



**BOARD OF EDUCATION**  
**September 14, 2015**  
**Administration Center Boardroom**  
**525 Mill Street**  
**Springfield, OR 97477**

**5:30 pm Work Session, First Floor Conference Room**  
**Superintendent Evaluation and Board and District Goals**

**7:00 pm Board Meeting**

<b>AGENDA</b>	<b>TAB</b>
1. Call Meeting to Order and Flag Salute	Board Chair Nancy Bigley
2. Student Board Member Introductions	Superintendent Sue Rieke-Smith
3. Work Session Summary	Chair Bigley
4. Recognition: Certificate of Achievement for Excellence in Financial Reporting	Chair Bigley
5. Public Comments (Three (3) minutes each; maximum time 20 minutes. Speakers may not yield their time to other speakers.)	
6. Consent Agenda	
A. August 10, 2015 Board Meeting Minutes	1
B. August 19, 2015 Summer Planning Meeting Minutes	2
C. Financial Statement	Brett Yancey 3
D. Technology Bond Update	Tom Lindly 4
E. Personnel Action, Resolution #15-16.006	Michael Henry 5
F. Board Policies Approval, Resolution #15-16.007	Jenna McCulley 6
G. E-Rate Network Subsidized Tech. Upgrades, Res. #15-16.008	Tom Lindly 7
7. Reports and Discussion	
A. Administration Building Report	Brett Yancey
B. Construction Bond Update	Brett Yancey
C. Superintendent Communication	Sue Rieke-Smith
D. Board Communication	Chair Bigley
• OSBA Elections – Nominations for Position 6	
• 2015-16 Board Committee Reports	
8. Other Business	
9. Next Meetings: September 28, 2015, 4:00 pm, Board Work Session	
October 12, 2015, 7:00 pm, Business Meeting	
10. Adjournment	Chair Bigley

## MINUTES

1/ A Regular Meeting of the Lane County School District No. 19 Board of Education was held on August 10, 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 7:00 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, Anne Goff, Linda Henry, Cara Mico, Greg James, John Saraceno, Gary Cole, Whitney McKinley, Kevin Wright, Dan Sterling, James Moore, Chad Towe, Keri Pilgrim, Kari Isham, and Jeremy Hugo.

### 2. OATH OF OFFICE

Chair Bigley administered the Oath of Office for Laurie Adams, Position No. 1, term expiring June 30, 2019; and Sandra L. Boyst, Position No. 4, term expiring June 30, 2019.

### 3. NEW ADMINISTRATOR INTRODUCTION

Superintendent Rieke-Smith welcomed the following new administrators into Springfield Public Schools:

- Jenna McCulley, Community Engagement Officer
- Dr. Michael Henry, Director of Human Resources
- Kevin Ricker, Director of Secondary Education

Other administrators introduced included:

- James Moore, Thurston Middle School Assistant Principal
- Dan Sterling, Centennial Elementary Principal

The new administrators introduced family members and friends in attendance.

### 4. PUBLIC COMMENTS

There was no one who wished to offer public comment.

### 5. CONSENT AGENDA

#### A. June 22, 2015 Board Meeting Minutes

#### B. Board Policy, First Reading

Dr. Susan Rieke-Smith recommended that the Board of Directors review the following board policy as a first reading:

- JHCDA Prescription Medication

#### C. Reporting Requirements for the Use of Restraint & Seclusion

#### D. Personnel Action, Resolution #15-16.001

Michael Henry recommended that the Board of Directors approve the personnel action for licensed employees as reflected in the resolution. Categories include:



- Evaluating options for short-term & long-term solution
- Tier One Study Results
  - Exterior concrete walls do not appear to be anchored to the floor and roof diaphragms, however they act as bearing walls.
  - There does not appear to be a connection for transfer between the floor diaphragms and exterior concrete walls.
  - Concrete wall reinforcement is unknown.
- Non-Destructive Examination & Results
  - Scans performed at wall piers between window openings, solid wall segments and lintels above opening on multiple levels and elevations.
  - The scans did not reveal the presence of reinforcement in any of the walls.
- Tier Two Study Results
  - Anchorage of exterior concrete walls to floor and roof diaphragms are not present.
  - There is no connection between the floors and exterior concrete walls.
  - Diagonally sheathed floor diaphragms are not adequate to transfer seismic forces to the concrete walls.
  - Retrofit recommendations include
    - Install epoxied anchor rods and hold downs at the perimeter of the building. This requires plywood sheathing be installed around the perimeter of the building.
    - Wall anchorage retrofit at roof is similar, however it is necessary to provide plywood sheathing for a distance of 16 feet from the walls at the 3rd floor ceiling.
    - Add plywood sheathing to the underside of the floor framing in overstressed areas. The “band” of plywood sheathing required is approximately 20-24 feet wide.
- Ongoing Steps
  - Convened Facilities Advisory Committee (7/6/2015)—Endorsed relocating Administration Building and supports School Board continuing its due diligence.
  - Affirmed that District facilities housing students are seismically sound and safe.
  - Evaluate options for retrofit of current building (per report). Approximately
    - \$200 sq. ft. (\$8 million)
  - Build new Administration building from “ground-up”. (\$7.75 - \$8.5 million)
    - \$185 sq. ft.—new construction (\$3.7 million)
    - \$100 sq. ft.—remodel EMC (\$1.2 million)
    - Site Construction/Demolition/Abatement (\$1.35 million)
    - Soft Cost—Permits, design, etc. (\$1.5 million)
    - Contingency & Escalation (\$.75 million)
  - Purchase/repurpose an existing building and remodel (TBD).
  - Identify space needs, potential short-term solution(s), establish relocation work plan, develop timeline.
    - Short-term lease of existing facility or facilities.
  - Identify long-term solution.
    - Identify a solution that could include downtown programs and the ongoing needs for students/programs.
    - Establish space needs, timeline and relocation work plan (tiered).
    - Locate viable options and work towards potential purchase/lease.
    - Identify funding strategy, amount and gain authority through Board approval.

Mr. Yancey said the District’s General Obligation Bond would not be spent on this project and the District would need to look at other financing options. Board approval would be required for any financial obligation.

Mr. Yancey responded to questions from Board members.

Chair Bigley concurred that the goal of the Board was to serve children but the staff that worked in the building was also a priority. She asked for additional information on proceeding with the options Mr. Yancey identified.

Mr. Yancey said it would be challenging to identify a building that was adequate to house the administrative functions, which could include a satellite operation for the District and looking at a short-term lease in various buildings. Superintendent Rieke-Smith had shared the information with staff. He noted this was a serious matter and he had a responsibility to the people who worked for the District, which the Board and Superintendent understood. He was working diligently to identify viable options, which would be subject to due diligence, to ensure any building identified was a strong structure.

Ms. Adams said the Board had received the report in Executive Session and was stunned by how dismal the situation appeared to be. The process was a good one, but not fast enough for her. She wanted something done by the time school started in September 2015, while doing the right thing. It was difficult to identify a site in Springfield that was large enough to house the staff currently located in the Administration Building. She appreciated the work Mr. Yancey was doing to resolve the issue. She asked if there was an exit plan for staff in the event of an earthquake.

Mr. Yancey said an earthquake drill was much different than a fire drill. Fire drills were practiced regularly in the schools and the Administration Building. He noted there had been some earthquakes with epicenters near Waltherville and the University of Oregon recently held a seminar, which provided information for emergency evacuations. In all emergency situations, staff were empowered to do what they felt was best for them to protect their safety. Staff at the District's buildings would be provided information during the school year.

Mr. King observed the Administration Building was an old building that had served the District well for many years. Replacement of the building had not been on the last two bond measures because the District administration, the Board and the community valued providing buildings for the education the kids. The Administration Building did not rise to the level of interest for updating the structure and the time had come to replace it. He hoped the community could understand why replacing the building had not been placed on bond measures in the past and why the District now needed to do something. He hoped there was a building in the area that was large enough and safe enough to meet the District's needs that would provide a cost effective solution. However, if a satisfactory building was not available, the District would have to go to the next bond measure to address the \$8 million solution.

