

Three Rivers School District Board of Directors met for a work session, Tuesday, January 7, 2014 at the District Administrative Office, 8550 New Hope Road, Grants Pass, Josephine County, Oregon at 5:00 p.m.

PRESENT: Ron Crume, Chairperson of the Board, Zone IV
Kate Dwyer, Member of the Board, Zone I PRESENT
Danny York, Member of the Board, Zone II
Kara Olmo, Member of the Board, Zone III
Ron Lengwin, Vice-Chair of the Board, Zone V
Patricia Adams, Superintendent-Clerk
Debbie Breckner, Director of Human Resources and Athletics
David Marshall, Director of Support Services
Dave Valenzuela, Director of K-12 Education and Technology
Stephanie Allen-Hart, Director of Student Services

Also Present: Debbie Yerby, Linda Kappen, Damian Crowson/Lincoln Savage
MS Principal, Lisa Cross/District Accountant, Dave Marks/
TREA, Renee Hults/Applegate and Williams Principal, Mark
Higgins/Lincoln Savage MS Principal, Kari O'Brien, Kirby
Erickson, Rachael George/Lorna Byrne MS Principal, Margaret
Keip, Rev. B. Alan Little, Patricia Krauss, Sally Clements, Chris
Jelderks, Dennis Misner/North Valley HS Principal, Daye Stone/
Hidden Valley HS Principal, Lise VanBrunt/Madrona
Elementary Principal, Kevin Marr, and Shelly Quick/Recording
Secretary. ALSO PRESENT

Board Chair Ron Crume called the meeting to order at 5:00 PM and led the audience in the Pledge of Allegiance. CALL TO ORDER

Board Chair Ron Crume presented the Consent Agenda. All items on the Consent Agenda may be approved by a single motion unless a member of the Board or the Superintendent requests an item be removed and voted on separately. Member York made a motion to approve the consent agenda as presented. Member Lengwin seconded and the motion passed unanimously. CONSENT AGENDA

Board Chair Crume introduced Greg McKenzie to talk about the superintendent search. Mr. McKenzie stated that he operates Window to Leadership, a superintendent search firm out of West Linn, Oregon. He introduced Cec Amuchastegui, former superintendent of Klamath Falls City Schools, who assists with searches being conducted in Southern Oregon. He talked about the packet he put together and presented it to the board regarding their search services. The timeline - there is a distinctive search season where the market is open and thriving.—that is to be out there in February and March. There is a later season where searches are conducted in March, April and May—there is more urgency attached to them and conflicts with end of school year events. He suggested the following timeline and briefly described how they work through each phase: SUPERINTENDENT SEARCH

- January - Planning phase
- January/February - Qualifications phase. Online preferred method of communication

SUPERINTENDENT
SEARCH (CONTINUED)

- | | |
|------------------|-------------------|
| • February/March | Advertising phase |
| • February/March | Recruitment phase |
| • March/April | Screening phase |
| • April | Interview phase |
| • April/May | Selection phase |

Questions from the board:

Board Chair Crume asked if there was a license required to conduct these searches? Mr. McKenzie responded that there is not. They would be a contract consultant for the school district working for the board.

Member Lengwin asked how far out there search goes—by state or? Mr. McKenzie responded that is something the board would determine in the planning meeting. The board would direct them as to how wide they wanted to cast the net. Their e-mail base covers the western United States plus other people they know that are motivated to move from all over the country.

Board Chair Crume asked if they had a pool of candidates that are already pre-qualified? Mr. McKenzie responded that they open the doors and see who wants to come in. They do not represent a pool of candidates but they know a lot of people who have expressed interest in moving. Also, superintendents interested in relocating or changing areas will contact them. Mr. Crume asked what's the competition? Mr. McKenzie stated that last year there were three major firms in our region—themselves, Oregon School Boards Association (OSBA) and Northwest Leadership Associates out of Spokane. This year OSBA has discontinued their executive search services and refer all inquiries to them. They are typically within 10% of each other in their pricing to conduct a search.

Member Olmo asked that in the event that they decide to go with another interim, are the prices the same? Mr. McKenzie responded that they are with the district until they find the right fit. So if they had to change paths and find an interim they would do that and it would be the same price. They would then come back next year and continue the contract and look for a full time superintendent. It would be the same contract, just more expenses incurred.

Member York asked how many searches they are currently involved in? Mr. McKenzie responded that they currently have 10-11 and believes they will have 15-18 before the year is over. On an average year Oregon will have 20-25 positions open to turnover. He has conducted 70 searches himself, and there are others within the firm that have different levels of experience.

Superintendent Adams asked what the competition was among any surrounding school districts? Mr. McKenzie stated that at the moment for a district our size there are two districts that he would see competition—Lake Oswego, being handled by a firm out of Iowa. They close applications on January 14 or 15. They are also doing Lincoln County School District in Newport, Oregon which has 5200 students. They are closing applications January 31st. Medford is also searching but they have 12,000 students and doesn't believe it would be the same field of candidates applying. The rest of them are small districts with a size of 500 to 2000 students.

TRANSPORTATION
COMMITTEE REPORT

District Accountant Lisa Cross thanked the members of the committee: Damian Crowson, Patty Goodin, David Marshall, Jamie Ongman, Daye Stone, Kevin Marr, Kara Olmo, Kathleen Philipp, JoAnne Wardle and Rowdy Bates was invited to attend a meeting to answer some questions. Mr. Bates did a great job educating the committee on how transportation works, the intricacies of the contract, the buses, etc. Outside of personnel and employer costs transportation is the largest expense in our general fund budget, so it

made sense to look at how to become efficient in that area. The committee came up with four areas to look into.

TRANSPORTATION
COMMITTEE REPORT
(CONTINUED)

