

MINUTES

4/ A Work Session of the Lane County School District No. 19 Board of Education was held on September 28, 2015.

1. CALL MEETING TO ORDER

Board Vice Chair Laurie Adams called the Springfield Board of Education Work Session to order in the Board Room of the District Administration Center at 4:05 pm.

Attendance

Board Members present included Chair Nancy Bigley (arrived at 4:45 pm), Laurie Adams, Sandra Boyst, and Jonathan Light. Al King was excused from the meeting.

District staff and audience members included Superintendent Sue Rieke-Smith, Brett Yancey, Karen Lewis, Jenna McCulley, Kevin Ricker, Tom Lindly, Suzy Price, Brian Megert, Yvonne Atteberry, Kevin Wright, Chris Reiersgaard, Erik Bishoff, Greg James, Brad McEntire, Laura Pavlat, Gary Cole, Brenda James, David Collins, Jim Crist, Whitney McKinley, Anne Goff, Brenda Holt, Audrea Shelley, Justin Starck, Linda Henry and Alisha Roemeling for the Register Guard.

2. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

Ms. Adams welcomed those present.

3. HAMLIN MIDDLE SCHOOL ARCHITECT PRESENTATION

Brett Yancey introduced Renee Alexander, BBT Architects, and Dave Watson, Blaine Grover, and Mike Frettie, Fortis Construction. Mr. Yancey explained the District still had much work to do for the Hamlin Middle School (HMS) project, including putting the architect's design work through a budget filter. The District had not yet entered into any negotiations and was working towards a guaranteed maximum price.

Ms. Alexander provided a PowerPoint presentation entitled *Updated/New Hamlin Middle School—September 2015*. The Design Team had been meeting regularly since June 2015, and would continue to meet until early 2016. The Design Team had met with HMS staff several times to provide updates, and would continue to meet periodically with staff through the end of 2015. The Design Team spent two days in the Seattle/Tacoma area looking at six schools, and in Bend, visiting a middle school.

Ms. Alexander reviewed the Design Team Phases:

Master Plan/Programming—done during late spring and summer 2015.

- Schematics Design Team—completed September 25, 2015.
- Design Development—October 2015 through January 2016.
- Construction Documents—completed May 2016.
- Bidding—follows Construction Documents.
- Construction—starts 2016.

Ms. Alexander reviewed the work completed:

- Goal setting.
- Reviewed site options.
- Facility programming.
- Ongoing staff meeting.

- Developed site plan and floor plans.
- Virtual school tours as well as two days in Seattle/Tacoma and one day in Bend.
- Visual survey and evaluation of architecture of inside and outside of buildings.
- Development of design concepts.
- Met with focus groups, including HMS students and parents.

Ms. Alexander reviewed the Next Steps:

- Cost Estimates.
- Design Documents.
- Staff Meetings.
- Selection of Colors and Materials.

Ms. Alexander walked the Board members through the site plan and floor plan, and facilitated a discussion of the process to date.

Chair Bigley arrived at 4:45 pm.

Board members shared their thoughts on signage, the building entrance, family resource center, gymnasium, band and choir rooms/sound system, commons, cafeteria, media center, special education, physical education, STEM classrooms, bathrooms and other project elements.

Superintendent Rieke-Smith thanked Ms. Alexander, Mr. Watson, Mr. Grover, and Mr. Frettie for their work on the project.

Mr. Yancey said he was looking for acknowledgment by Board members that the work shared with the Board tonight represented what the community wanted, what the Board believed would represent the District well and be the pinnacle of the District, and be a good value for the money. Staff would return to the Board with more specific information and a request for action.

Ms. Adams expressed concern that the District had not gotten its arms around what STEM and STEAM meant, which was not just about space.

Ms. Boyst said the Design Team had seen STEM facilities when it toured the Seattle/Tacoma area schools, and observed engineering and arts classrooms that opened to the outdoors, and a culinary arts program that opened into a store operated by the students where they sold goods that they made.

Mr. Light suggested now was the time to link video and audio cabling, so that the technology would be linked on a school wide basis.

Superintendent Rieke-Smith emphasized the importance of having a building that could grow with the District. Staff would provide a report related to the work HMS staff have been doing to prepare using the new building for an integrated STEAM type education at the next Board meeting.

Mr. Yancey noted there was consensus on the part of the Board that the Design Team was moving in the right direction with the new space.

The Board took a short break.

4. HIGH SCHOOL ATHLETICS AND UPDATE

Ms. Adams introduced Audrea Shelley, Springfield High School (SHS) athletic director, and Justin Starck,

Thurston High School (THS) athletic director.

