

Three Rivers School District Board of Directors met for a special session, Tuesday, October 7, 2014 at the District Administrative Office, 8550 New Hope Road, Grants Pass, Josephine County, Oregon at 6:00 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 (*Arrived late*)
Ron Crume, Member of the Board, Zone IV
Ron Lengwin, Vice-Chair of the Board, Zone V (*Arrived late*)
David Holmes, Superintendent-Clerk
Debbie Breckner, Director of Human Resources
Dave Valenzuela, Director of K-8 Education & Technology
Casey Alderson, Director of Secondary Ed., Athletics & Alt. Ed.

ABSENT: Stephanie Allen-Hart, Director of Student Services ABSENT

Also Present: Neil Clark, Peri Wilson, Dave Marks, Renee Hults/Manzanita
Principal, Keith Haley, Liz Dolantree, Van Grainger, Patricia
Krauss, David Smith and Shelly Quick/Recording Secretary. ALSO PRESENT

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

Member Dwyer made a motion to approve the agenda as presented. Mr. York seconded the motion. Superintendent Holmes stated that item 4-B.2 (Out of State Travel—Lorna Byrne MS GEAR UP) needs to be removed from the Consent Agenda as it no longer needs approval—it has been cancelled. Member Crume stated that for discussion purposes there is still no item for ‘new business’ or ‘unfinished business’ categories. He has requested that several times concerning the Robert’s Rules of Order. Ms. Dwyer responded she thought that had been requested for board regular sessions—not work sessions. Mr. Crume said that he doesn’t know that Robert’s Rules of Order states that. He believes it should be for any agenda. Mr. Holmes added that he looked into that and from a Robert’s Rules of Order perspective that is just a suggestion, not a rule. By not doing it you are not in violation of Robert’s Rules of Order or board policy. It does not preclude you from, as a board, putting it on there but want to clarify from a legal perspective, it is a suggestion. Mr. Crume stated that many times they have wanted to discuss something further and haven’t had the ability. The argument seems to have been from Member Olmo usually that she wanted to have the public be notified on any additional items. But under ORS 192.640 it states that additional subjects can be considered at public meetings and goes on to tell why. It also goes on to state that it’s nice to try to list everything but by all means they can be considered. He requested for the future board meetings that they have a ‘new business’ and ‘unfinished business’ category. Mr. York responded they will work towards that. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Board Chair York called for a vote to approve the agenda as presented with the revision of the removal of item 4-B.2 and the motion passed unanimously (3-0—Members Olmo and Lengwin not yet present).

Board Chair York presented the Consent Agenda. All items on the Consent Agenda

CONSENT AGENDA

may 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 arrived)

Member Crume asked that item 'C' (Approval of minutes) be pulled from the Consent Agenda then made a motion to approve the Consent Agenda with items A (Routine Personnel Items) and B (Out of State Travel Request). Member Olmo seconded and the motion passed unanimously (4-0 Member Lengwin not yet present).

Member Olmo made a motion to approve the minutes presented as a fair representation of the audio recording of the meetings. Member Dwyer seconded and the motion passed 3-0, (Member Crume abstaining).

CURRICULUM REVIEW
SEQUENCE

Superintendent Holmes presented a representation of a seven year curriculum review sequence and explained that when we use the words 'curriculum' we are talking about student learning goals that are included under each specific content area. All of the content areas have a list of state learning goals the state creates for all districts that we are required to meet. Those are fairly narrow in relationship to the entire curriculum. When the district goes through a review of curriculum we start with the state learning standards and then add on to those anything that the local district would want our students to learn in that particular content area outside of the range that the state provides. Our district curriculum is always going to be as wide or broader than the state curriculum. When we use the word 'curriculum' that is only student learning goals. The student will be able to do this—that's what curriculum is. Instructional materials are those things that we either purchase and provide for staff or that staff creates on their own or finds on their own, or anything that the teacher would use in the learning environment to have students meet those student learning goals. The typical, back when he was in school, the curriculum and instructional materials were the same thing and they were a textbook. Nowadays we have instructional materials adoptions, we still in many cases adopt a textbook, but that is just one tool that teachers will use in a cadre of things that would involve movies, internet, magazines, research papers and a variety of things that they would find and pull together. The district generally provides some guidance around what the breadth and the depth of those instructional materials are so that we don't have particular teachers running afoul of things that we don't find appropriate for either a particular grade level or our students and our district—they are given guidance on what those are but we would still provide the ELA adoption that we did K-8 last year where we adopted the *Journey's* curriculum. That's an example of something we provided for them. We are having a very healthy discussion right now with the teachers as a group around how are those materials used and what level of professional leniency they have around what they have to use and what they can use and put their own voice and choice in to creating their classroom environment with those materials.

