

WORK SESSION MINUTES

7/A Summer Planning Work Session of the Lane County School District No. 19 Board of Education was held on October 24, 2016.

1. CALL MEETING TO ORDER

Board Chair Tina DeHaven called the Springfield Board of Education Fall Planning Session to order in the Board Room at the District Administration Center at 4:04 pm.

Attendance

Board Members present included Chair Tina DeHaven, Erik Bishoff, Sandra Boyst and Emilio Hernandez.

District staff and community members identified included Superintendent Sue Rieke-Smith, David Collins, Brett Yancey, Tom Lindly, Jenna McCulley, Brian Megert, Suzy Price, Judy Bowden, Anne Goff, Laura Weiss, Linda Henry, Ana Maria Vergara and Whitney McKinley. Alisha Roemeling of *The Register Guard*.

2. OVERVIEW OF AGENDA

Chair DeHaven shared an overview of the agenda for the work session.

Ms. DeHaven revised the order of Agenda Item 3 a, b, c and d.

The following documents were distributed:

- *English Learner Outcomes—HB 3499*
- *Springfield School District's English Language Development Program*
- *Dual Language/Two-Way Bilingual Grant Program 2013-2016*
- *Changing District Boundaries—October 24, 2016*
- *Boundary map*
- *2017-2019 General Fund/Lottery Funds Tentative Budget—Source: Legislative Fiscal Office & DAS Chief Financial Office—Dated: August 10, 2016*
- *2017-2019 Tentative Budget Projections—May 2016 Emergency Board w/June 2016 Forecast spreadsheet*
- *Quality Education Fund Model Requirements—Combined General Funds and Lottery Funds (millions) 10/24/16 spreadsheet*
- *Email from Noor Salam, Dated October 19, 2016, Subject: Every Student Succeeds Act Update and Timeline*
- *What Oregonians Want—the Oregon's Rising survey about education in the spring of 2016*
- *Quality Education Model—A Primer*
- *Board Work Session—Strategic Planning—October 24, 2016*
- *OSBA elections—official ballot information packet*

3. UPDATES

c. Transportation: Boundaries and other Districts

Mr. Yancey stated staff had been asked to provide information to the Board related to a request that had been made regarding changing the District boundaries.

Mr. Lindly directed Board members to a document entitled *Boundary Map*. He explained he had been working with a parent who had approached the Board about changing District boundaries to enable the parent's child to be eligible for District provided bus transportation. He explained when the State law changed to allow students to apply to attend school in a district other than the district in which they lived, superintendents in Lane County agreed they would not place school bus stops in other districts' boundary areas, with the exception of special needs students for whom the District was required to provide transportation. Additionally, anyone who was not a bus rider could apply for an exemption to the superintendents' agreement as a temporary rider. Upon review, the District had granted some exemptions under the temporary rider provision if there was room on busses that served the area in which the student lived. He noted there were similar boundary issues in the Gateway and Goshen areas. Mr. Lindly said staff had advised the parent who had requested the boundary change, that he could bring his student to another bus stop near the Marcola fire station that was close to his home. Unfortunately, although this location was safe for picking up and dropping off students, it was not safe for students to walk to the bus stop from their homes.

Mr. Hernandez arrived at 4:10 pm.

Mr. Yancey explained there were several other areas, including the Gateway area, that had boundary issues. He directed Board members to the document entitled *Changing District Boundaries—October 24, 2016*. He explained there were three ways school district boundaries could be changed:

- By a vote of the people
- By the mutual consent of each school district
- On a request for change submitted to the district boundary board, which was the Lane Education Service District (ESD) for Lane County, by the patrons of the impacted district(s). Oregon Revised Statute (ORS) 330.095 outlined the process for considering changing boundaries and merging boundaries of two or more schools districts. If the Board was interested in moving forward with a boundary change, the District would retain legal services to go through the process.

Responding to Ms. DeHaven, Mr. Yancey said a boundary change in the Gateway area would be between Springfield Public Schools and the Eugene School District 4J.

In response to Mr. Bishoff, Mr. Yancey said smaller districts like the Marcola School District were sensitive to boundary change requests.

Dr. Rieke-Smith agreed to speak with the parent and the Marcola School District superintendent, and to provide Board members with information about the boundary change.