Mr. Ricker said the Board had tasked him to provide an update on high school athletics. He had asked Mr. Shelley and Mr. Starck to provide an overview of events at their schools. Mr. Ricker, Ms. Shelley and Mr. Starck would then provide the Board share their goals for this year with the Board to move the District program forward.

Mr. Starck said he was excited for the new school year and the school was thrilled to be in the new covered grandstand. THS was about to begin the Cosmos Creations Bellotti Foundation sale. Cosmos and the Bellotti Foundation had created a program in which they donated Cosmos products to local schools to sell as a fundraiser, which could generate up to \$12,000 per participating school annually. Mr. Stark was hopeful for the school's athletic programs, and he noted that every program, with the exception of the cheer team, was struggling. The teams were classified at the 6A level, while THS had as many as 1,500 fewer students than the schools with which it competed. In response to Mr. Light, Mr. Starck said THS was the smallest 6A school. THS had petitioned two times to be reclassified, but unless there were 5A schools that were larger than THS, the Oregon School Activities Association (OSAA) would not reclassify THS. THS needed to look at the 5A schools in the state to see if there were any 5A schools whose enrollment was larger than THS's.

Ms. Shelley echoed that it had been a blessing to be able to do a fund raiser with Cosmos because it was unusual to be provided a free product and receive the full sale price as profit. The Cosmos staff delivered approximately 2700 sample bags of Cosmos corn to SHS today, which were distributed to the kids during the lunch hour. Cosmos also delivered three pallets with 84 cases per pallet, which would generate approximately \$12,500. The Equestrian Team, Vocational Industrial Clubs of America (VICA), girls' basketball, boys' soccer, and the band planned to sell the Cosmos products. Some students planned to sell the Cosmos products to University of Oregon football tailgaters. She noted that Mike Bellotti developed the program as a benefit to the high schools in the area and the Foundation had provided banners that would be hung during school events to acknowledge the gift to the schools. Additionally, each team and club which sold the Cosmos would send a thank you card with a team/club picture to the Foundation. Ms. Shelley shared Mr. Starck's concerns about THS being in placed in 6A by OSAA. She noted North Eugene High School (NEHS) in the Eugene School District was currently playing independently for football because they had not won a game at the 5A level in many years. While winning was not everything, it did produce kids who were excited and wanted to be a part of something that was fun. The NEHS football program had taken a hit because they could not recruit kids to play football. She thought THS was facing a similar challenge. Since the NEHS football team became independent, it was winning and excited again, and had over 80 kids out for football. The OSAA 5A/6A classification created a competitive imbalance, by not allowing kids to compete at the most appropriate level. SHS was 100 percent in support of THS moving to 5A. Ms. Shelley reported that SHS was starting a mentoring program, Athletes helping Athletes, in which athletes who were not participating in fall sports would tutor athletes who were participating in fall sports. She noted the SHS/THS rivalry had always been a big deal for the schools and the District. As athletic directors, she and Mr. Starck could work together, with the coaches and the athletes, to create a healthier atmosphere for the rivalry.

Ms. Adams expressed appreciation to the Foundation for supporting the Springfield Public Schools (SPS). She asked what the Board could do about the negative aspects of the rivalry. The kids were not the problem so much as the parents who engaged in inappropriate behavior.

Chair Bigley noted SPS recently held a training for coaches, and she asked if changes in behavior had been observed.

Ms. Shelley said 84 coaches had attended the training, which had been well received. She asked that the District continue to offer the training annually in the future, and consider having a parent session.

Mr. Starck added all coaches were required to be certified, which could be done either with the coaches' training the District offered or with an OSAA online video. He felt the onsite, in person training was more effective.

Mr. Ricker noted statistics showed that students who participated in any extracurricular activity, including sports, clubs and other groups, had higher GPAs, had a better chance of graduating, and better school attendance. He planned to meet monthly with Ms. Shelley and Mr. Starck, to develop an athletic program for the District, which would include a mission, vision and a set of goals for all students in the District. The program would include a collective set of procedures, policies, guidelines and forms that would align with the District's policies as well as OSAA's policies. Ms. Shelley and Mr. Starck were interested in developing a proactive, supportive environment that was committed to supporting professional development of the coaches and their staff, including volunteer coaches and people who supported the schools' extracurricular activities.

In response to Ms. Adams, Ms. Shelley said people would not be permitted to coach if they had not had the training. Training videos had been ordered for both schools.

