

BUSINESS MEETING MINUTES

2/A regular meeting of the Lane County School District No. 19 Board of Education was held on August 14, 2017.

1. CALL MEETING TO ORDER

Board Chair Erik Bishoff called the Springfield Board of Education meeting to order in the Board Room at the District Administration Center at 7:02 pm.

Board Chair Bishoff asked if there were any changes or additions to the agenda. There were no changes to the agenda.

Attendance

Board Members present included Chair Erik Bishoff, Laurie Adams, Zach Bessett and Emilio Hernandez.

District staff and community members identified included Superintendent Sue Rieke-Smith, David Collins, Tom Lindly, Bruce Smolnisky, Jenna McCulley, Brian Megert, Kevin Ricker, Suzy Price, Greg James, Judy Bowden, Anne Goff, Tim Stephens, Chad Towe, Gary Cole, Craig Prindel and Linda Henry.

2. PUBLIC COMMENT

No public comment was offered.

3. CONSENT AGENDA

A. July 31, 2017 Board Meeting Minutes

B. Personnel Action, Resolution #17-18.002

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

New Hires

Jeremy Campbell
David Carter
Colin Farnsworth
Kimberly Green
Kristen Grottkau
Laura Latham
Lane Littlefield
Brittany Maddoux

Melissa Morgenlaender
Miranda Nchekwube
Nathan Poukish
Andrew Price
Raina Silva
Heather St. Louis
Kathryn Tiernan

Change in Contract Status

Jonathan Kempe

C. Nutrition Services Fresh Produce Products, Resolution #17-18.003

Gary Cole, Nutrition Services Supervisor recommended that the Board of Directors award the fresh produce products contract to Emerald Fruit & Produce of Eugene for an estimated amount of \$210,000.00.

D. Nutrition Services Dairy Products, Resolution #17-18.004

Gary Cole recommended that the Board of Directors award the dairy products contract to Spring Valley Dairy of Eugene for an estimated amount of \$370,000.00.

E. Nutrition Services Bakery Products, Resolution #17-18.005

Gary Cole recommended that the Board of Directors award the bakery products contract to Franz Family Bakeries of Eugene for an estimated amount of \$100,000.00.

F. Purchase of Nutrition Services Supplies

Gary Cole recommended that the Board of Directors approve the purchase of Nutrition Services supplies from the following vendors for the following estimated amounts:

Food Services of America, Woodburn, OR	\$325,000.00
McDonald Wholesale Company, Eugene, OR	\$325,000.00
NW Distribution – Tools for Schools, Emmitt, ID	\$50,000.00
EcNow Tech, Albany, OR	\$25,000.00
Wallace Packaging LLC, Tucson, AZ	\$25,000.00
TOTAL ANTICIPATED AWARD	\$750,000.00

G. 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, dual language programming, STEM, and recruiting, supporting and training bilingual/bicultural community members to become highly qualified teachers.

2016-2017 Highlights:

- Successfully submitted various grant applications totaling, \$6,236,677.93.
- \$174,132.00 awarded for ELL Transformation.
- \$200,000.00 awarded for Preschool Promise.
- \$3,219,827.00 was allocated during the 2016-17 school year for Title IA.
- \$80,552.00 was allocated during 2016-17 school year for Title III ELL.
- \$1,916,117.94 was allocated during 2016-17 school year for IDEA Part B.
- Awarded a \$33,197.00 for College and Career Readiness.
- Awarded \$53,969.30 for the Student Centered Assessment Project.
- \$503,079.00 was allocated during 2016-17 school year for Title IIA.
- Awarded \$44,600.00 for ASPIRING Leader.
- \$11,203.69 was allocated during 2016-17 for Title X McKinney Vento.

H. Restraint and Seclusion Report

This is year five 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.

Summary Report: 2016-17

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>4</u>
Total number of incidents involving physical restraint:	<u>4</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>4</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	4

Ethnicity:

Hispanic	0
Non-Hispanic	4

Gender:

Female	2
Male	2

Disability Status:

Identified as Disabled under IDEA or Section 504:	
	1
Non-Disabled:	
	3

Migrant Status: 0

English Proficiency:

0 Students receiving ELL services.

Status as Economically Disadvantaged:

1 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:

1

In response to Ms. Adams, Dr. Rieke-Smith said the Board would receive a report on the progress at Hamlin Middle School when Mr. Yancey returned.

Motion: Dr. Hernandez moved and seconded by Mr. Bessett to approve the Consent Agenda. The vote carried 4:0.

Dr. Hernandez noted this year was the final year of the agreement for the Applegate Cooperative. Mr. James confirmed the agreement would need to go out for bid. Dr. Hernandez proposed that the Board discuss the issue before the big process began.

Dr. Hernandez inquired about the Use of Physical Restraint and Seclusion in Springfield Public Schools report included in the agenda packet for tonight's meeting. He asked if the District's reporting process was sufficient to meet the District's needs in the future.

Dr. Megert explained that this was required by law for the District to report to the Oregon Department of Education (ODE). When the new law went into effect in July 2012, there were new reporting requirements, new definitions for restraint and seclusion, and new requirements for seclusion rooms. Very specific requirements were identified for what was a seclusion room and currently the District did not have any approved rooms. Thus, the District did not have any seclusions during 2015-2016 and 2016-2017. However, there were seclusions prior to that because students were isolated in their classrooms, which resulted in students acting out and teachers and students vacating rooms until de-escalation took place. The only time the District would engage in seclusion was when a student was alone in a room for a period of time without any adults present.