Mr. Yancey said he would be bringing more information to the Board as it became available.

## **B. Bond Update**

Mr. Yancey shared before and after photographs of current bond projects. He noted the work currently underway on the Thurston High School (THS) stadium was scheduled for completion on September 4, 2015. It would be unveiled to the community as scheduled for the THS football team's first home game of the year on September 11, 2015. Mr. Saraceno shared information on current and previous roofing work done at Thurston High School. Mr. Yancey provided a budget for the various construction projects and explained that the District had a plan in place for dealing with over budget projects. He reported that the Bond Oversight Committee met on June 11, 2015. The group would reconvene in September 2015 after which a report would be submitted to the Board. He stated the Facilities Review Committee reviewed all of the bond projects at its July 6, 2015 meeting. The Facilities Advisory Committee would meet later this year or in early 2016 to review the bond premium dollars, review the projects that had not been completed in the past, and formulate a recommendation for projects that should be considered by the Board.

Mr. King asked for information about the structure of the Facilities Review Committee and the process for appointing people to the Committee.

Mr. Yancey reported the District currently had approximately \$26 million in investment income, with a current yield of slightly more than 1.2 percent. The District had earned \$411,000 in investment income as of July 31, 2015. The investment income must be spent on approved bond projects, within the timeline established for the bond projects.

Mr. Lindly provided a PowerPoint presentation entitled Technology Bond Project Update dated August 10, 2015 and reviewed the work done. He noted the technology projects were not as visible as the construction projects. He reviewed the twelve technology areas that would be funded with proceeds from the bond measure. He shared before and after photographs of various technology projects in the District. He commended Brad McEntire, who was the project manager for the District's technology improvements, working with contractors and staff to ensure projects stayed on task.

1. Core Network Infrastructure—Standards
  - New firewall & packet shaper
  - New high speed central switches
  - Total network replacements at Page, Guy Lee, GHS
  - Scheduled for 2015 - DG, Yolanda, THS
  - Other Work - THS, Fiber to IDF's w/conduit, access point wiring
2. Central Server Infrastructure
  - Replacing 2 end-of-life email servers
  - Purchased new storage access network (SAN)
3. Enterprise Wireless
  - Running in conjunction with Core Network Infrastructure
  - Making other additions as needed (THS, Memorial Building)
4. Unified Communications
  - Future Project (2016)
5. Classroom Equipment
  - Changed from a 6 yr. to a 2 yr. project
  - 94" screens with projectors
  - Wall or ceiling mounted
  - Completed Ridgeview, Riverbend, Briggs, Mt. Vernon
  - Scheduled for 2015—ASMS, TMS, Walterville, TRDR, GHS, SHS
6. Library Computer Devices
  - Principal meetings to define needs
  - Guy Lee (6), Yolanda (6), ASMS (6), TMS (6)
  - TRDR (20 Chrome Base), THS
7. Lab Computer Devices
  - THS (LCC Learning Center)
  - ASMS (Lab off Library)
  - BMS (Room 21)
  - SHS Drafting lab Technology Bond Update
8. Testing Lab Computer Devices
  - THS—36 Chromebases
  - Testing Lab
  - TMS (Filled existing carts)
  - Four traveling Chromebook carts
9. Staff Computer Devices
  - Established Certified & Classified replacement process

- 2015-16 replacing the 100 oldest Certified staff machines
  - Providing 50-70 new teacher machines
10. Student Computer Devices
- Developed proposal process for replacement
  - District, School, Pilot project proposals
  - 398 Chromebooks at high schools for ELA
11. eReaders
- Future project (2017)
12. Professional Technical
- 3 CNC machines at THS
  - 1 3D printer at THS
  - Working to identify UL approved metal lathes, 6 for SHS and 3 for THS

In response to Ms. Adams, Mr. Lindly said the District had a unified communications system, which differed from typical home telephones. He explained how the District's system routed calls and said the District was currently required to maintain some landlines, which may evolve as the technology changed.

Superintendent Rieke-Smith added at the recent Cabinet retreat, staff discussed realigning some of the technology staff to enable them to engage with instructional Teachers on Special Assignment (TOSAs) to find ways to integrate technology through professional development in math and language arts.

### **C. Superintendent Communication**

Superintendent Sue Rieke-Smith invited Board members to the morning in-service and lunch with all district administrators at Thurston Elementary School (TES). She noted Cabinet and Board members had been given a copy of Simon Sinek's book, *Leaders Eat Last: Why Some Teams Pull Together and Others Don't*. She added Cabinet members would be asked to share their insights related to the book at the August 19, 2015 Board summer planning meeting. She noted Board members had received an invitation to the Superintendent's welcome on September 8, 2015. She added city, state and federal representatives as well as representatives from UO and Lane Community College (LCC), the District's business partners, the Springfield Area Chamber of Commerce, the Springfield Ministerial Alliance, District administrators and faculty, and community members had also been invited to the Superintendent's welcome. She recently spent time with the District's transportation, maintenance and custodial staff, and had an opportunity to do some vehicle and building maintenance with staff. She had an opportunity to visit the migrant education summer program at Two Rivers-Dos Rios (TRDR) in conjunction with Lane Education Service District (ESD). Over 150 migrant students, aged three through grade eight, were served. She commended the Cabinet for their support of the Mary Pilgreen Scholarship Tournament. She reported that Bruce Brown, the director of Proactive Coaching, would be providing a mandatory professional development training to all of the District's coaches in September. She noted the coaches welcomed the opportunity for the training.

### **D. Board Communication**

#### **• 2015-2016 Board Committee Representation**

Board members discussed representation of district committees and community organizations for the 2015-2016 school year.

Ms. Boyst reported that Les Perry, a member of the Springfield Education Foundation (SEF), recently passed away. Ronnel Curry, SEF Executive Director, recently sent information to all staff about the SEF grant workshop. This year, grants would be awarded up to \$3,000. She asked Board members to let her know if they planned to attend the SEF Night of 11,000 Stars, which was scheduled for Thursday, October 15, 2015 at Willamalane Center, 5:00 pm to 9:00 pm.

Mr. King stated he recently hosted a SEF luau, which had been attended by about 70 people.

Chair Bigley said she had received an email from a District parent about the closed schools discussion the Board had last spring and the District's policy for siblings.

Superintendent Rieke-Smith said this provided an opportunity for the Board to have an ongoing discussion about how families were prioritized relative to the transfer process.

Chair Bigley agreed to follow up with the family.

**7. OTHER BUSINESS**

None

**8. NEXT MEETINGS**

Ms. Bigley said the Board would hold its Summer Planning Meeting on August 19, 2015 at 4:00 pm.

**9. ADJOURNMENT**

With no other business, Ms. Bigley adjourned the meeting at 8:55 pm

*(Minutes recorded by Linda Henry)*

## MINUTES

2/ A Summer Planning Meeting of the Lane County School District No. 19 Board of Education was held on August 19, 2015.

### 1. CALL MEETING TO ORDER

Board Chair Nancy Bigley called the Springfield Board of Education meeting to order in Room 312 of the District Administration Center at 4:04 pm.

#### Attendance

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

District staff included Superintendent Sue Rieke-Smith, Brett Yancey, Karen Lewis, Jenna McCulley, Kevin Ricker, Michael Henry, Tom Lindly, Suzy Price, Brian Megert, Chad Towe, José da Silva, Mark Bray, Greg Proden and Yvonne Atteberry.

Board members and staff shared what they had done this summer.

### 2. OVERVIEW OF AGENDA

Nancy Bigley reviewed the agenda and timeline for the meeting.