Mr. Holmes explained what the curriculum review sequence represents is there are seven major content areas and then CTE/vocational ed and technology. ELA shows grades 9-12 as we did the K-8 adoption last year. It's a four year process and year one of the process we would create a curriculum committee around that particular content area and spend a year looking at what the latest research and student learning objectives are in that content area and we would make a determination based on that research around what we wanted our district curriculum to be. That curriculum committee would be comprised of the professionals, teachers, administrators and people from the community that have a background in that particular content area that can provide that asset and a viewpoint that would be healthy and productive in that environment. As an example, for science, would love to have somebody from the community that's a biologist, somebody that works in forestry, somebody that works in the water lab—so that we are bringing in

people in our community that are parents and have a background in a profession that uses that content on a daily basis. Similar to the vocational piece, it changes every day. So, when we are looking at those instructional materials the following year, and reviewing those things, those people can lend a very keen insight in to how this is applicable. Year one is a review of best practice, research and what is going on in that content area. Year two we would bring in sets of instructional materials. More than likely it would be a combination of things at different grade levels from different publishers. Sometimes it is a consistent scope and sequence of materials from one publisher and then we find other pieces to add to that and enrich and support the core piece. Year three is where we are at right now with the ELA adoption for K-8. That's the implementation year where we do all the professional development for getting the instructional materials in the hands of the teachers and providing the oversight in the classrooms and outside of the classrooms. Himself and all of the directors have been working very hard around supporting our teachers with what's going on in the classroom with these new materials. Making sure they have everything they need to do the best job they can with those materials for the benefit of our students. Year four, which is usually the piece that is always missing in most districts in all materials adoptions and curriculum adoptions, is a review of how's it going, what is working, what is not working well and going through and adapting and maybe even throwing something out, pulling a piece out or readopting a new piece that's missing. The professionals in the classroom that are using it will be able to come in and say this is great, this is not, this is working well, or need to modify this, etc. Then we can go back out again and it keeps getting better year after year. Every year, over a four year sequence, you are dealing with four content areas at one time. So when you are in the process of doing the research around the curriculum in one area, you are at the same time doing evaluation of materials in another area and at the same time implementing in a third area and evaluating in a fourth area and it continues to rotate at all times. You are continually updating your curriculum so every seven years your are taking a fresh look at what the learning standards are for your students, your getting new fresh materials, you are implementing them in the classroom and getting the teachers up to speed in those content areas and you are reviewing what happened the year before in that previous content area. The critical piece is that you can't miss a funding year—as soon as you miss a funding year then it slows the whole process down and gets off cycle and we end up where we are right now. One of the biggest things we are dealing with, with teachers right now, is that it has been 14 years since they have had an adoption of materials. In the absence of an adoption of new materials in 14 years they have spent an incredible amount of time of creating their own materials. Now, when we come in with these new best researched, best practices materials what we are really doing is asking them to give up all that hard work and put it away of those materials they have spent all that time on creating and not use it again. There's a lot of grieving going on right now over 'my stuff' they are not using any more. As a professional they did a good job of creating the materials and they worked well. Staff will begin to expect that process on a regular basis and will also begin to expect the turnover of those materials every seven years and begin to look forward to it. Teachers in his former district were always looking forward to it.

Mr. Holmes stated the other thing they need to know that the particular content area they will address in order follows the state's piece around what they are looking at and what they are reviewing. The state will look at what is the latest and what the state's going to adopt in a particular content area. We don't want to be doing ours and then find the state to do theirs the following year, or two or three years later. We want to make sure that the state does theirs and they're done so we know what they are going to ask us to do and then we can come in after them and add what we want to do to what they have already done. So that it's not the other way around—so that we end up adopting something and then a year later the state comes in and changes all of their learning standards and now we have new materials and all this work we have done and it doesn't match up with what they want us to do. The order presented follows what is currently published at ODE around

CURRICULUM REVIEW
SEQUENCE

what their adoption policy is. Mr. Holmes then asked if there were questions?

