Every Student a Graduate Prepared for a Bright and Successful Future

Springfield Public Schools

BOARD OF EDUCATION
October 12, 2015
Administration Center Boardroom
525 Mill Street
Springfield, OR 97477

3:45 pm Work Session, Board Candidate Interviews, First Floor Conference Room

6:00 pm, Reception for Al King

7:00 pm Board Meeting

	AGENDA		TAB
1.	Call Meeting to Order and Flag Salute	Board Chair Nancy Bigley	
2.	Board Member Appointment • Oath of Office	Chair Bigley	
3.	Student Board Member Introductions • Willamette Leadership Academy	Chair Bigley	
4.	Recognition: International Alpha Delta Kappa Month Proclamation	Chair Bigley	
5.	School Presentation: Springfield High School	Principal José da Silva	
6.	Public Comments (Three (3) minutes each; maximum time 20 minutes. Speakers may not yield their time to other speakers.)		
7.	Consent Agenda		
	A. September 12, 2015 Board Meeting Minutes		1
	B. Financial Statement	Brett Yancey	2
	C. Technology Bond Update	Tom Lindly	3
	D. Board Policies, First Reading	Jenna McCulley	4
	E. Enrollment Update	Brett Yancey	5
8.	Reports and Discussion		
	A. Full Day Kindergarten Report	Suzanne Price	
	B. Student Communication		
	C. Superintendent Communication	Sue Rieke-Smith	
	D. Board Communication • 2015-16 Board Committee Assignments and Reports	Chair Bigley	
9.	Other Business		
10.	Next Meetings: October 26, 2015 4:00 pm, Fall Planning Meeting November 9, 2015, 7:00 pm, Business Meeting		
11.	Adjournment	Chair Bigley	

Springfield Public Schools is an equal opportunity educator and employer.
Persons having questions about or requests for special needs and accommodation at Board Meetings should contact the Office of the Superintendent; 525 Mill Street, Springfield, OR 97477; Phone: (541) 726-3201. Contact should be made 72 hours in advance of the event.

MINUTES

3/ A Work Session of the Lane County School District No. 19 Board of Education was held on September 14, 2015.

Board Chair Nancy Bigley welcomed those in attendance and called the meeting to order at 5:32 pm, in the First Floor Conference Room of the District Administration.

Attendance
Board Members present included Chair Nancy Bigley, Laurie Adams, Sandra Boyst, Al King, and Jonathan Light.

District staff, students and community members identified included Superintendent Sue Rieke-Smith, Brett Yancey, Michael Henry, Jenna McCulley, Karen Lewis, Tom Lindly, Brian Megert, Kevin Ricker, Suzy Price, Yvonne Atteberry, Jim Crist, Linda Henry, and Anne Goff.

Ms. Bigley stated the Board had some unfinished business from the Summer Planning Session in August 2015 related to the Superintendent Evaluation and Board and District Goals. There was consensus to discuss the Superintendent Evaluation first.

Superintendent Evaluation
Chair Bigley asked Superintendent Rieke-Smith to comment on the meeting they had regarding the evaluation process.

Superintendent Rieke-Smith appreciated that the evaluation was taking place at a work session because it brought transparency to the process. She met with Anne Goff, Springfield Education Association (SEA) President today, who had shared that the SEA favored the 360-degree evaluation process, which would provide a formal method for input by SEA.

Chair Bigley said a 360 evaluation was an evaluation tool of full evaluation, and there were other tools that could be included in a broad evaluation process.

Superintendent Rieke-Smith noted in the last district she worked in, the District followed a Policy Governance model, which included 12 sections, and there were 12 metrics the superintendent was evaluated on.

Mr. King thought the 360 model, which was supported by District teachers, was the best evaluation tool. However, Superintendent Rieke-Smith had not been in the Superintendent position long enough to use the 360 model effectively and he suggested using it in her next evaluation. The 360 process could be used effectively every five years.

Ms. Adams agreed with Mr. King that the 360 process could be used effectively, and felt the Board would waste its money on a 360 evaluation now because there had not been enough time working with Superintendent Rieke-Smith as the Interim Superintendent to make that process effective. Since assuming the role of Interim Superintendent, Superintendent Rieke-Smith had been busy putting out fires and moving beyond some hurdles that had caused uproar in the District. She supported providing an opportunity for people to have their voices heard in the form of a questionnaire that could be completed anonymously.

Superintendent Rieke-Smith welcomed an evaluation because it would help her do her work better and help her provide a safe, effective learning environment for students.

Chair Bigley said she had received calls from the public about the 360-evaluation process. There was some confusion about the superintendent evaluation and people who wanted to give feedback. A 360 evaluation would put the Board weeks out in gathering information and she wanted to move forward with the evaluation as soon as possible, to identify issues that could be addressed today, rather than waiting for a lengthy process. In response to Ms. Adams, Chair Bigley said the feedback from people was not necessarily related to issues at SHS.

Mr. Light concurred there was a great deal of interest from the community and staff. It was in the best interest of the District for the Board to be transparent with the evaluation process because it would help Superintendent Rieke-Smith do a better job if light was shed on the criticisms. Otherwise people's comments would be beneath the surface, which did not allow the Board and the superintendent to address them. While this may not be the time to do a 360 evaluation, it was important that all stakeholders felt they had a voice in the process.

Chair Bigley said last time the Board conducted a 360 evaluation, it took six weeks to prepare the evaluation and it took another three weeks for stakeholders to complete the evaluation. She did not think the Board wanted to take that much time right now.

Mr. Light preferred to wait a bit to give Superintendent Rieke-Smith a chance to work through some of the school year, and give people an opportunity to work with her. He understood people wanted to be heard.

Superintendent Rieke-Smith had heard that people wanted to see what she could do and there were issues that needed to be cleared up. She would ask the Board to help her with the issues, help her fix the problems and move forward. She added the District needed to provide some forums for the community to share their thoughts and concerns about Smarter Balanced and other District issues, and to identify gaps in the education process. She suggested having three forums throughout the school year would provide the District and Board with good feedback and give her an opportunity to develop relationships with community members. It would take time to resolve some of the issues with Smarter Balanced.

Ms. Boyst felt Superintendent Rieke-Smith had not been in the position enough time to provide adequate information for a 360 evaluation now.

Mr. King preferred doing the 360 evaluation, which would measure the sentiment of the community. It was important to get a broad based community sentiment where the community would have an opportunity to tell the Board what it was concerned about.

Ms. Adams read a letter to the Board from Carol Hastings. Ms. Adams wanted Superintendent Rieke-Smith to be evaluated on firm data, and did not want her to be evaluated on the District's work of the last two years. She shared an email from a community member who requested a 360 evaluation.

Chair Bigley noted the Board did one 360 evaluation of former Superintendent Nancy Golden during her tenure with the District. The Board intentionally did not do a 360 evaluation with former Superintendent Hertica Martin after her first year because it wanted to give her an opportunity to become familiar with the District and address some issues. Chair Bigley wanted to have a forum to solicit feedback from the community as soon as possible.

Superintendent Rieke-Smith wanted to have the first community forum by the end of September.

Chair Bigley thought the forum would be one tool for soliciting feedback. She understood there was interest in the community and with staff in providing anonymous feedback. She noted the Board had not adopted new goals for the 2015-2016 school year, but it did have goals adopted for last year.

Superintendent Rieke-Smith said there were some consistencies between last year's goals, and the draft goals staff was preparing for the 2015-2016 school year. It was important to include defined metrics in the goals to assist with evaluating how well the District and Board were meeting those goals.

Mr. Light said staff and the community was interested in what was the District's vision. The community forums would provide an opportunity for people to express the opinions and concerns.

Chair Bigley asked for input from the Cabinet members.

Ms. Price asked what the purpose for the feedback was—was it intended for the Board or Superintendent Rieke-Smith and/or the cabinet.

Mr. Yancey said a lot of fires had been put out since July, but he heard that that people still had an axe to grind over the former superintendent. While improvements had been made, and the District would continue to make improvements, that work was overshadowed by dissent that had continued to drag on. There were people who waited for the Board to make a mistake and highlight that mistake.

Ms. Adams said there had been pain and frustration on the part of staff and the Board. The District needed to heal from the wounds and if listening to the community helped to heal those wounds, she supported those efforts.