Superintendent Rieke-Smith said she was very excited about the new year. Three new members on the Cabinet team had given renewed energy and purpose to their work.

### 3. BOARD OPERATIONS/BUSINESS MANAGEMENT

Superintendent Rieke-Smith asked the Board for clarification on how the Board wanted to accomplish its work this year with the District's schools. It was important for the Board to be visible in the District and the Cabinet wanted to support that work.

Chair Bigley facilitated a review of protocols for informing the Board about activities board members may be invited to, and whether the activities were District activities or outside activities.

#### a. Invitations, School Visits, eMails and Calendars

Ms. Lewis reported that some schools sent email invitations and other schools sent written invitations to Board members for activities at their schools, in a format that worked best for the individual schools. She emphasized the importance for Board members to personally respond to the individual schools whether or not they planned to attend. It was also important for Board members to respond for District events where they may be acknowledged or where Superintendent Rieke-Smith was making presentations at community events, whether or not they planned to attend.

Ms. McCulley proposed creating an *Invite the School Board* form on the District's webpage, which would help standardize invitations and help coordinate Board member participation.

Mr. King said the District needed to clarify what events the Board should attend, and whether or not the Board should represent the District at events.

Superintendent Rieke-Smith said this was an opportunity for Ms. McCulley to develop protocols that

recognized the importance of the Board's service to the District. She stated Board members would be invited to the September 11, 2015 Springfield High School (SHS) vs Thurston High School (THS) football game where the new THS bleachers would be inaugurated. Ms. McCulley was preparing a program that would precede the kickoff.

Mr. Yancey said the SHS vs THS football game provided an opportunity for the District to thank the community for supporting the Bond Measure, which funded the bleacher renovation. He added paving for the Page parking lot would start August 20, 2015.

Ms. Lewis said she would add Board meetings and other events to the Board calendar.

Chair Bigley iterated the importance for Board members to acknowledge email invitations by accepting or declining them.

#### **b. Board Reps on Agency/Civic Organizations and District Committees**

Board members reviewed the document entitled School Board Representation—2015-2016, and confirmed their membership on the following organizations and committees:

##### Agencies and Civic Organizations

- Lane Council of Governments—Al King
- Lane ESD Advisory Board—Al King
- Lane ESD Budget Committee—Al King
- Oregon Leadership Network—Nancy Bigley
- Springfield Chamber Education Committee—Sandra Boyst
- Springfield Education Foundation—Sandra Boyst
- Wildish Theater—Jonathan Light

##### District Committees

- Budget Committee—All five Board Members
- Charter School Committee/Willamette Leadership Academy (WLA)—Laurie Adams
- Charter School Committee/Academy of Arts and Academics (A3)—Jonathan Light
- Facilities Advisory—Laurie Adams and Sandra Boyst (parent representative)
- Ministerial Group—Nancy Bigley
- Student V.O.I.C.E.—Laurie Adams
- Wellness—Nancy Bigley and/or Jonathan Light

#### **4. BUSINESS TO SCHOOL PARTNERSHIPS/ CAREER & TECHNICAL EDUCATION**

Kevin Ricker introduced SHS principal José da Silva and THS principal Chad Towe.

Mr. Towe introduced THS teachers Mark Bray, who led the eCars program at THS and Greg Proden, who worked with drafting and metals technology classes. He thanked the Board for the opportunity to share the great work of a team of consummate professionals. Today he would share the result of hard work done on behalf of the students by many people at the building. He directed Board members a document entitled *Thurston High School—CTE and Industrial Technology—August 19, 2015*. He noted the STEM and eCourse programs at THS were the jewels in the crown of CTE. He asked Mr. Bray and Mr. Proden to share the work their students were doing.

Mr. Bray said most of the juniors and seniors he taught had taken many of the CTE welding and drafting classes, as well as some math and physics. Two students who graduated in 2015 went directly into the workforce, and were working as welders for a local company, based on what they learned at THS. Four of his students who graduated in 2014 were in the engineering program at Oregon State University (OSU). What

the students learned in the program applied directly to entering the workforce or higher education. The eCar program, which allowed the students to race, was self-motivating. Some of the recently purchased technologies were used successfully last year. In response to Mr. Light, Mr. Bray said students were asked to meet several prerequisites for entry into the program.

Mr. Proden said he had been on the Advisory Council, required for receiving grants from the Perkins Funds. The Advisory Council, which consisted of representatives from the industrial engineering and manufacturing community, as well as THS' career and technical education (CTE) faculty, met two times a year, and developed partnerships to support the program and the students. He reported that THS students had participated in and won several regional and state contests. Ms. Adams asked him to bring the students to Board meetings to show off their accomplishments.

Mr. Towe reviewed equipment purchases that had been made with the grant. He invited Board members to THS to observe how the 3-D laser printers worked. He said the Bond dollars had provided some funding to remodel the CTE and Industrial Technology space, and additional funding would allow the completion of facility upgrades and capital improvements to the building, which had been constructed in 1960. The school was currently seeking \$4,000 to fund an architect to help with the engineering of the space.

Mr. da Silva distributed a document entitled *CTE Presentation to the Board—August 19, 2015*. The SHS CTE program had achieved industry recognition. The current options included basic and advanced CTE courses as well as college now offerings in partnership with Lane Community College (LCC). SHS would take advantage of new legislation around career pathways by increasing credit offerings, to enable students to achieve the industry level certification. Grants in partnership with the school were key in helping the school achieve the industry certification. He explained that each program had a cohort that participated in the industry certification program. Upon successful completion after one year, students could move on to those respective industries, and the program received a return of some funds. He directed Board members to the document.

#### CTE Program Highlights

- Manufacturing
  - The school recently began offering tours for industry representatives to see the work SHS was doing. This resulted in some of the industries wanting to compete to have the first opportunity to hire seniors who would be graduating. He said Lane Workforce Partnership offered opportunities for youth at least 18 years of age to participate in on-the-job training.
- Automotive
  - Students participated in the Auto Tech skills competition at Mt. Hood Community College in August 2015. Two students placed second in the competition and were awarded \$12,000 scholarships from the Universal Technical Institute and \$1,500 scholarships from the Ford Asset Training Program.
- Advanced Studio
  - Students created four major projects that incorporated historical, consumerism, and movement aspects, and began to create their fine art projects.
- Construction Engineering Technology Revitalization Grant
  - SHS was awarded a Revitalization Grant of \$10,000 to purchase supplies and equipment. Additionally, \$5,000 was awarded to staff for participating in regional programs of study offered by the Association for Career & Technical Education (ACTE).
- Health Occupation Students of America (HOSA)
  - Two students participated in the Oregon HOSA State Leadership Conference and qualified for HOSA Nationals.
- Graphic Design
  - The beginning and advanced graphic design classes were new CTE offerings in art, glass and

printmaking, and incorporating computer graphic design and digital photography.

#### Partnerships

- Lunar Logic
- Lane Workforce Partnership
- Neighborhood Economic Development Corporation (NEDCO)
- Private donations.

In response to Ms. Adams, Mr. Ricker said a roadblock to setting up a consortium of SHS and THS for CTE programs was the time it took.

Mr. da Silva participated in the monthly CTE consortium meetings with Lane Education Service District (ESD), and he was a member of the CTE coordinating committee that oversaw the advisory committees for every pathway at LCC.

Mr. King asserted it was a responsibility of the Board rather than the principals to identify funding to support the programs.

Mr. Light said \$300,000 in bond funds was insufficient to pay for all of the facilities' needs. He was glad they were using the equipment and not waiting for improved facilities. He suggested highlighting the CTE programs on the District's website.

Chair Bigley wanted to discuss Mr. Towe's need to identify \$4,000 to fund an architect to design engineering space at THS.

Ms. Boyst asked when the District would fund full day high school schedules to keep students engaged. She had observed kids wandering around when they were not in class.

