



BOARD OF EDUCATION
September 10, 2018
Administration Center Board Room
640 A Street
Springfield, OR 97477

7:00 pm Board Meeting

AGENDA	TAB
1. Call Meeting to Order and Flag Salute • Changes or Additions to the Agenda	Board Chair Zach Bessett
2. Recognition: International Alpha Delta Kappa Month Proclamation	Chair Bessett
3. Recognition: Certificate of Achievement for Excellence in Financial Reporting	Brett Yancey
4. Public Comments (Three (3) minutes each; maximum time 20 minutes. Speakers may not yield their time to other speakers.)	
5. Consent Agenda	
A. August 13, 2018 Board Meeting Minutes	1
B. August 27, 2018 Summer Planning Meeting Minutes	2
C. Personnel Action, Resolution #18-19.003	Dustin Reese 3
D. Financial Statement	Brett Yancey 4
6. Action Items	
A. Strategic Plan and Board Goals, Resolution #18-19.004	Bruce Smolnisky 5
B. Board & Superintendent Working Agreements, Res. #18-19.005	Bruce Smolnisky 6
C. Old Administration Building, Resolution #18-19.006	Brett Yancey 7
7. Reports and Discussion	
A. Superintendent Communication	Bruce Smolnisky
B. Board Communication	Chair Bessett
8. Other Business	
• October 8 th Business meeting will be cancelled due to TEAM Springfield Annual Meeting	
9. Next Meetings: September 24, 2017, 4:00 pm, Board Work Session October 22, 2017, 4:00 pm, Fall Planning Meeting and 7:00 pm Business Meeting	
10. Adjournment	Chair Bessett

BUSINESS MEETING MINUTES

1/A Regular Meeting of the Lane County School District No. 19 Board of Education was held on August 13, 2018.

1. CALL MEETING TO ORDER

Board Chair Zach Bessett called the Springfield Board of Education meeting to order in the Board Room of the District Administration Building at 7:02 pm and led the Pledge of Allegiance.

No changes to the agenda were requested.

Attendance

Board Members present included Chair Zach Bessett, Dr. Emilio Hernandez and Michelle Webber. Tony Jobanek was excused from the meeting because he was out of the country. Laurie Adams was excused from the meeting due to illness.

District staff, students and community members identified included Superintendent Bruce Smolnisky, Jeff Michna, Jenna McCulley, Brian Megert, Whitney McKinley, David Collins, Suzy Price, Dustin Reese, Brett Yancey, Judy Bowden, Melissa Stalder, Laura Weiss, Tim Stephens, Mike Eyster, John DeWenter, Brenda Holt, Chad Towe, Joan Bolls, Colleen Hunter, Anne Goff, Ryan Dougherty, Ame Beard, Jeremy Hugo, Amy Halley, Sheryl Cramer, Chris Reiersgaard, Doug Darling, Nathan Parker, Terry Rutledge, Mike Schlosser and Beth Bridges.

2. ELECTION OF OFFICERS

Election of Board Chair and Board Vice Chair

Motion: Dr. Hernandez moved, seconded by Ms. Webber, to nominate Mr. Bessett for Board Chair and Mr. Jobanek for Board Vice Chair.

Chair Bessett called for the vote. The motion carried unanimously (3:0).

3. INTRODUCTION OF NEW ADMINISTRATORS

Director Suzanne Price introduced Amy Halley as the new principal at Centennial Elementary School.

Director of Elementary Education Suzanne Price introduced Jeremy Hugo as the new principal at Ridgeview Elementary School.

Director of Special Programs Dr. Brian Megert introduced Laura Weiss. She was to oversee the federal grant programs.

Assistant Superintendent David Collins introduced Ame Beard as the new principal at the Academy of Arts and Academics (A3).

Chief Operations Officer Brett Yancey introduced: Melissa Stalder, Purchasing Manager and Accountant; Doug Darling, Print Services Supervisor; Tim Stephens, Assistant Transportation Supervisor (Operations); Ryan Dogherty, Assistant Transportation Supervisor (Students with special needs); Nathan Parker, Facilities Foreman. They all started their new positions on July 1, 2018.

4. PUBLIC COMMENT

Chair Bessett read the following statement:

This is the portion of our agenda for public comment. I want to remind those members of the public who have indicated a desire to make comments that our policy provides for a limitation of three (3) minutes per person.

Those wishing to make public comments must complete a “request to speak” form and speakers will be called upon in the order in which they are received. Audience members who wish to make public comments must state their name and address for the record.

We encourage groups with a common purpose to designate a spokesperson. If your comments will be covered by a group spokesperson, please indicate so when your name is called.

The Board will not hear personal complaints concerning school personnel or against any person connected with the school system. Any complaints regarding a particular employee must be processed through the procedure set forth in policy, which requires that complaints be submitted in writing to the Superintendent. This procedure must be followed before there is any Board involvement with such issues.

Speakers are reminded that their public comments will be limited to three (3) minutes.

No one wished to provide public comment.

5. CONSENT AGENDA

A. June 25, 2018 Board Meeting Minutes

B. Personnel Action, Resolution #18-19.001

Dustin Reese recommended that the Board of Directors approve the personnel action for licensed employees as reflected below:

New Hires

Michelle Albrich
Teresa Blake
Anna Coddington
Louis DeVille
Erinn Ernst
Elda Galvan
Zackery Grimsley
Amy Halley
Jonathan Heagy
Nathaniel Horwood

Rebecca Krop
Ginger Latta
Robyn Loudon
Hannah Mason
Kimberly McLennan
Jared Mills
Torrey Newhart
James Olsen
Tami Reinhardt-Lux
Cody Rosenberg
Korinne Ross

Ariana Schwartz
Laura Weiss
Bradford Weyand
Miranda Wilborn

Resignations

Anahid Bertrand
Deborah Ettl
Dan Sterling

Change of Contract Status

Amy Rowe Hughes

C. 2017-2018 Grants and Development Report

Staff in the Instruction Department has collaborated with other District staff and departments to submit grant applications to the U.S. Department of Education, Oregon Department of Education, and a variety of private and public funding organizations. The goal is to secure funds that benefit District students, teachers and schools.

The District’s process for selecting the grant applications it chooses to pursue is established in accordance with District policy and funding opportunities that are aligned with District goals to support existing initiatives, enhance current projects, offset budget and staff reductions, and find funding for projects for which the District currently has budgeted matching funds.

This year the District’s Instruction Department grant efforts prioritized projects that were aligned with current District initiatives such as collaboration, college and career readiness, high school success, dual language programming, STEM, and recruiting, supporting and training bilingual/bicultural community members to become highly qualified teachers.

2017-2018 Highlights:

- Successfully submitted various grant applications totaling, \$1,586,835.97:
- \$62,527.00 for Title IV-A.
- \$23,794.00 for CTE Career Pathways.
- \$46,375.00 for PEEK 8 Teacher Hire.
- \$24,000.00 for PEEK & Professional Development.
- \$34,334.00 for Measure 99 – Outdoor School.
- \$1,395,805.97 awarded for Measure 98 – High School Success.

Fund	17-18	Initial Award \$		Carried Forward from 2016-17 Grant
201	Title IA	3,576,802.00	F	209,321
202	ArtCore	548,764.00	F	274,173
203	SIF – KITS	106,411.00	C	
208	EWEB WET	47,000.00	C	78,261
212	Title IV-B 21 st CCLC	459,000.00	C	169,698
214	Title III ELL	82,322.00	F	9,691
216	SOAR	44,227.00	C	42,376
217	ELL Transformation	180,000.00	D	161,380
219	Preschool Promise	203,340.00	C	
220	SPR&I	10,463.00	D	
221	Title VII Indian Education	55,226.00	F	
222	IDEA Part B, 611 17-18	1,919,682.37	F	707,729
224	Title IV-A	62,527.00	F	
225	LTCT GF/SSF	1,483,579.60	F	
225	LTCT Title ID	85,616.90	F	
225	LTCT IDEA	62,565.89	F	
228	IDEA Part B, 619	19,617.51	F	
235	CTE Career Pathways	23,794.00	F	
243	IDEA Enhancement	12,731.00	F	
245	Youth Transition Program	194,347.47	F	
248	Title IIA	458,128.00	F	236,741
254	Title IIC Perkins	43,675.72	F	
256	Measure 98 – High School Success	1,395,805.97	F	
257	Measure 99 – Outdoor School	34,334.00	C	
267	PEEK 8 Teacher Hire	46,375.00	C	
268	Safe Routes to School	44,900.73	C	
270	PEEK & Professional Development	24,000.00	C	
280-777	UO C2SL	50,000.00	C	
281	Extended Assessment	3,600.00	F	
285	SUB	146,066.00	C	129,994
288	Music Matters	5,798.00	C	

F=Formula C=Competitive D=Discretionary

D. 2017-2018 Restraint and Seclusion Report

This is year six of the restraint and seclusion reporting requirements that took affect in July 2012. The wording of the OAR has been adjusted on more than one occasion in the last few years, but the substance of

the physical restraint and seclusion law has remained consistent. As part of the law, the district must make available to the board and to the public all incidents of restraint and seclusion during the school year. Additionally, specific demographic information pertaining to the students involved in the incidents of restraint and seclusion must be made available. The attached report provides the applicable OARs and the required information. This report will be kept on file at the district office and will be available on our website. In some cases, the demographic information potentially reveals student identifiable information and that portion has been redacted. For specific information regarding the number of restraint and seclusions, please see pages three and four of the attached report.

