr. Alderson explained that the fees before for the fields before (football, soccer, baseball) there was no charge or one dollar charge. Mr. Lengwin asked how this is coordinated? Mr. Alderson explained how the facility use process works within the school. Ms. Olmo asked if there was an existing pathway in place if they need the fee waived? Mr. Alderson explained that there is a process for that in the policy itself where the superintendent may waive that fee. Ms. Olmo asked if this has to go to the superintendent? Mr. Alderson said that is something they have talked about having at the building level. That is something they can look at also. Mr. Holmes asked if they want to change it to "Superintendent or his designee." Ms. Olmo feels this is something that could be solved at the building location. Ms. Quick provided some history and explained that the reason it is superintendent is for consistency throughout the district. Mr. Crume asked if there were to be an exception made why wouldn't it go to the board instead of the superintendent? The it would be the board to make a decision and it could never go back on one person. Member Dwyer said she is not sure they would want to review that many

ADDENDUM FOR BOARD
POLICY KG-AR(3)

ADDENDUM FOR BOARD
POLICY KG-AR(3)
(CONTINUED)

applications. There is also a timeline question. Ms. Olmo suggested it going to the Athletic Director. Mr. Alderson said they have had an athletic committee where the three Athletic Directors would meet and could review the specific organizations that are requesting a fee waiver. There were various scenarios discussed. Mr. York asked how many groups ask for the fees to be waived? Ms. Olmo suggested there may be more when we raise the rates. Then Mr. Crume responded that he can name one that pops right into mind—it was Ft. Vannoy Elementary School. It was a sick parent with cancer. They wanted to have a garage sale for a fundraiser at the school and there was a bad decision that got made and a whole uproar in the community. If it would have been to the board or somebody else the weight would have been shifted off of that one person and that would have been resolved. Ms. Dwyer said it makes sense to her that there would be a liaison or person who coordinates that at the District Office, but she doesn't think that the timing of the board meeting every month is going to meet that need. Ms. Olmo said if they approve the policy with just the word changes, the superintendent or designee, then that would give enough flexibility to have this make sense long term? Mr. Holmes responded that that's the philosophical piece where trusting your subordinates, through training and experience, that they make good decisions on a regular basis. Mr. York said there is going to be bumps in the road where decisions might be made that are questionable and we just deal with it, learn from it and move on. Member Olmo made a motion to approve the addendum for board policy KG-AR(3) - *Fee Changes for Use of District Facilities* with the additional language changing to "Superintendent or designee". Member Dwyer seconded the motion and the motion passed 4-1 (Crume opposing).

BOARD POLICIES—
FIRST READING

Superintendent Holmes explained the policies being brought forward are electronic policies around internet use, personal devices, cyberbullying, etc. These are all pulled out of the list of need to/have to required policies that have been reviewed. These policies are important to him as this has been a critical year, particularly with our high school students, with bullying and with social media. We have had a heightened problem with students at North Valley. We have had three or four different instances there with high school students. A couple of which got into the local court system here. We needed to take a look at what the board policies were and have some standard language and then we can move to updating our student handbooks and doing some more formalized, specific training and education of students as we move into next school year as well. For the most part, those activities have become bigger problems because of lack of knowledge and understanding by students. Not because there is a lack of policy, but having a policy in place to follow is a first step.

Mr. Holmes introduced the first one IIBGA—*Electronic Communication System*. The highlighted areas are changes to current policy. He asked if the board wanted to take a look at these policies one at a time or just ask questions? Ms. Dwyer said she has questions, but not on the first one. Ms. Olmo suggested they just go ahead and do them one at a time. Ms. Olmo made a motion to approve IIBGA and IIBGA-AR—*Electronic Communications System*. Mr. Crume said none of these policies were on the agenda for a motion were they? Ms. Olmo said they can approve them on the first reading if they want to. Mr. Holmes confirmed. Ms. Dwyer seconded the motion. Mr. Holmes said the main point on this is appropriate online behavior. That is a specific law that comes out of our E-rate agreements. For us to receive those grant monies we have to agree that we are educating our students appropriately and have this in policy. The other portion at the bottom is due to changes in state and federal law about not discriminating. He responded to a concern from Mr. Marks about the word "proprietary." The main goal around the "proprietary" piece was that there has become standard practice for students and staff to use their personal communication devices to access student, teacher, and district information off of our system with those personal devices. The concern for that is that the district has no control over what is done with that information should the student or employee disconnect from the organization. One of the key pieces here is a change that includes the wording "*obtain staff intent to comply with administrative regulations pertaining to the use of personal devices to download or access district proprietary information, which insures the protection of said information and*