Mr. Towe said it was not that there were enough seats in the classes, but the classes the kids needed or wanted were not offered when they needed them. There was consensus that the Board needed to discuss this in the future.

The Board took a short break 5:50 p.m. to 6:05 p.m.

## **5. INDIVIDUAL BOARD REQUESTS**

Mr. Light said one unique aspect of the District was that it kept the CTE programs, which were critical in the open enrollment environment.

### **a. Smarter Balanced Testing/Intra-district Work Groups**

Superintendent Rieke-Smith shared information on the latest updates at the State level on Smarter Balanced Testing. She directed Board members to an article included in the agenda packet entitled *Teacher evaluations now include test scores* by Laura Frazier, from The Oregonian/OregonLive, which provided an overview of where the State stood with standardized testing. Springfield Public Schools (SPS) had been notified that the initial data indicated SPS was below the required participation rate. She subsequently received an email from Dr. Salam Noor, Deputy Superintendent of Public Instruction, indicating the low participation rate would put SPS on a list of districts to receive a personal visit with Dr. Noor to discuss ways the low participation rate could be corrected. She stated she planned to travel to Salem on August 18, 2015 with Colt Gill, Superintendent of the Bethel School District, Gustavo Balderas, Superintendent of Eugene 4J School District, and Nancy Golden to meet with Confederation of Oregon School Administrators (COSA) superintendents. She planned to have a discussion with Dr. Golden about how SPS could work most effectively with the Oregon Department of Education (ODE), what was her thinking on the white paper she shared with the Board,

and was there an opportunity for SPS to tap into some of her pilot work. Superintendent Rieke-Smith was interested in identifying ways to address the SPS low participation rate. Superintendent Rieke-Smith reported that SPS would apply for a third year of the collaboration grant, which would provide \$996,000 to address the issue of identifying better metrics to evaluate students. This would provide the Board an opportunity to identify its goals and to measure the success of achieving those goals. Collaboration funds would allow SPS an opportunity to build back the professional learning communities and to develop a long-term solution to sustain the professional learning communities.

Ms. Adams said she had attended a meeting with Dr. Golden with students at THS, and she was disappointed when she heard from some of the kids that the teachers encouraged them to opt out of Smarter Balanced testing.

Superintendent Rieke-Smith said SPS and other districts in Lane County and the State were facing the challenge of low participation in Smarter Balanced testing. The challenge would be to see how the reconstituted OEIB, which was now the Chief Education Office (CEO), would work with the ODE. She had reached out to Senator Arnie Roblan, Chair of the Oregon Senate Interim Education Committee and Representative Greg Barreto, Chair of the House Oregon Interim Education Committee because they were the ones who gave direction to ODE on how school districts would be evaluated.

Mr. Light stated when he proposed the moratorium on Smarter Balanced testing last spring, his intent was to create a conversation point. He did not think Common Core nor Smarter Balanced had been adequately vetted at the state or federal levels. He asked if there were other things SPS could do to evaluate students, based on the values of the community, as well as on the federal standards of Common Core and Smarter Balanced.

Superintendent Rieke-Smith reported that she recently participated in site visits of six Washington schools with a team of SPS teachers and administrators. Her takeaway from the visits was that it was not the building, but what you put into the building. The building helped education children, but it was important to have a clear philosophy. The SPS Ed Spec process said you valued the whole child. SPS knew that children who were educated in SPS either stayed in Springfield, or returned and reinvested in the community. The work SPS did was vital to the future of Springfield. If SPS did not educate the whole child and provide multiple pathways for that education, it was cutting off of a lifeline of Springfield.

Chair Bigley said everything SPS did should have value and serve the whole child.

Ms. Adams said she had an opportunity to visit schools in New York City (NYC), where at one high school, the students were engaged with their responsibility for their education. She often saw this lacking in some kids in SPS. She noted the students at the NYC school had good relationships with the teachers.

Mr. Light said SPS needed to evaluate Smarter Balanced to ensure that it adequately served the students in the District. And, if it did, SPS needed to provide opportunities for teachers to be more comfortable working with Smarter Balanced so they were not encouraging students to opt out of the testing.

Superintendent Rieke-Smith said the recent letter from ODE notifying SPS that it was below the participation rate for Smarter Balanced provided an inkling that ODE had finally heard SPS following a conversation with OSBA a year ago, where SPS said ODE needed to do a better job of providing SPS with information and materials that were centered on the community, parents and teachers. She understood ODE had a packet it was ready to share with SPS. She would bring the packet to the Board for processing, after which it could make a determination on who should be on the workgroup that would evaluate Smarter Balanced.

Mr. King thought Dr. Golden had issues with Smarter Balanced, as did the Board. Dr. Golden was charged with enforcing standards while she had issues with Smarter Balanced. He would be supportive of an inter-district group dialogue rather than SPS addressing the issue alone with ODE. He opined the Eugene 4J and Bethel School Districts had issues with Smarter Balanced as did SPS, and he was interested in learning about their problems. If school districts collaborated with their efforts in conversations with ODE, the State would be more inclined to listen to them.

Mr. Light said he had supporting having the Big Three join together, which would give them a stronger voice at the State level.

Superintendent Rieke-Smith looked forward to working collaboratively with the Eugene 4J School District and the Bethel School District. She recently talked with Dr. Balderas and Mr. Gill about partnering on issues of mutual concern. She planned to circle back with OSBA on SPS interests and concerns. She was interested in SPS hosting a table at the OSBA fall meeting for a facilitated conversation about Smarter Balanced. Ms. Adams wanted to have a pre-meeting conversation with other boards (4J & Bethel) at OSBA. Mr. Light suggested inviting all Lane County boards, as it would be interesting to have input from the smaller districts.

#### **b. Sibling Attendance/Transfers**

Superintendent Rieke-Smith updated the Board on sibling transfers at schools closed to transfers. She recommended that the Board uphold the decision not to accept a request for a transfer for a student whose sibling had moved on to middle school. She opined this would reset where the student sat relative to other students on the waiting list. This was particularly challenging because the parent was a SPS teacher, and from an ethics perspective, it could be interpreted as showing preference to an employee's children over children whose parents did not have a teaching position in SPS. She agreed to have a conversation with the parent.

Chair Bigley agreed Superintendent Rieke-Smith's proposal was reasonable and the SPS needed to have a conversation around this issue.

Superintendent Rieke-Smith said there had been a recommendation that prioritizing sibling transfers could be used as an incentive for teachers. As she understood the current laws related to out of district transfer, SPS may not be able to do that. SPS would continue to explore the ethics issue with OSBA. One option for identifying transfers from outside of SPS would be to go to a lottery system, which other districts in the state had gone to.

Ms. Boyst said a new subdivision was being developed on 55<sup>th</sup> Street, which would bring more students into the District.

Superintendent Rieke-Smith said the new housing would place additional pressure on Riverbend Elementary School. The Board may need to review school boundaries in the near future. The boundary review may help SPS as it prepared for the next bond measure in determining where new or expanded facilities should be sited.

Ms. Adams wanted SPS to make a decision and not continue to explore the open enrollment/sibling transfer issue.

#### **c. Revisiting the Springfield Quality Education Model/ Organizational Assessment**

Superintendent Rieke-Smith distributed a document entitled *Springfield Quality Education Model: S-QEM—Our Call to Action—Adopted June 2004* and asked for input from the Board on how SPS should move on it.

Mr. King said the process needed to be updated before the next bond measure, which was six or eight years away. He suggested deferring updating the document until after the 2015-2016 school year and

after a permanent superintendent was hired. The QEM had been held up at the State level due to partisan politics at the Oregon Legislature.

Ms. Adams stated the State had its QEM and SPS intended to complete the S-QEM. However, the State had done nothing with its QEM. She suggested that the document needed to be rewritten rather than revised. The work should be deferred for a couple of years, when the new superintendent was in place.