Member Crume stated he didn't have questions, but many comments about some of the statements Mr. Holmes made. First, he believes Mr. Holmes' interpretation of a curriculum committee and his interpretation are two completely separate things. He visualizes the curriculum committee being made up of our community members—no title or stipulations to their education level, whatever that may be. He wants grass roots, common sense thinkers that can sit down and evaluate the material that our kids are getting taught. We seem to have changed the way the U.S. Constitution is being taught. We have a gross sex ed program—what's being shoved down our kids throats; our math is horrible—all related to Common Core. His reason for wanting a curriculum committee is so that we can have parents of our community and community members come forward and look and evaluate the problems that we are seeing with Common Core and that our community members are speaking about and report to the board with a voice. Mr. Holmes talked about the professionals in this outline that these teachers are given. What he has heard from teachers is that they are being put in a box and they are being handed scripts to teach and they are not happy about it. He hears words from the administrators like 'fidelity' and 'autonomy' and he interprets that as "*All Hail to Hitler*"; "*Keep your heads down and your mouths shut*" and he doesn't think that's what our teachers need to do. He heard Ms. Dwyer say at the last board meeting that the teachers should have the freedom to teach and he doesn't think our teachers are having the freedom to teach any more. He thinks they are being handed scripts and it's not good and he's passionate about it. He listened to what Mr. Holmes said and we have talked about a curriculum committee and he feels like this is an appeasement to dance around that. He feels like, him personally, we need a curriculum committee made up of our community members, of the parents and the grandparents and the taxpayers that can have the freedom to review the materials and sit in the classrooms and see what's being shoved down our kids throats. Our schools are giving kids Smarter Balance tests and the content of those tests are secretive. The parents are not even supposed to review what's on those tests and that's not right. When we have things going on in our public schools like that it is not right.

Mr. York asked if that was a true statement? That the Smarter Balance test can't be reviewed by a parent? Mr. Holmes suggested Director Valenzuela may be able to speak to that specific question. In the state of Washington, as a parent, if you want to challenge any particular question or any particular test there is a process to go through and you can, as a parent, review your student's test and their answers. Mr. Valenzuela responded that Smarter Balance assessment is completely online. You can take practice tests at every grade level and every subject that's testable. You can see all of the vetted test questions that are in there. You cannot see what is actually be tested on—teachers can't and he can't. No one at any level can see because if we did the test results wouldn't be valid. But, the types of test questions that are being asked are completely online and you can take a practice test at any level any time you want. Mr. Holmes added that in Washington there has always been that process—you can challenge that test and you can see a particular question or the whole thing and review it. It's very clumsy in terms of how that is done but you can do that. They are concerned about test questions getting out and ruining the validity of the test. Mr. York asked then as a parent you find out your son or daughter did lousy on the test—you would be able to come back and? Mr. Holmes responded that with Smarter Balance there are practice assessments online and you will know whether they are in the ballpark; being able to address most of those things ahead of time. Mr. Valenzuela added they would be able to find out in what areas, what strands that your student didn't do well in. A teacher would be able to tell them that information right away once we got the results in. Looking at specific questions, being our first year, he is not sure if we will be able to go to the actual question. That was never available with OAKS or TESA or any version of our statewide testing.

Mr. Crume stated we have talked many times in the past, over the last couple of years,

about a curriculum committee. We have asked to have it on the agenda and he would like to have that as a future topic on our agenda item as the board forming a curriculum committee. We have had community members step forward and ask for a curriculum committee; we have people that stepped up and been willing to volunteer and he requests that for future a board meeting agenda item that we would have a curriculum committee discussion. Member Dwyer asked if he was proposing that we have two committees functioning at the same time, with the same name and two completely different sets of responsibilities. Mr. Crume said no—we can have a different name but this seems to be the administrations idea of their curriculum committee and it's something completely different than what he has heard from the community members and what he had visualized in his mind. Ms. Olmo stated that if we take the structure or foundation that they were presented with tonight, and certainly want parents and community members, she thinks having a reasonable background level with the appropriate topic, seems like a great start. Getting a group of people together to work with their administration and our school district seems to be what they are doing tonight. This idea makes sense to her.

CURRICULUM REVIEW
SEQUENCE

Mr. Holmes said if the board, as a group, wants to put together a committee to challenge Common Core—go for it. Mr. Crume responded that it's not necessarily to challenge Common Core. Mr. Holmes said it is—absolutely the idea of the Common Core perspective and how Smarter Balance connects to that and the problem he has with that is that if the state wants to do away with Common Core, he's not sure what they would change when they do away with that in terms of their learning standards. A few might change—but whatever they change as a result of what they do we would then take that into consideration as we go through this process to create that. His perspective is, he has a job to do and that is to have our students meet the state learning standards, whatever those are. Within that, if the district's student learning standards are broader than those then that's an additional challenge on top of that to have our students meet that. That's where his and his staff focus and energy needs to be at. If the board wants to do something that's action oriented as a group, because as a board you believe Common Core is wrong, then he suggested taking some action as a board and sending that to the state and giving that to Ron Saxton and sending to the Governor. Send a memorandum that the Three Rivers School District Board is opposed—and send that off and take some political action as a political committee against that. He has no personal agenda for or against Common Core. He looks at the state learning standards that came out of that; he's looked at the one's in Washington and read them and we're already doing that stuff, we already teach it. He can go through every one of those learning standards that's in Common Core and can't find one of those that he can say he doesn't want his student to learn that. There is not one them that he believes is harmful to our students or that our students shouldn't learn. Then we are down to—if those learning standards are appropriate or they are all ones that we would say we don't want our students doing, then it becomes a matter of how you go about creating learning environments in the classroom that have students be prepared to master those learning standards. Mr. Crume made a good point about our math program. They are not going to disagree about some of the things in that math program that are not done maybe the best way possible. One of things he has addressed frequently in his other district that he sees exactly going on here is that the way we do math now is different than the way anybody in the room over thirty years old learned how to do math. When we send stuff home with their students to those parents they don't understand how to help their students and that's a bad position to put the parent in. He has had that conversation with principals at one level or another to be thinking about what are math program is doing and what message is it sending because homework should be practice. Parents can help with that and those are skill sets that our parents need to have. It is all about teaching our kids how to think and process, compare and contrast, evaluate, synthesize. It's not about memorizing things. It's not about even application, because that's not the society they are moving in to. That said, you have to have something to think about and if you don't have a basis of knowledge—what do you think about? The learning environments he has been in the classrooms he has been in were phenomenal. He doesn't know where the board