In response to Mr. Light, Mr. Yancey noted if the Board did nothing to allow people to voice their opinion, the effort by some who waited for the Board to make a mistake would not go away. He supported providing an opportunity to voice their opinion.

Ms. McCulley stated it would be beneficial to provide an opportunity for the community to give feedback, and it would be helpful in the healing process if Superintendent Rieke-Smith were removed from the equation. The community was not tuned in enough to know the nuance of where Superintendent Rieke-Smith's leadership started and ended before she became Superintendent. It would be helpful to ask for feedback in terms of the District rather than in terms of Superintendent Rieke-Smith. The Board should then establish an evaluation process for Superintendent Rieke-Smith that would enable the Board to determine whether she was the right person to serve as the District's Superintendent, or if the Board wanted to go a different direction.

Superintendent Rieke-Smith said she would begin having meetings at the schools. She planned to listen to the staff and to give them an opportunity as individuals or groups to engage in a longer conversation with her. She hoped people would eventually feel comfortable bringing issues to her.

Ms. Adams suggested that the Board reach agreement on the message it wanted to take to the community and the schools.

Mr. Light said it was important for the Board to give people an opportunity to say good and bad things about the District and the Superintendent's job performance, while acknowledging that two and one-half months was not sufficient time for the superintendent's evaluation.

In response to Ms. Boyst, Ms. McCulley said she was in the process of developing a better forum for Superintendent Rieke-Smith to share her vision for the District. She was developing a blog space for her to share her thoughts, and an easy avenue for people to ask questions. She wanted to work with the Board to

develop a process for the public to make comments and share their thoughts.

In response to Mr. Light, Ms. Lewis reviewed the Board's fall meeting schedule. The superintendent hiring decision was scheduled for the October 26, 2015 Board meeting.

Chair Bigley stated the superintendent hiring decision should be moved to the November 9, 2015 meeting to give the Board more time for a good process.

Ms. Adams asked if the Board would wait until it had more feedback before doing a superintendent evaluation and at what point would the Board decide it would conduct a search for a new superintendent. She wanted Superintendent Rieke-Smith to have an opportunity to do the work she needed to do, have a chance to work with the Cabinet, and have a chance to see how the District would function under Superintendent Rieke-Smith's leadership. She did not want the Board to undertake a superintendent search this year.

Chair Bigley reviewed the Board's timeline, noting the Board would make a decision on hiring Superintendent Rieke-Smith as the superintendent in November 2015. The Board needed an effective tool to evaluate how Superintendent Rieke-Smith was working towards achieving her goals in her role as superintendent.

Superintendent Rieke-Smith said the 2013-2015 goals were the most recently adopted goals, and the ones which she was basing her work plan on, and on which she would be able to provide the Board evidence on her work toward achieving those goals. The most challenging pieces would be student achievement data because a limited amount of data was available from the new measurement tools.

Mr. Light noted Superintendent Rieke-Smith inherited the goals and had not participated in establishing them. He said the people most able to evaluate Superintendent Rieke-Smith were the Cabinet and the Board, including representatives of the employees associations.

The Board, Cabinet and Superintendent Rieke-Smith discussed options for soliciting feedback for Superintendent Rieke-Smith's evaluation.

Mr. Yancey recommended the Board have the superintendent evaluation conducted and evaluated by an outside entity, because there had been some concerns expressed in the past that the data collected through internally administered evaluations had been tampered with.

Ms. Price asked if the purpose of the survey was to get feedback for the Board to make a decision regarding Superintendent Rieke-Smith's performance, or to provide feedback to the Board and the Cabinet.

Mr. King said the purpose of the survey was to help the Board make a decision on whether or not to hire Dr. Rieke-Smith as the District Superintendent, and to provide tools and information to help her do a better job.

Mr. Ricker asked if the Board wanted to know whether the Cabinet was happy with the decision or concerned about whether or not the decision was made with the best interest of the kids.

Chair Bigley said the Board could talk about the evaluation at the September 28, 2015 work session. It was important for Board members to let community members know their questions and concerns had been heard by the Board. In response to Ms. McCulley, Chair Bigley confirmed that staff should move forward to identify an outside consultant to conduct the survey.

Dr. Megert said the Board needed to go through a process to go from interim to permanent, and determine whether or not it would conduct a search for a permanent superintendent. He asked if a portion of the

evaluation should inform the Board about its decision, or did the Board already have a decision making process it intended to use.

Chair Bigley said how long it would take to get feedback back from a survey that would take two weeks to administer? She wanted people to have an opportunity to give feedback now, but she did not want to slow the process down so that the data was not available to help the Board make a decision.

Dr. Megert said if the Board wanted to include survey data in its evaluation decision, it would take the Board past November.

Ms. Boyst suggested that the Board had committed to doing a full interview process as it had done for Dr. Hertica Martin.

Chair Bigley responded that the Board had indicated it would decide in November what type of an interview process it would use.

Ms. Adams said the Board had decided previously that it would give Superintendent Rieke-Smith a full year to demonstrate her effectiveness in serving as the District Superintendent, with the recruitment process beginning in spring 2016.

Mr. King thought the Board had committed to undertaking recruitment for a superintendent at the end of the 2015 school year.

Superintendent Rieke-Smith reviewed her schedule, noting that she would begin offering forums this month to provide people with an opportunity to have conversations with her.

Chair Bigley adjourned the work session at 6:58 pm.

BOARD BUSINESS MEETING

A Regular Meeting of the Lane County School District No. 19 Board of Education was held on September 14, 2015.

1. CALL MEETING TO ORDER

Board Chair Nancy Bigley called the Springfield Board of Education meeting to order in the boardroom of the District Administration Center at 7:04 pm and led the Pledge of Allegiance.

Attendance

Board Members present included Chair Nancy Bigley, Laurie Adams, Sandra Boyst, Al King, and Jonathan Light.

District staff, students and community members identified included Superintendent Sue Rieke-Smith, Brett Yancey, Michael Henry, Jenna McCulley, Karen Lewis, Tom Lindly, Brian Megert, Kevin Ricker, Suzy Price, Yvonne Atteberry, Anne Goff, Linda Henry, Erik Bishoff, Brenda Holt, Joan Bolls, Laura Pavlat, John Saraceno, Jeff Butler, Kari Isham, Deborah Lange, José da Silva, Audrea Shelley, Paul Weill, Laurie Glazener, and Gina King.

2. STUDENT BOARD MEMBER INTRODUCTIONS

Superintendent Sue Rieke-Smith introduced the following students who will serve as representatives to the Board for the 2015-2016 school year:

Academy of Arts and Academics (A3): Kyra Hanson and Sabrina Gross

Gateways High School (GHS): Natasha Persinger and Stevie Poole

Springfield High School (SHS): Sydney Baker and Elexis Frazier

Thurston High School (THS): Blake McKay and Kathryn Glazener

3. WORK SESSION SUMMARY

Mr. Light provided summary of this evening's work session on Superintendent Evaluation, and Board and District Goals.

4. RECOGNITION: CERTIFICATE OF ACHIEVEMENT FOR EXCELLENCE IN FINANCIAL REPORTING

Chair Bigley said the Certificate of Achievement for Excellence in Financial Reporting was awarded to Springfield Public Schools by the Government Finance Officers Association (GFOA) of the United States and Canada for its Comprehensive Annual Financial Report (CAFR). The Certificate of Achievement was the highest form of recognition in government accounting and financial reporting, and its attainment represented a significant accomplishment by a government and its management.

Director of Business Operations Brett Yancey introduced staff members Joan Bolls and Brenda Holt and recognized them for their efforts in preparing the District's CAFR.

5. PUBLIC COMMENTS

Debra Lange, Principal of Page Elementary School, thanked the Board and the community for their support of the 2014 Bond Measure, which included funding for the Page parking lot. Four hundred and fifty students and their families faced potential dangers and risks associated with the current configuration of the parking lot. A committee had been working on communicating the functionalities to the families and supporting school personnel with drop off and pick up formats. The parking lot was much safer for the kids than it had ever been. She thanked the community for creating a safer environment for the kids.

Barry Lind stated he was the pastor of the church across the street from Page Elementary School, and the congregation loved its partnership with the school. The congregation had done projects with the school, which had benefitted the church as well as the school. Page Elementary and the church had a shared parking program, which had been a significant blessing to both organizations. He lived in the area and regularly traveled down Hayden Bridge Road, and was aware of the after school vehicle/pedestrian/bicycle hazard. The new parking had taken all of the cars off the street and provided a safer route for people traveling through the neighborhood. The members of his congregation were thankful for the Page parking lot, which looked beautiful and worked efficiently. He thanked the Board for doing great work.