Summary Report: 2017-18

Use of Physical Restraint and Seclusion in Springfield Public Schools

581-021-0559

Reporting Requirements for the Use of Physical Restraint and Seclusion

- (1) Each entity that has jurisdiction over a public education program must prepare and submit to the Superintendent of Public Instruction an annual report detailing the use of physical restraint and seclusion for the preceding school year, including, at a minimum:
- (a) The total number of incidents involving physical restraint;
 - (b) The total number of incidents involving seclusion;
 - (c) The total number of seclusions in a locked room;
 - (d) The total number of students placed in physical restraint;
 - (e) The total number of students placed in seclusion;
 - (f) The total number of seclusion rooms available; and a description, including the location of those rooms, designated solely for seclusion;
 - (g) The total number of incidents that resulted in injuries or death to students or personnel as a result of the use of physical restraint or seclusion;
 - (h) The number of students who were placed in physical restraint or seclusion more than 10 times in the course of a school year and an explanation of what steps have been taken by the public education program to decrease the use of physical restraint and seclusion for each student;
 - (i) The number of incidents in which the personnel of the public education program administering physical restraint or seclusion were not trained; and
 - (j) The demographic characteristics of all students upon whom physical restraint or seclusion was imposed, including race, ethnicity, gender, disability status, migrant status, English proficiency, and status as economically disadvantaged, unless the demographic information would reveal personally identifiable information about an individual student.

(2) Each entity that has jurisdiction over a public education program shall make its annual report about physical restraint and seclusion available to:

- (a) The public at the entity's main office and the website of the entity;
- (b) The school board or governing body overseeing the entity;
- (c) If the entity is an education service district, the component school districts of the education service district;
- (d) If the entity is a public charter school, the sponsor of the public charter school;
- (e) Parents and guardians of students in a public education program, who shall be advised at least once each school year about how to access the report.

Stat. Auth. 326.051

Stats. Implemented: 2011 OL Ch. 665 (Enrolled HB 2939)

Hist.: ODE 12-2012, f. 3-30-12, cert. ef. 5-1-12; ODE 13-2014, f. & cert. ef. 2-19-14; ODE 15-2014, f. & cert. ef. 3-4-14

Definitions: As used in OAR 581-021-0550 to 581-021-0566:

“Physical restraint” means the restriction of a student's movement by one or more persons holding the student or applying physical pressure upon the student.

“Physical restraint” may not be used for discipline, punishment or convenience of personnel of the public education program.

“Seclusion” means the involuntary confinement of a student alone in a room from which the student is physically prevented from leaving. “Seclusion” does not include the removal of a student for a short period of time to provide the student with an opportunity to regain self-control if the student is in a setting from which the student is not physically prevented from leaving.

Physical restraint or seclusion may be used on a student in a public education program only if:

- (A) The student's behavior imposes a reasonable threat of imminent, serious bodily injury to the student or others; and,
- (B) Less restrictive interventions would not be effective.

Total Incidents of Physical Restraint and Seclusion:

	<u>6</u>
Total number of incidents involving physical restraint:	<u>6</u>
Total number of incidents involving seclusion:	<u>0</u>
Total number of seclusions in a locked room:	<u>0</u>
Total number of students placed in physical restraint:	<u>6</u>
Total number of students placed in seclusion:	<u>0</u>

Demographic characteristics:

Race:

African American	0
------------------	---

Asian	0
Multi-Racial	0
Native American/American Indian	0
White	5

Ethnicity:

Hispanic	1
Non-Hispanic	5

Gender:

Female	1
Male	5

Disability Status:

Identified as Disabled under IDEA or Section 504:	
	4
Non-Disabled:	
	2

Migrant Status: 0

English Proficiency:

0 Students receiving ELL services.

Status as Economically Disadvantaged:

4 Students eligible for free and reduced lunch.

Total number of incidents that resulted in **injuries or death** to students or personnel as a result of the use of physical restraint or seclusion: 0 incidents resulted in reported injuries to staff.

Number of students placed in physical restraint or seclusion **more than 10** times in the 2011-12 school year: 0

Steps taken to reduce the use of physical restraint for each student:

In each case, the team debriefed the incident, reviewed the behavior support plan, identified triggers and consequences for behavior, and determined next steps. Following the meeting, the team implemented strategies based on the information collected with the team, including the parents and team members from outside the school system. While the information is confidential, each incident was thoroughly documented as part of the required, formal process.

Number of incidents in which personnel administering physical restraint or seclusion were not trained: 0

MOTION: Ms. Webber moved, and Dr. Hernandez seconded, for approval of the Consent Agenda. The motion carried unanimously (3.0).

Dr. Hernandez requested quarterly updates regarding the use of physical restraint or seclusion. He opined the importance for new Board members to get the information more quickly so they were able to respond to concerned parents.

Dr. Megret explained Oregon had strong limitations on the use of physical restraint or seclusion and therefore the number of incidents was very low. Were the reports given more frequently, the demographic information might enable people to identify the child(ren) involved, a confidentiality violation. When he recommended discussing the topic further at a future work session to help inform new Board members, Dr. Hernandez agreed.

6. ACTION ITEMS

A. Academy of Arts & Academics (A3) Charter Closure & Status Change, Resolution #18-19.002

2017-18 was a year that surfaced significant concerns with Academy of Arts and Academics (A3). Specifically, it was determined that the school placed students in danger and exposed students to illegal behaviors by adult employees. During the latter half of the 2018-2019 school year, Springfield School District placed A3 administration on leave, gained control of school operations, and conducted multiple levels of investigations with the desire of learning details regarding allegations.

The issue continues as the District has been notified that a federal lawsuit has been filed by one victim of alleged abuse. The District continues to cooperate and work with PACE (insurance trust) and assigned legal counsel.

As we enter the 2018-2019 school year, Springfield School District is planning to continue offering students a high school education and diploma through A3, however not as a Charter School. As the District continues to move through this process, Oregon Department of Education has requested that “official” paperwork be filed. This resolution is intended to fulfill ODE’s request.

David Collins recommended that Springfield School District Board of Directors approve the closure of Academy of Arts and Academics Charter School and terminate the Charter Agreement, effective June 30, 2018.

Mr. Collins also recommended that Springfield School District Board of Directors approve the opening of Academy of Arts and Academics as a regular high school program within the Springfield School District effective July 1, 2018.

MOTION: Dr. Hernandez moved, Ms. Webber seconded, to approve the closure of Academy of Arts and Academics Charter School and terminate the Charter Agreement, effective June 30, 2018, and approve the opening of Academy of Arts and Academics as a regular high school program within the Springfield School District, effective July 1, 2018. The motion carried 3-0.

When Mr. Bessett asked how long the process would take to change the school from a charter school to a regular high school? Mr. Collins responded it would take a few months. He offered to report back to the Board when the process was completed.

Dr. Hernandez expressed concerns for the incoming senior class regarding the transition. Were there issues regarding graduations? He thought it important to support the seniors.

Mr. Collins explained there were between sixty and seventy senior students potentially affected (exact numbers were not available until school started). Principal Beard was developing plans to ensure on-time graduations for these students.