Mr. Light said the S-QEM had been an excellent community engagement process and was adopted shortly before Dr. Golden became the SPS superintendent. During the early years of her time with SPS, she used the S-QEM frequently to justify directions SPS took. While he did not want to wait too long, this was not the year or the time to revise the document. He opined the 2016-2017 school year may be more appropriate. SPS needed to plan for and engage the community in the review process, which should occur before the next bond measure. He thought a 10-year review cycle would be appropriate. The S-QEM had helped SPS maintain the CTE.

Chair Bigley concurred with Mr. Light's comments. S-QEM was a great tool. The Springfield community understood its right to know what was happening in the schools, and this was a tool that helped engage the community and gave the community ownership. Since the S-QEM was adopted in 2004, many students had graduated from SPS schools, families had changed and their needs had changed.

Superintendent Rieke-Smith was concerned that the strategic plan for the District was over ten years old, and, as noted by Chair Bigley, SPS had changed. The country was coming out of a recession that profoundly changed the way SPS did business. She agreed with Mr. Light that the review process was a phenomenal way to engage the community.

#### **d. District Work around PBIS & Board Policy to Support**

Dr. Brian Megert provided a PowerPoint presentation entitled *School-Wide PBIS*, which had been given to principals. He distributed handouts entitled *PBIS Board Policy* and *Student Achievement Program—revised June 2013*. He reviewed the following issues:

- **Implement**—Were participating schools implementing the policy?
  - Nine out of twelve of participating schools met criterion (80 percent) for Tier I in Spring 2015, and three schools were at 77 percent for Tier I.
  - Of the eight schools targeting Tier II this year, six out of eight met criterion (80 percent) for Tier II.
  - Twelve of twelve participating schools had at least 80 percent of students receiving 0-1 major office discipline referrals.
  - Three middle schools and two high schools were using SWIS.
- **Scale Up**
  - Sustain fidelity of Tier I and Tier II.
  - Add Tier III to ready schools.
  - Add Cohort 4 (remaining middle schools and one elementary school) next year.
- **Sustain**
  - Continue offering two trainings per year to participating schools.
  - Continue offering coaching support for each participating school.
  - Consider district wide policies and procedures for multi-tiered systems (PBIS, RtI)

Dr. Megert said the District Capacity Assessment (DCA) would answer questions about systems in place at the district level for implementation. Over a three-year period, the DCA showed year-to-year growth what could be attributed to structures the District continued to improve upon, and helped the Cabinet and the Board grown.

The DCA questions aligned with the District continuous improvement plan required by the State, and was backed by 15 years of research on scaling up and sustainability. The District would continue to receive technical assistance from University of Oregon (UO) and cross train District staff to provide support to SPS schools in the future. Every building in the District had a PBIS coach.

Dr. Megert directed Board members to the *PBIS Board Policy* document, and reviewed *School Climate Wording for Student Discipline and Equity Policies* and *School Climate Policy*. In response to Ms. Adams, he said District goals, Board goals, and school level continuous improvement planning (CIP) were tied together. Implementation of PBIS was not a Board duty, but had to be associated with student achievement, social and emotionally, for the whole child, with measureable achievement outcomes on standardized assessments. PBIS was a tool to help the District move forward.

Mr. Light wanted definitive metrics in the Board policy. He was concerned PBIS would become the overriding policy which would be used as a hammer, which had not worked in other applications.

Dr. Megert said the instruction team was experiencing success at the high school level and he would be able to provide meaningful data. He agreed to bring a more formalized policy to the Board in the future.

Dr. Megert directed Board members to the *Student Achievement Program*, which contained the existing student, conduct policy.

Mr. King understood there were multi-methods used by different schools. He leaned towards a universal policy to enable the District to evaluate the schools on common characteristics, which would provide consistent data.

Dr. Megert asked if the PBIS and Student Achievement Program language should be added to multiple policies to make the various policies more consistent. In response to Mr. Light, he said the language spoke to the sustainability and the concept of scaling up from a District perspective in guiding the buildings. There was always a tension between guiding the buildings and individual building practices. Mr. Light proposed sharing this with OSBA because other districts were facing similar challenges.

Ms. Boyst shared her experience with Hamlin Pride tickets given for behavior that should be expected of all students, rather than for exemplary behavior. She wanted to have a conversation about this.

Mr. Light concurred with Ms. Boyst, and he too had seen capricious handouts for expected behavior.

Dr. Megert said there was a delicate balance because there was a level of reinforcement that was real and tangible. Adults often forgot to tell kids when they were doing a good job, but at some point, awarding good behavior was no longer productive.

There was Board consensus that the policy would be ready for a first reading after Dr. Megert finalized it and Superintendent Rieke-Smith reviewed it.

#### **e. Technology 1:1**

Mr. Lindly distributed a document entitled *Springfield School District 19--Bond-supported Student Devices* prepared by Lynn Lary, in collaboration with the Instruction Department, in preparation for the November 2014 bond measure. Before the bond passed, the ratio of students to devices varied by school because there was not a common funding source for devices. As a result of the bond, the District would be able to work toward implementing a 2:1 ratio of students to devices. Equipment would be rolled out over a six-year period in alignment with Technology Services workflow. Additionally, between 2009 and 2014, Technology Services invested in multiple 2:1 technology rich classrooms through the District. The age and performance

of this technology was currently being monitored and devices would be replaced in accordance with programmatic needs. Additional student devices would be distributed for classroom use in each of the schools through a School Initiated Innovation Proposal process, which took into account the following factors:

- Staff and school readiness;
- Student understanding of online safety and appropriate online behavior;
- A clear plan for instructional strategies with a strong technology component; and
- A clear plan for ongoing professional development.

Ms. Lary stated as more devices were available to students, it changed the way teachers thought about instruction with the devices as a usable tool. The opportunities had opened up the possibilities of teaching and learning in the digital age.

Superintendent Rieke-Smith said it took deep thinking and opportunity for teachers to change how they thought about instruction. She commended Mr. Lindly and Ms. Lary for providing teachers with the necessary tools.

In response to Ms. Adams, Mr. Lindly said the District's middle school and high school students had access to active directory devices, which enabled them to log into Microsoft programs. Those students could log into the District's networks at school, and there were some classrooms where students were using smart phones for basic research. Students could bring their own devices and use them while at school.

Ms. Adams recalled there had been a question about allowing use of student owned devices when the policy was last updated. The policy needed to be revisited.

Chair Bigley noted the Board decided to have a policy that was not very restrictive because it understood that technology was changing and the District would need to adapt to those changes.

Mr. Lindly added principals wanted to ensure that they had access to the student owned devices to ensure they were being used in a safe manner. This should be included in any policy review.

In response to Mr. King, Mr. Lindly said the cloud based Google applications for education were an example of how well the cloud-based systems would work for the District in providing tools for a broad array of applications.

Mr. King said the *Bond-supported Student Devices* was a good product that would serve as a starting base for a working group.

Superintendent Rieke-Smith said many of the teachers had begun to implement some of the projects. The District's technology grants would help staff learn to use the tools. She would bring this conversation back to the Board.

Ms. Boyst suggested having electronic device release forms available at student registration that would release the District from liability if personal devices were lost or damaged. Additionally, students would sign an agreement that the devices would be used in accordance with District policies.

Mr. Light said it was important to look at the policies of other districts and other states, to determine what the data showed about improved performance and achievement when electronic devices were introduced into the classroom. Education was still in the development phase for true educational software.

Mr. Light left the meeting at 7:57 pm.

Chair Bigley asked that a monthly technology update be included in Board Packets under the Consent Agenda.

**f. School Naming Board Policy**

Mr. Yancey distributed a document entitled *Springfield School District 19—Naming New Facilities—FF/FFA*, which was adopted in June 2015. The process outlined in the document would be used for naming new facilities, or changing the name of existing facilities.