- *Efficiencies in Transportation.* Director David Marshall reported that transportation utilizes 8-1/2 to 9% of the general fund budget—\$4.3 million. He compared our transportation to three other school districts. Grants Pass is only eight square miles. Lincoln County School District is over 5000 square miles, has over 6000 students, 15 schools and is comparable in some ways. However our school district is more comparable to Klamath County School District which is almost 6000 square miles, 6200 students and 20 schools. Klamath County is 3-4 times our size, more students, and more schools and spends \$1.1 million less than we do. Mr. Marshall explained that First Student is very receptive to things that will benefit the district. Even though their contract does not expire until June 30, 2017, if there are things that we can do they would be receptive to talking about them. These include items such as the fuel cap, onsite fuel tanks, the number of operating days, in-kind athletic trips—they give the district \$125,000. The base rates are based upon three hours of time. The first three hours \$220/hour—\$180/hour. There are three basic rates. The average bus trip in this district is six hours and 6 minutes so there are overage charges. In regards to route efficiencies—Mr. Marshall explained how are bus routes work in making duplicate routes in the morning and afternoon due to the start and end times for the schools. For our 49 basic routes—times four equals 196 trips (AM 1, AM 2, PM 1 and PM 2). Klamath County has 68 routes that are all single-tier routes (one AM and one PM). Our district is tenth in the state out of 197 school district in transportation costs. The primary reason is that we duplicate every route. What we need to address next is do we want to continue double tier routes?
- *Grants and Sponsorships.* Kevin Marr explained the reasons that people don't like elementary kids riding with high school and junior high are due to the worries of things such as language, bullying, etc. He is in favor of cutting the routes to one in the morning and one in the afternoon. If you take the positive approach and use it as a teaching moment—you teach the high school kids how to be responsible. We also need to look at a process of knowing which kids never ride buses and be able to adjust the routes. Lisa Cross stated that there are not a lot of grants and sponsorships available because we contract the services for First Student. The things available that could save money are buying fuel in bulk. To do that we would have to have an above ground fuel tank.
- *State Funding Inequities.* Lisa Cross reported that there is a state committee looking at the State School Fund formula and how there are inequities, what the inequities are and what changes need to be made. Right now they are looking for input as to what could be changed and this is a prime time to talk about the inequities in funding. Out of the districts that Mr. Marshall mentioned, we were the lowest in the cost per mile. This is likely due to the fact that we drive more miles. Member Olmo asked about changing our bus routes to more straight line routes. Ms. Cross responded that she checked with the State and the district is required to provide transportation on all public roads. Ms. Cross would like, on behalf of Three Rivers School District, to send an e-mail to the State committee stating that transportation is not funded appropriately because even if you cut down our number of routes, we would still be higher than other districts because of the size of our district. Based on the percentage, our district spends more than many other districts for just getting kids to school. Mr. Crume asked why we are required to take busses down county roads when we have the ability to cancel bussing altogether. Director Breckner stated that the law was changed that requires us to provide bussing on all public roads. Ms. Cross then explained how the state reimbursement for transportation works. It is 70%, 80% or 90% based on the expenses.
- *Where does the district want to be in 2019, 2024?* Does the district want to look at alternative vehicles, reallocating how many schools there are? We should be looking that far ahead as it will take a lot of planning to make those types of changes.

TRANSPORTATION
COMMITTEE REPORT
(CONTINUED)

Board Chair Crume stated that he would love to find a way to get our busses to compressed natural gas. It's cleaner it's better mileage and it's cheaper. He can't imagine that if we didn't work with Josephine County, District 7 and all the different county ran facilities to get a compressed natural gas fueling station in Josephine County that we couldn't make that possible. Ms. Cross responded that there is one district in the state that has compressed natural gas and they have been doing great. Mr. Crume added that he looks at other districts and looks at their busses—he sees clean, nice, bright shiny busses. Their districts own their busses and with an area that we have with our geographic challenges and with the state funding don't see how we can't get their ourselves to find a better, cheaper way. Member York asked that with the fuel cap we have, do we dictate where they buy fuel? Mr. Marshall replied that they use whatever is available—the 76 station across the street, the Chevron station, the CFN station by the maintenance compound and the Chevron station in Cave Junction. There is no centralized place because there cannot be. The excess fuel costs are up to \$30,000 a month. Mr. Marr explained that if we were to cease the contract with First Student and purchase our own fleet there is a large initial outlay which would require some sort of grant or sponsorship to buy busses. Mr. Crume stated that it seems our costs are so high, if there were certain grants required; if there was a chance to have compressed natural gas busses with the fuel savings and grants he couldn't believe there wouldn't be a way that we could take out a loan. Ms. Cross responded that Central Point went from having their own fleet to contracting with First Student as a measure of savings, but there are other areas we can look at to determine if that is an option.

Superintendent Adams stated that as the committee worked toward this final stage there are two directions that the findings are taking us. One is the consolidation of routes, which was brought up at the admin meeting today and could affect the start and ending times has an impact on K-12 busses and kids riding together. The second is to go towards state funding. Ms. Cross responded there are those two items along with looking at the First Student contract. There are different ways that First Student can bill. At the time the contract was made this way was the most beneficial. But, First Student is open to talking about all different ways of formulating a contract. The committee is now looking for direction from the board. Ms. Adams suggested the board look at the three areas that the Transportation Committee has defined and add a fourth to that. She asked if there was interest in a sub-group that would require board participation in the research of this?

Member Olmo responded that it makes sense to split it up in to two or three different work groups to work on the details. One of the sub groups to look at the contract efficiencies and potentially that group could look at a longer term goal such as owning our own fleet.

Board Chair Crume suggested the board take some time in a week or two and have the board submit questions and things they would like to see researched. Superintendent Adams asked the board to email the questions to board secretary Shelly Quick and she will coordinate the questions and provide them to Lisa Cross to provide a Q&A for the board.

Member Lengwin asked the average age of the busses we are running? Mr. Marshall responded he believes they are 17-20 years, but will get more precise information and provide it to the board. Mr. Lengwin believes the district is paying the cost for aging busses.

Member Dwyer stated she is really pleased to see discussion of the opt-out possibility. She has heard a lot of parents say that they are frustrated the routes have to be calculated to include kids they know are not going to ride the bus. She is interested in the legalities of that and how it would work. She is also willing to serve on that committee. She is interested in creative solutions for things like how do we have all the different age groups on the bus and can we put a bus monitor on that bus; can that be that bus

monitor's transportation to town and back every day? If they are not already on staff can they become a volunteer and save on their own transportation cost? There are a lot of creative ways that we can solve that problem and make that bus ride a more teachable moment for how the kids are going to behave.

TRANSPORTATION
COMMITTEE REPORT
(CONTINUED)

Board Chair Crume added that he made a comment earlier about being able to upgrade and have more efficient busses. These busses are a direct representation of our school district and we have asked time and time again for these busses to be clean. It has been stated that First Student will do about whatever it takes to make ends meet—they would like to see the busses washed. They have had numerous complaints by community members, they have taken many pictures themselves of what the busses look like and they don't represent our district well. Member Olmo commented that after break our busses looked like they had been through a couple of snow storms and the Grants Pass busses in town were beautiful and looked like they had been detailed over the break. It was embarrassing.

Superintendent Adams presented a packet to the board that included the Budget Process and Timeline, 2014-15 Budget Assumptions and Administrative Budget Priorities. She then reviewed the Budget Process and Timeline that covers a period of January to June 2014. She then covered the budget assumptions and explained in the beginning of the preparation of the budget it is based on assumptions. She covered the revenue and expenditure assumptions—which were a draft at this time. The revenue included: student enrollment, state school fund estimate, property taxes, interest earnings, beginning fund balance and other revenue. The expenditures included: roll-up costs, salaries, staffing, retirement and resignations, health insurance, PERS, resource allocation model, utilities, transportation, contingency and the cost of the Unfair Labor Practice.