the removal of that information from the device when it is no longer authorized.” That will be a change we will see in probably ‘Welcome Back’ packets for employees—that they can sign that they intend to remove all information when no longer with the district. Mr. Marks explained that what he was concerned about was no so much that he could keep his SPED program, but explained how last year he taught a computer class that he created lesson plans for and feels that is all his work and even though it is on the district Google site, is that his? Ms. Dwyer agreed and asked how do they define intellectual property of our staff and arguing that they made this curriculum while the district was paying them and the questions that could arise. Defining what constitutes the intellectual property of our staff may be beyond the scope of this policy, but may need to be something they need to address. Mr. Holmes explained that is not the intent of this policy. This was strictly about identifiable information of students and staff, which they use on a regular basis. This is not the appropriate time for the conversation around proprietary information. Ms. Olmo suggested it is probably worth the board spending some time trying to define. Ms. Dwyer asked about section F under ‘Guidelines/Etiquette’ it has the whole subset about email. She felt like that was more of a guideline and didn’t necessarily belong in policy. She would like the board policies to be streamlined in general and not list such detail. Mr. Holmes responded that it is under ‘Guidelines/Etiquette’ and this information does get shared with staff and students. Ms. Quick added that this policy goes home with every student at the beginning of the year. Ms. Olmo said she likes it as a guideline, but as a policy is it law? Mr. Holmes responded that it is an AR so it is more implementation of the policy as opposed to actual policy. Ms. Olmo said she likes having an ideal put out there—that this is how they would like to see people communicate professionally. She would like to leave it in unless there is a serious concern. Ms. Dwyer stated she does not have a strong objection to it—she agrees with what is being said in the guideline. It is a larger question of including lengthy guidelines in policies. Mr. Crume agreed. He thinks it is vague to some extent and it should be taken out. He thinks the board should set their policies to be clear and concise and they know there is no room for... Mr. York responded that this is the AR and this is the “how-to”. Mr. Crume responded that’s interesting too. “It’s just the AR.” Sometimes you hear the AR is law and that is what you have to abide by and then other times you hear that this is just the AR—interesting. Mr. York stated that the policy is just three-quarters of a page and the AR is seven pages long. Mr. York stated that they all agree that the revisions to the actual policy IIBGA are okay and the AR is a guideline. He asked if they wanted to hold this? Ms. Olmo said she would be willing to revise her motion to remove “f”. Ms. Dwyer believes this is valuable information. If the guidelines are going to be referred to then it shouldn’t be removed. Mr. Holmes stated that this information was covered with him when he first started. It’s part of the online stuff that employees go through each year. If they are new staff it gets covered personally, one-on-one, when they cover all the stuff—or returning staff it is covered online every year. Ms. Olmo said she would prefer not to amend her motion. Board Chair York then called for a vote and the motion passed unanimously.

BOARD POLICIES—FIRST
READING (CONTINUED)

Superintendent Holmes then brought forward policy JFCEB—*Personal Communication Devices and Social Media* and explained that this is probably the one that’s the crux of what his concerns have been this year with our students. Having something in place that directly talks about social media and what’s appropriate and what’s not. This policy is all brand new. Director Valenzuela and his department has gone through it, he has gone through it. They only additional comment came from a conversation he had with Keith Haley and it was he thinks the board is trying to pass a policy we can’t enforce. His response was the State of Oregon passes those laws all of the time and gave an example. If standards aren’t set for certain behavior and activity then you can’t hold people accountable when they do something wrong and shared his philosophy on the subject. A bigger part of this is not just the idea of using those things—it’s the activity that they are involved in. Students that he has encountered that have encountered bullying or

BOARD POLICIES—
FIRST READING
(CONTINUED)

been involved in bullying on social media—once something is posted it is public forever. They think they can erase or delete it but they can't. Almost every appeal that he has dealt with this year the family of the victim has come in with printed copies. This policy and AR is about putting some parameters around student behavior and what we expect them to do and not do with electronic devices and personal electronic devices.