7. Reports and Discussion

A. Summer Planning Meeting Agenda Items

Superintendent Bruce Smolnisky reviewed the draft agenda for the August 27, 2018 Summer Planning Meeting. The document had been distributed to Board members just prior to the meeting.

Responding to his question regarding additional items requested, Dr. Hernandez suggested discussing how federal grant programs were monitored and reported.

When Mr. Bessett suggested reassessing Board members' commitments to other groups, e.g., Lane Council of Government, Superintendent Smolnisky suggested including the list of current assignments in the agenda packet for the Summer Planning Meeting, but waiting to discuss assignments until Mr. Jobanek and Ms. Adams were present. Mr. Bessett concurred.

Mr. Bessett also shared he had discussed with Human Resources Director Dustin Reese about the possibility of speeding up the recruitment efforts for the permanent Superintendent, but now agreed keeping the schedule as presented was the best way forward.

B. Superintendent Communication

Superintendent Smolnisky described recent events for administrative staff, including a cabinet retreat to identify goals and strategies and an equity workshop. The new teacher in-service day was to be held later in August. There were eighty new teachers expected to attend. All teachers were to report for service on August 28, 2018.

Turning to strategies to improve safety in schools, Superintendent Smolnisky noted upcoming training sessions (Alert, Lockdown, Inform, Counter, Evacuate (ALICE)) for the 271 people who had not received the training in 2016. He also referred to the push button entrances being installed at many facilities.

Mr. Yancey explained the technology was the same as had been used at Hamlin Middle School. The District had purchased twenty more units. The next facility to be equipped with the technology was Briggs Middle School. Mr. Yancey also described a safety enhancement at Thurston High School. Once school was in session, there would be only one access point available.

Superintendent Smolnisky concluded his remarks by inviting Board members to attend the all-staff Bar-B-Que on August 31, 2018 at 12:30 pm.

C. Board Communications

Ms. Webber noted she had attended the Oregon School Board Association (OSBA) Summer Board Conference and had found the information presented very useful.

Dr. Hernandez agreed. He had also attended the OSBA event and had found the keynote speaker excellent. Dr. William Parrett had presented a session entitled, "The Board's Role in Disrupting Poverty".

Mr. Bessett also concurred. He described the accompanying book as setting forth a methodology to engage students who live in poverty. Mr. Bessett also recognized members of the Springfield Chamber of Commerce in the audience and noted their support for articulating District Goals.

8. OTHER BUSINESS

No other business was discussed.

9. NEXT MEETING:

The next meeting will be the Summer Planning Meeting scheduled for August 27, 2018 beginning at 4:00 pm in the Board Room at the Administration Building.

Chair Bessett announced he was unable to attend the October 22, 2018 Board planning meeting. When he suggested re-scheduling it to November 5, 2018, Executive Assistant Judy Bowden offered another alternative. The Board could have their planning meeting on October 8th and the business meeting on October 22nd. The Vice Chair could conduct the business meeting. Board members present agreed with Ms. Bowden's proposal.

10. ADJOURNMENT

With no other business, Chair Bessett adjourned the meeting at 7:57 pm.

(Minutes recorded by Beth Bridges)

SUMMER PLANNING SESSION MINUTES

2/A Summer Planning Work Session of the Lane County School District No. 19 Board of Education was held on August 27, 2018.

1. CALL MEETING TO ORDER

Board Chair Zach Bessett called the Springfield Board of Education Summer Planning Session to order in the Board Room at the District Administration Center at 4:02 p.m.

Attendance

Board Members present included Chair Zach Bessett, Tony Jobanek, Dr. Emilio Hernandez and Michelle Webber. Board Member absent was Laurie Adams.

District staff and community members identified included Superintendent Bruce Smolnisky, David Collins, Brett Yancey, Jeff Michna, Jenna McCulley, Brian Megert, Whitney McKinley, Suzy Price, Judy Bowden, Anne Goff, Mike Eyster, John DeWenter, Sally Storm, Chris Reiersgaard, Alekzander Ames, Linda Whadon and Marina Brassfield.

2. OVERVIEW OF AGENDA

Zach Bessett welcomed Board members. Superintendent Bruce Smolnisky provided an overview of the agenda. There were no changes.

Mr. Smolnisky noted some topics may take a while to work through, such as the working agreements between the Board and Superintendent and the District Goals. He added that the documents did not need to be finalized that evening.

3. BOARD WORKING AGREEMENTS

Mr. Smolnisky directed Board members to the document entitled *Board and Superintendent Working Agreements*.

Mr. Smolnisky explained the purpose of reviewing the working agreements. The agreement focused on how the Board and Superintendent would work together, communicate with one another, and communicate with the greater community. It cleared up expectations and procedures, and also included information on evaluations.

Mr. Smolnisky noted it was important to discuss the agreement at that meeting, because it was a new academic year and it had been a couple years since the document had been considered. There were three relatively new Board members and Mr. Smolnisky wanted to provide them a chance to review the agreement. Additionally, Mr. Smolnisky wanted to position the District to hire an excellent new Superintendent; all applicants would want to see agreements, like the one reviewed, in place. If questions were asked which couldn't be answered that evening, staff would conduct research and provide information at a future meeting.

Mr. Smolnisky introduced Part A, Purpose of Agreements. He wondered if there were any concerns. In the second sentence of Part A, Mr. Bessett wanted to see the wording "cohesive leadership team," instead of "leadership team." Mr. Smolnisky asked what "cohesive" meant to the Board. Mr. Bessett wanted to ensure the Board didn't have a separate agenda from the District.

Mr. Smolnisky moved to Part B, the Board Job Description and Relationship with Superintendent. He explained Part B discussed the 12 main responsibilities of Board members. Mr. Bessett wondered if Part B was meant to be more of a general outline for Board responsibilities, or if there needed to be a certain timeline of frequency, such as quarterly or annually. Mr. Smolnisky thought the Board could look at tasks whenever needed, but some tasks, such as Item Number 9, would be done on an annual basis.

Mr. Jobanek asked what had historically been done for a Board Retreat. Mr. Yancey said prior Board's had gone a few different directions. The Board used to do an all-day annual retreat; however, the last four years, they opted to do four quarterly planning sessions instead. Mr. Bessett wanted to change Item Number 9 to reflect quarterly planning sessions.

Ms. Webber asked about consistency in communication between the board, staff, and the public. Ms. McCulley said the District tried different iterations of outreach, but nothing was in place. Ms. Webber wondered if some type of monthly or quarterly newsletter could be posted on the District website so the public could access updates and District successes. Mr. Smolnisky noted the minutes of Board meetings were posted online; he wondered what type of communication she thought of in addition to the minutes. Ms. Webber thought community members might be unsure of where to access the minutes, or that the minutes might not make sense to someone who didn't attend the meeting. Ms. McCulley asked for content clarification. Ms. Webber said questions she heard were around what exactly the Board and District were accomplishing.

Mr. Jobanek wondered whether more understanding on the District website was needed for people to direct themselves to the minutes, or if the minutes generally had excess information. Ms. Webber thought staff and Board members could first provide direction and see if more people were engaged.

Mr. Smolnisky had no issue with additional public outreach, but also wanted to protect necessary staff time. Staff would look at options and return to the Board with recommendations. Ms. McCulley added that the District has created a new website specifically to help facilitate more community engagement. The website would go live at the start of the 2018-2019 academic year. Additionally, Ms. McCulley conducted professional development with staff around functional newsletters. The department would restart a sign up option so people could receive updates. Ms. McCulley thought a Board section could be included if that was helpful.

Dr. Hernandez reiterated Ms. Webber's point, and said when he was vice chair, there were many items in the "parking lot." Some of those issues hadn't been revisited, such as how to get information out to the community. Dr. Hernandez wondered where the "parking lot" list was? Mr. Bessett responded the list was included on a GoogleDoc which he would go through and update. He added the issue would be on the agenda at a future meeting.

Mr. Smolnisky moved to Part C, Role of Board Leadership, which discussed the chair and vice chair positions. He asked for questions or concerns. Mr. Bessett asked about Item Number 4. He had no issue ensuring the facilitation of new Board members orientation, however, as a new Board member himself, he felt somewhat uneasy conducting the process. Mr. Smolnisky explained staff would lead the process, per District policy.