BUDGET PROCESS

Superintendent Adams then reviewed the administrative budget priorities. She explained that when we build the budget, whether we cut or we allocate, we make our decision based on priorities. Today the administrative staff spent a period of time on what are there budget priorities? She shared that for our administrators as individuals identified that a full calendar year and class size is their top two priorities. Our administrators as a group based on levels, identified the following: High school—full school year, class size and full financial support for all co-curricular and extra-curricular activities. Middle school—staff increase/class size, financial support for their co-curricular and extra-curricular activities and a full school year. Elementary—class size (25 or fewer), full calendar year and professional development resources. Directors—full school year, adequate staffing levels and class size. There is a consistent theme of class size and a full calendar year. Another area of discussion were programs. The administrative team feels strongly that we maintain our current level of programs, and if any opportunity allows that we add back programs that we have lost. Our co-curricular and elective program at the high school is essential to their ability and class size to build a master schedule. She then opened it up to hear what the board's budget priorities are, because they will influence decisions they make in the coming months.

Member Dwyer responded that she is thrilled to see class size, because that is why she is sitting here as a board member. There are so many things they can do to support our teachers, but if there are too many kids in the room for them to succeed nothing else they do will be as effective as reducing class sizes.

Member Olmo stated that she is supportive of working toward a full year calendar. She would be interested to know of the programs that have been lost at the specific schools in the last 5-7 years. Not that they can all be added back this year, but to keep a running list so that when they are looking at the budget they don't get so far away from where they were five years ago—that they forget that they ever offered them to begin with.

BUDGET PROCESS
(CONTINUED)

Member York asked if the class size target is 1:25? Superintendent Adams responded that their hope was actually 1:25 or less—what they currently have is unacceptable. It may not be accomplished in the next year, but the district should be moving in that direction. The reality today is that there are classes anywhere from 35 to 50 at the high school level. Ms. Adams stated that we need to be advocating for more revenue to the legislature. Some of the priorities need to be tiered as to what is realistic over a two to three year period. If the board agrees that class size is the number one priority then we need to move to establish another level of priorities within the priority—is the first round the primary level—or the high school?

Member Olmo was happy to state that class size is her number one priority—even before going back to a full calendar year. Rather than reaching a goal in one year, for one particular group, would be more in favor of taking a tiered approach to all groups, possibly a two or three year plan. Member Dwyer would like feedback from the administrators on their priorities in regards to class sizes.

Board Chair Crume stated that class size is at the top of the list along with a full school year. Third on his list would be the programs and the vocational classes—adding as many vocational classes back as they can.

Member York stated that class size is a priority—even over a full school year. We need to put as much into each student as possible and create an environment that would spur on the success for them.

Member Lengwin stated a full school year. Try and get the class sizes down by getting more teachers. We are in a tough spot now but might be able to get there.

Member Olmo added that structuring our student/teacher time so that all teachers have enough time to prep. She has been hearing this a lot throughout a number of buildings—that teachers just want enough time by themselves so that they can adequately prep so they can do the job that they have dedicated their careers to doing. She would like to make sure they have the resources to do that whether it's computers or printers or things they are hearing that they need—and a reasonable amount of time at school to be able to do that or start working towards allowing them time away from school that's paid.

Superintendent Adams responded that she will provide the board with a two year option for them to review knowing that they have the flexibility as a board to align that with the new superintendent. Ms. Adams then shared the other priority from the administrators which was paid coaching positions.

Member Olmo asked if there was any opportunity to look at potential grants available for athletic coaches so that we can keep our physical education programs going and thriving in our schools? There has been so much talk at the federal level about getting kids moving—are there any grants that are flowing through Oregon through the state to help keep those programs going? Director Breckner responded that the majority of the grants that have come before the board have been for athletic facilities, she was not aware of any grants that pay specifically for coaching salaries, but the board does have the option of pursuing an operating levy for extracurricular.

Board Chair Crume stated that it takes every aspect—athletics, vocational, academics—every piece of it to keep the majority of students in school.

Member Olmo suggested we take the core budget and apply it towards class size and a full calendar year as a priority then with the secondary goals such as athletic coaches and vocational training—it seems there should be grants or partners that would rather do that with the district than work on classroom size. This may be an opportunity for a couple of

board members, along with a director, to make some visits to Ford Family Foundation or some of the other groups in our area that have regularly supported our community and see where they see potential partnership in the future with the district.

BUDGET PROCESS
(CONTINUED)

Superintendent Adams stated that state funding may increase, but if the enrollment is on the decline then the funding decreases. It is based on our enrollment and ADM.

Member Olmo stressed the importance of customer service through our district serving our students and parents. Without a high level customer service program we're not going to retain and attract students in our area.

Superintendent Adams reminded the board the information provided was in draft form. She encouraged the board to contact her with input regarding additional things she may need to address or if they have suggestions.

Board Chair Crume suggested they review each of the policies one by one and vote on them that way if they can come to an agreement or have discussion on them. The first policy is a new policy, policy KGB—*Public Conduct on District Property*. He asked where the recommended policy came from? Superintendent Adams responded that it came from the Oregon School Boards Association (OSBA). They keep them updated according to any law changes, lawsuits, Senate Bills and House Bills. Mr. Crume stated that the lines he has issues with and would like removed include:

POLICIES—FOURTH
READING

- #10—Fly, launch or otherwise operate motorized model airplanes/helicopters or other similar propulsion devices unless approved in advance by the district;
- #11—Distribute or post circulars, notices, leaflets, pamphlets or other written or printed material in violation of Board policy *KJA - Materials and Announcements Carried Home by Students*;
- #13—Use a skateboard, rollerblades, scooter or similar device.
- #14—Bring an animal into a district building or on district grounds without prior administrator approval and, where appropriate, only when proof of current rabies vaccination has been provided. Dogs are prohibited on district grounds. Animals serving the disabled are permitted as provided by law;
- #16—Use or operate any noise-producing machine, vehicle, device or instrument in a manner that, in the judgment of district officials, is disturbing to, or interferes with, the orderly conduct of district programs or approved activities;

Mr. Crume stated the issue with #10 is he sees this as a family that wants to go out to one of the school fields on a weekend and fly their model airplane—and we're telling the public with all of the taxes they pay that they are not allowed to do that. Member Dwyer asked what the liabilities would be for the district? Mr. Crume responded that it has happened for years, he knows several people that do it at numerous schools. There was further discussion regarding the potential liabilities.