Mr. Marks suggested in the title heading that after the policy title they add the word 'students'. There are others that indicate 'staff'. Mr. Holmes said he thought about that but all of the 'J' policies are student policies. The board agreed that if it makes the policy more clear it's a good idea. Ms. Olmo asked that we make sure that our teachers and administrators not selectively enforce it because then we are creating another huge level of liability for the district. Mr. Holmes said for him—does it cause a disruption in the educational environment? Hopefully that is what's catching teacher's interest as well. If it is disrupting their educational environment then they should be concerned. Mr. Crume said he likes the policy although he thinks it is a little hypocritical. He made a motion to approve JFCEB and JFCEB-AR—*Personal Communication Devices and Social Media*. Member Olmo seconded the motion. Mr. Crume finds it interesting that down at the bottom of the policy it states "*The taking, disseminating, transferring, or sharing of obscene, pornographic, or otherwise illegal images or photographs, whether by electronic data transfer or otherwise (commonly called texting, sexting, emailing, etc.) may constitute a crime under state and/or federal law.*" After he reads that he wonders... we have a book in our school with a man holding his penis—very detailed and graphic, urinating on the back of another man. Then he would go to ORS 336.067 that talks about honesty and morality and desirable citizenry and we have had a complaint filed about that book and this board's done nothing to follow through with voting on that complaint. He is curious—he likes the policy. Board Chair York responded that as far as the book complaint goes, it's either in process or hasn't been appealed to the board. Mr. Holmes added that it is done and has been delivered to Mr. Rice months ago. Ms. Olmo asked then he would have to appeal it to the board? Mr. Holmes said that is correct. Mr. Crume thought it went back to the board to be voted on. Mr. York said not if it has been resolved. Mr. Crume said he likes the policy and hopes that is where the district stands. After no further discussion Board Chair York called for a vote and the motion, with the addition of the word 'student' to the title passed unanimously.

Mr. Holmes then brought forward board policy GCAB—*Personal Communication Devices and Social Media-Staff* and explained that it is the staff version of that. It is specific to use of personal devices and interfering with job duties—those kinds of things. Member Lengwin asked how is that enforced? If there are students or parents complaining about a teacher using their cell phone excessively. How does that come about? Do they just go in and talk to the principal about it? Mr. Holmes responded that he hasn't dealt with one this year, and he's not aware that we have dealt with one on the district. Should it occur we would follow the formal complaint process that was passed last month. It could also take the form of anything—an email to him, or an email to the principal or a phone call, a written note or any type of communication to file a complaint which would, if it came to him— would hand them the form and ask them to fill the formal complaint out. From there we would go through those processes in the policy that was approved last month, which is really good. Mr. Lengwin said he gets not one, but two or three phone calls and it is the same situation so he wanted to know how he would like it handled. Mr. Holmes said he would want him to let him know who it is because that would initiate an investigation at that building level. Mr. Lengwin clarified then it is not a phone call to the principal—it's basically, they have to fill out a formal complaint. Mr. Holmes said that is what they would be asked to do. If they did not want to fill out the complaint form, it would still be investigated. He is not going to not do something just because they don't want to fill out a formal complaint form. If they are not going to fill out the formal complaint form it does kind of tie his hands a little bit from an HR perspective. But, he will continue to look into that. It would start at the building principal level.

Ms. O'Brien asked to make a comment. Coming from Daniel Burdis, their Uniserve rep and he is saying that 'off duty of staff' that phrase in there is assuming a lot of, or trying to take liberties and they may agree that staff members, while off duty and on duty will utilize social networks sites, etc. judiciously, it seems like they are removing that potential of removing liberties from their freedom of speech by simply removing 'while on duty and off duty' by simply stating that you have to say staff members will utilize these networks judiciously. There is no real reason to state while on duty and off duty. Member Olmo suggested it read "*staff members will utilize.*" Ms. O'Brien stated these things are in other work rules and there is history of bargaining on this, so to be clear and to be fair and to not try tell staff member what they can and cannot do off duty—by removing that phrase it's a lot more equitable. Mr. Holmes responded that he has no problem with that. Teacher Dave Marks agreed with the comment and recommended not approving this policy tonight and suggested the board go back and read the work rules. There was more discussion regarding the proper wording and it was decided the words "*while on duty or off duty*" would be removed from the policy. Member Dwyer made a motion to approve policy GCAB *Personal Communication Devices and Social Media-Staff* striking the phrase "*while on duty and off duty*" out of the policy. Member Crume suggested it would be better just to re-write the policy and vote on it at the next meeting. Ms. Olmo said she is okay voting on this policy, striking that language. Ms. Olmo then seconded the motion. Board Chair York called for a vote and the motion passed unanimously.