Mr. Smolnisky introduced Part D, Role of the Superintendent. Mr. Smolnisky was unsure of exactly what Item Number 6 meant when it said facilitation of communication requiring "more than 20 minutes of staff time." Mr. Yancey responded that several years ago, there was an agreement between the Superintendent and the Board in which Board members were free to contact cabinet level staff, without going through the Superintendent, if the issue took about 20 minutes or less. The clause was included to ensure the Superintendent was involved and to ensure staff time wasn't taken away for issues that could have been streamlined differently. Mr. Collins added the item was also to ensure everyone had the same information.

Mr. Jobanek asked how Mr. Smolnisky felt about Item Number 6. Mr. Smolnisky supported Item Number 6, and reiterated the need to keep everyone informed. Mr. Jobanek agreed, and thought it would be important for Board members to relay information to each other and to the Superintendent when and if they met with a director. Mr. Smolnisky added that he would send email updates on Fridays. Mr. Yancey noted simple questions about happenings at schools (such as small landscaping projects, evening events, etc.) required informal conversations, and board members could send him an email or text. Other questions might require more formal, sit down settings. Mr. Jobanek thought it was important to use discretion when making those contacts, and to let Mr. Smolnisky know about the contact as a common courtesy.

Mr. Smolnisky introduced Part E, Meeting Operations and Decision Making. He pointed to Item Number 2, which focused on cell phones and computers. He hoped the use of the devices would be minimal, in order to respect everyone's work and time. Mr. Bessett agreed, and added it was especially important to avoid use during the public comment portion of a business meeting.

Mr. Smolnisky wanted to discuss Item Number 6. He clarified that staff welcomed questions from Board members during meetings, but asked that whenever possible, they provide those questions in advance so staff could come prepared. He explained if staff couldn't answer a question brought forward during a meeting, staff would return with answers in the future.

Mr. Bessett addressed a similar issue. He asked to receive meeting topic requests from board members prior to meeting with the vice chair. He proposed having a deadline of 5:00 p.m. the Monday before this meeting. Mr. Bessett also committed himself to send reminders to Board members.

Mr. Smolnisky moved to Part F, Communication. Mr. Smolnisky thought Item Number 5 might be tricky for Board members, because they often received informal complaints from community members in their role. Each situation was unique. Mr. Bessett added that often times Board members were called to attend meetings. He wanted to ensure members were inviting the Superintendent when appropriate.

Ms. Webber thought it was important to have the Chair and Superintendent meet with community leaders together to build trust and transparency. It would allow Board members be on the same page, and to avoid several one on one conversations about the same issue.

Since the district would begin the hiring process for a new superintendent starting January 2019, Mr. Smolnisky recommended Board members take a close look at Part F. Some superintendents wanted specific language within the contract on how they would communicate with members of the community. Mr. Jobanek wondered if, as written, Section F functioned as hoped. Mr. Smolnisky said yes, and added the toughest situations were really when a community member had a complaint outside of a public meeting, because Board members were sometimes put in uncomfortable positions.

Dr. Hernandez asked how they would follow up with public comments, as a Board and a district. Mr. Bessett thought it was great to keep track of issues brought to the Board during meetings, but was unsure if they wanted to continue the GoogleDoc as a tracking method. He thought an update on items the public brought forward could possibly be included in the Friday update. Mr. Smolnisky clarified whether Dr. Hernandez was interested in how staff relayed information to the Board, the individual patron, or the entire community. Dr. Hernandez responded that information should be shared with the entire community at the following meeting whenever issues were brought to the Board.

Mr. Smolnisky moved to Section G, Board and Superintendent Subcommittees. He explained if a committee was formed, the Board member sitting on it was responsible to keep their colleagues informed. Mr. Bessett wondered about responsibilities to Board members' assigned committees. Mr. Smolnisky thought responsibilities could be discussed. Generally, each Board member would provide a summary on the committee meeting to the Board and Superintendent at the next regular Board meeting. Mr. Smolnisky

explained when members were at meetings, they were to represent the District and might sometimes need to vote on issues.

Mr. Smolnisky closed the discussion, and said staff would edit the working agreements based on Board comments. The document would be brought forward for adoption at the next meeting.

4. HIRING PERMANENT SUPERINTENDENT

Jen McCulley shared a PowerPoint entitled, "*Superintendent Search.*" She explained the PowerPoint would allow the board to understand the overall process and prepare to move forward. One question to consider during the presentation was whether the Board wanted to delegate search tasks to a group, or conduct the search themselves.

In preparing for a candidate search, Ms. McCulley met with peers from partner districts and conducted extensive research. Key decision points included: undergoing a public or confidential process; conducting a regional or national search; using a search firm, OSBA, or conducting the search in-house (although that option was not recommended); and identification of stakeholder groups.

Ms. McCulley shared pros and cons of a public process in which candidates were known from the beginning. Positives included the fact that the process was completely transparent, so there was increased trust from community members. She concluded that was the main positive, and most high-level executive searches were moving to a closed process. Concerns of an open process were that it was challenging for candidates, and it could impact the candidate pool before evaluation even began.

Ms. McCulley shared positives of a closed process, which included a greater ability to recruit the largest candidate pool. Confidential processes were routinely recommended by search firms and were generally understood by stakeholders as common practice for hiring high level executives. Some concerns were the potential for less initial buy in by stakeholders because fewer were involved from the start. Ms. McCulley said the process could be designed where it was confidential until the final few applicants, with stakeholder involvement occurring during the final stages.

Mr. Bessett asked whether the Board would look at applications and résumés. Ms. McCulley said that would be step two in the decision making process. It was a large process so some districts delegated portions of the process to a Board representative and a screening committee. Ultimately, interviews and the way the process rolled out was up to the Board. In addition, if a search firm was hired, they would help guide the board in these decisions. Mr. Smolnisky said technically, the board could conduct the entire process itself. Dr. Hernandez didn't believe it was wise for the Board to conduct the entire process itself.

Mr. Bessett asked if a search firm would go through applications and take out demographic indicators. Ms. McCulley didn't ask the search firm that degree of finite questions, since the Board hadn't yet made their decision. The contract with the firm would be for the Board to negotiate. Dr. Hernandez said that the Board didn't want to know demographics, however, it did want a diversified applicant pool.

In response to a question from Mr. Bessett, Ms. McCulley said different firms had different approaches in re-naming applicants (i.e. Applicant 1A) to ensure privacy. Some had all personal information in a separate portal and managed that information for the district. Mr. Jobanek asked whether a confidential type process could have ample ways for stakeholders to take part in the process. Ms. McCulley said absolutely. In a recent conversation with Eugene 4J School District (4J), they delegated the initial screening to a committee. Then, there was an interview committee; ultimately, they designed the process in a way where candidates came and met with a wide swath of stakeholder groups.

Ms. McCulley explained that once the Board decided whether or not to utilize a search firm or staff, the firm would need to know whether they wanted to conduct a regional or national search. When speaking with other

August 27, 2018

districts, she heard pros and cons for both choices. Positive aspects of regional searches included more applicants who were familiar with Oregon's education system, as well as lower advertising and travel costs. Cons were that the District would be geographically limiting itself, so there would be a smaller and less diverse candidate pool. The main pro for a national search was a broader pool of applicants overall. Cons were that there would be additional advertising and travel costs. In addition, candidates from out of state may be used to an entirely different system of education.

Ms. McCulley explained that out-of-house search firms would be OSBA or an unidentified firm. She prepared some information in case the Board opted for any sort of outside expertise, however, Ms. McCulley didn't have detailed information in case the Board opted for an in-house process. She explained OSBA was familiar with the district, as well as nearby districts and employees in the region. Ms. McCulley added OSBA was the cheaper option overall. Partner districts reported OSBA was a great resource for smaller districts, but not as beneficial for larger districts (like Springfield). In general, partner districts felt they could do most of the process themselves or hire out some parts.

Ms. McCulley said a search firm would have larger recruiting and advertising options, so they would be more familiar with national candidates; however, they would also be more expensive.

Dr. Hernandez asked if it would be possible to create a budget for both options. Mr. Yancey explained the district needed to go through a formal process, therefore a set of criteria would need to be defined. In order to get an equal comparison from firms, Ms. McCulley would release a Request for Proposals (RFP) with particular criteria; then, firms would provide bids. Based on those bids the Board would select a firm. Mr. Yancey noted cost was only one variable, and didn't need to be the deciding factor. The district could choose to go with a more expensive firm, if the firm fit the criteria in a better fashion. Mr. Yancey reiterated the budget wasn't limiting the district as there were other funds to draw from if absolutely needed.