Mr. Starck added he had met with Ms. Shelley and Mr. Ricker, and they had decided a refresher course would be provided annually for coaches already in the system, and new coaches would be required to complete an introductory course before they would be allowed to work with the kids.

Superintendent Rieke-Smith said she recently met with Bethel School District Superintendent Colt Gill and Eugene School District Superintendent Dr. Gustavo Balderas, and they agreed there was a lot of interaction between the students in their districts. While the districts were clearly separate organizations, they should think of themselves as a metropolitan district which provided opportunities to work collaboratively and pool resources.

Ms. Shelley said Willamette High School hosted a Proactive Coaching event to which it invited area high schools. Bi-Mart was a major sponsor of the Spirit of a Champion event, a Bruce Brown proactive teaching event. SHS kids and coaches were encouraged to attend the event.

Mr. Light was concerned about poor behavior on the part of parents of younger kids he had observed at Kidsports events. Chair Bigley stated she had spoken with Bev Smith, Executive Director of Kidsports, about parent behavior at events.

Ms. Boyst said the code of conduct for parents was read by a student before every Kidsports' game.

Ms. Shelley thanked the Board for giving her and Mr. Starck an opportunity to have this conversation with the Board.

Mr. Starck distributed THS participation reports for athletic teams for the last nine years to Board members.

The Board took a short dinner break.

5. SUPERINTENDENT EVALUATION, BOARD AND DISTRICT GOALS

Superintendent Rieke-Smith directed Board members to the *SPS District Goals—2013-2015*, which had been developed by the Cabinet, and *Springfield Board of Education Goals—2012-2014*, which had been developed by the Board. The two sets of goals had some overlapping themes. The Board needed to develop a set of metrics by which to measure if the District and Board were meeting those goals. While some of the goals were still relevant, some needed to be revised to be in line with State policies that may have changed as Common Core and Smarter Balanced were introduced to the District.

- *SPS District Goals—2013-2015.*
 - Goal 1—All Students are Future Ready.
 - Goal 2—Communication.
 - Goal 3—Advocacy.
 - Goal 4—Leading Technology for Learning.
 - Goal 5—Stewardship of District Resources for Facilities Management.

- *Springfield Board of Education Goals—2012-2014.*
 - Goal 1—Student Achievement Milestones.
 - Goal 2—Communications.
 - Goal 3—Upward Advocacy.
 - Goal 4—Leading Technology for Learning.

Superintendent Rieke-Smith facilitated a Board discussion on the goals:

- Wants students to love learning and to be confident in themselves.
- Students need to have basic skills in math and reading to be able to be lifelong learners and be able to grow.
- Student need to graduate confident and motivated with some drive.
- Success is someone who is productive in society and giving back to the community, contributing, not taking.
- Happiness in life....life is meant to be enjoyed.
- The 2015 A3 graduation ceremony was not traditional, but the students could clearly articulate how their educational experience moved them forward and made them ready for the next step.
- Goal 1 is tough to quantify because it was about personal experience and relationships.
- Create conditions where students can experience beyond the four walls of the school.
- Whatever keeps kids engaged in the learning environment is key.
- Easy way to measure engagement is with attendance and how well students are on track related to meeting graduation requirements.
- Measuring success in language arts and math is but one set of quantifiable measurements, some of which are quantifiable, and some of which are not quantifiable.
- A confident and motivated person is employable.
- Some items on the goals have been watered down and not as specific as those identified on the Springfield Board of Education Goals. The District was not holding itself to a high enough standard.
- The whole child is important, but all children need to read at grade level, and all 7th graders should be able to complete a job application correctly.
- Look at 20 years of reading data, and you will see it hasn't moved.
- Children who struggled with reading in kindergarten are struggling in 3rd grade, and they are struggling in higher grades.
- Superintendent's job with her team was to build out the continuum for reading through the grades. The District was working with Skillful Teacher Strategies; several schools have adopted Lucy Calkins method of engaging kids in holistic reading, while being specific and targeted relative to instruction around comprehension strategies and critical thinking.
- Full day kindergarten would be a huge lift. The results would not be immediately available because the kids would be tracked moving forward.
- Kids in Transition (KITS) program prepared kids for kindergarten.
- The Superintendent could be held accountable for ensuring the right systems were in place and did the District work collaboratively with teachers to understand what strategies were working around project based learning. The Superintendent could be held responsible for the whole child education.