Olivia Creighton said she was a student at SHS and was representing her fellow SHS students in the theater department. Board members cautioned her that she could not present personnel issues to the Board. Last year she stage managed *Sherlock Holmes a Steampunk*. There were some incidents which had an impact on the theater department. In response to Chair Bigley, Ms. Creighton said she had not gone through the steps, including writing letters and talking to administrators, to address her concerns prior to coming to tonight's Board meeting. Chair Bigley suggested Ms. Creighton go through the process so that her concerns would be heard and people would protected, as required by Oregon law. Superintendent Rieke-Smith introduced Ms. Creighton to Dr. Michael Henry, the District's Human Resources Director, and Kevin Ricker, the District's Director of Secondary Education. Superintendent Rieke-Smith suggested Ms. Creighton could send letters to SHS Principal José da Silva, Mr. Ricker and Dr. Henry. Superintendent Rieke-Smith suggested the student

representatives have conversations with the administrators to share their concerns and their hopes for moving forward.

Superintendent Rieke-Smith commended Ms. Creighton who had served as a member of the Superintendent's Student Advisory Council. She was a hard worker and she had the right vision for her school. Superintendent Rieke-Smith thanked Ms. Creighton for being willing to work with Dr. Henry and Mr. Ricker on this issue.

Desiree Bohn said she was a SHS graduate, and had received the Martin Luther King award from the District when she attended SHS. She had gone through the process of talking with the principal and to the Board. She thanked the Board for actions it had taken regarding a staff member. It was extremely stressful for her, her family and some of her fellow students who had dealt with a problem at the school. She thanked the Board for the actions it had taken. Mr. King suggested that Ms. Bone should raise her concerns with Superintendent Rieke-Smith.

Chad Towe, Principal of THS, thanked the Board and the Cabinet for their work on behalf of students and the District. He was extremely proud when the THS and SHS varsity football teams competed last Friday, September 11, 2015. It was an incredible event and he appreciated the support of Board members who attended the game. He congratulated SHS for their win, which was a win for the entire community. He commended the players, the coaches, the students, the concession workers, police officers and many other people who contributed to the success of the event. He shared a telephone call he had received from a neighbor of THS, who thanked THS and the District for the efforts to beautify the THS building and draw in the community. Dr. Towe explained THS now had wireless access in all instructional spaces, with upgraded computers in the school library and computer lab, new, cutting edge technology in the CTE wing, with 3D printers, CNC routers, arc and mig welders, vinyl cutters, and computer technology in the fabrication lab. THS was preparing a grant application through the Oregon Department of Education (ODE) for capital improvements at the school. He thanked Mr. King for his advocacy for the CTE and for his understanding of the importance of the strong CTE program at THS and the alliances that encouraged strong school to work trainings. Bond projects would continue to improve the District's schools.

Mr. King noted the bleachers at THS were full when the ceremony occurred.

Jeffrey Pywell wished to offer comments on the SHS theater department. Chair Bigley suggested Mr. Pywell direct his comments to SHS Principal José da Silva, Dr. Michael Henry, and Kevin Ricker.

Andira Clements thanked Board members for allowing an open forum. She was a parent with two children in the Springfield Public Schools. She expressed appreciation for SHS Principal José da Silva for his work at SHS.

Mr. Light emphasized that the Board would follow up on the concerns expressed tonight.

6. CONSENT AGENDA
A. August 10, 2015 Board Meeting Minutes
B. August 19, 2015 Summer Planning Meeting Minutes
C. Financial Statement
D. Technology Bond Update
E. Personnel Action, Resolution #15-16.006
Michael Henry recommended that the Board of Directors approve the personnel action for licensed employees as reflected in the resolution. Categories include:
New Hires

Christine Ancell	Bonnie Aulakh	Teresa Collins

Derek Daniel	Carly Johnson	Christina Slaughterback
Scott Evanson	Stephanie Leahy	Bryne Thorpe
Brandon Ferguson	Kelsey Moore	Jeffrey Thompson
James Hallwyler	Cassandra Moorhead	Denice Ward
Sidney Hughes	Diana Morgan	Rebekah Whittaker
Jeanette Jacobson	Joelee Northup	
Resignations		
Michelle Jensen	Jennifer Knapp	Connie Kuei
Christian Noble		
Change of Contract Status		
Tiffany Swalm	Jessica Whelan	Jared Williams

F. Board Policy Approval, Resolution #15-16.007
Jenna McCulley recommended that the Board of Directors approve the following board policy:
- JHCDA Prescription Medication

G. E-Rate Subsidized Network Infrastructure Technology Upgrades, Resolution #15-16.008
Tom Lindly recommended that the Board of Directors approve the award the Network Infrastructure Technology Upgrades to CenturyLink Inc. of Phoenix, Arizona for $421,867.71, of which $84,373.55 will be paid from Bond proceeds.

Motion: Ms. Adams moved, seconded by Ms. Boyst, to approve the Consent Agenda.

The motion carried unanimously, 5-0.

7. REPORTS AND DISCUSSION
A. Administration Building Report
Mr. Yancey provided a report on the current Administration Building and progress staff had made on evaluating the building. He iterated he had made a report to the Board on the current Administration Building during the summer. The District had been working with Evans, Elder & Brown Commercial Real Estate brokers since April 2015 on options available for a possible relocation of staff in the Administration Building. The current building had significant seismic concerns. Staff had provided information on the cost of retrofitting and rebuilding the current building. Staff had determined the best option was to find a reasonable location to relocate the administrative complex. A building at 640 A Street in Springfield, which currently housed the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT), was large enough to accommodate the District's administrative functions, including adequate meeting space and a Board Room that was larger than the Board Room at the current Administration Building. The District had requested that the owner of the building conduct a series of seismic evaluations, which had been completed and provided to the District. The building was built in 1973 to code at that time, and according to the structural engineer, in significantly better condition than the current Administration Building. The results of the seismic evaluations revealed that some retrofit would be recommended, but those retrofits for the roof line and the second floor would not be as costly as what the District faced with the current Administration Building. After the District received the report, Mr. Saraceno contacted the architect that had done many of the upgrades to that building, and asked them for a proposal on retrofit services and cost estimates, to provide the Board with accurate information on what the upgrades to the building would cost. The next steps would be to receive the retrofit cost estimates, report those costs, including other challenges with the building, to the Board, and meet with the Board to receive further direction. It may be necessary for the Board to meet in an Executive Session to negotiate with the owner or make an offer to the owner.

In response to Ms. Adams, Mr. Yancey confirmed a walkthrough of the building for the Board could be arranged.

Mr. King thanked Superintendent Rieke-Smith for her great back to school talk. He emphasized the importance of keeping staff appraised on the status of relocating administrative functions. He noted the Lane Council of Governments (LCOG), of which Springfield Public Schools was a member agency, owned the building. The District and LCOG wanted to engage in a fair transaction. He opined relocating the administrative functions was an interim solution for three to ten years, and the eventually the District would need to design and build a new building.

Mr. Yancey reported he had been contacted by a local construction firm while researching possible relocation options about the former Key Bank building, which they had procured during an auction. He and Mr. Saraceno met with the president of the company regarding providing student services currently provided in the Memorial Building at the Key Bank building. The District leased the Memorial Building, which was not an ideal learning environment, from Willamalane Park and Recreation District (WPRD). The Key Bank building was approximately 7,500 square feet and expandable to 10,000 plus square feet, and was single story construction, which could serve the District with remodeling. He had inquired if the bank building would be available for lease/purchase or outright purchase, and the company president indicated all of those options were available. Staff recommended that the District continue pursuing the bank building as a long-term solution for the District's downtown educational programs. He had met with Dr. Megert and Mr. Ricker about how the bank building could be remodeled to meet District needs. He would bring financing recommendations to the Board for the ODOT and Key Bank buildings. The purchase of buildings would be wrapped up into one type of financing, either through using reserves and/or financing a portion of a purchase.

Sydney Baker, SHS Board representative, said the Student Voice group met at the current Administration Building and expressed concern about being notified of a location change for those meetings.