Dr. Hernandez said the process made sense. He noted Board members would travel to sites in order to receive information from the applicant's school district and community, so those costs also had to be looked at. Ms. McCulley said he was absolutely right; there was a base travel cost for backgrounding. She added there were lessons learned from an unnamed partner district on how to approach the process differently, in terms of bringing candidates in. As they approached that finite level, the Board could start working with the finance office and add it to the contract so it was known from the onset where they were with respect to the budget. Mr. Yancey said legal counsel would also be asked for their input to ensure the process was done correctly.

Ms. McCulley reiterated the process was up to the Board, but noted that recruitment firms were experienced, and would articulate the needs of the district during the search. She added the District wanted to ensure groups of key stakeholders were engaged along the way, whether they opted for a search firm, OSBA, or in-house. One thing that worked well for districts was a broader survey. Board members could provide the same questions to stakeholders who missed the larger meetings. The information would be compiled and returned to the Board. Surveys would allow the Board to define a clear description of what the community was looking for in a superintendent. Dr. Hernandez thought the initial group of stakeholders was strong, but wanted to specifically mention students. He also wanted to include the LGBTQ, Native American, African American, and Asian American communities. Ms. McCulley responded she thought the additions were a great idea.

Ms. McCulley shared the preliminary calendar outline. She explained that based on best practices, the District would plan the process during the fall and offer options for meetings and public surveys. Then, the job description would be created Winter 2018, with posting and recruitment beginning January 2019. Ideally, finalists would be identified Spring 2019 with a public announcement to follow.

Mr. Smolnisky said in the past there were stakeholder interviews with the last two or three candidates, in which anyone from the public came to ask questions, which was a useful process. Mr. Bessett thought the next steps seemed right on par for the overall timeline. Ms. McCulley said the timeline would be more

formalized in order to coordinate with all five board members. Mr. Bessett asked if it seemed reasonable for the Board to direct the Chair and Vice Chair to work through the next steps. Dr. Hernandez said yes, and Ms. Webber agreed. Dr. Hernandez said if any questions arose he would be happy to help, as he had been through similar processes before.

5. DISTRICT GOALS UPDATE

Mr. Smolnisky led a discussion and shared a PowerPoint entitled “*2018-19 Strategic Plan Overview.*” The Strategic Plan was adopted a few years ago by the Board, but the District wanted to update the document.

Mr. Smolnisky explained the Strategic Plan informed staff exactly what they needed to be doing. Additionally, superintendent candidates would look at any strategic plans adopted by the District.

Mr. Smolnisky walked through each of the five goals. He said mission values were taken from a larger visioning document to create one statement. The vision was *Every student a graduate, prepared for a bright and successful future, through supporting every student every day.* Mr. Smolnisky said the measurement didn’t include graduation rates because a 100% graduation rate was the only goal the District would ever have. It would celebrate progress made along the way, but the District would not be completely successful until every student graduated. In addition, the District wanted to prepare students with skills and habits of mind, like integrity.

Mr. Smolnisky started with strategic objectives around Goal #1, *Promote Growth and Success for Every Student.* Specific indicators of success included: an articulated curriculum, and a systematic, master schedule to optimize student learning. A second objective was to have highly effective staff systems in place to support teaching and learning. The final strategic objective was responsible deployment of resources.

Mr. Jabonek asked if discussion should wait until the end of the presentation. Mr. Bessett wanted to dissect the goals as they moved along. Mr. Bessett asked how to hire for specific qualities in teachers who kept kids wanting to come to class daily. Mr. Smolnisky said it was difficult to know whenever the District hired someone. It was partly on how staff was trained upon hiring. Mr. Reese, Director of Human Resources explained the recruitment process and said candidates interviewed the District as much as the District interviewed the applicant. Mr. Collins added the quality of classroom infrastructure also affected learning; it was important to develop a rich classroom environment.

Dr. Hernandez asked how to attract diversity and equity in teachers. He thought the community overall didn’t have the best image when it came to those types of issues. He wondered if the district would consider things to attract those applicants. Mr. Smolnisky thought Board members would see the issue addressed in the following section, Family Support.

Mr. Bessett announced the Board would take a short break from 5:30 p.m. until 5:50 p.m.

Mr. Smolnisky introduced Goal # 2, *Support families so that every student is ready to learn.* Strategic objectives included diversifying the District’s workforce by creating an equitable and inclusive recruitment, hiring, and selection process. Success indicators included all job announcements having equity minded language; hiring committee members trained on the importance of Equal Employment Opportunity; and an adverse impact analysis would allow for exploration into the if and how selection processes have implicit or explicit bias. Other objectives included safe and inclusive learning environments. Essentially, the District wanted to provide learning environments that met the needs of students and staff, while also providing parents confidence in the District’s care for their children.

Dr. Hernandez noted the previous year, Board members were asked questions about specific buildings, regarding safety doors. He wondered how members would answer those questions, especially when they involved unsolvable issues around infrastructure. Mr. Yancey explained in 2017-2018, an issue with safety

doors arose. The District worked with the Fire Marshall to come up with an alternate solution, and added doors to other classrooms so students could evacuate to a classroom that did lock. There were ongoing conversations with staff and public officials around school safety.

Mr. Smolnisky shared Goal #3, *Provide personalized learning opportunities for every student*. Strategic objectives included offering a multi-tiered system of support. One way to accomplish the goal was to support administrative, classified, and teaching staff in improving skills. Success indicators included setting goals; reviewing progress; and staff development. Surveys and School Wide Information System (SWIS) data were considered to understand parent involvement. Other strategic objectives included high school success, facilities and technology and Career and Technical Education (CTE). Mr. Smolnisky discussed the success indicators for each objective. The strategic objectives were embedded in all of the goals.

Dr. Hernandez asked if there was any flexibility in ODE's requirement for Smarter Balance. He wondered if there were other options for students who didn't have the capability to take those tests. Mr. Collins said there was an opt out option. The District also looked at other measures of success over the past couple years, such as formative benchmarks. Currently, the District had not explored alternative options within the *Every Student Succeeds Act* (ESSA) model. He didn't believe it was viable option based on state reporting system.

Mr. Smolnisky stated all kids deserved inspiring and equitable facilities, and explained what the District planned to accomplish in order to reach Goal #4, *Create safe and future ready facilities that inspire learning*. At a recent staff meeting, there was a presentation from maintenance staff who understood this goal perfectly. From the department's point of view, everything needed to be maintained and in excellent working condition so that every kid had access to the best tools for learning.

Mr. Smolnisky shared Goal #5, *Advocate for funding and policies that support education*. The first objective was intentional and effective advocacy, meaning Board members might have roles to play in meeting with legislators. The Board would see outreach develop throughout the year. Mr. Smolnisky added that clear and meaningful policies were crucial. He added that OSBA recommended the District update their policies. This process would take place over the next two years.

Mr. Bessett asked if an advocacy plan had been developed. Ms. McCulley responded that in past years, the District and Board moved away from a more formalized legislative priorities list. During Fall 2018, staff would discuss potential legislation. At the Fall OSBA Conference in November, Board members would hear OSBA's legislative priorities. Afterward, the District and Board would work to create a concise document of their own legislative priorities.

Mr. Jobanek asked if there was a legislative point person? Ms. McCulley said no, there was not. Mr. Smolnisky said the District spoke with local legislators, who were advocates of SPS. Ms. McCulley thought the Board was poised to make targeted movement. She was looking forward to engaging in advocacy with the Board. Ms. McCulley noted that historically the community liked to hear from elected officials.

Mr. Smolnisky shared next steps. At the District level, staff would continue to work on an action plan and measurable outcomes for each goal and subsequent strategies. Those would be published to the new website. Finally, the District would develop a strategic plan document and position themselves with a new Superintendent. Staff would bring back the document to the Board at a future meeting, and the Board would pass a resolution to amend and readopt goals for the 2018-2019 academic year.