BOARD POLICIES—FIRST
READING (CONTINUED)

Superintendent Holmes then brought forward policy GBNA *Hazing/Harassment/Intimidation/Bullying/Cyberbullying-Staff* and the accompanying AR and explained the change is simply six words "*of staff, students or third parties.*" It identifies those groups as being possible victims of that behavior. On the AR it adds the word "*Board*" and "*administrative regulation.*" It just cleans it up so that it meets the standard. Member Olmo made a motion to approve policy GBNA and GBNA-AR as presented. Member Dwyer seconded and the motion passed 4-1 (Crume opposing).

Member Crume said that they have stated tonight that the AR's are just suggestions, guidelines? M. Holmes responded that is not the way he looks at it. He looks at them as guidelines for implementation of the actual policies. It's a way for the board to describe for him and anybody else the way they intend these policies to be implemented and enacted. It's a great way to put in more language, flush things out, get better descriptors, give examples, give ideas, clarifying points. Taking a policy in of itself, unless you were at this meeting and had the discussion or from five years ago were at the meeting when the policy was passed, you might not have a good remembrance of what you thought the board's intent was based on the words in that policy. The AR gives you an ability, as a board, to lay out with much better descriptors what the expectations are. Mr. Crume asked if they are still in conjunction with the Oregon AR's—correct? They have been told so many times by their staff that the AR's are Oregon law. Ms. Breckner told them that. He has always been under the assumption that the AR's are Oregon's suggestions and the ORS is the law. Ms. Olmo responded that ORS is the law and has to be changed by legislature. OAR can be changed at department levels. Mr. Crume said he has called OSBA and asked this question many times—you always get a different answer.

Superintendent Holmes added an informational piece for the board. There was a robocall and a letter that went home today to parents at fourth grade at Evergreen. We are working on the process of moving the fourth graders from Evergreen as fifth graders to Lorna Byrne next year. We have been involved almost for a month now in conversations with a variety of people, some key community members, a board member, a lot of people in the Cave Junction area, to lay the ground work for this move. The basic reasoning behind it is the first thing that started is that we were looking at moving the Evergreen Lifeskills students who are now currently housed in a wing all by themselves at Lorna Byrne, for space reasons. Ms. Olmo interjected that it sounds like the community might be interested in this. It seems like this should be an agenda item. Mr. Holmes said he

INFORMATIONAL

INFORMATIONAL
(CONTINUED)

just wanted to fill in the board while he has the opportunity of all five of them here to communicate. We are in the process, there is a plan to communicate with a variety of people, whether it's the Chamber, Rotary, the key communicators in the Cave Junction area, all the parents. We needed a place to put them and the logical place to put them at Evergreen was at the fifth grade wing. Ms. Olmo said that she needed to leave and would follow up with Mr. Holmes. Mr. Holmes continued—in the fifth grade hall because of the structure that's already there that exists would make it really inexpensive and a perfect place to move that Lifeskills class. So then they needed to figure out what to do with the fifth grade. Mr. Regal would then get another eleven adults that he would have supervise with the movement of the EA's and Lifeskills people to that building. Up at Lorna Byrne we have the flagship middle school of the district, which is almost brand new, with an entire wing that's totally unoccupied. Lorna Byrne principal Scott Polen has half the number of adults to supervise and he has a half time administrator that helps him do those things. That started the conversation around what would this look like if we move the fifth grade out of Evergreen and moved them up in to Lorna Byrne? The situation they are working on right now is putting them in their own wing downstairs. They will be able to have their own lunch and their own recess with the sixth grade group. They will still be in self contained classrooms as fifth graders. They will also have access to the much better library, a much better computer lab and they will have access to a science lab that the teachers can use as well—and they are going to be able to have music because we have a music teacher that has space in their schedule that we can offer fifth grade music to these students as well. He explained that was the thought process that went behind it. On Thursday night, the ninth, we have a community meeting out in Cave Junction. We invited all of the fourth and fifth grade parents. We have already talked to all of the staff. We will be getting to Rotary and the Chamber in the next week or so. Member Dwyer added that if this passes muster on the community level then it will be coming to the board for approval. But it would be backward to approve something the community hadn't bought into yet. At this point they are feeling like the community is pretty positive about it. Mr. Holmes said his plan would be, based on how it goes on Thursday night with the community, if everything continues to go well and it's all positive in the community, then this will be on the board agenda at the Illinois Valley High School board meeting and we will invite anyone that wants to speak to the board about it and they will be able to do that.