Mr. Crume stated that if you go through the items that he has a problem with, you can see a pattern. Regarding #11—He sees that as people that come into our schools with Good News information, Constitutional flyers and with what we are seeing in regards to the Common Core State Standards around the country, school districts in other states that are being told to teach the Constitution, the second amendment is being, for military purposes, changing it in general and he has a problem with this. If somebody wants to put leaflets out about the Constitution in our schools for our kids to grab, then as long as they are accurate he doesn't have a problem with it. Member Olmo asked what if they were pamphlets about something they would consider inappropriate? Board Secretary, Shelly Quick added that right now we have it in place that anything posted or distributed in the schools goes through the superintendent's office first for approval.

POLICIES—FOURTH
READING
(CONTINUED)

Mr. Crume read #13 regarding the use of skateboards and roller blades and stated we have seen the problems with skateboards on roofs and damage. but now we are going to stop a kid from riding a skateboard or scooter to school? #14—Regarding bringing an animal on school grounds without prior approval. He is not an animal person, but he has kids that play soccer and sees a lot of parents coming to the soccer field or football fields walking their dogs. We're going to tell these people they can't bring their dogs on the school grounds? Ms. Quick stated that one of the main reasons for this policy was the inconsistency noted by a lot of our administrators about dogs on the school grounds. When this policy was approved in November 2013, the schools were posted with "No Dogs Allowed" signs. Mr. Crume stated that when two or more are gathered there will be conflict and there will always be problems. We are turning our schools into some kind of jail. It doesn't feel right. People are paying taxes to support our schools and we're putting these policies in place and telling them that if they break any of these rules they can be issued a trespass citation, ejected from the premises, excluded from district-approved activities temporarily or permanently and/or referred to law enforcement officials. Ms. Dwyer stated they just had an issue at Evergreen school where the police had to shoot dogs that were fighting and threatening children. Mr. Crume responded they were unattended dogs. Ms. Dwyer added that dogs will be dogs. People bring unleashed dogs on to the property there isn't a lot of control that they will be able to have over the behavior of those animals. A very small child could get mauled very fast and we have a responsibility for them at the school.

Superintendent Adams advised the board to look at these and understand what our liabilities are. Before they move forward give them an opportunity to check with our insurance company of what are the liabilities. If something happens and it is not a policy you are more liable. The policy is here to protect them. Some of the key words are 'may'. When it talks to the trespass remember 'may be issued' - 'may' and 'will' have a difference in meaning. If these are areas of concern she would also like an opportunity to speak to our administrators and see what areas this can be disruptive to our building. One is the distribution of flyers and what her experience has been in that area is that it is a tough call when people want to bring something and you do want to serve them—but once you open up this floodgate you would need an office staff who is going to distribute and organize and before you know it you are printing flyers. You would not believe the flyers you will have and would need office staff to distribute them—and before you know it then you are taking class time because you have a stack of five flyers that have to be handed out to primary students before they go home on the busses. Mr. Crume responded that some of the examples she gave are personal businesses and business things. He is talking about freedom of speech. Ms. Adams stated the policy doesn't limit that. It says flyers, brochures, notices, etc. Mr. Crume wants to protect our rights and protect our freedom. The way that it's worded, he is not comfortable with it—or any of those he mentioned. If we are going to go to the insurance company and ask advice on every situation, of course they will tell you not to do it. Why not just put gates up around the schools and lock them up so nobody can use them?

Principal Dennis Misner added that it has been his experience in dealing with the pamphlets—things like advertising on every car at sporting events, invitations to parties that are private, advertisements for night clubs, concerts, election materials. He appreciates the idea of freedom of speech but it feels to him that the orderly idea for the school is somewhat undermined when a kid or any adult can come on campus and distribute or post something on the school or school grounds. In regards to the comment about schools are jails—we lock up the gates at school all the time. They have people that come and see us to request to use the facilities, and most recently a family that wanted to float some balloons on the softball field. They came and got permission beforehand and it was no big deal. There is a place for administrators for them to say what goes on in their school that is for the orderly operation of the school. He personally feels like if they open the gate to say the can publish whatever they want, lord knows what they will actually see. Member York added that 95% of what is posted will be left for someone to pick up. Mr. Misner does not see that as an infringement of a person's free speech. We have a whole concept around controversial

issues and we have a requirement that states if a view is presented here—you have an obligation to present the opposite view that is there. He does not believe they want people putting up the entire range of all kinds of religious posters that people would want to put up. By saying they would like to have some control over what is published in their schools is a fairly safe thing.

POLICIES—FOURTH
READING (CONTINUED)

Director Breckner stated the other issue they need to be aware of is that means freedom of speech for everyone. If you open it up and have people that want to post things about Constitutional rights and personal freedom, once you open it up for one group you have to open it up for the others. You then would have to post things for groups such as the KKK, the skinheads and such. Mr. Crume asked how much of that has actually gone on? Ms. Breckner responded more than he would believe.

Ms. Dwyer stated that of the people on the board, she is the number one user of the flyer distribution system in the school because she works for the public library and sends material home a lot. She explained her process which is sending it to Ms. Quick, who then submits it to the superintendent for approval. Once approved she then is responsible for making the copies and get the numbers to distribute the appropriate number of flyers to the school, then delivers the flyers to the school for distribution. The logistics of what has to happen to get those flyers in the children's hands would be a significant burden on the school staff.

Member Lengwin asked for some clarification on #16? Superintendent Adams shared a previous experience with an airplane device that produced a constant hum, that was very loud and how it disturbed neighbors which created an issue for the school district. Mr. Crume responded that they could go to their City Council or County Commissioner. There are laws about noise at certain hours of the day and not something a school district should take on. He sees this more as somebody blowing an air horn at graduation or a whistle.