Chair Bigley assured Ms. Baker that student representatives would know early in the process if or when the meeting location would change.

B. Construction Bond Update

Mr. Yancey provided a PowerPoint presentation entitled *General Obligation Bond Update—September 14, 2015*. The summer had been very busy. He reviewed the following:

- GO Bond progress—complete by December 31, 2015.
    - Maple Elementary School—4 room addition
    - Ridgeview Elementary School—1 room remodel, 1 room addition
    - Yolanda Elementary School—cafeteria and 2 room addition
    - Mt. Vernon Elementary School—2 room addition
    - Riverbend Elementary School—2 room addition.
- Capital Improvement Projects—year 1—2014-2015—completed or nearing completion
    - Page Elementary School—parking lot and ADA restroom
    - Thurston High School—bleachers and cover, gym siding, concrete and fence
    - All sites—door locks, perimeter gates
    - Douglas Gardens—siding and painting, ADA upgrades
    - Yolanda Elementary School—ADA upgrades
    - Briggs Middle School—ADA restrooms
    - Springfield High School—parking lot repair, slurry
    - Guy Lee Elementary School—parking lot repair
    - Warehouse—sprinkler system
    - Riverbend Elementary School—parking lot repair.
- Capital Improvement Projects—year 2—2015-2016
    - Thurston High School—boiler replacement (3 units)
    - Guy Lee Elementary School—boiler replacement

    - Thurston Middle School—gymnasium floor replacement
    - Mt. Vernon Elementary School—siding replacement and carpet replacement
    - Riverbend Elementary School—carpet replacement
    - Ridgeview Elementary School—stormwater pipe repair
    - Briggs Middle School—HVAC and digital control upgrade
    - Yolanda Elementary School—interior wall replacement (one pod) and parking lot upgrade
    - Centennial Elementary School—ADA restroom upgrade
    - Walterville Elementary School, Thurston Middle School and BELC—secure entry upgrades
    - District wide—camera and security upgrades.
- Next Steps
    - Bond Oversight Committee: meeting to be scheduled in late September. Report to School Board to follow.
    - September 28, 2015: Architect presentation to School Board regarding Hamlin Middle School replacement.

Chair Bigley invited student representatives to offer comments.

Kathryn Glazener thanked the Board for the new crosswalk at THS which many people used.

Sydney Baker loved the new parking lot at SHS.

Stevie Poole said GHS did not have a parking lot. The students used to be able to park at the bank, but the building was sold, and the students could no longer park there.

Mr. Yancey said a number of things had happened with downtown Springfield parking. The City of Springfield recently implemented new parking rules and the bank building and adjacent parking lot recently changed ownership. Parking on the street was a challenge for staff and students. The District was in conversation with the building owners about parking and the building. In response to Mr. Light, Mr. Yancey said the District still owned the parking lot at GHS and he would look into the parking situation there.

Kyra Hanson reported the first three days of school were held at a camp. The Triangle Lake campsite did not work out and which resulted in last minute scrambling to make it work at the main A3 campus. Guest artists did break out sessions and the event went well.

Sabrina Gross agreed with Ms. Hanson's comments. The camp at the A3 campus was a great experience.

Chair Bigley thanked the students for attending tonight's meeting.

C. Superintendent Communication

Superintendent Sue Rieke-Smith thanked Board members for their support during the first week of school. Staff had repeatedly shared with her how good they felt about the picnic and having an opportunity to spend time with Board members. She visited schools following Tuesday's welcome back session. The Alert Lockdown Inform Counter and Evacuate (ALICE) training, which was a response system to an active shooter situation, was attended by all classified and certified staff, over a two day period. She commended Mr. Yancey, Mr. Lindly, the Springfield Police Department and police officers from across Lane County who did an amazing job. It was challenging for the staff because of the District's history with THS. There were counselors present to help staff through those challenging experiences. Comments from participants were that the training was challenging and difficult, but probably the best training they had in a long time.

Mr. Yancey said the ALICE training provided an opportunity for staff to know there were options available when faced with difficult situations. He was working with administrators to develop an appropriate way to provide the training to students.

Superintendent Rieke-Smith said she would look to the Student Voice group to help with designing a good way to present the ALICE training at the high schools, which would differ from how it would be rolled out at the middle schools and elementary schools.

Superintendent Rieke-Smith said she had been working with Jenna McCulley, the District's new Community Engagement Officer, to schedule three forums throughout the District, where Superintendent Rieke-Smith would be available to have conversations around a particular theme, such as Smarter Balanced results, and provide parents and community an opportunity to understand what the results might mean, and how the District would move forward. The meetings would provide Superintendent Rieke-Smith an opportunity to have conversations about new legislation related to parent refusal and other concerns in the community about the District. She was available to the community to address their concerns and questions.

D. Board Communication

• OSBA Elections – Nominations for Position 6

Chair Bigley said Sherry Duerst-Higgins was rerunning for OSBA Position 6, which represented the Springfield area. There were no Board members who were interested in running against her.

• 2015-2016 Board Committee Representation

In response to Ms. Adams, Paul Weill said Student Voice lost its last adult ally at SHS, who was now teaching at THS. SHS was recruiting a new adult ally and he was working with A3 in their recruitment of an adult ally.

Ms. Boyst said the Springfield Education Foundation's (SEF) annual fundraising gala, *Night of 11,000 Stars*, was scheduled for October 15, 2015. Tickets were still available for the event. SEF's Executive Director, Ronnel Curry, reported there were $22,600 in sponsorships for the event. Travis Fryback was SEF's new Chair and Micah Adams was SEF's new Vice Chair.

Chair Bigley circulated a handout about the upcoming OSBA conference.

Mr. King announced this would be his last Board meeting and he would be resigning from the Board because he sold his house in Springfield and would be moving to Eugene. Serving on the Springfield School Board, serving the students and working with the teachers, administrators, community and the Board was one of the best experiences of a lifetime. He began his service on the School Board in 2002 and had served five superintendents.

Board members and staff offered their thanks and appreciation to Mr. King for his wisdom, kindness, and years of service.

Motion: Ms. Adams moved, seconded by Mr. Light, to accept Mr. King's resignation effective at noon on October 12, 2015, with regret and thanks.

The motion carried unanimously, 4-0-1, with Board members Adams, Bigley, Boyst, and Light voting in favor of the motion and Board member King abstaining.

8. OTHER BUSINESS

Mr. Light noted the Wildish Community Theatre was under new management. The Board needed to discuss the current ten-year lease with the District, which would expire in 2016. A3 was not a charter school when

the Board partnered with A3 on managing the theater building, which may change when a new lease was negotiated. He suggested discussing the issue at a future Board work session. He asked if there had been progress on the inter-district committee on Common Core Standards and Smarter Balanced. He suggested that the student leadership could think about Common Core and Smarter Balanced, which was significant in their world. He opined the conversation on this topic had been absent around the nation.

Superintendent Rieke-Smith said OSBA would be having a Hot Topics table on Common Core and Smarter Balanced at its fall conference. OSBA had heard loudly and clearly at the summer session that there was a lot of work to do around these issues. With Dr. Nancy Golden's departure as Chief Education Officer, the conversations around alternative assessments and other options were at a critical point. Superintendent Rieke-Smith had asked COSA if she could sit on the committee, which gave input to the Legislature and the Oregon Department of Education (ODE). She along with Dr. Balderas, Superintendent of the Eugene School District and Colt Gill, Superintendent of the Bethel School District, felt there was a better way to do the work.

Ms. Adams noted Dr. Golden met with students at THS earlier this year about standardized testing. Ms. Adams asked the students if they were interested in holding a student summit with Bethel and Eugene students on Smarter Balanced and Common Core. She commended Superintendent Rieke-Smith on her back to school speech. She was proud that so many administrators and Board members attended a recent THS/SHS football game at the new THS stadium, which had been built with bond revenues the voters, had approved. Ms. McCulley had done a great job organizing their attendance at the game and THS Principal Chad Towe was instrumental in having a successful event. The Brattain House had a garage sale over Labor Day weekend where they sold items that had been left behind in the University of Oregon dormitories at the end of the 2014-2015 school year.

Mr. Light suggested the bigger question may be "Is standardized testing a legitimate metric for measuring student growth?" The people who funded public education felt a need to have justification that money was well spent.