In response to Ms. Boyst, Mr. Yancey said Willamette Leadership Academy had its own busses and bus drivers.

a. ELL Transformational District

Dave Collins introduced Brian Megert, Director of Special Programs, Suzy Price, Director of Elementary Education and Laura Weiss, English Learner Development (ELD) Teacher on Special Assignment (TOSA).

Mr. Megert directed Board members to the document entitled *English Learner Outcomes—HB 3499*. Mr. Megert said the District had been identified as an English Language Learner (ELL) Transformational District by the State of Oregon. The intent of the program was to provide assistance and support to districts that were not meeting requirements with the English learner population. The District had been allocated \$180,000 a year for four years from the State to assist the District in

meeting State required outcomes based on improvements supported with the allocation. He stated the meeting with the Oregon Department of Education (ODE) staff regarding the EDL program had been a good meeting. Staff had explained the District had a concentration of ELL in some schools while there was a low concentration in other schools. Thus, providing programming in that environment was challenging.

Ms. Weiss directed Board members to the document entitled *Springfield School District's English Language Development Program*. She noted the table entitled AMAOs (Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives) provided data on how the District was rated on its Educational goals listed below:

- Provide English Learners high quality instruction that leads to proficiency in reading, writing, speaking and understanding English through ELD classes in order to achieve academic success in an all English curriculum.
- Provide English Learners instruction that leads to the mastery of the Common Core State Standards in English Language Arts, Math, Science, and Social Studies through Sheltered instruction as measured by local district assessments.
- Provide parents of English learners the opportunity to participate in their child's educational experience as well as participate in the decision making of the ELD program.
- Provide equitable access to education and promote culturally relevant and responsive curricula and pedagogies embracing the unique identities of those gaining proficiencies in additional languages.

Ms. Weiss stated the District was seeing an increase in the number of newcomers, who came with a high level of need, into the ELD program. It was very challenging to provide those students all of the support they needed at the middle and high school levels. In response to Ms. DeHaven, Ms. Weiss confirmed it would be better for the ELD students if they were able to spend more time in ELL classes but the District did not have funding to support that additional time.

b. Dual Immersion Program

Ms. Price directed Board members to the document entitled *Dual Language/Two-Way Bilingual Grant Program 2013-2016*. The goals of the program were to:

- Implement an effective and innovative dual language program designed to accelerate learning and student achievement in schools with high proportions of EL students
- Offer EL students high quality in and out of school time STEM or STEAM experiences in preparation for high school and for 21st Century careers
- Develop an effective model for other schools within our system so that we can expand dual language offerings across Springfield.

Ms. Price added that expected outcomes included:

- An increase in EL student's achievement at ALAS schools as compared to non-participating schools
- An increase in Spanish language literacy
- An increase in EL students participating in out of school time STEM and STEAM career preparation beginning in grade 4
- 90 percent of ALAS staff completing GLAD, SIOP or other sheltered instruction training by the end of the third year of implementation at the site level
- 90 percent parent satisfaction by year 2 of implementation at each site
- An increase in bilingual/bicultural staff at all ALAS schools.

Ms. Price said the District received a grant in 2013-14 that provided professional development, and planned for and provided implementation of the dual language program. She reviewed the history of the program to date.

In response to Ms. Boyst, Dr. Rieke-Smith said it may be time for the District to evaluate the pros and cons of contracting externally rather than having in house staff for bilingual recruiting.

Ms. DeHaven said it was important for the District to remain competitive in hiring practices and be in a place where people wanted to work

Dr. Hernandez stressed the importance of looking at the bigger picture and encouraging community involvement.

Ms. Price said an information meeting for K through 2nd grade dual language parents was scheduled for November 9, 2016 at Guy Lee Elementary School (GLES) K-2nd grade parents. Staff would share information about the goals of the grant, where GLES was with the grant and where they planned to go with the program in the future. Staff would also ask for the parents' help in informing staff about the students' needs.

In response to Dr. Hernandez, Mr. Collins said Board members were welcome to attend the meeting. Board members could best support staff after the event by encouraging participation of work groups consisting of community members, parents and District staff around the dual immersion program for GLES and where people would like to see the program go. Staff would bring information back to the Board and Dr. Rieke-Smith for guidance and direction.