Mr. Crume stated he see groups of people at Redwood that fly little electric planes and we have seen them at Fruitdale as well. It doesn't feel right to him. Member York would be interested to see what feedback they get from the insurance company. Mr. Crume asked if there was a suggestion from the board or if this was going to be tabled? He sees what is coming from the federal government with the Common Core State Standards. He sees what's coming from the State of Oregon with the Governor's executive orders. He does not trust much of what comes from the State of Oregon or the Oregon School Board's Association when it comes like this and feels like our rights are being taken away one after the other and has an issue with it. He feels like we need to be partners with our community—we are not law enforcement officers. Member Olmo asked if they removed #10, possibly not this evening—they would want to run it past insurance and legal counsel to make sure. She would need to support #11 and #14, it makes sense to not have dogs running around. Director Allen-Hart stated that #10 just asks for advance approval and provided the board an example from Applegate School. She asked the group to let her know in advance so that if something were to happen, or something left behind there was some kind of connection. She sees that written in #10. Director Valenzuela added that when he was at Evergreen they have a big RC community out there that flies airplanes and they came to the school and did demonstrations for their kids. They always get permission to fly there. They wanted to fly there on a weekend when the school had both soccer and football and he was able to tell them no. Because he got approval, they were able to work out the scheduling in advance. Ms. Adams added that our taxpayers and our community count on them as a board to keep them safe and the integrity of the education not be disrupted. Mr. York stated that as an administrator you would like to think that they are giving them enough leeway to have reins over their own campus, to understand what the community is doing. If the community has a problem with how the administrators are handling something then they would come to the superintendent or to the board and he's

POLICIES—FOURTH
READING
(CONTINUED)

sure they would hear about it. There was then discussion about skateboards and roller blades on campus. Ms. Adams stated there is nothing wrong with riding them to school, but believes once they get to school they carry them through the halls and walkways. Mr. Crume reiterated that #13 states *"No person on district property shall use a skateboard, roller blades, scooter or similar device"* and if you do you're subject to a trespass citation, ejected from the premises, on and on . . . Ms. Olmo said this policy is stating that once they are on school property they should pick up their skateboard and carry it into the classroom. Mr. Crume responded that is not the way he understands it. There was further discussion on appropriate wording. Ms. Olmo supports our students riding their skateboard or scooter to school, but thinks it is not appropriate for them to be riding them on school property once they are on school grounds, and would certainly not want to see any destruction to our property. Board Chair Crume asked the board if they would like to table this policy and come up with some suggestions for wording? Ms. Dwyer responded that the problem with tabling it at the moment is that we're temporarily without any kind of policy. There are a lot of policies to still go through—does the board want to go through them and see what the concerns are and then take action on them one by one? The board agreed. Board Chair Crume stated he won't approve this policy the way it is—he won't vote for it so we can move on and come back to it. Ms. Dwyer asked to move on as she wanted to hear what his concerns are with the other policies.

Board Chair Crume then brought forward policy KL—*Public Complaints*. He is okay with this one, along with KL-AR. He then brought forward JFCF—*Hazing/Harassment/Intimidation/Menacing/Bullying/Cyberbullying/Teen Dating Violence-Student*. Mr. Crume stated he has many issues with this one. The first one is *'Students behavior that is found to be in violation of this policy will be subject to discipline up to and including expulsion. The district may also file a request with the Oregon Department of Transportation to suspend the driving privileges or the right to apply for driving privileges of a student 15 years of age or older who has been suspended or expelled at least twice for menacing another student or employee, willful damage or injury to district property or for the use of threats, intimidation, harassment or coercion.'* This policy is on the books as we speak and he does not know what business the school district has calling the DMV and playing police officer. He has looked into this and has heard that the State of Oregon can take it upon themselves to suspend the driving privileges of a student—he doesn't know what business the school district has doing that and has an issue with that. Member York stated that it is a pretty tight leash that the kids have now for driving privileges, he doesn't know why we have to be involved. Mr. Crume said it puts more liability on the school district as many of his issues with this whole policy does. It puts much liability on the district, the teachers, the administrators and the board. Mr. Crume then added he has a huge, huge problem with the sexual orientation. *"Sexual orientation means an individual's actual or perceived heterosexuality, homosexuality, bisexuality or gender identity, regardless of whether the individual's gender identity, appearance, expression or behaviors differs from that traditionally associated with the individual's sex at birth."* Ms. Dwyer responded that it is language directly from ORS statutes. Mr. Crume has a problem putting it in our policies. If they are going to make policies for homosexuality or transgender people then they need language for fat people, skinny people, short people, tall people, left-handed people, people with glasses, on and on and on. Ms. Dwyer said there are specific classes that are protected by law both federally and by the state. Her understanding is that our policies are reflecting the laws that they have been given by the state and federal laws. Have we added any classes beyond the protections of state and federal statute to this policy? Superintendent Adams responded no, it aligns with Senate Bills and House Bills that are identified on the final page. Member Olmo stated we then have to uphold state and federal law, regardless of whether they wish to or not. Ms. Adams stated they have an oath to follow state law. She has a licensure to follow state law. Our buildings have an administrative licensure that follows state law and ethics. Any violation of intentionally not following state law or violating ethics is a report to TSPC and disciplinary action or revoking their license. Ms. Dwyer asked Mr. Crume to articulate what his challenge is to the protection of our homosexual or perceived

homosexual students or staff and state law? Mr. Crume responded that it's just singling out anybody and he doesn't believe that this is state law and doesn't believe that we have to have this language in our policies. He has been on the phone with three different attorneys and has e-mail correspondence and can provide them with their names and numbers. One was from the ACLP, one was from Wallbuilders, and one was from Alliance Defending Freedom in Phoenix, Arizona. They say that this is absolutely unacceptable and by no means do we have to have this language in our policies and they have provided us with model bullying policies. Member Dwyer then called for a motion to express their support for the laws of our state. Member Olmo seconded the motion. Member Lengwin and York responded that they didn't understand what they were voting on. Ms. Dwyer stated it was just what she said. If they want to debate whether it's the law of the state we can take that up with our legal council, but at the moment she would like to move that the board affirm their support as a board for the laws of the State of Oregon and United States of America. Board Chair Crume responded that they do have a choice, they do not have to adopt this. He is not adopting it—or voting on it. He will not vote for this language. Ms. Dwyer stated she was not asking for a vote on this language, she asked for the board to vote for the board to affirm it's upholding of the laws of the State and the Country. Board Chair Crume said he would abstain—he is not playing into this game. He doesn't know what he is being asked, and will abstain until he has a chance to research exactly what she's asking. He does not believe he is breaking any laws by doing this. Member Olmo asked the board Secretary to read back the motion. Board Chair Crume stated there was a motion and a second and called for a vote. The motion passes 3-0, members Crume and Lengwin abstaining. Mr. Crume again stated he does not believe we are required to put that language in our policies. He has talked to attorneys and been advised that they do not have to put that language and that language is very dangerous and opens them up for all kinds of lawsuits. The way that these policies are written exposes our teachers and our staff and he has been sent a model bullying policy and asked the board if they would like a copy of it. He then passed it out to board members. Ms. Olmo said it sounds like they need legal council to help them understand what they can and cannot do. She certainly has every intent to put policies into place in this district that uphold state and federal laws and wouldn't want to do anything that deviates from that—or do anything that puts the district at risk. If Mr. Crume has been having conversations with people that they haven't. Mr. Crume offered to provide the names to other board members so they could call them. Ms. Dwyer asked how we place our students or our staff at risk by protecting people from bullying on the basis of this protected class? Mr. Crume responded that it's the way that the language is written that talks about whether a teacher sees and acts, they are forced to report it or not report it. Ms. Dwyer asked for further clarification on what Mr. Crume's issues were. He responded that the policies in general; the way these policies are written as a whole. Ms. Dwyer asked Mr. Crume why he thinks sexual orientation should not be a protected class? Member York responded that they are all part of a protected class. Member Crume asked if it wasn't fair to say that we don't bully anybody? Why do we have to have protected classes in there? He doesn't want any kid to bully anybody—but he will not make special rules for somebody because they are a homosexual. Ms. Dwyer responded that it is her understanding that sexual orientation is among the protected classes of the State of Oregon, along with race, creed, color, marital status . . . Member York again added that we are all part of a protected class and he is confused about the language and why they have to create a protected class so that everyone knows that they are in a protected class? Director Breckner responded that it relates directly to personnel. One of the things the District has an obligation to do—regardless and one of the things board policies do is provide notice to staff, students, and public where you have to provide notice. Sexual orientation is one of the protected classes both at the federal level and state statute. Not providing notice that you may not discriminate against one of the protected classes she believes and it's something she can verify through legal counsel. If you discriminate in any way, or fail to protect one of the protected classes you open the district up to lawsuits both through EEOC, BOLI and the ACLU. There is a reason those