Chair Bigley recently attended the Eugene City Club where Superintendent Rieke-Smith, Superintendent Balderas, Superintendent Gill and Mapleton Superintendent Jodi O'Mara did a presentation on civic studies in the schools. The Eugene City Club had taken teaching civics on as their area of focus. Superintendent Rieke-Smith did a very nice job with her back to school speech.

Ms. Boyst commended Mr. Yancey for his efforts on behalf of the Hamlin Middle School design team. She thanked the members of the design team for their work. It was good to see everyone working together.

Ms. Glazener thanked Mr. King for his donation of food and clothing to the Thurston pantry.

Ms. Baker said she had partnered with Mr. King as a 7th grader during a science project when she was at Thurston Middle School. He had left a great impression on her and she thought he was cool. She wished him good luck.

9. NEXT MEETINGS

Ms. Bigley said the Board would hold a Board Work Session on September 28, 2015 at 4:00 pm, and the next Business Meeting would be held on October 12, 2015 at 7:00 pm.

10. ADJOURNMENT

With no other business, Ms. Bigley adjourned the meeting at 8:39 pm.

(Minutes recorded by Linda Henry)

BOARD REPORT **October 12, 2015**

SPRINGFIELD PUBLIC SCHOOLS
2015-2016 Revenue/Expenditure Forecast
As of September 30, 2015
****Please see attached report****

REVENUES:

- A majority of our (current year) property taxes will be received during the month of November, with minor collections remaining throughout the remainder of the year. Additionally, it is estimated that approximately $475,000 of prior year property taxes are to be received on behalf of the District. This report is based on the information received through the Lane County Tax and Assessment office.
- The District's most significant portion of revenue is the District's scheduled Basic School Support payments. According to Oregon Department of Education's estimate, the District is scheduled to receive approximately 99.6% of the adopted budget. This estimate includes the additional students enrolled in the SPS Online program, as well as Charter School enrollment at both A3 and Willamette Leadership Academy.
- The District is anticipating receiving approximately $190,000 in County School Funds. To date the District has not received anticipated funds.
- The District is anticipating receiving approximately $1.26 million in Common School Funds. To date the District has no received anticipated funds.

EXPENDITURES:

- Salary amounts are based upon staff allocations adopted during the budgeting process. This is estimated using actual data (per year-end estimates). These projections reflect anticipated and realized retirements.
- Benefit amounts are based upon staff allocations revised during the budgeting process, along with budgeted salaries.
- The purchased services, supplies and capital outlay expenditure projections are based upon budgeted expenditures and anticipated to be expended similar to past trends. While historically the District has under spent these budget areas, reductions in discretionary budget no longer afford for significant under-expending.
- Other objects include the cost for property and liability insurance and is based upon premiums negotiated after the 2015-2016 adopted budget.

Additional Notes: For the 2015-2016 budget year the current estimate of ending fund balance is $6,055,101. Included in this number is the un-audited ending fund balance from the 2014-2015 fiscal year ($5,000,000).

Submitted by: Reviewed by:

Brett M. Yancey
Chief Operations Officer

Dr. Sue Rieke-Smith
Superintendent

SPRINGFIELD SCHOOL DISTRICT 19
2015-2016 REVENUE/EXPENDITURE FORECAST
as of
9/30/15

	BUDGET	ACTUAL through 09/30/15	ESTIMATED from 09/30/15 to year end	PROJECTED 2015-2016	PROJECTED as % of BUDGET
REVENUES:					
Property taxes - current	22,757,340	0	22,757,340	22,757,340	100.00%
Property taxes - prior years	475,000	0	475,000	475,000	100.00%
Other local sources	911,100	295,843	615,257	911,100	100.00%
Lane ESD Apportionment	1,516,180	0	1,516,180	1,516,180	100.00%
County School Fund	190,000	0	190,000	190,000	100.00%
State School Fund	68,798,807	23,548,390	44,991,783	68,540,173	99.62%
Common School Fund	997,484		1,265,737	1,265,737	126.89%
Federal Forest Fees	400,000		550,000	550,000	137.50%
Total revenues	96,045,911	23,844,233	72,361,296	96,205,530	100.17%
Beginning fund balance	4,407,051	0	5,000,000	5,000,000	113.45%
Total Beginning fund balance	4,407,051	0	5,000,000	5,000,000	113.45%
Total resources	100,452,962	23,844,233	77,361,296	101,205,530	100.75%
EXPENDITURES:					
Personal services	49,394,218	5,353,311	44,040,907	49,394,218	100.00%
Employee benefits	30,417,001	2,844,254	27,572,747	30,417,001	100.00%
Purchased services	10,466,354	1,979,132	8,487,222	10,466,354	100.00%
Supplies & materials	2,891,426	645,078	2,217,434	2,862,512	99.00%
Capital outlay	132,375	13,492	118,883	132,375	100.00%
Other objects	700,111	637,076	63,035	700,111	100.00%
Fund transfers	1,177,858	0	1,177,858	1,177,858	100.00%
Total expenditures	95,179,343	11,472,343	83,678,086	95,150,429	99.97%
Unappropriated	4,000,000	0	0	0	-
Contingency	1,273,619	0	0	0	0.00%
Total appropriations	100,452,962	11,472,343	83,678,086	95,150,429	94.72%
Total resources		23,844,233	77,361,296	101,205,530	
Total appropriations		11,472,343	83,678,086	95,150,429	
Ending fund balance		12,371,891	(6,316,790)	6,055,101	
Less: contingency			0	0	
Net fund balance		12,371,891	(6,316,790)	6,055,101	

BOARD REPORT DATE: OCTOBER 12, 2015

TECHNOLOGY BOND UPDATE

At the September Board, meeting I provided the first written report describing the work that we have completed on the technology portion of the bond. I also said that after the September meeting, we would report only those items that we completed since the initial report. I would also like to include a quarterly financial update, which is included in this report.

It is important to note in the sections titled "Work Completed Since the Previous Report", I only include work that is completely finished, not work that is currently underway. For example, under "Core Network Equipment", we list Douglas Gardens as complete. There are network updates happening at Thurston High that are not yet complete that are identified under "Next Steps / Work in Progress". As a result, you will see that for some projects the "% Spent" is higher than the "% Complete". In these cases, we have ordered the equipment, encumbered the funds, and have not yet completed the work.

Another important point related to budget is the fact that "% Complete" is difficult to calculate for some projects. For example, the Professional Technical Technology project allocated $300,000 to upgrade some of the CTE equipment at the two comprehensive high schools. As a result, the "% Complete" calculation is simply the amount spent divided by the budget. This is also true with the Central Server Infrastructure & Storage project, the Library Computer Devices, eReaders, and the Testing Computer Devices.

The technology portion of the bond is broken into 12 projects, each project with its own budget and timeline. Some of the projects were scheduled to start immediately while others were not scheduled to begin until the 2017-18 school year.

1. Core Network Equipment (Time Frame: 2015-2018)

   Project Scope - This project provides for the upgrade of the core network infrastructure which includes the computing center as well as all of the district schools including A3. These upgrades (in most cases wholesale replacements) set the stage for increased Internet bandwidth, building-wide wireless connectivity, and unified communications.

   Work Completed Since the Previous Report
   - Network equipment upgrades and replacements at Douglas Gardens

   Next Steps / Work in Progress - Network equipment upgrades and replacements at THS and Yolanda.

   We were recently granted more than $300,000 of Erate funding to help fund work in this area. This funding will be used to help support the purchase of equipment for Thurston

High, Mt Vernon, Ridgeview, Walterville, Briggs, and Thurston Middle. Next year, we will have the opportunity to apply for Erate funding to support additional network replacements.

Project Budget

We have purchased a large portion of the network and wireless equipment for Thurston High, Yolanda, Mt Vernon, Ridgeview, Walterville, Briggs, Douglas Gardens, and Thurston Middle. With the $300,000 in Erate funding, the purchase of this equipment will result in a net cost of $88,000.

Initial Budget:	$1,572,216
$ Spent to Date:	$698,741
% Completion:	13%
% Spent:	44%

2. Central Server Infrastructure & Storage (Time Frame: 2015-2018)

Project Scope – Provide up to date high capacity server and storage equipment to support computing within the district.

Work Completed Since the Previous Report

- No new work has been completed on this project.

Next Steps / Work in Progress – We have purchased high speed switching equipment, two new servers to support email, a tape backup unit, and a large storage device called a SAN.