CURRICULUM REVIEW
SEQUENCE

wants to go with this. What he is presenting to them is an idea around looking at district learning standards, in terms of what the state's done, matching those up, expanding looking at those pieces, looking at instructional materials that help our teachers teach to that and then following through with that. He does think the Common Core, Smarter Balance is a whole different conversation.

Mr. Crume said so many times they have talked about increasing our ADM and building the bridge with our community and transparency. He doesn't see what would be wrong—we have had community members come forward and request to be a part of some kind of curriculum committee or some kind of a group that has access to be the classrooms, to talk with the curriculum directors, to see the information. He thinks the transparency would be good. He would invite a committee to come forward, assuming they have enough people volunteer to do that and be able to come forward and alert the board. Share what they think is going great, where there are areas of concern, where there are problems with books, questions, or whatever it is. He doesn't see what the problem would be. Ms. Olmo said basically what they are talking about doing—but doing it in a methodical way starting with technology and whoever puts the committee together, but working with a group of people who are willing to volunteer their time and hopefully have the background knowledge in the subject area to spend time and energy focusing and communicating with them; certainly being representative of their community—parents and professionals and whoever might best make up that group. Taking one bit at a time and clearly communicating and then move forward. Mr. Crume said that's not the way he feels about it—it's just what they envision. What he envisions is a group that has the freedom to work these things out on their own. To do what that group wants to do to address what the group wants to do. What he sees her recommending is a structured, controlled environment from the administration possibly. Mr. York said his thoughts on that would be that in a controlled environment they actually have a focus. Mr. Crume recommended they put a request out for a group to come forward, for some people to volunteer? Ms. Olmo asked if that would be for the technology piece? Mr. Crume responded no—for a whole curriculum committee. Ms. Olmo responded that's not what she is hearing being proposed. Mr. Crume said no—that's what he is proposing. Mr. Holmes stated he doesn't understand what the focus or the purpose of that committee would be. He doesn't know what they would be challenged with looking at or solving or giving input on. When Mr. Crume refers to whole curriculum, we are talking seven content areas along with a number of peripheral learning standards as well. If we are back to the Common Core piece that's the problem—or maybe it's at the state level? Mr. Crume had mentioned health and sex ed. To take on the idea of looking at curriculum—there's no focus and where do they start, what level do they start and what content area we start? Mr. Crume responded that maybe we should advertise it on a regular board agenda and let the community come forward and tell us how they feel? He is just trying to interpret what he has heard and doesn't have the answers. He stated he wasn't behind this and doesn't intend on being a part of this committee. Ms. Olmo asked if we have parents that have concerns about our current curriculum isn't there a process in place with our district for them to voice their concerns and have those ideas addressed? Mr. Crume responded that he is just telling them what he has heard and what he has interpreted from our community. He feels like we should put it on an agenda and we should leave that open for them to come forward and let them tell us what they visualize and what they have in mind. There have been several of them speak of it.

Mr. Holmes stated this is the process he is presenting for what he wants to try to accomplish. If we want to put together, and just call it a Common Core committee then go for it. Mr. Crume responded that he doesn't think that's what he has heard. He doesn't think that this is a group that is just totally against Common Core. He doesn't think that's their agenda. We need to hear from the public. Mr. Holmes said we want to advertise it as that because the resulting group of people that comes together then the board needs to determine what their focus is going to be and what direction they are going to be given