Member Crume responded that he would be ticked if his fifth grader was going to be going to a middle school. Then added, unfortunately in Josephine County, we have a school based health center that's out in Cave Junction. It is his understanding that junior high and high schoolers are allowed to go to that school based health center. Does this now mean that fifth graders are going to be allowed to go to that school based health center as well? Ms. Dwyer stated that the school based health center is run by Siskiyou and everything they do she feels really good about. Mr. Crume said that they are allowed to go get abortion pills—Mr. Holmes responded no they are not-not on campus. Mr. Crume argued that they are. Mr. Holmes looked into this. Mr. Crume emailed him about this months ago and he looked into it. He went out there specifically to ask those questions. Mr. Crume responded that we must have one unique school based health center in Oregon because the rest of them—these kids are allowed to do this. They are allowed to go without the consent of their parents. Mr. Holmes said it is part of their contract with our district. It says specifically in their contract that they will no do that. Mr. Crume said that's news to him—he would like to see that. If he sent Mr. Holmes an email he would have like to have seen a response. Mr. Holmes said he did—he answered that months ago. Anything that's outside of that contract they send them downtown. They have a health center in downtown Cave Junction. Member Dwyer added that it is important to be aware that in the Illinois Valley there is no pediatrician. Families that need care for their children can't get it so this program supplies Carolyn Litak, Marshall Hamilton—wonderful people right there providing great care. Mr. Crume said what he has researched and seen that comes from these school based health centers across Oregon is not just health care. Mr. Holmes said it is not happening in Cave Junction. Mr. Crume said that is good to know.

Mr. Holmes said that the fliers went home tonight, so as board members you might get a phone call, but he doesn't think they will.

INFORMATIONAL
(CONTINUED)

Mr. Holmes then provided a budget update. The latest number is 7.255 and he and Ms. Cross spent a good majority of Monday morning going through key things and based on that number, and the funding at 50/50, as opposed to the typical 49/51 split, that would allow school districts to budget for roll up costs and increased costs of living and all those variety of things. Given that number we will be about \$124,000 short of our current budget and our current level of service right now. So what that would mean would be our current staffing level, our current class sizes, our current number of school days, adding kindergarten, having kindergarten staff hired—does not pay for kindergarten instructional materials (desk, chairs and those kinds of things). We will be about \$124,000 short. As they probably read, the legislature is committed to, when the May forecast comes out if there's increased revenues available based on that forecast, they're committed to giving K-12 schools forth percent of that increase. Their hope is that based on those increases they will turn it back into a 49/51 split. If that doesn't happen nobody in their right mind is going to be able to budget based on that 50/50 split in good conscience because the second year of the biennium would be pretty disastrous in terms of what you might have to do such as cutting days or staff or programs. Right now it is a matter of wait and see. May forecast will be pretty critical. The only silver lining from his perspective is that it does appear that our ADM downturn has stopped. We continue to make up ground over last year from where we have been at so we are not losing kids like we had been for years. That's a good thing. It's certainly going to be a rather mundane Budget Committee meeting because there aren't going to be any decisions to be made unless something happens between now and May 15th.

Mr. Marks stated that he just got an email that the Ways and Means is doing a community forum and they will be in Grants Pass. Mr. Holmes said May 24th—Saturday afternoon, we don't know where yet. Mr. Marks said his letter said the Performing Arts Center. Mr. Holmes added that our local representatives are incredibly supportive—no matter how you take it from a political perspective. We are Republican heavy in this county and this district, they are all 100% supportive of schools increasing the budget. He has talked to every one of them multiple times and they have been nothing but incredibly supportive. Going to that meeting on the 24th is going to be like preaching to the choir—not that he is telling them not to show up, because he will be there and thinks it will be great for everyone to be there because they need to hear from us that it really is true and we really need these things. It is going to be like preaching to the choir because that group from Southern Oregon is 100% supportive. Even the Democrats from down here are supportive even though they voted yes. They are saying the right things even though they voted yes. It's pretty political at this point. Ms. Dwyer added that Senator Merkley is going to be at Illinois Valley High School Friday at 10:00 in the morning.

Board Chair York adjourned the meeting at 6:55 p.m.

ADJOURNED

Danny York
Chairperson of the Board

David Holmes
Superintendent-Clerk