Ms. Adams said she had raised the concern of naming parts of schools. There had been occurrences where parts of schools were renamed and the Board had not been informed of the action.

Mr. King asserted Nancy Golden had been an epiphany for SPS and the community, and she was worthy of recognition through a naming opportunity. He had inquired for some time who “Hamlin” was, and no one knew who. He contacted Hamlin Middle School (HMS), which shared an article from the 1950’s about Mr. Hamlin with him. He opined the name Hamlin had little meaning for Springfield today. Conversely, many of the good things Dr. Golden brought to Springfield would be around for decades. He did not want to lose the Hamlin name, but it made sense to retain by naming the gymnasium or other room at the school. He supported having the naming committee make a recommendation to the Board.

Ms. Adams agreed with the sentiment but had some reservations about changing the name of the school. She supported maintaining the HMS name.

Chair Bigley supported maintaining the HMS name. She said if the Board appointed a naming committee, it may not know what names they would propose. She added Mr. Light told her he also supported maintaining the HMS name before he left the meeting.

Mr. Yancey said there was a significant amount of literature, clothing and other things branded with HMS, and there would be a significant cost to rebranding these items. If the Board wanted to rename the school, he suggested the Board do so soon, because the new school was taking form as HMS. The District was designing and master planning HMS.

Ms. McCulley understood the community was unique in the way that its students grew up in Springfield, went out into the world, and returned to settle in Springfield. If the Board decided to rename HMS, it would face the deep-rooted community connections in Springfield.

Ms. Boyst opined this should have been approached at the beginning of the bond process. The community supported building a new HMS, not a new school.

Chair Bigley suggested the library or a wing at HMS or a future new elementary school could be named for Dr. Golden.

**g. Facilities Advisory Committee (FAC): Structure and Purpose**

Mr. Yancey distributed a document entitled *Facilities Advisory Committee Members*. He said the committee, which came from the Springfield Quality Education Model, was initially appointed in 2005. The membership of the committee had ranged from 14 members in 2005, to 33 members in 2010, 26 members in 2012, and 25 members in 2014. The membership of the committee was referred to as the Blue Ribbon Panel, consisting of prominent thinkers and respected community members. The committee had looked at a variety of issues, including evaluation of facilities; resource availability as it related to facilities; enrollment issues; prioritizing facility needs for the District; school environment issues such as crime prevention through educational design; and facility security. The committee looked not only at the design of buildings, but also how to insulate students from intruders, and the best design for a school that could be attractive while avoiding opportunities where people could do bad things. The committee had participated in studying boundaries related to school

closures, and had been integral in providing information to the Board on school closures. The committee had also been helpful in providing input on General Obligation bonds. The committee members were heavy lifters, were well respected in the community and had been in the community for a long time. The committee had served the Board in an advisory capacity, and he had observed that when the FAC made recommendations to the Board, the Board accepted the majority of those recommendations. They clearly understood what their role was.

Ms. Adams said the FAC had never overstepped their bounds or insisted that the Board accept its recommendations.

Mr. Yancey said three people on the most current FAC membership list, Jim Balumas, Garry Weber and Devon Ashbridge, were no longer on the FAC. Staff continued to reach out to the remaining members of the FAC.

Mr. King said the District would need a FAC forever, but he was uncertain about the status of the current committee, and people were appointed to the FAC through an informal process. He opined the Board should take action to officially enfranchise the FAC, and convert it from an informal status to a formal status.

Mr. Yancey agreed to prepare a proposal to convert the FAC to a more formal committee for consideration by the Board.

#### **h. HMS Master Site Plan**

Mr. Yancey offered a PowerPoint presentation on the HMS Master Site Plan, which provided an overview of the plans. The design team, which included two Board members, had finalized the Master Site Plan. He was currently pricing the cost of artificial turf, and design of soccer and baseball fields. The North Wing of the school would house STEM, life skills and behavior classrooms. The other wings would house learning studios, collaboration and discovery labs, and resource rooms. The school would have a two-story media center, and centralized choir and band rooms. The schematic designs were almost completed. The next step would be to select fits and finishes.

#### **i. HMS Training Facility**

Mr. Yancey shared that he had received the preliminary construction budget for the HMS building and it was over budget. The preliminary construction budget was being reviewed. The cost of the training facility was estimated to be \$2.5 - \$3.0 million. He recommended dropping the training facility from the plans. The floor plan needed to be finalized by September 20, 2015.

Chair Bigley asked Mr. Yancey for a project update report at every Board meeting.

#### **FUTURE WORK SESSION:**

Board members reviewed the remaining agenda and decided to carry the remaining agenda items to a future Board work session.

#### **6. 2015-2016 BOARD AND DISTRICT GOALS**

Board and District Goals should be scheduled as soon as possible.

#### **7. TOPICS FOR FUTURE BOARD WORK SESSIONS**

- a. United Front**
- b. Social Media**
- c. Full High School Schedules**
- d. Use of Library/Media Centers K-12 in District**

## **8. WRAP UP AND NEXT STEPS**

Nancy Bigley and Board members appreciated the format of the meeting.

The Fall Planning meeting was scheduled for October 26, 2015.

With no other business, Ms. Bigley adjourned the meeting at 9:13 pm

*(Minutes recorded by Linda Henry)*

**SPRINGFIELD PUBLIC SCHOOLS  
2015-2016 Revenue/Expenditure Forecast  
As of August 31, 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  
**8/31/15**

	BUDGET	ACTUAL through 08/31/15	ESTIMATED from 08/31/15 to year end	PROJECTED 2015-2016	PROJECTED as % of BUDGET
<b>REVENUES:</b>					
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	228,011	683,089	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	17,838,989	50,701,184	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%
<b>Total revenues</b>	<b>96,045,911</b>	<b>18,067,000</b>	<b>78,138,529</b>	<b>96,205,530</b>	<b>100.17%</b>
Beginning fund balance	4,407,051	0	5,000,000	5,000,000	113.45%
<b>Total Beginning fund balance</b>	<b>4,407,051</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>5,000,000</b>	<b>5,000,000</b>	<b>113.45%</b>
<b>Total resources</b>	<b>100,452,962</b>	<b>18,067,000</b>	<b>83,138,529</b>	<b>101,205,530</b>	<b>100.75%</b>
<b>EXPENDITURES:</b>					
Personal services	49,394,218	1,725,987	47,668,231	49,394,218	100.00%
Employee benefits	30,417,001	893,066	29,523,935	30,417,001	100.00%
Purchased services	10,466,354	810,985	9,655,369	10,466,354	100.00%
Supplies & materials	2,891,426	357,912	2,504,599	2,862,512	99.00%
Capital outlay	132,375	12,760	119,615	132,375	100.00%
Other objects	700,111	632,717	67,394	700,111	100.00%
Fund transfers	1,177,858	0	1,177,858	1,177,858	100.00%
<b>Total expenditures</b>	<b>95,179,343</b>	<b>4,433,427</b>	<b>90,717,001</b>	<b>95,150,429</b>	<b>99.97%</b>
Unappropriated	4,000,000	0	0	0	-
Contingency	1,273,619	0	0	0	0.00%
<b>Total appropriations</b>	<b>100,452,962</b>	<b>4,433,427</b>	<b>90,717,001</b>	<b>95,150,429</b>	<b>94.72%</b>
<b>Total resources</b>		<b>18,067,000</b>	<b>83,138,529</b>	<b>101,205,530</b>	
<b>Total appropriations</b>		<b>4,433,427</b>	<b>90,717,001</b>	<b>95,150,429</b>	
Ending fund balance		13,633,573	(7,578,472)	6,055,101	
Less: contingency			0	0	
<b>Net fund balance</b>		<b>13,633,573</b>	<b>(7,578,472)</b>	<b>6,055,101</b>	

## Technology Bond Update

At the last Board work session, it was suggested that we submit a monthly update to the Board regarding progress on the technology portion of the bond. In this first report, I will recap the work that has been completed since the beginning of the bond. Future reports will be much shorter containing only work completed since the last report.