Dr. Hernandez returned to Vision and Values of the District. As Board members, the goal of every student graduating made sense, but people in the community specifically wanted to see numbers around graduation rates. Mr. Smolnisky said those numbers were still out there and published by the State; the District would accept those numbers and work with them because it didn't change the ultimate goal. Dr. Hernandez

understood, but for the community to understand they needed to see the numbers changing. He wondered if the website was a good place to address statistics and put more meaning to the backstory.

Mr. Collins said the District wanted to consider growth over the year, rather than the end of a year situation. Every plan would report back on high school success in various ways. The Strategic Plan focused on Measure 98 and normal indicators of success. The data would inform and adjust District strategies employed throughout the year. He hoped the public heard about progress through classroom teachers and schools, and that it aligned with feedback the Board heard during meetings. Dr. Hernandez asked if schools would communicate to parents, through a newsletter for example. Mr. Collins said each school would consider parent engagement. The hope was to have personalized communication for each student. Dr. Hernandez added the hope was also to increase parent engagement.

Ms. McCulley said an added benefit of aligning and embedding work into plans themselves was alignment across departments. Dr. Hernandez liked the idea of embedding the work, and thought something could be created where superintendent candidates could quickly look at the data in order to understand the overall Strategic Plan and conduct their own research on the District.

Mr. Smolnisky concluded an updated District Goals document would come forward at the next Board meeting for Board approval.

6. BOARD COMMITTEE REPRESENTATION

Mr. Bessett directed the Board members to a document entitled “*School Board Representation 2018-2019.*” It was a revised version of agencies and civic organizations board member assignments, following a discussion by the Chair and Vice Chair. Big changes included that Mr. Bessett would work with Ms. Adams on Springfield Education Foundation. Ms. Webber would represent SPS for the Wildish Theater while Mr. Jobanek would represent SPS at Lane Council of Governments (LCOG) Board Meetings. Lastly, the Chair and Vice Chair would work on the Facilities Advisory Committee.

Mr. Jobanek requested a schedule of assigned committee meeting dates and times for the 2018-2019 academic year. Staff would identify meeting information for Board members.

7. OLD ADMINISTRATION BUILDING PLANS

Mr. Yancey shared a document entitled “*Hazardous Material Study and Phase I environmental Assessment.*” He explained it was important for the Board to have the information, as they decided what to do with the building. The Hazardous Material Study was required no matter what the District ended up doing with the building. The study performed uncovered hazardous materials including asbestos and lead paint in windows, doors, flooring, roofing, walls, and chalkboards. Mr. Yancey said the building needed to be abated in order to do any demolition work.

Mr. Yancey explained Phase I of the Environmental Assessment, which looked at soils and the surrounding landscape. There was some good news, including a 4,000-gallon heating tank that had already been decommissioned. It still sat underground in sand or cement. However, no one could find the decommissioning papers, so additional testing was needed. Minimal testing didn’t show soil contamination. As of that time, there were no environmental conditions with the property, however, Phase II had not been conducted. He was nervous about Phase II because the entire area used to be used for orchards and farming, so a lot of pesticides were used. Mr. Yancey said the cost to abate hazardous materials would be an estimated \$150,000 to \$200,000.

Mr. Yancey said according to the City of Springfield, 525 Mill Street was considered one tax lot but it was formed from 13 platted lots. The District would have to redo the plat planning process again if it wanted to sell a portion of the 3.32-acre property. The cost estimate to replat was just under \$30,000. The cost estimate

of demolition was \$50,000. Mr. Yancey concluded the total estimate cost of the project would be \$251,835 to \$396,834. The District had not yet gone through a formal bid process.

Mr. Yancey said at that point, they needed to discuss options for the property. It was not big enough for a school site. He thought it would be wise to hang onto the bare land because it would be worth more. The land could be used for parking or saved for future space if the District wanted to build a training facility, or a staff support building, for example. A second option was that the District could enter into conversations with the City or a nonprofit organization to create an affordable housing development.

Mr. Yancey thought options and opportunities were there, but only without the building on it; the Board would have to discuss demolition at a future meeting. The site was a liability in its current condition. Mr. Yancey shared the site was not currently designated as a historical site, however, it could potentially be one if someone initiated the process.

Mr. Jabonek thanked Mr. Yancey for putting the information together. He clarified the potential costs.

Mr. Yancey said a realtor previously outlined two options for the Board. One option was to put the land up for sale and to see what was offered. The realtor thought a sale would be contingent on demolition or taking abatement costs into consideration. Another option would be a sealed bid process where the sale was announced, and all bids were due on a particular date. The Board would then look at the confidential bids and then accept one or none of them.

Dr. Hernandez asked how much taxes would be if the property sat without a building. Mr. Yancey said the property would still be tax exempt because it was owned by a government entity.

Mr. Jabonek asked how much the assessed value was of the property. Mr. Yancey responded the assessed value was \$3.2 million, but that included all structures on site. He explained any interested party would want a copy of the hazardous materials and environmental assessment reports.

Dr. Hernandez thought the District was approached by an individual who wanted to submit the site as historical. Mr. Yancey said there were interested parties in the community, but they still hadn't heard from those folks. Ms. McCulley clarified no one had filled out paperwork.

Mr. Jabonek clarified in order to sell the property, it would have to be re-platted because the District didn't want to sell the entire property. Mr. Yancey said yes, the District was looking to keep about two thirds of the property. Income from the sale could be net zero due to expenses associated with the project. Mr. Bessett said the buyer would have to take care of those expenses. Mr. Yancey said yes, but any buyer would take those costs into consideration in their bid. Mr. Jabonek was unclear exactly which expenses the District would cover; he asked if the District was responsible for the replat. Mr. Yancey confirmed yes.

Dr. Hernandez wondered if the information presented would be available to the public. All the meeting information would be posted as part of the agenda packet on the Board webpage. Dr. Hernandez thought the data would cause fewer people to view the building as historic and more people viewing it as a hazard. Mr. Yancey said there was a small amount of dollars in capital improvement fund that could be used to demolish the building, but staff would likely have to approach the Board with a contingency request. Mr. Jabonek asked if the District had to replat whether they kept or sold the property. Mr. Yancey said a replat wouldn't be recommended if the property was kept.

Mr. Yancey thought the land could be valuable to the City or other entities in the future, because the land might be needed for projects such as parks or low-income housing; however, at this time, no options were presenting themselves.

Dr. Hernandez asked if there was a project timeline, if the Board chose to demolish the building. Mr. Yancey said companies moved quickly. Abatement would take the longest because there was a lot of asbestos. Once it was abated, it was essentially torn apart and was no longer a functional building. After that, the demolition process was about two weeks. Dr. Hernandez asked if it would be disruptive to nearby workplaces. Mr. Yancey said it wouldn't be very disruptive, as there would be security fencing and other measures taken.

Mr. Bessett asked if the building could be sold after abatement without demolition. Mr. Yancey said yes, but he was unsure of what type of infrastructure would be left after abatement. The District staff would also collect anything useable such as hardware and fire alarms, so the building wouldn't be functional.

Mr. Jabonek said the District's options were to pay up to \$300,000 to demolish the building with the idea to utilize the property in future, or, sell the property and have a net zero gain. Mr. Yancey added that John Brown, a local realtor, shared the building's seismic information with folks and the site became even more unattractive to them.

Dr. Hernandez asked how long the building would sit there if it was put up for sale. Mr. Yancey said staff had thoughts, but he wanted direction on what the Board wanted to see next, such as a more formal ask in a regular board meeting. Mr. Jabonek thought it would be helpful to have Mr. Yancey return with recommendations. Mr. Yancey said the decision was inevitable, it was just a matter of when to make it.

8. WRAP UP AND NEXT STEPS

Mr. Bessett said he was looking forward to Mr. Yancey and Mr. Smolnisky's recommendations.

10. ADJOURNMENT

With no other business, Mr. Bessett adjourned the meeting at 6:51 pm.

(Minutes recorded by Marina Brassfield)

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, resignation, and change of 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. Dustin Reese is available for questions.