POLICIES—FOURTH
READING
(CONTINUED)

classes have been identified specifically both at the state and federal level. Staff has an obligation, because of the law, if they see that happening they have an obligation to stop it and they have an obligation to report it. Failure to do it jeopardizes their license. Part of it is the district has to provide notice and she believes that's what that policy is doing. She would have to look at the one Mr. Crume provided to see what the comparison is. But they have an obligation as a board to provide notice about what their policies are, and the consequences of not following them are as well. She believes the board is obligated under the law to declare protection for the protected classes that are identified at the state and federal level. Mr. Crume stated he is not comfortable with the language in the policy at all and is not prepared to approve it. He has talked to several attorneys in regards to it and does not believe they are under any obligation to adopt the policy. There are other ways they can write the policies and believes they are better for our district. He then asked the board if they want to vote on the policies individually or if they want to table it for further discussion or legal counsel? Mr. York responded that he would be interested to see whether they have to. Ms. Olmo stated the policy that they approved prior (in November), because they were vetted through the Oregon School Boards Association, for her there was a sense of support and thoughtfulness because it came from OSBA and the superintendent's office, she was happy to support them and the inclusion of them. Ms. Adams interjected that they have been through legal counsel as well as OSBA. Ms. Olmo stated she was not philosophically opposed to doing it in a different way, but wouldn't do anything a different way without legal counsel. She wouldn't be prepared to talk about making any sort of new policy without OSBA or legal counsel because they one that they had approved had been vetted. Mr. Crume stated that the attorney from the Alliance Defending Freedom said that he would be glad to fly up and present to the board for no charge at any time they ask him, which would be free legal advice. Ms. Olmo said she doesn't know why they would veer away from what OSBA has provided us. She understands some of the issues with the first policy that was discussed as they want to make sure that our grounds are accessible to the community and we don't lock out our community. On this policy she doesn't understand what is in there that they are afraid of. Everything to her seems thoughtful and in regards to turning students into the DMV—she can't think of a situation where you would want to turn a student in to the DMV—but it says 'may', it doesn't say they have to. It is a pathway that is open to the district if they encounter a situation where they want to pursue it for whatever reason that may be. All of the stuff regarding sexual orientation and protected classes has been vetted a number of times and suspects it's in the policy for a good reason and if they need to take more time to make sure of it then she would support it. Mr. Crume stated it is there for a reason, not necessarily a good reason—there is an agenda. You read in California about the school districts that have adopted this and now support transgender bathrooms. Do we want that is Josephine County, Oregon or anywhere? He doesn't think it is right. When you start adopting policies like this you are opening the door for that—in his opinion. Ms. Olmo responded that they have a responsibility to serve their constituents and whether or not their constituents are directly reflective of their family and what they deal with at home, they have a responsibility to serve all of their constituents, especially if they are protected under state or federal law. She doesn't know if they have the right to decide if they are willing to do that or not. Mr. Crume said they have the right to set their policies. They are the board. They do not have to adopt this. They do not have to put that language in there. If they have the right not to put that language in there why would they consciously do that. Ms. Olmo stated she supports it and agrees with the language. Ms. Dwyer agreed. Director Breckner added that another thing they have an obligation to do as a board is protect each and every student and staff member from any kind of discrimination, harassment or bullying. As a public school system they have the obligation to educate each and every child that come to us regardless of how they come to us. Mr. Crume agreed that no child should bully another—but right now they are making special categories and makes no sense to him. Ms. Breckner said the special categories have been determined by state and federal law. Mr. Crume disagreed with what she said because they do not have to adopt this language. He has been counseled by three different attorneys that have all told them they do not have to

accept this language and is foolish to accept it. It is dangerous to our whole community. Member Olmo said she would need to hear from the district's counsel on this. Ms. Adams assured the board this has gone through OSBA, Senate Bill, House Bill and ORS. It is the law, why they would want to go with anything besides law is beyond her understanding—but that is their choice. Their responsibility as a board is to set policy; their responsibility as a board is also to follow the law; and if the law is clearly articulated in a policy why would they object to that? The policy has gone through legal counsel for the State of Oregon on school law for school districts in the State of Oregon to help them operate and to protect them from lawsuits.

POLICIES—FOURTH
READING (CONTINUED)