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. I will provide a brief update for each of the projects.

### 1. Core Network Equipment (Budget: \$1,572,216, 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 to Date – The initial work focused on designing a standard network configuration that we could apply to all of our district schools. With the help of Cisco Engineers, NERO, and others, we came up with a design that provided for high availability, provided for future growth, and fit within our project budget. To date we have completed core network equipment replacements at Page, Guy Lee, and Gateways. In order to increase the bandwidth at the schools we first needed to increase the available bandwidth at the EMC. As part of that work we replaced the firewall and Internet filtering devices.

Next Steps – The next schools in line for network equipment upgrades include: Douglas Gardens, Yolanda, Thurston High School (phase one), and Mt Vernon. Work in this area will continue through out the school year with the actual move to the new systems taking place on weekends to minimize the disruption to the schools. We are estimating that we can upgrade a computer equipment room about every 4-6 weeks.

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 funding to support additional network replacements.

2. Central Server Infrastructure & Storage (Budget \$653,068, Time Frame: 2015-2018)

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

Work Completed to Date – We have purchased high speed switching equipment, two new servers to support email, and a large storage device called a SAN.

Next Steps – We will continue to look at district servers and make replacements as we the devices approach end of life. We are also looking at replacing our end of life tape backup equipment.

3. Enterprise Wireless Network (Budget: \$205,627, 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 – We have completed the deployment of the enterprise wireless network at Page, Guy Lee, and Gateways high school. Additional wireless access points have been added at the Memorial Building, A3, and Thurston High.

Next Steps - The next schools in line for wireless network upgrades are the same schools scheduled for network equipment upgrades, Douglas Gardens, Yolanda, Thurston High, and Mt Vernon. 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.

4. Unified Communications (Budget: \$923,200, Time Frame: 2016-2020)

Work in this area not scheduled to begin until 2016-17

5. Classroom Equipment (Budget: \$2,523,484, 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 - Projection systems have been installed in nine schools including Ridgeview, Riverbend, Briggs, Mt Vernon, Agnes Stewart, Thurston Middle, Waltherville, Two Rivers, and Gateways.

Next Steps – The equipment to finish Springfield High has arrived and installation will be completed this calendar year. The contractor installing projection systems at SHS will be working swing shift to minimize disruption. Design in preparation for bidding projection system installations for the remaining schools will begin immediately with additional installations scheduled to start during summer 2016. We are taking a look at developments in the document camera market as we look to provide the devices to classrooms without these devices.

6. Library Computer Devices (Budget: \$227,513, 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 - Starting at the top of our priority list, have provided new and replacement technology at six schools. The completed installations include: 36 computer devices at Thurston High, 26 computer devices at Yolanda, 20 computer devices at Two Rivers, 6 computer devices at Guy Lee, 6 computer devices at Thurston Middle, and 6 computer devices at Agnes Stewart.

Next Steps – We have completed the work that was budgeted for year one. For year two we will continue to work through our prioritized list of schools.

7. Computer Lab Devices (Budget: \$633,600, 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 – We have added a new computer lab THS and replaced labs at the following locations: Douglas Gardens, Springfield High drafting lab, Agnes Stewart, Briggs, and Ridgeview. All of these labs consisted of 34-36 computer devices.

Next Steps – 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.

8. Testing Computer Devices (Budget: \$257,742, Time Frame: 2015-2018)

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

Work Completed – We have replaced the testing lab at Thurston High and purchased four carts of Chromebooks that are transported to the various schools as required.

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

9. Staff Computer Devices (Budget: \$1,352,760, 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 – We have developed processes for the replacement of computers for school based certified, administrative, and classified staff. We started this school year replacing the oldest 100 staff machines along with providing new computers for new teachers. We have replaced a total of 175 staff computers.

Next Steps – 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.

10. Student Computer Devices (Budget: \$4,125,790, 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 – We have developed a process for the replacement of student computer devices in the schools. This process allows for schools to generate proposals requesting new devices. The first round of proposals are due in October. Devices can also be requested at the district level based on instructional initiatives. Based on work that Lynn Lary is leading in 2015-16, we have deployed Chromebook

carts totaling 128 devices spread amongst Agnes Stewart, Briggs, Springfield High, Thurston Middle School, and Thurston High.

Next Steps – We are in the process of preparing another eight carts of Chromebooks that will be deployed within the next several months spread amongst Thurston Middle, Hamlin, Briggs, Agnes Stewart, Thurston High, and Springfield High. School proposal will be evaluated in October to determine the next round of student computers.

11. eReaders (Budget: \$825,000, Time Frame: 2017-2020)  
Work in this area is not scheduled to begin until 2017-18

12. Professional Technical Technology (Budget: \$300,000, Time Frame: 2015-2016)

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

Work Completed – Three numerical control machines have been delivered to Thurston High along with a 3-D printer, industrial sander, and laser engraver.

Next Steps – We are working with both Thurston and Springfield High to purchase new metal lathes. The issue has been trying to find lathes that Underwriters Laboratories (UL) approved. We are currently working with an engineering firm who can do the work to get UL approval on these devices.

SUBMITTED BY:

REVIEWED BY:

Tom Lindly  
Director of Technology & Transportation

Susan Rieke-Smith, D.Ed.  
Superintendent

RESOLUTION: #15-16.006

DATE: September 14, 2015

## PERSONNEL ACTION

### RELEVANT DATA:

Each month the board of Directors is asked to approve personnel action involving licensed employees. Tonight the Board is being asked to approve the attached new hires, resignations, and change in contract status. If the Board of Directors would like to discuss any of these recommendations in executive session, in accordance with ORS 192.660(2)(f) Exempt Public Records, the employee should be identified by the number preceding the name and it will be withdrawn pending further instruction from the Board. Michael Henry is available for questions.

### RECOMMENDATION:

It is recommended that the Board of Directors approve the personnel action for licensed employees as reflected in this resolution and any addendum presented along with this resolution. Categories include:

- New Hires
- Resignations
- Change in Contract Status

### SUBMITTED BY:

Dr. Michael Henry  
Director of Human Resources

### APPROVED BY:

Dr. Susan Rieke-Smith  
Superintendent

NO	NAME	CURRENT BUILDING ASSIGNMENT	STATUS	FTE	EFFECTIVE DATE	NOTES
	<b>NEW HIRES</b>					
1	CHRISTINE ANCELL	RIVERBEND	PROBATIONARY 1	FT	9/1/2015	NEW HIRE
2	BONNIE AULAKH	THURSTON MS	PROBATIONARY 1	PT	9/1/2015	NEW HIRE
3	TERESA COLLINS	SPED	PROBATIONARY 1	PT	9/1/2015	NEW HIRE
4	DEREK DANIEL	THS	TEMPORARY	PT	9/3/15-6/17/16	TEMPORARY NEW HIRE
5	SCOTT EVANSON	THS	PROBATIONARY 1	FT	9/1/2015	NEW HIRE
6	BRANDON FERGUSON	HAMLIN	PROBATIONARY 1	FT	9/1/2015	NEW HIRE
7	JAMES HALLWYLER	SHS	PROBATIONARY 1	PT	9/1/2015	NEW HIRE
8	SIDNEY HUGHES	DOUGLAS GARDENS	TEMPORARY CONTRACT	FT	9/1/2015	NEW HIRE
9	JEANETTE JACOBSON	THURSTON MS	TEMPORARY CONTRACT	FT	9/1/2015	NEW HIRE
10	CARLY JOHNSON	BRIGGS	PROBATIONARY 1	PT	9/1/2015	NEW HIRE
11	STEPHANIE LEAHY	RIVERBEND	PROBATIONARY 1	PT	10/5/15	NEW HIRE
12	KELSEY MOORE	MAPLE	PROBATIONARY 1	FT	9/1/2015	NEW HIRE
13	CASSANDRA MOORHEAD	PAGE	PROBATIONARY 1	FT	9/1/2015	NEW NIRE
14	DIANA MORGAN	DOUGLAS GARDENS	PROBATIONARY 1	FT	9/1/2015	NEW HIRE
15	JOEELEE NORTHUP	HAMLIN	PROBATIONARY 1	FT	9/1/2015	NEW HIRE
16	CHRISTINA SLAUGHTERBACK	MT VERNON	PROBATIONARY 1	FT	9/1/2015	NEW HIRE