RECOMMENDATION:

It is recommended 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
- Resignation
- Change of Contract Status

SUBMITTED BY:

Dustin Reese
Director of Human Resources

APPROVED BY:

Bruce Smolnisky
Interim Superintendent

NO	NAME	CURRENT BUILDING ASSIGNMENT	CURRENT STATUS	FTE	EFFECTIVE DATE	NOTES
	NEW HIRES					
1	ASHWORTH, ELIZABETH	HAMLIN	PROBATIONARY 1	FT	8/28/2018	NEW HIRE
2	BARTELS, IAN	SHS	PROBATIONARY 1	FT	9/04/2018	NEW HIRE
3	BOND, MARK	PAGE	PROBATIONARY 1	FT	8/28/2018	NEW HIRE
4	CANO-SOTO, SERGIO	THS	PROBATIONARY 1	FT	2018/19	NEW HIRE
5	COOMBS, CHRISTINA	HAMLIN	TEMPORARY	FT	8/28/2018	TEMPORARY NEW HIRE
6	LAPLANTE, MARY	TES	TEMPORARY	FT	8/28/2018	TEMPORARY NEW HIRE
7	MOWERY, AARON	CENTENNIAL	PROBATIONARY 1	FT	8/28/2018	NEW HIRE
8	PERRY, HALEY	HAMLIN	PROBATIONARY 1	FT	8/28/2018	NEW HIRE
9	REES, MORGAN	GUY LEE	TEMPORARY	FT	8/28/2018	TEMPORARY NEW HIRE
10	SABO, DANIELLE	ADMIN	PROBATIONARY 1	FT	2018/19	NEW HIRE
	RESIGNATION					
11	TRUJILLO, JENNIFER	TES	CONTRACT	FT	8/13/2018	RESIGNATION
	CHANGE OF CONTRACT STATUS					
12	SMITH, ANDREA	ADMIN BLDG	PROBATIONARY 2	PT	8/28/2018	MOVE FROM PART TIME TO FULL TIME @ SHS

**SPRINGFIELD PUBLIC SCHOOLS
2018-2019 Revenue/Expenditure Forecast
As of August 31, 2018
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 \$425,000 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 100% of the adopted budget. This estimate includes the additional students enrolled in the SPS Online program, as well as Charter School enrollment at 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 \$1.066 million in Common School Funds. To date the District has not received any revenue specific to this source.

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 2017-2018 adopted budget.

Additional Notes: For the 2018-2019 budget year the current estimate of ending fund balance is \$6,175,640. Included in this number is the un-audited ending fund balance estimate from the 2017-2018 fiscal year (\$10,800,000).

Submitted by:

Reviewed by:

Brett M. Yancey
Chief Operations Officer

Bruce Smolnisky
Superintendent

SPRINGFIELD SCHOOL DISTRICT 19
2018-2019 REVENUE/EXPENDITURE FORECAST
as of
8/31/18

	BUDGET	ACTUAL through 08/31/18	ESTIMATED from 08/31/18 to year end	PROJECTED 2018-2019	PROJECTED as % of BUDGET
REVENUES:					
Property taxes - current	25,236,816	0	25,236,816	25,236,816	100.00%
Property taxes - prior years	425,000	0	425,000	425,000	100.00%
Other local sources	730,100	176,454	553,646	730,100	100.00%
Lane ESD Apportionment	1,806,126	76,000	1,730,126	1,806,126	100.00%
County School Fund	190,000	0	190,000	190,000	100.00%
State School Fund	75,893,821	19,208,527	56,685,294	75,893,821	100.00%
Common School Fund	1,065,886	0	1,065,886	1,065,886	100.00%
Total revenues	105,347,749	19,460,981	85,886,768	105,347,749	100.00%
Beginning fund balance	10,602,129	0	10,800,000	10,800,000	101.87%
Total Beginning fund balance	10,602,129	0	10,800,000	10,800,000	101.87%
Total resources	115,949,878	19,460,981	96,686,768	116,147,749	100.17%
EXPENDITURES:					
Personal services	57,494,622	1,945,611	54,993,521	56,939,132	99.03%
Employee benefits	36,886,691	1,073,042	35,455,513	36,528,555	99.03%
Purchased services	9,717,273	774,861	8,942,412	9,717,273	100.00%
Supplies & materials	3,216,751	425,499	2,707,514	3,133,013	97.40%
Capital outlay	143,000	4,817	138,183	143,000	100.00%
Other objects	790,972	686,018	104,954	790,972	100.00%
Fund transfers	2,721,164	0	2,721,164	2,721,164	100.00%
Total expenditures	110,970,473	4,909,848	105,063,261	109,973,109	99.10%
Unappropriated	4,000,000	0	0	0	-
Contingency	979,405	0	0	0	0.00%
Total appropriations	115,949,878	4,909,848	105,063,261	109,973,109	94.85%
Total resources		19,460,981	96,686,768	116,147,749	
Total appropriations		4,909,848	105,063,261	109,973,109	
Ending fund balance		14,551,133	(8,376,493)	6,174,640	
Less: contingency			0	0	
Net fund balance		14,551,133	(8,376,493)	6,174,640	

RESOLUTION: #18-19.004

DATE: SEPTEMBER 10, 2018

STRATEGIC PLAN AND BOARD GOALS

RELEVANT DATA:

An important role of the Springfield School Board is to set the direction of the district through clearly established policies and goals. On Monday, August 27, during the public summer planning meeting of the school board, concensus was gained to continue to reaffirm the following goals which will serve as to focus the work of the district towards increasing outcomes for the students of Springfield.

- Promote growth and success for every student
- Support families so that every student is ready to learn
- Provide personalized learning opportunities for every student
- Create safe and future ready facilities that inspire learning
- Advocate for funding and policies that support education

The above five guiding goals will be the foundation for the district's strategic plan and will serve as the basis for the evaluation of the superintendent for the coming year.

RECOMMENDATION:

It is recommended that the Board of Directors move to formally adopt the five district goals as listed above.

SUBMITTED BY:

Jenna McCulley
Community Engagement Officer

RECOMMENDED BY:

Bruce Smolnisky
Superintendent

RESOLUTION: #18-19.005

DATE: SEPTEMBER 10, 2018

BOARD AND SUPERINTENDENT WORKING AGREEMENTS

RELEVANT DATA:

In an effort to ensure effective district operations and oversight, the Springfield School Board revisited their collective working agreements articulating how the Board of Directors will interact together as a governing body, as well as with the superintendent and district administration.

On August 27, during the public summer planning meeting of the school board, consensus was reached on the following working agreements, which reflect updates made during that discussion.

RECOMMENDATION:

It is recommended that the Board of Directors move to approve the following working agreements as attached:

- BOARD AND SUPERINTENDENT WORKING AGREEMENTS

SUBMITTED BY:

Jenna McCulley
Community Engagement Officer

RECOMMENDED BY:

Bruce Smolnisky
Superintendent

BOARD AND SUPERINTENDENT WORKING AGREEMENTS

A. Purpose of Agreements

The Board of Directors is the policy making body for the Springfield School District. To effectively meet the District's challenges, the School Board, Superintendent, and District Administration must function together as a **cohesive** leadership team. Successful organizations value effective and dynamic leadership. Leaders of high-quality organizations set in place a basic framework of how they work together to lead, serve and provide vision for their organizations.

We agree and commit ourselves collectively and individually to the following operating protocols, adhering to all district policies and procedures:

B. The Board Job Description and Relationship with Superintendent

1. Set the long-term direction of the District through the mission, vision, goals, and priorities.
2. Focus on policymaking, planning and evaluation.
3. Maintain effective two-way communication with students, staff and the public. This will include board highlights and key items from board meetings in district communication avenues such as newsletters.
4. Understand that as an individual, a Board member has no authority. It is when acting as a body that a majority of the Board has influence.
5. Be accountable for the financial stewardship of the District, including aligning resources with goals and priorities, setting expectations, and monitoring progress.
6. Manage Board processes, including operating agreements. Actively pursue opportunities to give and receive feedback regarding Board member performance as responsible communicators. Participate in an annual self-assessment of the Board's performance.
7. Deliberate and make decisions in accordance with public meeting law. Foster a positive Board environment; encouraging debate, different points of view, and listening, doing so with care and respect.
8. Board members will adhere to standards of ethical conduct and professionalism. They will also maintain confidentiality according to the Oregon Revised Statute standards, particularly in executive session and administrative function sessions, including when interacting with staff, elected officials and the community.
9. Set priorities for Board professional development annually, pursuing continuous improvement through quarterly Board planning meetings.
10. Supervise the hiring, performance evaluation and other personnel management processes related to the Superintendent.
11. Work with the Superintendent as a team, recognizing that the Superintendent is the Board's advisor.
12. Respect the Superintendent's responsibility to manage the day-to-day operations of the District and to direct employees in District and school matters.