for their work. What ultimately will they be looking at and when they come up with whatever they decide they found or not found then what does that mean? What is the board going to do with that information? How are they going to make an impact either at the local or the state level. For him, most of this stuff comes back to *it's above our pay grade*. A lot of people have the same issue that we get told what we must do in a public school system by the people that are above us. There are certain things that we have liberties to change and modify and other things that we don't. Most of our battles at the local level are always at the state level. They are never really at the local level. This district did a phenomenal job last year looking at the budgeting process which was the money drives everything and district did a phenomenal job of going through that process—it was highly successful. But impacting those people above us as the state level is a whole other ball game. So then what we have to do is we have to decide—are we going to be that community and are we going to be that district that's going to raise our hand and say “up yours state” this is where we're going and this is what we're doing and do to us what you will? Because ultimately that's what that comes down to. Mr. Crume said he doesn't think so necessarily. We have had community members come forward and speak of books that they have concerns with in our libraries. Ms. Olmo responded that there is a process for that. Mr. Crume continued that there are processes to follow—let's take the sex ed piece for instance. The State of Oregon gives us a set of guidelines—we can have Planned Parenthood come in and presentations or we can have the Pregnancy Care Center come in and give presentations. We need a curriculum committee that knows what's going on and they can be a voice to the public and say *Hey, your kids are safe, this is what's being taught*. They can report to the board. Mr. Holmes responded that he doesn't understand why he wouldn't report that to the board? Mr. Crume said they have had community members come forward with these concerns and ask to have a curriculum committee like this and have put it off. He thinks we need to get it on an agenda and we need to allow those people to come forward and state their case. Ms. Olmo asked if we have a systematic problem at the Three Rivers School District where we have parents complaining about what's being taught in our classrooms and those concerns are not getting addressed? Because they are not getting to the board level. When she follows up and asks if their concern was met, everyone seems to be okay. She is not seeing them escalate. She certainly sees that we need a path for all of our parents and constituents to continue to participate but it seems to her what we have right now is working. Mr. Crume stated in the last couple of years he doesn't know what she has heard, but he knows what he has heard and these parents that have come forward with their concerns about Common Core, about some of the math, about the sex education, about the United States history, about the English/Language Arts. Ms. Olmo asked if when they file those complaints, are the complaints not getting addressed? Mr. Crume responded that they have come forward, before the board and asked to have a curriculum committee. Ms. Olmo said that she is asking one question and Mr. Crume is answering something completely different. Mr. Crume said he doesn't know—how can he answer that question? He doesn't know how many have filed complaints and how many of them haven't. He doesn't talk to them on a daily basis. Ms. Olmo stated that they are not appealing to the board so don't we have to assume that the process is working and their complaints and concerns are being addressed? Mr. Crume said no—because the complaints keep coming forward—isn't she listening to what the people are saying? Ms. Olmo responded that there is an obvious disconnect. Ms. Dwyer asked if the Curriculum Department is receiving regular complaints that are going through that process? Mr. Valenzuela said no—he has not received any complaints from parents. Ms. Dwyer said we have an existing process which would be the first step before concerns would be brought to the board. Mr. Lengwin said he has received a few emails. Ms. Dwyer asked if he had referred them to the process? Mr. Lengwin responded they are more concerns than complaints. He doesn't think everybody is going to march to the District Office and file a complaint. Mr. Crume asked if either of them remember people coming forward and complaining and asking to have a curriculum committee at different meetings? Mr. Lengwin said he has heard them come forward before—but it's not an every meeting thing. Ms. Olmo said that when they