- Maslow’s hierarchy existed in education, and certain things needed to take place to enable kids to feel good in their school settings. If kids were not reading and all of their friends did read, the kids would not feel good about themselves and the District would not see growth in learning.
- The District could not solve everything, and it was important to pay attention to what was going on at home. Schools were held accountable for things that occurred outside of the school day.
- The District and the Board needed to be able to say they had done everything to ensure kids could achieve the goals.
- The bigger hammer approach had not been successful and it was important to have strategies that provided kids with the support they needed.
- Seven schools provided free and reduced lunches to all kids in seven District schools. Some kids worked after school.
- Educators did not quit when kids did not reach required levels of achievement. The poverty rate across the District was 70 percent, and the level was consistent across all schools in the District. The District needed to think differently on how to reach those children, who lived in generational or situational poverty. It was important to wrap our arms around each child, get them what they needed, and not make a fuss about it. If children read at the appropriate grade level and do math at the appropriate grade level, it may be possible to break the cycle of poverty.
- It was important for the Board to identify the “whats” the children needed, and it was the job of the Superintendent, the cabinet, administrators and teachers to make the “what” happen.
- When children achieved skills in math, reading and other areas, they became confident and desired to learn more.
- The graduation metric was about improving graduation rates as well as examining why some kids dropped out.

Superintendent Rieke-Smith said she would share this conversation with the Cabinet so it could have a discussion on the “what.”

Mr. Light said while it was important to track the metrics, the data cited in Goal 1 (a) had been the focus for at least 15 years. If he looked at 15 years of data, there were not many metrics that he could support as working. Many programs had been brought forward to improve performance including No Child Left Behind, EasyCBM, the Skillful Teacher and others, but they were not working. He did not want to walk away from the goals, but he did not think Smarter Balanced was the way. The District was already tracking data that it needed internally, which was the data that was important.

Superintendent Rieke-Smith said the data was formative and meant to help change or target instruction for every individual child. She, Mr. Gill and Dr. Balderas would meet with Dr. Nancy Golden and others at the October 1, 2015 OSBA meeting, to determine how to look at formative data, and how to support teachers by providing them the data they needed to be able to adjust instruction to meet the needs of the students. As she visited District schools, she continued to be impressed as she listened to teachers share the work they were doing, the heart and passion they had, and the strategies they wanted to apply. When kids felt loved and valued, the teachers went beyond the call to deliver the needed instruction.

Chair Bigley noted the poverty rate in the District was growing and the teachers wanted to do right for the students. She asked why the dial on many of the strategies had not moved. She asked Superintendent Rieke-Smith to bring the answer to that question to a future Board work session.

Superintendent Rieke-Smith said the issue was multifaceted and there was not one single answer. She took the Cabinet through the instructional coherence model this summer, thinking about what was the District’s core mission—to teach children so that they loved learning and would be successful. Everything else around that were in service to the central mission. She hoped she could get people to look past “the District” this year.

Faculty, staff and administrators were united in a common mission, the kids. Everyone needed to get past “them”, “us”, “someone else” thinking, and work as a cohesive whole that worked together for each child. As she met with staff in her “Sit with Sue” meetings, she saw they wanted to know that the District was working with them towards achieving their goals, which was to teach the whole child.

Mr. Light asked Superintendent Rieke-Smith what metrics would speak to her performance and tell her she was on track. He asked how the Board could work with her in developing goals that would show she and the Board were aligned.

Superintendent Rieke-Smith said both qualitative and quantitative data were important. Quantitative data was important but not the whole story, and could be measured. Qualitative data measured how teachers felt when they came to school. Did they feel valued, was it a great place to do their work, was everyday a child sat in front of them was a gift, were there great ways for them to solve problems? Another qualitative measure was how parents felt. How did parents feel about their children, how did they feel about the school that they walked into, how did they feel about the way the District office responded to them? Those questions could be quantified in terms of the culture of the District. The District would not always get everything right, but the Board should hold Superintendent Rieke-Smith responsible for the feel good, cultural pieces.

Mr. Light said if Superintendent Rieke-Smith had goals, if the Board intended to work with her to achieve those goals, and if Superintendent Rieke-Smith and the Board were in agreement on where to go, the metrics would design themselves.

Superintendent Rieke-Smith iterated it was all about “the whole child matters.” There should be equity of outcome, regardless of who a child was or their circumstances, which would help the child grow and move towards success. If the culture placed around the child was one of transparency, had conversations and owned problems when things did not go right, and people acknowledged they needed to learn, make adjustments and corrections, these things could be measured.

Ms. Boyst agreed with Superintendent Rieke-Smith’s perspective on attendance, which stated kids showed up when they liked school, and they could only be taught when they showed up.

Chair Bigley asked what the Board needed to do to support the school from a budget perspective.