C. Role of Board Leadership

1. Manage the Board's process; convene meetings; develop the Board agenda with the Superintendent, seeking Board member input; and execute documents, as appropriate.
2. Serve as the authorized spokesperson for the Board with regard to Board policy, process and decisions. The Chair may delegate this responsibility to other Board members and/or the Superintendent.
3. Communicate with individual Board members concerns shared with the chair by other board members regarding issues agreed to in the working agreements or group operating norms.
4. Facilitate the orientation of new Board members.
5. Assist the Superintendent in communicating important information to the full Board. Keep Board members apprised of information exchanged with the Superintendent.
6. The Vice Chair will perform these duties when the Chair is not available.

D. Role of the Superintendent

1. Manage the day-to-day operations of the District.
2. Work as a team with Board members.
3. Work with the Board to establish a clear vision for the District and affirm it annually.
4. Collaborate with the Board to set annual District goals.
5. Work with the Chair and Vice Chair to effectively bring information and issues to the Board so that it can make proactive data driven decisions on policy and budget/revenue issues.
6. Facilitate and direct, communication between the central office staff and the Board that will require more than 20 minutes of staff time or when confidential by nature.
7. Provide regular communications to the Board. This may include: scheduling information for activities and events, as well as notice, follow-up or resolution of issues.

E. Meeting Operations and Decision Making

1. Respect the scheduled starting and ending times for meetings. Executive sessions and work sessions will end no later than 10 minutes before Board meetings. The Vice Chair will assist the Board Chair with keeping on schedule.
2. Attend and be fully engaged with a minimal distraction from cell phones, etc. at regularly scheduled Board meetings unless prevented by sickness or an unavoidable cause.
3. Cooperate in scheduling special meetings and/or work sessions for planning and training purposes.
4. Prepare for Board meetings by reading materials ahead of the meeting and asking questions that you have of the Superintendent or members of the Executive Team prior to the day of the meeting if possible. If after you have asked questions you intend to pull something from the consent agenda action, please notify the Board Chair and/or Superintendent before the meeting.
5. Board discussions should be thorough yet concise and pertinent to the issues on the agenda.

6. Make it a goal to make no new proposals on the night that the Board is scheduled to make a decision or take action. Items for discussion should be brought first to the Board Chair or Superintendent to be placed on the agenda, by Monday, the week prior to a scheduled Board meeting. Try to avoid surprises.
7. Cast a vote on all matters except when a conflict of interest arises.
8. Uphold decisions that have been made by the Board.

F. Communication

1. Communicate openly and honestly.
2. Respect differences and listen well and for positive intent.
3. Operate as representatives and make decisions in the best interest of the whole District. Consider research, best practices, evaluative data and public input in making mindful and purposeful decisions. Being mindful of the needs of ALL the children in our District and the interests of our collective community.
4. Focus on the situation, issue, or behavior, not the person.
5. When a Board member receives an informal complaint, listen carefully and empathetically. Direct the person to solve the problem at the lowest level.
 - a) Please talk with the teacher.
 - b) Please talk with the principal.
 - c) Please talk with the Superintendent.
6. Formal complaints must be forwarded to the Superintendent. These are heard by the Superintendent or designee. Complainants may appeal the Superintendent's decision to the School Board.
7. If a complainant is unwilling to speak to the Superintendent a Board member may share the issue and the source of the complaint, concern or criticism of the District. The Superintendent will keep the Board informant "source" confidential at the request of a Board member but every effort should be made to encourage trust and open communication. This is the best hope for full understanding and resolution.
8. When the Board receives communication from the community, the chair will respond or will delegate that responsibility to another Board member. A "footnote" statement will be added to the bottom of the board chair's email so that patrons understand that it is the practice of the Board that the chair will be responding on behalf of the board. The footnote will state, "The Board Chair responds to emails sent to the full board. School board members only deliberate when gathered as a quorum as outlined in the Public Meeting Law. To assure that board conversations and deliberations do not occur on email, the Board Chair will respond on behalf of the Board. All Board members receive communications that come from the community and the response given by the Board Chair." All Board members will be included in responses made by the Board chair. Following the communication from the Board chair, other Board members may also respond if they wish. The full Board should be included in communications with the public.
9. When a single Board member receives a communication from a member of the public s/he may respond to that patron as an individual. The Board member may elect to

forward the email and his/her response to the Board Chair or full Board if he/she wishes.

10. When a concern or problem arises, communicate one-on-one with the Board member. If the issue is not resolved, communicate with the Board chair and finally with the Superintendent if necessary.
11. To increase transparency in district operations and board oversight, the Superintendent should be included in meetings between a board member and key stakeholders.
12. When possible and appropriate responses to public questions should be included in Superintendent board updates.

G. Board or Superintendent Committees

Board Committees: The committee chair is responsible for implementing the charge of the Board. The committee chair will provide regular updates of committee progress to the Board. External communication of committee progress is the responsibility of the committee chair – the committee chair will provide advanced copies to the Board and the Superintendent of any external communication 36 hours before release.

Superintendent Committees: Board members may be asked to serve on a Superintendent or District committee. The Board member is a representative of the Board to staff, student, parent and community members. Board members serving on a committee should temper their participation, mindful of their position as an elected official. Board members serving on a committee are to respect the role of the committee chair and refrain from initiating a new direction for the committee or initiating formal community input except when requested by the committee chair. The Board representative on a Superintendent or District committee will assist the Superintendent in reporting committee progress to the Board. Voting rights will be determined on a case-by-case basis.

“OLD” ADMINISTRATION BUILDING

RELEVANT DATA:

Following discussion at the August 27, 2018 summer planning session, members of the Springfield School Board requested additional information and an administrative recommendation on next steps as it relates to the previous administration building, located at 525 Mill Street. For the purpose of shared information, the following is a summary of previous actions taken by administration that has led to this recommendation and resolution.

April 28, 2015: Tier one seismic study completed and the following results were reported.

- Exterior concrete walls do not appear to be anchored to floor and roof diaphragms, however they act as bearing walls.
- There does not appear to be a connection for transfer between floor diaphragms and exterior concrete walls.
- Concrete wall reinforcement is not known to exist. Verification needs to be performed.

May 26, 2015: Ground penetrating radar study completed and the following results were reported.

- Scans did not reveal the presence of reinforcement in any building walls.

June 5, 2015: Tier two seismic study completed and the following results were reported.

- Anchoring relationship of exterior 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 concrete walls.

Based on these studies and professional reports, the retrofit recommendations include;

1. Install epoxied anchor rods and hold downs at the perimeter of the building.
2. Anchor roof in a similar manner, however the repair would require plywood sheathing for a distance of 16 feet from the walls at the third-floor ceiling.
3. Add plywood sheathing to the underside of the floor framing in overstressed area.

At the time of this study (2015), estimated costs for repair were approximately \$8 - \$10 million. This estimated cost did not include temporary relocation of staff while work was being performed. Also not included in this cost estimate were any required abatement costs, as shown below.

July 6, 2015: Facilities Advisory Committee convened, recommended and endorsed relocating School District Administration Building and encouraged the School Board to exercise their due diligence. Additionally, the Committee affirmed that District facilities housing students and staff should be seismically sound and safe.

August 22, 2018: Hazardous material study and Phase One environmental study completed and the following results were reported.

- Asbestos material confirmed with approximately 17,450 SF floor tile with mastic, chalkboards with mastic located throughout the building, approximately 750 SF ceiling tile with mastic, built up roofing, and 110 window units with glazing compound.
- Of nine paint chip samples collected, lead was detected in all samples, therefore the abatement is considered necessary.
- Phase one environmental study identified a 4,000-gallon underground oil tank that was properly decommissioned in 1992. Further investigation may be required to verify leaching has not occurred.

Estimated cost for abatement and demolition (including contingency): \$223,000 - \$278,000.

Brett Yancey will be available for questions.

RECOMMENDATION:

It is hereby recommended that the Board of Directors retain the property (land and EMC building) located at 525 Mill Street and direct staff to begin the abatement and demolition process of the original three-story building and small storage building (small blue house) located on the property.

SUBMITTED BY:

Brett M. Yancey
Chief Operations Officer

RECOMMENDED BY:

Bruce Smolnisky
Superintendent of Schools