Member Olmo made a motion to support and adopt policy JFCF—*Hazing/Harassment/Intimidation/Menacing/Bullying/Cyberbullying/Teen Dating Violence-Student* as presented. Member Dwyer seconded the motion. Member Lengwin stated he still has a problem with the driving privileges. He doesn't understand why our school system would want to get involved in the personal matter with the DMV. Ms. Dwyer asked if there have been legal requests made of us to inform the DMV of ongoing disciplinary problems? Director Breckner responded that the district signs off when kids go to get their drivers license for behavior, grades and attendance. Director Valenzuela stated that it became a law that the district can do that but it is rarely used. There are often times when trying to keep a student in school there are not very many incentives to do that and the driving privilege becomes one. It's only used in those types of circumstances. The State of Oregon passed a law that we enact it and use it as a tool. It's just another tool to try keep kids in school and make them successful. Mr. Lengwin said it feels like we are over-stepping our bounds—we are here to educate kids and not police families and their driving privileges; it seems like a DMV matter and not a school matter. Superintendent Adams stated the only time she has seen it used is in juvenile court where the district and the juvenile court are working together with an attendance issue and to keep the child in school. Mr. Valenzuela stated that if that language was removed from the policy the action could still be taken, barring a policy stating that we can't do it because it is in the law. Mr. Crume said that it is not a law and he has legal counsel that says otherwise and encouraged the rest of the board to table it and read the information that he has been given as to why they don't want to adopt these policies and what the difference is between good policies and bad policies to protect students right, protect teachers right and protect parents rights. There is language in the policy that says a kid can be investigated for bullying without even letting their parents know. In the sample policy he provided, it protects the kids and gives their parents rights that their parents need to be notified before they are under investigation for bullying or harassment. There is language in the policy that protects them from being falsely accused. Member York asked that if the language was added about notifying the parent. Mr. Crume asked that they table the policy and they read the information that he brought. He will send them the emails and asked the board to get some counsel themselves and that they do not have to adopt this stuff. They can have bullying policies in place without the language. It is not the right thing to do. Member Lengwin made a motion to table policy JFCF. Board Chair Crume stated there was already a motion to approve policy JFCF as presented. Member Olmo revised her motion to remove the second paragraph regarding contacting DMV to suspend driving privileges if it helps other board members support the intent of the policy. Mr. Crume responded that it would not help his support. He would like the board to have a chance to read what he has read. Ms. Adams stated the changes in the policy are in response to the House Bill and Senate Bill indicated on the last page. Ms. Olmo stated that in adopting this policy they are supporting state law, which is her intent. She prefers it with the paragraph regarding the DMV, just as a tool. If the friendly amendment to remove the DMV portion gathers support to get this policy on the books she would be happy to submit that amendment. Board Chair Crume responded that she has a board member looking her in the eye and saying that he received legal counsel from three different attorneys, and he questions all that is highlighted is the law and she is willing to adopt that-with that question? Ms. Olmo said that they have an obligation to stand in front of this district, staff

POLICIES—FOURTH
READING
(CONTINUED)

and constituents and say that they uphold state law. They are being told this is state law and they are creating a situation that is nervous and unstable because they are saying that they don't believe it is state law? She believes this is state law and she supports state law. She wants it clearly stated from the board of their district that they support state law throughout their buildings and their district and that this is their intent. She is sorry for the disagreement and does not like the confrontation. Mr. Crume apologized to Ms. Adams if he had offended her in any way. Ms. Adams said that she is not offended. She has a responsibility to inform them of state law. She has a responsibility to inform them that they have taken an oath of office to follow state law as a school board member and she has a responsibility to remind them that her licensure, the administrator's licensure is contingent on that. If their policy leads the district away from state law they are putting the district staff at risk. Ms. Dwyer reminded them that they had a motion on the floor with a second. Mr. Crume asked what if it is not state law? What if they don't have to adopt this policy? Ms. Adams does not know how to tell him that it is not state law even though that is what he would like to hear. She does not even know what kind of attorney he has. She knows what kind of attorney we have. The attorney we have aligns with Oregon state law and is an expert recommendation. They are not going to take 197 school districts down this path. There are 197 school districts in the State of Oregon that have revisited this policy. Mr. Crume asked if we have to adopt this? Ms. Adams responded that we have to follow state law. If the policy allows for another level of building level leverage and it's not within this policy she has to advise the board that they could be at risk and gave an example of a potential lawsuit. Mr. Crume responded that they have something to protect kids—bullying is not allowed. That is in place right now. Ms. Olmo said that rather that let this continue to spiral out of control she asked that Mr. Crume to call for a vote. Board Chair Crume stated that there is a motion on the table and a second. The motion to approve policy JFCF and JFCF-AR passed 4-1 (board Chair Crume opposing).

Board Chair Crume then brought forward policy *GBNA-Hazing/Harassment/Intimidation/Bullying/Menacing-Staff* and GBNA-AR. Member Olmo made a motion to adopt policy GBNA and GBNA-AR as presented. Member Dwyer seconded and the motion passed 4-1 (Board Chair Crume opposing).

Member Olmo then made a motion to approve policy *KL-Public Complaints* and KL-AR *Public Complaint Procedure*. Member York seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

Member Olmo then stated the policy that there is still some concern and disagreement about is policy *KGB—Public Conduct on District Property*. She asked Mr. Crume if he had some idea of amendments that could be made to the policy that would help home support the policy? Mr. Crume responded that he stated them at the beginning and still stands where he stated them. He is not in favor of people putting flyers all over the schools to promote their businesses but there is an older gentlemen in the community that goes around to all of the schools and puts out constitution pamphlets at each of our schools for the kids to read. Ms. Olmo asked what if groups were doing the same thing and the content and activity in those groups aren't things that he would support? Where do they draw the line in stating one is valuable and one is trash? If it is not being vetted through the district office where would the control be? She expressed concern about what the students might be exposed to.

Mr. Misner stated that multiple times they have handed out the Constitution and the Bill of Rights. They have a class that covers all of that material very clearly. In his entire experience at all three of the high schools he has never seen anyone prohibit the distribution of any of the original documents. Some of their proficiencies now in social studies are based on the study of the original documents—Constitution, Bill of Rights, etc. It seems like we are providing for freedom of expression. Ms. Olmo asked if somebody wanted to come and hand some Constitution material and they go through the district office would they be allowed to do that? Ms. Quick responded yes as it is educational. Ms. Olmo then stated so

we have a system now where that type of information can be disseminated to our students and information or solicitations that are inappropriate can not be? The types of material that are previously allowed include: educational, athletics—Pop Warner, etc. Ms. Dwyer said that if that gentleman submitted his pamphlet to the district for approval it sounds like he would be able to post that material at the school. Ms. Olmo does not want to see a flyer advertising for work at the inappropriate bar down the street at our high schools. Ms. Dwyer added that it is her experience this line of the policy has been quite effective. She has felt no undue barriers due to utilizing the school as an avenue of distribution and communication with the parents for the educational materials that she regularly sends home. Member York likes the idea of the school district and the superintendent having the control of what's going on and if the board has a problem with what the superintendent is doing then they can take that up with the superintendent. Mr. Crume responded that we need to put that in the policy. The board agreed to add an amendment to #11 stating "unless approved in advance by the district".