Project Budget

Initial Budget:	$653,068
$ Spent to Date:	$138,068
% Completion:	21%
% Spent:	21%

3. Enterprise Wireless Network (Time Frame: 2015-2016)

Project Scope – This project provides for high speed wireless access in all learning spaces at all district schools, including A3). In the majority of our schools, this work will be completed at the same time that we are upgrading the core network equipment.

Work Completed Since the Previous Report

- Douglas Gardens wireless network

Next Steps / Work in Progress - The next schools in line for wireless network upgrades are the same schools scheduled for network equipment upgrades, Thurston High and Yolanda. We will continue to add a few wireless access points at various schools based upon

identified needs as we work towards total network upgrades at these facilities. Work in this area will continue though out the school year.

Project Budget

Initial Budget:	$205,627
$ Spent to Date:	$202,085
% Completion:	75%
% Spent:	98%

4. Unified Communications (Time Frame: 2016-2020)
    - Work in this area not scheduled to begin until 2016-17

Project Scope – Work in this area will allow the district to deploy a common districtwide IP based communications system. This system will provide traditional telephone services as well as voicemail, voice to text, etc. The goal is to integrate the IP based telephone systems with other IP based systems within the district such as bell systems, intercom, video, and alarm systems.

Work Completed Since the Previous Report
- No new work has been completed on this project.

Project Budget

Initial Budget:	$923,200
$ Spent to Date:	$0
% Completion:	0%
% Spent:	0%

5. Classroom Equipment (Time Frame: 2015 - 2020)

Project Scope – The scope of this work is to provide ceiling or wall mounted projectors, quality projection screens, and sound systems in every classroom in the district). In addition to the projection systems, the project will provide document cameras for those classrooms that do not have one.

Work Completed Since the Previous Report
- No new work has been completed on this project.

Next Steps / Work in Progress – Springfield High should be completed by October 9th. Although not initially scheduled, we will be moving to Page once the work is complete at the high school. We have started the design process in preparation for bidding projection system installations at the remaining schools. These installations are scheduled to start

June 2016. We are piloting some document cameras in preparation for providing these devices in classrooms with ceiling mounted projectors that currently do not have them.

Project Budget

Initial Budget:	$2,523.484
$ Spent to Date:	$1,011,727
% Completion:	56%
% Spent:	40%

6. Library Computer Devices (Time Frame: 2015-2017)

Project Scope – This project is designed to provide up to date equipment for each of the school libraries. In preparation for this work, we have met with each of the schools to understand what technology they need based upon their vision of what the library will be at their school. From these meetings, we have developed a prioritized list of libraries.

Work Completed Since the Previous Report

- No new work has been completed on this project.

Next Steps / Work in Progress – We have completed the work that was budgeted for year one. During year two, we will continue to work through our prioritized list of schools.

Project Budget

Initial Budget	$227,513
$ Spent to Date	$23,762
% Completion	10%
% Spent	10%

7. Computer Lab Devices (Time Frame: 2015 – 2018)

Project Scope – The goal for this project is to insure that the various technology labs across the district have computers that meet instructional program needs.

Work Completed Since the Previous Report

- No new work has been completed on this project.

Next Steps / Work in Progress – We have completed the work in this area for year one. Moving into year two, we will continue to look at the highest need labs within the district for replacement.

Project Budget

Initial Budget:	$633,600
$ Spent to Date:	$148,493
% Completion:	23%
% Spent:	23%

8. Testing Computer Devices (Time Frame: 2015-2018)

Project Scope – This project is designed to provide equipment that meets the needs for Oregon standardized testing.

Work Completed Since the Previous Report

- No new work has been completed on this project.

Next Steps / Work in Progress – Debrief with the schools to determine the next steps in terms of providing testing devices. Additional low cost Chromebook carts may be the best solution for meeting testing needs.

Project Budget

Initial Budget:	$257,742
$ Spent to Date:	$47,743
% Completion:	19%
% Spent:	19%

9. Staff Computer Devices (Time Frame: 2015–2020)

Project Scope – This project was designed to provide a one-time refresh for computers used by school-based district staff.

Work Completed Since the Previous Report

- No new work has been completed on this project.

Next Steps / Work in Progress – During the school year we will continue to identify certified, classified, and administrative computers that are in immediate need of replacement and develop a list for ongoing replacement. We plan to continue replacement at some level during the school year.

Project Budget

Initial Budget:	$1,352,760
$ Spent to Date:	$186,161
% Completion:	18%
% Spent:	14%

10. Student Computer Devices (Time Frame: 2015-2020)

Project Scope – This project is designed to create a 2:1 student to computer ratio, of up-to-date computer devices in all schools in the district.

Work Completed Since the Previous Report

- No new work has been completed on this project.

Next Steps / Work in Progress – We have prepared eight carts of Chromebooks that will be deployed in October or November spread amongst Thurston Middle, Hamlin, Briggs, Agnes Stewart, Thurston High, and Springfield High. School proposals will be evaluated in October to determine the next round of student computer distribution.

Project Budget

Initial Budget:	$4,125,790
$ Spent to Date:	$326,763
% Completion:	5%
% Spent:	8%

11. eReaders (Time Frame: 2017-2020)
    - Work in this area is not scheduled to begin until 2017-18

Project Scope: This project while somewhat undefined, acknowledges the fact that eBooks and Internet based instructional materials are gaining popularity and will likely require funding in the near future. The purchases in this area will be devices capable of browsing the Internet and serving as electronic books or textbooks.

Work Completed Since the Previous Report

- No work has been completed on this project.

Project Budget

Initial Budget:	$825,000
$ Spent to Date:	$0
% Completion:	0%
% Spent::	0%

12. Professional Technical Technology (Time Frame: 2015-2016)

Project Scope – Provide equipment in support of the CTE programs at the comprehensive high schools that are representative of equipment used in the industry and vocational education programs.

Work Completed Since the Previous Report

- No work has been completed in this project.

Next Steps / Work in Progress – We have ordered the metal lathes for both Thurston and Springfield High. We are currently working with an engineering firm that can do the work to get UL approval on these devices. Thurston High is working to specify welding equipment.

Project Budget

Initial Budget:	$300,000
$ Spent to Date:	$217,088
% Completion:	72%
% Spent:	72%

In total, the budget for the technology portion of the bond is as follows:

Initial Budget:	$13,600,000
$ Spent to Date:	$3,000,631
% Spent:	22%

We welcome your feedback regarding information that would be valuable for future reports or additional detail that would be helpful.

Submitted by:

Tom Lindly
Director of Technology and Transportation

Reviewed by:

Dr. Sue Rieke-Smith
Superintendent

FIRST READING/REVIEW DATE: OCTOBER 12, 2015

BOARD POLICY FOR REVIEW

RELEVANT DATA:

From time to time, changes in laws or operating practice require changes or additions to board policies. In addition, the district subscribes to a policy review service with Oregon School Boards Association and receives samples that are used to craft policy for Springfield Public Schools.

Five current policies need to be rewritten to meet legal standards. Three of these are actually the same policy with three different codes so that the policy language can be found under the following categories of board policies: G – Personnel, J – Students, and K – Community Relations.

Jenna McCulley is available for questions.

RECOMMENDATION:

It is recommended that the Board of Directors review the following board policies as a first reading:

- GBDA — Mother-Friendly Workplace
- GBK/JFCG/KGC — Prohibited Use, Possession, Distribution or Sale of Tobacco Products and Inhalant Delivery Systems
- GBM — Staff Complaints
- JFCG/KGC/GBK — Prohibited Use, Possession, Distribution or Sale of Tobacco Products and Inhalant Delivery Systems
- KGC/GBK/JFCG — Prohibited Use, Possession, Distribution or Sale of Tobacco Products and Inhalant Delivery Systems

SUBMITTED BY:

Jenna McCulley
Community Engagement Officer

Bold = Additions / ~~Strike Through~~ = Deletions

Springfield Public Schools

Code: **GBDA**
Adopted:

Mother Friendly Workplace*

The district recognizes that a normal and important role for mothers is to have the option and ability to provide for their child by breast-feeding or expressing milk in the workplace. The Board directs the superintendent or designee to take measures and develop regulations to ensure that all district employees shall be provided with an adequate location for the expression of milk or breast-feeding.