Dr. Rieke-Smith noted dual immersion programs were the gold standard related to second language acquisition. Dr. Rieke-Smith and District staff are 100 percent committed to bilingualism in the community. She looked forward to identifying what opportunities might exist in the community related to the transformation. She opined there would be a significant push by ODE for sheltered instruction versus bilingual. The District would not necessarily go in the direction preferred by ODE, and perhaps should look at blended model.

Ms. Price said it would be important for the District to identify what was working, what were the challenges and what were the unanticipated consequences through the work with community stakeholders. She would look to the District leadership to guide the process through the next steps.

Mr. Collins encouraged Dr. Hernandez to help the program move forward as a voice with his experiences in the community, as well as a Board member.

Mr. Bishoff said he had talked to many parents who wanted immersion schools for their students, and he noted people had transferred their students to immersion programs in the Eugene 4J School District. It was important for the program to be successful as it rolled out.

Dr. Rieke-Smith said an important issue was having enough qualified teachers who could teach in the program. In her conversations with area superintendents, they had discussed the issue of school districts poaching other districts' bilingual teachers. She suggested this may be a reason why the ODE was backing away from dual immersion as the gold standard in the State.

Mr. Collins offered a summary of the discussion. He appreciated the conversation the Board had and noted that moving forward with the dual immersion program was a matter of resources. Transformational funding would support the program but it was not enough. Transformation funding

did not support staff or materials. It would support professional development and some work with the parents. The District had lost staff at the District and building levels. In the future, the District would need to determine how it would meaningfully resource the program. He thanked Ms. Weiss for her work in the program.

The Board took a short break.

d. 2017-19 State School Funding

Brett Yancey directed Board members to the document entitled *2017-2019 General Fund/Lottery Funds Tentative Budget—Source: Legislative Fiscal Office & DAS Chief Financial Office—Dated: August 10, 2016* and shared information about the 2017-19 State School Funding situation. He noted “The current projected shortfall between available resources and estimated expenditures specific to State School Fund at Current Service Level for the biennium is currently projected at \$602.2 million.” He additionally noted “the current projected shortfall between available resources and estimated expenditures for the 2017-2019 biennium projected at \$1.35 billion” for the State budget. He reviewed the *2017-2019 Tentative Budget Projections—May 2016 Emergency Board w/June 2016 Forecast* and the *Quality Education Fund Model Requirements—Combined General Funds and Lottery Funds (millions) 10/24/16* spreadsheets. He added the State continued to fall woefully short compared to the Quality Education Model (QEM), with a shortfall of 31.7% in 2013-15, 24.2% in 2015-17, and a projected shortfall of 24.9% in 2017-19. In response to Mr. Bishoff, Mr. Yancey said while education continued to be underfunded, there was a significant effort to increase school funding in the 2015-17 biennium. The State was challenged in the health and human services area with an estimated 23% increase due to the federal Affordable Care Act.

Dr. Rieke-Smith stated this was the figure projected by the Legislative Fiscal Office that the Governor would use in the proposed budget for the 2017-19 biennium. She added if Ballot Measure (BM) 97 did not pass in November 2016, it would be challenging to meet the projected budget. When the State moved through BM 5 and BM 50, which took the local funding option out of the hands of the local communities, education funding shifted to the State. The Legislature typically adopted a higher budget than that proposed by the Governor.

Dr. Rieke-Smith directed Board members to the *Quality Education Model—A Primer* document, which provided information on Quality Education Commission (QEC) Development and History; the QEC Charge; the QEC Equity Stance; QEM Funding Estimates; QEC Findings; and, QEC Best Practices. There was a desire on the part of the Oregon School Board Association (OSBA) to modify the language to compel the Legislature to more adequately fund the QEM.

Mr. Yancey directed Board members to QEM Funding Estimates and the prototypical schools the estimates were built on. The numbers of students, teachers and specialists in the prototypical schools differed from the proportions in the Springfield schools.

Dr. Rieke-Smith directed Board members to *What Oregonians Want*—the Oregon’s Rising survey. She noted the top areas respondents identified in the “Big Dream question” as:

- Be prepared for life after high school
- Well-rounded, broad education
- Encourage student engagement and learning
- Good schools and education
- Teachers—quantity and quality
- Other—Eliminate or reduce standardized testing.