POLICIES—FOURTH
READING (CONTINUED)

Board Chair Crume asked for discussion on #10 [regarding motorized model airplanes, helicopters, etc.]. Member Dwyer stated that it is her understanding that we routinely approve those requests. Member Olmo said the requests also help alleviate potential conflict when they have events at the schools. Member York added that if people were to show up in spite of the activity then the district has the policy to enforce the proper use. Ms. Dwyer asked Mr. Crume if he could live with it. Mr. Crume responded no—he will not vote for it and told them to move on. Ms. Olmo then addressed item #13 [skateboards, roller blades, etc.] and stated there were good points brought up and they certainly want to have our students be able to bring skateboards, scooters and roller blades to get to school. She believes the intent of #13 is to make sure they are not using them on school property during school hours. Mr. Crume responded that is not what it says. If a principal is not happy with a kid, and the kid rides a skateboard to school, the principal is going to pull out the policy and say "no person on district property shall use a skateboard". Ms. Olmo responded that it probably, in most cases, is appropriate to give that discretion to the principal. Ms. Dwyer said she hardly thinks our principals use our policies as a punitive measure against students they dislike. She said that is what Mr. Crume's statement sounded like to her. Mr. Crume responded that he is trying to think of any scenario that could happen. Ms. Dwyer asked if they want it to say as a means of transportation to school wheels are okay - but hanging out on school grounds outside of school hours using their skateboard they are not okay with? Mr. Crume understands the damage part of it—he doesn't want damage to our schools. It just doesn't seem fair—doesn't seem right. There was more discussion regarding potential language changes regarding safety and insurance issues. Mr. Valenzuela suggested adding the terms "inappropriate use of" to the language, which would give the schools some control.

Hidden Valley Principal Daye Stone provided insight from a management angle as building principal. There are kids coming and going in vehicles, bicycles and skateboards. Skateboards are destructive of personal and public property. When you are a manager of something you need to think of it from this perspective—what you allow, you encourage. When you encourage things that could potentially create conflict you have to manage that. When you manage that, it takes resources. He provided an example at his school regarding skateboards in which they require students check their skateboards in at the office or leave it in their vehicle. They had some kids before break that kept their skateboards in the vehicle then at lunch time were in the school parking lot skating. A kid fell and hurt his arm; one kid got mad and started throwing rocks at another kid and his point was the management part of it is that would not have existed if kids didn't have skateboards. He has never seen a kid come on a bicycle to school and create conflict on the bicycle. With skateboards it happens all of the time. From a management perspective, it's a dangerous place to be just because they are conflictual. They can potentially create a hazard that is linked to safety with other students, whether it is at lunch time. He understands the freedom aspect, but the reality is they have a

POLICIES—FOURTH
READING
(CONTINUED)

responsibility to all students, not just the ones that bring the skateboard to school. Mr. Crume responded that if they are riding it down the hallway, it's inappropriate—if they are riding it on the curbs, scratching the curbs, it's inappropriate. They can fall and break their arm walking in the parking lot or riding a bicycle. Superintendent Adams asked the principals—when they see the busses and the parking and all of the movement of cars at the end of the day. If the kid is riding their skateboard from the building to the exit is there a higher risk? Mr. Stone believes it is. Mr. Misner stated they have a very attractive hill at North Valley and provided a story from this year in which students were weaving in and out of cars at the bottom of the driveway. The kid continues to have his skateboard at school every day since then and has not done that again. However, he is not wild about that kid having the opportunity by the blessing of the board to allow him to ride his skateboard at school. The 'when' question comes off of the table. Ms. Adams stated they have a responsibility to make sure kids are safe and if they are going to ride skateboards at school they have a responsibility to put safety protection in for kids. Member Olmo made a motion to approve policy KGB with the addition of #11 to read "unless approved in advance by the district" and after hearing from some of the administrators that is the only amendment. Member Dwyer seconded the motion and the motion failed 2-3 (Members Crume, Lengwin and York opposing).

Board Chair Crume asked if they wanted further discussion or to come back to it at a later date? Member York asked with the management aspect are they managing it today? Lorna Byrne Principal Rachael George responded they are managing it because they are asking the kids once they get to the property to get off their bike and walk it or to walk their skateboard. It is in their handbooks and has been very successful. They haven't had any complaints at any of the middle schools. The kids accept it. She has a lot of skateboard kids and a lot of bikes. Kids are happy to use it as an active transportation mode and it is managed. So the policy is in alignment with current practices that already exist.

Mr. Stone wanted to go on record that he is not against skateboards, but the management end of it has been an issue. For him, there are a lot of places to ride a skateboard—it doesn't have to be at school so he doesn't believe they should have them, which was his personal opinion. It's one more thing that they have to manage. As the board has heard from all of the administrative staff—what is our focus? What is our priority? If they can't create policies in the practice, that assure the safety of our students then nothing else matters. He then gave an example of a student on a skateboard that grabbed the receiver of a four wheel-drive truck flying down the driveway after school before the busses left. Kids can make stupid choices. Using some discretion on the management end is important. Member York asked with this policy, the way it is now, they would be prohibiting kids from bringing them to school? Many administrators responded "no". Mr. Misner responded that so far they have had pretty good luck with managing it. They have some appropriate use things in their handbook that work very well. It is a problem that is not broken.

Hidden Valley Assistant Principal Jamie Ongman added that it is managed by the building handbooks, which is for students inside of the school day. Where they don't have policy, and where he feels they are leaving themselves wide open for liability issues is at sporting events or activities where the general public is there and a student brings a skateboard and decides to do a grinder on the handrails and hits another person. The liability then falls on the district because they were hurt on district property. We have no policy around extra-curricular activities after school hours. Director Allen-Hart stated with the word "inappropriate" who's to decide what is inappropriate? Mr. Ongman stated the same could be said for animals/dogs at sporting events. Someone brings their dog and a little kid wants to pet the dog and the dog bites the little kid.

Member York clarified that with this district policy we would not be prohibiting them from being there. Ms. Olmo responded they are prohibiting them from using them on district property. Mr. Crume stated with this district policy they are telling the taxpayers of this

community that foot the bill they cannot come on school grounds and fly model airplanes, they cannot bring their dogs to soccer games. Mr. York also understands that we have a public that wants to see the board manage the properties well. He doesn't see that being a problem—to say that in the best interest of managing district property they have limitations for those that visit the properties. As a business owner, that is how view it also. Ms. Olmo asked if there was a motion that he could make? Mr. York responded that following this discussion, knowing that the policy that is in place is being managed the way it is he does not see that it is a hindrance to the kids. Mr. Crume stated he is not sure there a policy in place—this is a brand new policy. The principals are setting rules and it's working. Ms. Dwyer said that they are saying it is in the handbooks and they need it to be backed up by district policy.

POLICIES—FOURTH
READING (CONTINUED)

Member Olmo asked if she were to resubmit the motion she made earlier? Member York agreed to second the motion. Ms. Olmo made a motion to approve policy KGB—*Public Conduct on District Property* with the insertion of language “unless approved in advance by the district” to item #11. Member York seconded the motion and the motion passed 3-2 (Members Crume and Lengwin opposing).

Member Dwyer asked to state publicly her support for all of out state legally protected classes.

Adjourn at 8:05 PM

ADJOURN

Ron Crume
Chairperson of the Board

Patricia Adams
Superintendent-Clerk