The superintendent or designee shall see that the district makes a reasonable effort to provide a room or other location in close proximity to **the employees'** work area~~s~~, other than a restroom, where an employee can [breast-feed her child or] express milk in privacy. This policy directs the superintendent or designee to include the following in the development of a regulation to ensure the provisions for employees required by this policy:

1. The advice of a school nurse or health professional in determining the most reasonable facility accommodation;

2. The plan shall include an accessible, private room with a lock that would allow a mother:

   a. To breast-feed a child brought in during a lunch or other break period; or
   b. To pump breast milk to be stored for later use.

3. The room shall include:

   a. Electrical outlets for electric pumps;
   b. Sanitation facilities including a sink close by, for hand washing and the rinsing of containers; and
   c. A sign up sheet and a sign posting the room as "private during use."

A reasonable effort will be made to provide a flexible work schedule in consideration of the requirements of the staff member's responsibility.

The district shall provide the employee a 30-minute rest period to breast-feed or express milk during each 4-hour work period, or the major part of a 4-hour work period, to be taken by the employee approximately in the middle of the work period.[1] If feasible, the employee will take the rest period at the same time as the rest periods or meal periods provided by the district.

[1]Districts should refer to their collective bargaining agreements to determine if the "rest period" is paid, nonpaid or a combination.

This policy and a list of designated locations will be published in the employee handbook. A list of designated locations must be readily available upon request in the central office of each school facility and in the district's central office.

END OF POLICY

Legal Reference(s):

ORS 243.650
ORS 653.077
ORS 653.256
OAR 839-020-0051

Springfield Public Schools

Code: **GBK/JFCG/KGC**
Adopted:

~~Tobacco-Free Environment~~
Prohibited Use, Possession, Distribution or Sale of Tobacco Products and Inhalant Delivery Systems (Version 1)

It is the ~~school~~**district's** obligation to protect the health, welfare and safety of students. ~~In light of scientific evidence that the use of tobacco is hazardous to health, and t~~**T**o be consistent with ~~district curriculum and~~ Oregon law **and district curriculum,** student possession, use, distribution or sale of tobacco **products or inhalant delivery systems** in any form on district premises, at school-sponsored activities, on or off district premises**, on all district grounds, including parking lots,** in district-owned, rented or leased vehicles or otherwise, **or** while ~~the~~**a** student is under the jurisdiction of the ~~school~~**district**, is prohibited.

The use, distribution or sale of tobacco products or inhalant delivery systems by staff and all others is prohibited on district premises, in any building or facility, on district grounds, including parking lots, in any vehicle owned, leased, rented or chartered by the district, school or public charter school and at all school-sponsored activities.

For the purpose of this policy, "tobacco **products"** is defined to include**, but not limited to,** any lighted or unlighted cigarette, cigar, pipe, **bidi**, clove cigarette, and any other smoking product, spit tobacco, also known as smokeless, dip, chew~~,~~ **or** snuff~~,~~ in any form~~, nicotine or nicotine delivering devices, chemicals or devices that produce the physical effect of nicotine substances or any other tobacco substitute (e.g., e-cigarettes)~~. This does not include **USFDA**-approved ~~nicotine replacement~~ **tobacco products or other therapy products** used for the purpose of cessation.

For the purpose of this policy, "inhalant delivery system" means a device that can be used to deliver nicotine or cannabinoids in the form of a vapor or aerosol to a person inhaling from the device; or a component of a device or a substance in any form sold for the purpose of being vaporized or aerosolized by a device, whether the component or substance is sold or not sold separately. This does not include USFDA-approved tobacco products or other therapy products marked and sold solely for the approved purpose.

~~Tobacco use, distribution or sale by staff and all others is also prohibited on district premises in any building, facility or vehicle owned, leased, rented or chartered by the district, school or public charter school and at all school-sponsored activities.~~

Violation of this policy will lead to appropriate disciplinary action up to and including expulsion for students. When considering disciplinary action for a ~~child~~**student** with disabilities, the district must follow the requirements of Board policy JGDA/JGEA - Discipline of Students with Disabilities, including those involving functional behavioral assessment, change of placement, manifestation determination and an interim alternative educational setting. Community or school service may be required. A referral to law enforcement may be made. Parents will be notified of all violations involving their student and subsequent action taken by the school. Information about cessation support and/or tobacco education programs and how students can access these programs will be provided. At the discretion of the principal, attendance and completion of such programs, or successful completion of a behavior modification plan, may be allowed as a substitute for, or as part of student discipline.

Violation of this policy by nonstudents may result in the individuals removal from district property. The district reserves the right to restrict access to district property by individuals who are repeat offenders.

This policy shall be enforced at all times. The superintendent will develop administrative regulations as needed to implement this policy.

END OF POLICY

Legal Reference(s):

ORS 167.400
ORS 332.107
ORS 336.222
ORS 336.227
ORS 339.240
ORS 339.250

ORS 339.883
ORS 431.840
ORS 433.835 to- 433.990

OAR 581-021-0050 to -0075
OAR 581-021-0110

OAR 581-022-0413
OAR 581-053-0230(9)(s)
OAR 581-053-0330(1)(m)
OAR 581-053-0430(12)
OAR 581-053-0531(11)
OAR 581-053-0630

Pro-Children Act of 1994, 20 U.S.C. §§ 6081-6084 (2006).

Bold = Additions / ~~Strike Through~~ = Deletions

Code: **GBM**
Adopted:

Staff Complaints*

It is an unlawful employment practice for an employer to discharge, demote, suspend or in any manner discriminate or retaliate against an employee with regard to promotion, compensation or other terms, conditions or privileges of employment for the reason that the employee has in good faith reported information in a manner as to disclose employer violations of any federal or state law, rule or regulation, mismanagement, gross waste of funds, abuse of authority, or substantial and specific danger to public health and safety.

The superintendent or designee will develop a complaint procedure which will be available for all employees who contend they have been subject to a violation, misinterpretation or inappropriate application of district personnel policies and/or administrative regulations. The complaint procedure will provide an orderly process for the consideration and resolution of problems in the application or interpretation of district personnel policies.

The complaint procedure will not be used to resolve disputes and disagreements related to the provisions of any collective bargaining agreement, nor will it be used in any instance where a collective bargaining agreement provides a dispute resolution procedure. Disputes concerning an employee's dismissal, contract nonrenewal or contract nonextension will not be processed under this procedure.

Reasonable efforts will be made to resolve complaints informally.

Administrative regulations will be developed to outline procedural timelines and steps under this policy, as necessary.

END OF POLICY

Legal Reference(s):

ORS 332.107
ORS 659A.199 OAR 581-022-1720

Anderson v. Central Point Sch. Dist., 746 F.2d 505 (9th Cir. 1984).
Connick v. Myers, 461 U.S. 138 (1983).

Springfield Public Schools

Code: **JFCG/KGC/GBK**
Adopted:

~~Tobacco-Free Environment~~
Prohibited Use, Possession, Distribution or Sale of Tobacco Products and Inhalant Delivery Systems (Version 1)

It is the ~~school~~**district's** obligation to protect the health, welfare and safety of students. ~~In light of scientific evidence that the use of tobacco is hazardous to health, and t~~**T**o be consistent with ~~district curriculum and~~ Oregon law **and district curriculum,** student possession, use, distribution or sale of tobacco **products or inhalant delivery systems** in any form on district premises, at school-sponsored activities, on or off district premises**, on all district grounds, including parking lots,** in district-owned, rented or leased vehicles or otherwise, **or** while ~~the~~**a** student is under the jurisdiction of the ~~school~~**district**, is prohibited.

The use, distribution or sale of tobacco products or inhalant delivery systems by staff and all others is prohibited on district premises, in any building or facility, on district grounds, including parking lots, in any vehicle owned, leased, rented or chartered by the district, school or public charter school and at all school-sponsored activities.

For the purpose of this policy, "tobacco **products"** is defined to include**, but not limited to,** any lighted or unlighted cigarette, cigar, pipe, **bidi**, clove cigarette, and any other smoking product, spit tobacco, also known as smokeless, dip, chew~~,~~ **or** snuff~~,~~ in any form~~, nicotine or nicotine delivering devices, chemicals or devices that produce the physical effect of nicotine substances or any other tobacco substitute (e.g., e-cigarettes)~~. This does not include **USFDA**-approved ~~nicotine replacement~~ **tobacco products or other therapy products** used for the purpose of cessation.