CURRICULUM REVIEW
SEQUENCE

explain to them the process for complaints then people can go back and start that process. Mr. Crume asked what would be wrong with putting a future agenda item as *Curriculum Committee* on the agenda and let the people come forward and speak? If he was the general public and he read what they are supposed to be having tonight is a curriculum committee review and he read *Curriculum Review Sequence-Informational* he would not know that is when to go to the board meeting to talk about a curriculum committee. Why not just be transparent and put curriculum committee discussion on a future agenda item—is there a problem with that? Ms. Dwyer believes they have a challenge with the definition of a curriculum committee because she understands the presented sequencing process to be a curriculum committee and that is something she is familiar with from other schools and makes sense to her and that's what she would think they were discussing. Mr. York doesn't see a problem with having it as an item where they can have a discussion about it so that people would be informed and can say yes or no to being a part of that. He has received emails about the frustration with the elementary school math. Mr. Holmes would expect that when board members get those emails they would be sent to him so they can be dealt with. Because that is that voice from the community and he knows, coming from another district, the exact same issues around that math program. The contents and materials of that math program that are being taught in the classroom work incredibly well, but there are pieces of it that are challenging and need to be presented in certain ways and part of that is some of the homework pieces, that get sent home as homework, aren't the best thing to be doing in terms of the position to put the parents in. Maybe we have a conversation about how can we make this program better—and how do we modify what we are doing? Mr. York said for people to be involved and know when certain things will be reviewed—the math will come up and they want to be a part of that. Mr. Crume said her personally knows many, many families that have pulled their kids out of Three Rivers School District, out of public schools elsewhere as well, because of their concerns about what's going on—he did it himself. He was concerned. His kids brought home their homework and he watched the frustration in his kids eyes, he watched the frustration in his wife's eyes and when she finally said “bring it to your dad” and he got frustrated he was concerned. Mr. Holmes responded then he knows exactly what he's talking about. Mr. Crume added that there are many concerned parents out there and if we are going to quit losing kids and start building those numbers back up, we need to have some transparency, and we need to be open with our community. Mr. Holmes said that is exactly something he has already began working on and that's the exact kind of thing when it comes, whether it's through directors or directly to him, and they can make those kinds of adaptations and changes and address those things. Mr. Crume responded “that's great—and please don't let me hurt your feelings, or take this personally, but I don't think the people trust you”. He doesn't think they trust the administration—it's not him personally, it's what the media is saying, it's what they're reading on the front page of the newspapers and what they are hearing on the radio. It's all across the country from coast to coast. He trusts Mr. Holmes, and believes they are doing the right thing and certainly trust Daye (Stone), and knows he is looking out for the best interest—he has kids in this district, but the people need to know that. There needs to be transparency with our taxpayers; the people that are footing the bill and we need to have local control. They have asked for it—we need to reciprocate. We need to give them the chance to do what they want to do. Mr. Crume thinks it's going to be a win-win if we can. Mr. York asked if it would be a better discussion for another board meeting or another work session? Mr. Crume responded that if it's going to be a work session he better let them speak. Ms. Olmo said they have the ability to allow for public comment during a work session. Mr. Holmes said they could structure a public discussion or public forum on it. Mr. Crume asked why they don't they devote a work session to the subject? Mr. Holmes stated the only concern he would have would be controlling the length of time so that they are prepared for that and then the segments of time so not one person ends up monopolizing a bunch o

f other people's time. Mr. York said that would be the true challenge in just throwing it out

there to say “we want you to be the over-lord and report to us”. He doesn’t think that’s realistic. Mr. Holmes said that would be his concern around what power does that group have? What direction do they give to the board, which ultimately gives to him? What does that look like? In the scope of what we are able to do and what we are not able to do. Mr. Crume asked what power would they have? They would look at what’s being taught and they would report back to the board. Mr. Holmes stated what he is saying is that needs to be defined—even if it’s just as he said. It needs to be defined in a very specific way. Forming committees—what is their directive? What is their charge? Why? What are the parameters that they are given? Mr. York said if the state standards haven’t been achieved yet; if they are to be in the 2015-16 school year, we would be better off giving them direction. Mr. Holmes explained how the adoptions need to be aligned with the state adjusting the standards. Mr. Holmes explained that he needs to be a bit more active in being involved at the state level. We have a new legislative session coming and we need to have our voice be heard. If the board cares about the idea of being for or against Common Core—as a board representing a district, representing their constituency, then probably one of the most empowering things they can do is to send a board message to somebody about that feeling. There are going to be decisions made this Spring up there. Mr. York said with that in mind, talking about budget, what kind of budgetary concerns would there be in implementing something like this? Mr. Holmes responded that the big four alternate around the small three. You can set a specific number per year and keep a constant number. You will spend a little less on the fine arts piece, because then you will have some left over to spend on the science piece because that’s a big one. World language is a small one and save a little money from that year and roll it forward to do the math. Those big four: science, social studies, ELA and math are expensive. The ELA adoption we did last year was a very robust adoption and multiply it by about another third for a K-12. It’s something that needs done regardless of what the state learning standards are; regardless of where we are at. As he walks around the schools—the U.S. History books are twenty years old. Things that are impacting our kids right now aren’t even in those books and that is our major source of instructional materials. Mr. Crume said he would love to keep those history books or find some new ones of the same. Mr. York asked the board if they would like to open it up to public comment in a future work session? Ms. Dwyer responded she is not opposed to that but is aware they have at least two active committees asking for time on the agenda that they are still waiting for—the foods committee and the library improvement with House Bill 2586. Mr. Crume asked for clarification. Ms. Dwyer explained the library continuous improvement under House Bill 2586 has had people working on that such as the head of district libraries, different school librarians, and SOESD librarian. They have been requesting time on the agenda for some time now. There is also a committee of people working on trying to bring local foods in to our food system. That has a number of parents on it. People have been meeting with folks from Sodexo. They have been requesting time and waiting for that to happen also. Mr. Crume said he can tell them that this has been going on for a couple of years. This has been going on since before they were on the board. He doesn’t think anybody has waited any longer. Mr. Lengwin asked about the foods? Ms. Breckner responded that the foods has been going on for quite some time. Mr. Crume said he is talking about the curriculum committee. He doesn’t know that any other group that has had more people come forward than the curriculum committee. Ms. Olmo said she has had conversations with parents that have spoken with her as well and it seems to her that using this (Curriculum Review Sequence) as a foundation and starting and forming a committee to support where we need to start and getting a robust group of people together to move forward makes sense. It’s great that we would have the ability to include some of the people who have offered their time and energy towards this and get some professionals and start somewhere and start communicating and being even more transparent. Ms. Olmo applauded Superintendent Holmes on his presentation and she would love to see the district use it to move the committee forward and participate in the curriculum review. Mr. Holmes explained the board needs to decide as the Curriculum Review Sequence will show up on the next board agenda as an action item to approve so that he can move forward. There is