Dr. Rieke-Smith said the District's strategic plan called for themes similar to those identified in the survey and the Board was aligned with other districts in the State. The issue came down to how the District's strategic plan elements and the Oregon's Rising survey elements would be funded. The State had to decide what it wanted to do to raise funds necessary to support the Big Dream. She said the State of Massachusetts funded public education at approximately \$14,000 per Average Daily Membership (ADM), whereas the State of Oregon funded public education at approximately \$7,000 per ADM. She noted Massachusetts had a sales tax whereas Oregon did not. Teachers and administrators in Oregon had amazing accomplishments relative to the funding provided. Oregonians needed to have the conversation on how additional funds would be raised and how they would be accounted for.

Ms. DeHaven said preparing students for life after graduation aligned with her concerns about financial literacy education provided for District students.

Dr. Rieke-Smith directed Board members to the *Email from Noor Salam, Dated October 19, 2016, Subject: Every Student Succeeds Act Update and Timeline*. She highlighted the section **What is Oregon's Timeline for ESSA Planning and Implementation**, noting the initial plan should be available in November or December 2016. It would be important for boards and superintendents across the state to engage in conversations to fully understand what was in the plan. The Oregon Department of Education (ODE) was responsible for creating a State Plan that it would submit to the U.S. Department of Education that reflected a shared statewide vision for Oregon's students and schools of topics such as accountability, funding, school improvement, and grant-making systems. Oregon would fully implement ESSA for the 2017-18 school year.

Mr. Yancey said the Board would need to fill at least one Budget Committee position this fall.

4. EQUITY INITIATIVES

Ms. DeHaven said she had requested that equity initiatives be a regular agenda item for the Board. There was a lot of great work happening in the District and there may be opportunities for the Board to become more involved.

Dr. Rieke-Smith shared with the Board the progress of implementing new equity initiatives in the District this year. She would attach the Equity Plan recently completed by the Equity Cadre of the Oregon Leadership Network to her Friday Updates. She would bring additional tools developed by Education Northwest forward related to moving policy work and using it as a rubric to discern an overarching equity plan for the District to a future Board work session.

Ms. McCully said the National Equity Project (NEP) would visit the District on October 27, 2016 to assist with developing a plan for moving forward with the equity initiatives. NEP staff would meet with the cross-District Equity Cadre in targeted listening sessions to develop what the focus of the District's work would be moving forward. NEP staff would also meet individually with Cadre members to hear their concerns to get a sense of what the next steps would be for the District. The NEP staff would return on December 7, 2016 to meet with community partners and Board members.

Dr. Rieke-Smith said the work with NEP staff would help with the overarching goal for the OLM plan of equitable outcomes for all students. The Oregon Leadership Network (OLN) sub goals included developing a culturally aware and responsive staff; to intentionally recruit, hire, and retain a diverse staff; eliminate disparate discipline practices; and offer professional development with an equity stance and lens. She asked Board members to share their experiences with the Teaching with Purpose Conference.

Ms. DeHaven said she was pleased she had an opportunity to attend the Teaching with Purpose Conference. The speakers were very knowledgeable and she was very moved by their presentations. After listening to the speakers, she felt the conference had been a bigger undertaking than she had expected. She hoped the District staff who had an opportunity to attend the conference enjoyed it as much as she had. She thought the District was further ahead than some other districts, but it still had a long way to go.

Mr. Bishoff was interested in knowing the steps the District planned to take in moving forward with the Equity Initiatives.

In response to Mr. Bishoff, Ms. McCully said Board members were always welcome to attend monthly Equity Cadre meetings. Mr. Bishoff expressed an interest in the students being able to participate in sessions with the speakers from the Teaching with Purpose Conference.

Ms. Boyst suggested having student leadership joining staff in discussions if they were not able to attend a conference.

Dr. Rieke-Smith said the District had sponsored Teaching with Purpose for several years, which enabled District staff to attend. She agreed it would be a valuable experience for students and Board members to be able to view the video recordings of the sessions. She added it may be possible for staff to report regularly to the Board and the student representatives to the Board on equity progress.

In response to Dr. Hernandez, Ms. McCully said staff would have discussions about identifying what the focus of the equity work would be, both internally and with external partners. Staff would return to the Board for input on the process.