For the purpose of this policy, "inhalant delivery system" means a device that can be used to deliver nicotine or cannabinoids in the form of a vapor or aerosol to a person inhaling from the device; or a component of a device or a substance in any form sold for the purpose of being vaporized or aerosolized by a device, whether the component or substance is sold or not sold separately. This does not include USFDA-approved tobacco products or other therapy products marked and sold solely for the approved purpose.

~~Tobacco use, distribution or sale by staff and all others is also prohibited on district premises in any building, facility or vehicle owned, leased, rented or chartered by the district, school or public charter school and at all school-sponsored activities.~~

Violation of this policy will lead to appropriate disciplinary action up to and including expulsion for students. When considering disciplinary action for a ~~child~~**student** with disabilities, the district must follow the requirements of Board policy JGDA/JGEA - Discipline of Students with Disabilities, including those involving functional behavioral assessment, change of placement, manifestation determination and an interim alternative educational setting. Community or school service may be required. A referral to law enforcement may be made. Parents will be notified of all violations involving their student and subsequent action taken by the school. Information about cessation support and/or tobacco education programs and how students can access these programs will be provided. At the discretion of the principal, attendance and completion of such programs, or successful completion of a behavior modification plan, may be allowed as a substitute for, or as part of student discipline.

Violation of this policy by nonstudents may result in the individuals removal from district property. The district reserves the right to restrict access to district property by individuals who are repeat offenders.

This policy shall be enforced at all times. The superintendent will develop administrative regulations as needed to implement this policy.

END OF POLICY

Legal Reference(s):

ORS 167.400
ORS 332.107
ORS 336.222
ORS 336.227
ORS 339.240
ORS 339.250

ORS 339.883
ORS 431.840
ORS 433.835 to- 433.990

OAR 581-021-0050 to -0075
OAR 581-021-0110

OAR 581-022-0413
OAR 581-053-0230(9)(s)
OAR 581-053-0330(1)(m)
OAR 581-053-0430(12)
OAR 581-053-0531(11)
OAR 581-053-0630

Pro-Children Act of 1994, 20 U.S.C. §§ 6081-6084 (2006).

Springfield Public Schools

Code: **KGC/GBK/JFCG**
Adopted:

~~Tobacco-Free Environment~~
Prohibited Use, Possession, Distribution or Sale of Tobacco Products and Inhalant Delivery Systems (Version 1)

It is the ~~school~~**district's** obligation to protect the health, welfare and safety of students. ~~In light of scientific evidence that the use of tobacco is hazardous to health, and t~~**T**o be consistent with ~~district curriculum and~~ Oregon law **and district curriculum,** student possession, use, distribution or sale of tobacco **products or inhalant delivery systems** in any form on district premises, at school-sponsored activities, on or off district premises**, on all district grounds, including parking lots,** in district-owned, rented or leased vehicles or otherwise, **or** while ~~the~~**a** student is under the jurisdiction of the ~~school~~**district**, is prohibited.

The use, distribution or sale of tobacco products or inhalant delivery systems by staff and all others is prohibited on district premises, in any building or facility, on district grounds, including parking lots, in any vehicle owned, leased, rented or chartered by the district, school or public charter school and at all school-sponsored activities.

For the purpose of this policy, "tobacco **products"** is defined to include**, but not limited to,** any lighted or unlighted cigarette, cigar, pipe, **bidi**, clove cigarette, and any other smoking product, spit tobacco, also known as smokeless, dip, chew~~,~~ **or** snuff~~,~~ in any form~~, nicotine or nicotine delivering devices, chemicals or devices that produce the physical effect of nicotine substances or any other tobacco substitute (e.g., e-cigarettes)~~. This does not include **USFDA**-approved ~~nicotine replacement~~ **tobacco products or other therapy products** used for the purpose of cessation.

For the purpose of this policy, "inhalant delivery system" means a device that can be used to deliver nicotine or cannabinoids in the form of a vapor or aerosol to a person inhaling from the device; or a component of a device or a substance in any form sold for the purpose of being vaporized or aerosolized by a device, whether the component or substance is sold or not sold separately. This does not include USFDA-approved tobacco products or other therapy products marked and sold solely for the approved purpose.

~~Tobacco use, distribution or sale by staff and all others is also prohibited on district premises in any building, facility or vehicle owned, leased, rented or chartered by the district, school or public charter school and at all school-sponsored activities.~~

Violation of this policy will lead to appropriate disciplinary action up to and including expulsion for students. When considering disciplinary action for a ~~child~~**student** with disabilities, the district must follow the requirements of Board policy JGDA/JGEA - Discipline of Students with Disabilities, including those involving functional behavioral assessment, change of placement, manifestation determination and an interim alternative educational setting. Community or school service may be required. A referral to law enforcement may be made. Parents will be notified of all violations involving their student and subsequent action taken by the school. Information about cessation support and/or tobacco education programs and how students can access these programs will be provided. At the discretion of the principal, attendance and completion of such programs, or successful completion of a behavior modification plan, may be allowed as a substitute for, or as part of student discipline.

Violation of this policy by nonstudents may result in the individuals removal from district property. The district reserves the right to restrict access to district property by individuals who are repeat offenders.

This policy shall be enforced at all times. The superintendent will develop administrative regulations as needed to implement this policy.

END OF POLICY

Legal Reference(s):

ORS 167.400
ORS 332.107
ORS 336.222
ORS 336.227
ORS 339.240
ORS 339.250

ORS 339.883
ORS 431.840
ORS 433.835 to- 433.990

OAR 581-021-0050 to -0075
OAR 581-021-0110

OAR 581-022-0413
OAR 581-053-0230(9)(s)
OAR 581-053-0330(1)(m)
OAR 581-053-0430(12)
OAR 581-053-0531(11)
OAR 581-053-0630

Pro-Children Act of 1994, 20 U.S.C. §§ 6081-6084 (2006).

CONSENT AGENDA **DATE: OCTOBER 12, 2015**

ENROLLMENT UPDATE

RELEVANT DATA:

The final student count that the district will use for the remainder of the year is taken the last day of September. It is also this date in the year in which the district will use for projecting enrollment for the following year. This report is being prepared reflecting our enrollment following the state mandated "10 day drop period". It is at this point that the District drops any students who were in our system, yet have not enrolled for school.

SUBMITTED BY:

Brett M. Yancey
Chief Operating Officer

APPROVED BY:

Dr. Sue Rieke-Smith
Superintendent of Schools

SPRINGFIELD SCHOOL DISTRICT # 19
AS OF SEPTEMBER 30, 2015

School Name	Projected	Actual	Diff
Centennial Elementary	424	429	5
Douglas Gardens Elementary	338	344	6
Elizabeth Page Elementary	422	442	20
Guy Lee Elementary	428	375	(53)
Maple Elementary	350	347	(3)
Mt Vernon Elementary	555	526	(29)
Ridgeview Elementary	480	477	(3)
Riverbend Elementary	508	500	(8)
Thurston Elementary	491	472	(19)
Two Rivers Dos Rios Elementary	485	443	(42)
Walterville School	195	194	(1)
Yolanda Elementary	392	411	19
Agnes Stewart Middle	552	579	27
Briggs Middle	546	506	(40)
Hamlin Middle	569	597	28
Thurston Middle	614	577	(37)
Willamette Ldrshp Acad - Mid	117	120	3
Academy of Arts and Academics	350	359	9
Gateways High School	142	153	11
Springfield High	1315	1,410	95
Thurston High	1438	1,373	(65)
Willamette Ldrshp Acad - High	167	177	10
TOTAL ENROLLMENT	**10,878**	**10,811**	**(67)**

Grade Level	Projected	Actual	Diff
Kindergarten	815	778	(37)
1st Grade	846	844	(2)
2nd Grade	876	879	3
3rd Grade	865	834	(31)
4th Grade	858	841	(17)
5th Grade	808	784	(24)
Elementary Total	5,068	4,960	(108)
6th Grade	764	769	5
7th Grade	831	793	(38)
8th Grade	803	817	14
MS Total	2,398	2,379	(19)
9th Grade	914	914	-
10th Grade	795	824	29
11th Grade	834	861	27
12th Grade	869	873	4
HS Total	3,412	3,472	60
TOTAL ENROLLMENT	**10,878**	**10,811**	**(67)**