CURRICULUM REVIEW
SEQUENCE

no huge rush on approving it because we don't have anything in the budget this year to do any kind of purchase of things for implementation next year. It gives us that one free year to get our ducks in a row. If the compromise is that the committee in structure looks similar to what Mr. Crume is envisioning and operates in a manner in which Ms. Olmo is suggesting—he's all for that. Mr. Crume responded for Mr. Holmes not to take his vision into consideration. He just want to hear from the public and see what their vision is. Mr. Holmes said that he is representing them and Ms. Olmo is representing the idea of what she sees working well in terms of structure. If the board, in their wisdom, can pull together what they think the focus and mandate of that committee's going to be around this then great. Mr. Crume responded all he is saying is he has heard what the community has come forward and said and sees what Mr. Holmes is proposing and they are two complete opposites and he asked again that they get it on a future agenda. If they are going to talk further about it and let the public come forward and speak. Let them tell us what they want—let them tell us what they envision. Not what the board envisions and not what he envisions, but what they envision. They have been the ones that have requested this. Mr. Holmes responded that if that discussion turns into nothing but Common Core, then that has no connection to what he presented. He explained his concern is that he has heard a lot of those people as well and that's where he sees that going. If that's the direction then he doesn't want any part of it. He has no control over that—the state's done what the state's going to do. Mr. York said if nothing else, it allows people to hear it—that we have no control over that. If there is something at local control that we can put our fingers on then let's do that. Mr. Crume said he doesn't think the wording matters. He doesn't think they need to talk about Common Core. He thinks the people are concerned about what their kids are being taught in sex ed and U.S. History and math. Common Core doesn't need to be in that equation. Mr. Holmes responded that he agrees that in math—it's going to be great community, and professional, and district conversation around what is our math program going to look like and how are we going to do that and what materials are we going to use? He looks forward to that conversation.

Mr. York stated he is not opposed to putting it out to the public and they can figure out what time—when that best fits. He believes it would be better at a work session than a board session so they can dedicate a block of time to it. Mr. Holmes said what they can do is block out a work session when they have more time available so they don't have to worry about all of the business items. Mr. York said they would look at foods and library as well. Mr. Holmes added that he has spoken with Ms. Breckner and they should have some initial numbers in October on Sodexo and maybe getting the food committee people on there and make a food focus for the November work session. He doesn't believe they can accomplish both of those things in one night. He asked Ms. Dwyer if she knew how much time that committee would need to get together? Ms. Dwyer responded that she did not know but on November 4th she will need to leave early. Mr. Holmes clarified that he meant the October board meeting. He thought maybe they could get the food piece out of the way because that's pertinent to what's going on right now with Sodexo and our food service and a lot of other things. Maybe at the October board meeting we could have that piece and that would allow us to do the curriculum piece in November's workshop even though she has to leave at a certain time. Mr. Lengwin commented that with the food piece it wouldn't be too bad to get some vendor's that could maybe even partake in something with Sodexo here to speak also. He explained that if we had local farms then they would at least know where they are coming from and if they can do something. They could have a good structure that way—then having Sodexo. Ms. Breckner asked if they want her to put together some bids so they can go out for those vendors because most of those folks would have to respond to some kind of a bid. Mr. Lengwin said yes—he's sure some things they would be interested in and some things they may not but if they at least come and talk about what they have available at least they will know what's available and what's not available. Mr. Holmes asked to let them see how long it's going to take to put things together and get people organized and do a good job. Mr. York

stated this came up when they were at Lorna Byrne last year and the group has been working together ever since. Quite a few folks came forward. Mr. Crume asked for the November meeting if they could change it to Thursday night instead of Tuesday night—the election night? The board agreed they could make that change. The work session will be held on Thursday, November 6th.