5. STRATEGIC PLANNING

a. Superintendent Evaluation

Dr. Rieke-Smith directed Board members to the document *Board Work Session—Strategic Planning—October 24, 2016*. She emphasized it was the Board's responsibility to monitor the work of the District to ensure the District was moving in the direction the Board wanted it to go. The Board had delegated the job of monitoring the District's work to the Superintendent. She was responsible for acting within the scope of the Board's policies and the goals that were monitored. She was also responsible for providing the Board data throughout the year to enable it to make that evaluation.

b. Measures of Success on Goals

Dr. Rieke-Smith said there were several data points by which the Board would evaluate her performance: external reports consisting of a survey of District staff and community partners; internal reports from the Cabinet and staff that were specific to functions that supported the strategic plan goals; and reports the Board would provide related to its assessment of how well the Board complied with Board goals and policies.

Ms. DeHaven said it was important to make sure the Board identified key stakeholders because in her role as superintendent, Dr. Rieke-Smith was involved with employee associations, the Chamber of Commerce and the business community. Educators in the District were also key stakeholders that should be included in the evaluation process. Dr. Rieke-Smith represented not only the District but the community in her position as superintendent and it was important for the Board to craft the evaluation in a way that encompassed all of her responsibilities.

Dr. Rieke-Smith suggested the survey would occur in November or December 2016, with a follow up in February or March 2017, to probe areas that had been identified as those needing improvement. She said District staff, superintendents that she worked with, TEAM Springfield partners, the

Springfield Area Chamber of Commerce, business partners, District CTE partners, legislators, the Rotary Club of Springfield, the Springfield Education Foundation, Superintendent's Parent Advisory Council, the Superintendent's Ministerial Council. The Superintendent's Teacher Advisory Council and the three employee associations, SEA, OSEA and SAAC would be included as part of the employee outreach.

6. BOARD COMMUNICATION

Agenda Items 6a—Working Agreements and 6c—RFP for Legal Counsel were moved to November 14, 2016.

a. Working Agreement

Deferred to November 14, 2016 Board Work Session.

b. Ballot Measure 97

Mr. Bishoff said he had received feedback from District teachers inquiring why the Board had not taken a position on Ballot Measure 97. He wanted to send a strong message to the District's teachers.

Ms. DeHaven said the OSBA recently discussed BM 97. OSBA had taken a neutral stand on BM 97.

Dr. Rieke-Smith said in conversations with Senator Beyer, he asserted that if BM 97 did not pass this year, it would probably 10 to 15 years before another school funding proposal was brought forward by the Oregon Legislative Assembly. She noted prior to BM 5, Oregon was the leader in the nation related to the standards movement and other education areas. If BM 97 passed, there was no constitutional requirement and therefore guarantee that it would fund education. It would be the responsibility of school boards and districts to lobby effectively for those funds for education before the Oregon Legislative Assembly every biennium.

It was noted that the Board could not take action at today's meeting because it was a Work Session. In response to Mr. Bishoff, Dr. Rieke-Smith stated Ms. DeHaven could call for a special session to address the issue.

c. RFP for Legal Counsel

Deferred to November 14, 2016 Board meeting.

7. Wrap Up and Next Steps

Ms. DeHaven iterated Working Agreements and RFP for Legal Counsel were moved from today's agenda to the November 14, 2016 Board meeting. Ms. McCully would follow up on the superintendent evaluation process. Mr. Lindly or Dr. Rieke-Smith, would follow up with Mr. Adams regarding the transportation conversation. The Equity Initiative would be a standing agenda item. Staff would prepare a resource sheet with links to the Teaching with Purpose Conference.

Mr. Collins said he would provide specific data about grade level populations and names of individuals who attended the joint meeting of the State development group.

Dr. Rieke-Smith directed Board members to the document entitled *OSBA elections*—official ballot information packet. This topic would be on the November 14, 2016 Board meeting agenda.

Ms. Boyst said the community showed its care and belief in the District leadership through the community support of Springfield Education Foundation's annual gala fundraiser "Night of 11,000 Stars", which raised \$180,000.

8. Next Board Meeting: November 14, 2016, Work Session and Business Meeting

Ms. DeHaven said the next Board meeting was scheduled for November 14, 2016.

9. ADJOURNMENT

With no other business, Ms. De Haven adjourned the meeting at 7:22 pm.

(Minutes recorded by Linda Henry)