17	BRYNE THORPE	RIVERBEND	PROBATIONARY 1	FT	9/1/2015	NEW HIRE
18	JEFFREY THOMPSON	HAMLIN	PROBATIONARY 1	FT	9/1/2015	NEW HIRE
19	DENICE WARD	BRIGGS	PROBATIONARY 1	PT	9/1/2015	NEW HIRE
20	REBEKAH WHITTAKER	WALTERVILLE	PROBATIONARY 1	FT	9/1/2015	NEW HIRE
	<b>RESIGNATIONS</b>					
21	MICHELLE JENSEN	ADMIN BLDG	CONTRACT TEACHER	FT	8/24/2015	RESIGNATION
22	JENNIFER KNAPP	YOLANDA	CONTRACT TEACHER	FT	8/10/2015	RESIGNATION
23	CONNIE KUEI	THS	PROBATIONARY 1	FT	8/08/2015	RESIGNATION
24	CHRISTIAN NOBLE	RIVERBEND	CONTRACT TEACHER	FT	8/20/2015	RESIGNATION
	<b>CHANGE IN CONTRACT STATUS</b>					
25	TIFFANY SWALM	THS	PROBATIONARY 1	PT	2015-16	CHANGE FROM PART TIME TO FULL TIME STATUS
26	JESSICA WHELAN	SHS	CONTRACT TEACHER	PT	2015-16	CHANGE FROM PART TIME TO FULL TIME STATUS
27	JARED WILLIAMS	GATEWAYS	PROBATIONARY 1	PT	2015-16	CHANGE FROM PART TIME TO FULL TIME STATUS

RESOLUTION: #15-16.007

DATE: SEPTEMBER 14, 2015

## BOARD POLICY FOR APPROVAL

### 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.

One current policy needs to be rewritten to meet legal standards. This policy was presented for first reading at the August 10, 2015, board meeting.

Brian Megert is available for questions.

### RECOMMENDATION:

It is recommended that the Board of Directors approve the following board policy:

- JHCDA Prescription Medication

### SUBMITTED BY

Jenna McCulley  
Community Engagement Officer

### RECOMMENDED BY:

Dr. Susan Rieke-Smith  
Superintendent

## **Prescription Medication\*\*/\***

The district recognizes that the administration of prescription medication to students and/or student self-medication may be necessary when the failure to take such medication during school hours would prevent the student from attending school, and recognizes a need to ensure the health and well-being of students who require regular doses or injections of medication as a result of experiencing a severe allergic reaction, or have a need to manage hypoglycemia, asthma or diabetes. When a licensed health care professional is not immediately available, a designated trained staff member may administer to a student, epinephrine, glucagon or other medications as prescribed and allowed by Oregon law.

When directed by a physician or other licensed health care professional, students in grades K-12 will be allowed to self-administer prescription medication, including medication for asthma or severe allergy as defined by state law, and subject to age-appropriate guidelines.

A written treatment plan for a student who self administers medication will be developed and signed by a physician<sup>1</sup> or other Oregon licensed health care professional and kept on file. A written request and permission form signed by a parent or guardian is required and will be kept on file. If the student is deemed to have violated Board policy or medical protocol by the district, the district may revoke the permission given to a student to self-administer medication.

A request for the district to administer prescription medication to a student shall include the written permission of the parent or guardian and shall be accompanied by written instruction from a physician, physician assistant or nurse practitioner. A prescription label prepared by a pharmacist will be deemed sufficient to meet the requirements for a physician's order.

The district reserves the right to reject a request to administer or allow self administration of a medication when such medication is not necessary for the student to remain in school.

A premeasured dose of epinephrine may be administered by designated, trained district staff to any student or other individual on school premises who the personnel believe, in good faith, is experiencing a severe allergic reaction, regardless of whether the student or individual has a prescription for epinephrine.

A process shall be established by which, upon parent written request, a backup prescribed autoinjectable epinephrine is kept at a reasonable, secured location in the student's classroom as provided by state law.

---

<sup>1</sup>Added to Oregon Revised Statute 678.010 to -678.410: A registered nurse who is employed by a public or private school may accept an order from a physician licensed to practice medicine or osteopathy in another state or territory of the U.S. if the order is related to the care or treatment of a student who has been enrolled at the school for not more than 90 days (House Bill 3149 (2015)). (This is to allow time for new students to find an Oregon licensed physician.)

Training shall be provided to designated staff as required by law in accordance with approved protocols as established by the Oregon Health Authority. Staff designated to receive training shall also receive bloodborne pathogens training. Current first-aid and CPR cards are strongly encouraged for designated staff.

Prescription medication will be handled, stored, monitored, disposed of and records maintained in accordance with established district regulations governing administering noninjectable or injectable, or prescription or nonprescription medicines to students including procedures for the disposal of sharps and glass.

The superintendent will ensure student health management plans are developed as required by training protocols, maintained on file and pertinent health information is provided to district staff as appropriate.

Such plans will include provisions for administering medication and/or responding to emergency situations while the student is in school, at a school-sponsored activity, under the supervision of school personnel, in before- or after-school care programs on school-owned property and in transit to or from school or school-sponsored activities.

This policy and administrative regulation shall not prohibit, in any way, the administration of recognized first aid to students by district employees in accordance with established state law, Board policy and procedures.

END OF POLICY

---

**Legal Reference(s):**

ORS 109.640  
ORS 339.866 to -339.871  
ORS 433.800 to -433.830  
ORS 475.005 to -475.285

OAR 166-400-0010(17)  
OAR 166-400-0060(29)  
OAR 333-055-0000 to -0035  
OAR 581-021-0037

OAR 581-022-0705  
OAR 851-047-0030  
OAR 851-047-0040

E-RATE SUBSIDIZED  
NETWORK INFRASTRUCTURE  
TECHNOLOGY UPGRADES

RELEVANT DATA:

This purchase reflects pricing associated with the Western States Contracting Alliance (WSCA) Master Agreement #AR233 and State of Oregon price agreement #4715. As a member agency of the Oregon Cooperative Purchasing Program (ORCPP), Springfield School District is authorized to utilize this joint cooperative agreement Pursuant to ORS Chapter ORS 279A.210.

This purchase will provide equipment supporting the upgrade of the District network infrastructure. Federal E-Rate funding will offset 80% of the total equipment purchase price. The remaining 20% will be provided through Bond proceeds.

District Technology Services staff led by Tom Lindly selected the equipment to support these infrastructure upgrades in alignment with the District technology and bond implementation plans. Equipment purchased as part of this resolution will be used to upgrade network infrastructure at Douglas Gardens, Yolanda, Thurston High, Mt Vernon, Ridgeview, Walterville, Briggs, and Thurston Middle.

Board Member Laurie Adams reviewed the procurement file. Tom Lindly will be available to answer questions.

RECOMMENDATION:

It is 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.

SUBMITTED BY:

Tom Lindly  
Director of Technology & Transportation

RECOMMENDED BY:

Susan Rieke-Smith, D.Ed.  
Superintendent