CURRICULUM REVIEW
SEQUENCE

Superintendent Holmes presented the next top ten maintenance projects. He had updated them via email that they are making significant progress on the top ten. It's either done or it's scheduled to be done—a lot of the things will happen over the holiday break because the kids are out of the buildings and things can be shut off. He also explained that from the construction excise tax (CTE) budget perspective that our receipts continue to remain at the \$25-28,000 range. We haven't see the second quarter city one yet. Those come in by the quarter—those were up significantly about the same percentage. The construction excise tax receipts will have almost doubled this year. We are going to be close to the \$300,000 figure as opposed to historically at about \$165,000 over the past five years. This is great news on a number of fronts—it gives up the dollars to do a number of these projects and continue keeping things in good repair and the other thing is it's a lens on the current state of the economy. People are building and new construction is happening—which should mean more jobs and more dollars back in the economy. Based on those figures the district will be able to knock out a lot more things on the long range facility plan a lot sooner than having to string those dollars out for a longer period of time. There is no end of items that need to be done now, but wants to make sure they understand that his maintenance background would have him say that they will take care of things that might need to be fixed. There is a significant list of things that are critical that need to be addressed:

LONG RANGE
FACILITY PLAN

- 11) Irrigation upgrade to automated at Hidden Valley. The estimated amount of \$7,500 might be a bit high.
- 12) Replacing two tech vehicles—\$25,000. The current vehicles have 200-300 miles on them.
- 16) Replace TRACT vehicle—\$20,000. A 7-passenger van that has about 200,000 miles on it.
- 13) Replace water tank at Fleming and Lincoln Savage—\$50,000. The Lincoln Savage one leaked about a month and one-half ago and caused a huge asbestos problem. Asbestos abatement company had to come get rid of it. The tank at Fleming is the exact same age and model.
- 14) Replace field mower at HV—\$12,000
- 15) Repair dryrot at the ends of the structural roof beams at Evergreen ~ \$15,000
- 17) Replace freshwater pressure tank at Fleming—\$1,000
- 18) New play area with blacktop cover at Madrona ~ \$15,000 Feedback from staff said not to move equipment from JP to MD. Staff responded what would help them the most is putting blacktop in a dirt area and a covered structure.
- 19) Dedicated circuit runs for air conditioning at Hidden Valley HS ~ \$5,000
- 20) Purchase and install wastewater treatment meter for the rest area at North Valley HS ~ \$25,000.
- 21) Improvements to parking lot at maintenance ~ \$15,000

Mr. Holmes gave the board an update on the wastewater projects then asked if there were questions or concerns?

Mr. York asked if they were good to go with the bleachers at the high school? Mr. Holmes responded that they have all been repaired and are in good working order. During Christmas break they will be out to weld them all together and motorize them and have them be structurally sound for the future. None of them have to be replaced. They can all be welded together and motorized so that you hit a button and then come out together—

LONG RANGE FACILITY
PLAN

they don't bind. The binding and shifting is what causes the welds and bolts to break.

He and some of the high school principals have talked about, some of their more popular cheers on the inside of those buildings with people stomping and jumping up and down needs to be modified. He's all for school spirit, but it's very expensive long term. Hidden Valley High School Principal Daye Stone stated that they are already inquiring about Grants Pass High School for Senior Superstars because of that.

Ms. Dwyer stated she was at a football game at Illinois Valley High School last week and the music teacher gave a lot of the kids in the cheering section noise makers and it really cut down on the jumping up and down. They had another way to make noise.

Mr. Holmes stated that this item will be on the next board agenda as an action item to approve so that it gets added as official action to the long range facility plan.

CUSTOMER SERVICE
SURVEY

Mr. Holmes stated that he sent the board members a link to the Customer Service survey he created in Google forms. It is a way to collect, electronically, survey data that is both unidentifiable from its source and at the same time it will collate it. He could look at things under each question across the district and across buildings. When taking the survey they would select the school from the list. It will then take them to a set of questions that are specific to each school. That way he can compare and contrast schools and there is a question for every area. There is a question for communication with teachers. In the next section there are questions about how they would rate the education their child is receiving?; are they satisfied with what they are learning?; are you satisfied with the rate at which they're learning? Then it gets in to customer service and is broken down by office staffs—when you walk into a school, how are you greeted? There is a piece on there for principals and there is a piece on there for district administrators as well. This is just the first step. He can send this out electronically and email the link directly to every parent whose email we've got. The survey takes about six minutes to go through to read and answer the questions. The other thought he had was putting a Chrome book on the counter at every school to make available to parents when they walk in. We can make paper copies and send them out. The issue with doing that is you have to take the paper copy and input the data. This is the first step. His intent is to get this going either the end of this week or the beginning of next and get it emailed out to every email he has for a parent. He did this as part of the math adoption process at La Center and got 500 responses from parents on their math adoption. He asked for concerns or questions and there were none.

Board Chair York recessed the meeting to Executive Session at 6:30 PM.

Board Chair York called the meeting into Executive Session under ORS 192.660(2)(d) "Bargaining". At 6:35 PM.

The Board returned to open session and Board Chair York adjourned the meeting at 7:05 PM.

Danny York
Chairperson of the Board

David Holmes
Superintendent-Clerk