Superintendent Rieke-Smith looked at the budget through a collaborative lens, bringing teams together early during the budget preparation period, identifying priorities and what had to be done, and what needed to be supported, or supported differently. As she previously shared with Board members, curriculum adoption, assessment concerns and the community model for SPED instruction loomed large, and they would inform budget conversations.

Mr. Light added if there was a gap in bringing teams together and working effectively, that went to Goal 3. Communication.

Superintendent Rieke-Smith had spoken with Mr. Gill and Dr. Balderas about advocacy, and Mr. Gill had been active at the State level with COSA. It was important for the legislature to wrap their heads around how much poverty there was in the state. While the District received information annually from the state regarding how the Districts’ children ranked with health and wellness factors, people gave lip service to the issues and moved on without doing anything to improve those factors. All of the districts would be under the onus of the impact and needed to determine how they would address poverty and the supports needed by the children. The state would need to think differently in terms of how business was done at the schools and how to provide wraparound services for the kids. The Meyer Memorial Trust had reached out to Dr. Golden to sit on

their Board, and she wanted to emphasize the poverty issue. Superintendent Rieke-Smith had accepted Dr. Golden's request to be part of the superintendents' group that would have a conversation about poverty.

Ms. Adams thought people did not understand what poverty meant, and the concerns about the impact of using food stamps or food boxes. She understood why some children would not be able to read by 3rd grade, but the District needed a goal and a way to get there.

Superintendent Rieke-Smith iterated the Board's work was to define the "what" and her job was to deliver the "how."

Ms. Boyst liked to see growth in a measurement where you could see the needle move, even if the growth was small, to provide an environment for celebrating success.

Superintendent Rieke-Smith said the achievement compact was gone. She had previously led a school district through a federal restructuring, where the district identified goals and incremental steps to achieve the goals. This reinforced for the teachers that their work mattered and it made a difference, which led them to identify the next goal. This enabled teachers to see progress and shift strategies as they moved forward.

Mr. Light suggested that if every student had a personalized education plan that the District tracked through the student's educational career at SPS, the group goal would take care of itself.

Superintendent Rieke-Smith said it was challenging to meet the individual needs of children each day in larger districts like SPS. She was amazed and overwhelmed every day by the grit and determination of the District's teachers, who wanted to do the right thing. The teachers needed to hear they were approaching the work in the right way and their professional judgment mattered.

Mr. Light said it was important to have a common system that could share data between schools, so that students' metrics and achievements could move through the system with them.

Ms. Boyst stressed the importance of having volunteers in the schools who could help teachers with individual children.

Chair Bigley proposed that the Board revisit the Superintendent Evaluation. Board members discussed the timing of and the best way to evaluate Superintendent Rieke-Smith, since she had only been serving as Interim Superintendent since July 1, 2015. Chair Bigley suggested conducting a survey of the people with whom Superintendent Rieke-Smith worked closely, including Cabinet members, administrators and others, right away.

There was consensus that the Board would evaluate Superintendent Rieke-Smith from July 1, 2015 at the end of October 2015, with a goal for the Board to make a decision by November 2015 about whether to begin recruitment for a new superintendent.

Superintendent Rieke-Smith said her first concern was the well-being of the District and that the District have stable leadership. Stabilizing the District would help the Cabinet and the District. In conversations she had with staff as she visited schools, the principals consistently said they were hopeful about the future, but they were waiting. It was important for Superintendent Rieke-Smith to share information with the Board.

6. WRAP UP AND NEXT STEPS

In the past, Mr. Light had said the process would give an on-the-job type interview. If the Board was evaluating Superintendent Rieke-Smith for a three month period, he liked what he had seen with Superintendent Rieke-Smith as interim Superintendent, but he anticipated a year cycle, which called for an

evaluation in November 2015, and a decision in mid-2016, which would provide a full year's worth of information on Superintendent Rieke-Smith performance. The Board had discussed doing a 360 evaluation in mid-2016.

Chair Bigley agreed that she would work with OSBA and Karen Lewis to identify materials to provide Spencer Lewis, OSBA Board Development and Policy Specialist, that he would use in drafting questions for the survey. She would also work on identifying a list of people who should be asked to complete the survey, as well as Cabinet, staff and administrators.

7. NEXT MEETINGS:

October 12, 2015, 7:00 pm, Business Meeting

October 26, 2015, 4:00 pm, Fall Planning Meeting

8. ADJOURNMENT

With no other business, Ms. Bigley adjourned the meeting at 8:36 pm.

(Minutes recorded by Linda Henry)