Dr. Hernandez expressed concern about the term seclusion and preferred students be placed in a safe place.

Dr. Megert explained there were specific definitions in the Restraint and Seclusion technical report prepared by ODE. The report specifically differentiated between seclusion and time outs, safe spaces, sensory rooms and sensory motor rooms. In the definitions of physical restraint and seclusion, ODE leaned toward mental health and health care, designation of seclusion and restraint. He opined this helped to clarify questions about what was legal and what was not legal.

Dr. Hernandez opined that many of the children on whom restraints and seclusion were used had disabilities. He asked if there was a way to reduce the use so parents were not upset.

Dr. Megert said that the District worked hard to ensure that appropriate interventions were used. The District currently used the Mandt Training. He added every school in the District had an administrator, at least one certified teacher and two or more classified staff, all of whom were trained in restraining and working with parents in relation to de-escalation. The District chose to focus on de-escalation rather than use of restraints.

4. REPORTS AND DISCUSSION

A. Declare a Board Vacancy and Outline Process

In response to Chair Bishoff, Ms. McCulley said the Board position vacancy would be posted soon. Ms. McCulley reviewed the Board member recruitment process and Ms. Bowden shared the questions asked by Board members of applicants in the past:

SPRINGFIELD BOARD OF EDUCATION Appointment Interview Questions September 12, 2016

1. Why do you want to serve on the Springfield Board of Education?
2. How would you summarize your style for interacting with others and your ability to work as a member of a team? What qualities would you bring to the Board?
3. What do you see as a top budget priority? What is the most important focus for the District over the next five years?
4. What do you see as the biggest opportunities around student achievement for the District?
5. Board Policy KL, Public Complaints, states (in part): *No community member, staff member or student will be denied the right to complain to the Board. Complaints will be referred through the proper administrative channels for solution before investigating or action by the Board...Complaints are handled and resolved as close to their origin as possible. The proper channeling of complaints...is as follows: 1. Teacher; 2. Building principal; 3. Superintendent; and 4. Board.*
Please describe how you would handle the following situation in your role as a school Board member:
You are in the grocery store when a District employee approaches you and begins to share a

situation they are involved with at the building and is asking you to step in to help resolve the situation. What would you do?

6. Is there anything else that you would like the School Board to know?

B. Summer Planning Meeting Agenda Items

Dr. Rieke-Smith reviewed the proposed agenda for the Summer Planning Meeting scheduled for August 28, 2017:

- Board norms, roles and working agreements.
- Discuss and finalize the District's strategic plan.
- Discuss the Cabinet retreat and the Cabinet's work related to the John Kotter article.
- Discuss investment issues related to the \$8.2 billion allocation from the State of Oregon.

Chair Bishoff asked Board members to send suggestions to him for additional topics for discussion at the Summer Planning Meeting.

Dr. Hernandez added not all of the agenda items proposed by Board members were included in the agenda due to time constraints. He suggested the Board develop a parking lot be used for future Board discussions.

C. Superintendent Communication

Superintendent Sue Rieke-Smith reported in the spirit of new and renewed beginnings for the 2017-2018 school year, she wanted to share the District's ongoing commitment to equity in the District. Springfield administrators and confidential staff (SAAC), members of the Equity Cadre, TOSA Alyssa Dodds, Springfield Education Association (SEA) President Anne Goff and Monica Tapia, recently came together for two intense days of equity training with District partners from the National Equity Project (NEP).

The training focused on leadership skills that would address the following:

- Remove predictability of success or failure of students that currently correlated with race, social and economic status, and any other social or cultural factors;
- Find and end any alienating practices and create school multicultural environments for students and staff; and
- Discover and cultivate talents and interests that everyone possessed.

Dr. Rieke-Smith shared that initially, there was both staff excitement and anxiety regarding this work. She was proud that all participants leaned fully into the work and engaged in difficult conversations that challenged long held beliefs about ourselves and our students. In a conference call today with NEP, District staff shared written comments with NEP staff about the training which exuded the pride the District had taken on this challenge and provided the opportunity for this training as well as their commitment to continue to fully engage in future trainings throughout the year. She would communicate with SAAC and Equity Cadre members this week regarding next steps in developing a training schedule for the year.

In light of the tragedy that unfolded in Charlottesville, Virginia recently, Dr. Rieke-Smith was reminded of Mark Twain when he noted, "It is out of the public schools that rose the greatness of a nation." In these challenging times, the District's Equity Cadre was no longer just important, it was critical to the health, well being and success of its students, our community and our nation. Her goal was to encourage SAAC and the Equity Cadre members to share their NEP work with the Board throughout the coming year.

D. Board Communication

Dr. Emilio Hernandez, referring to Dr. Rieke-Smith's comments this evening, with all of the great work SAAC had been doing with NEP, he was concerned with the calls he had received from organizations he worked with across the county about recent events in the country, and if the District would be prepared with how community members would be pushing their school buildings to deal with those issues. He did not want

the good work being done with the buildings to be sidetracked by events at the national level and demands from community organizations that would take away from the good energy. There needed to be good communications from the buildings to the Board if issues arose.

Dr. Rieke-Smith emphasized the importance of the work was to provide skill sets and ways in which to communicate to the buildings and community. She recently met with the Latinx Alliance to discuss issues related to immigration. She said the recent events in Charlottesville, Virginia would be part of future conversations with the Latinx Alliance. It would be important for the District to continue to follow its adopted policies and procedures in this area.

Board Committee Representation

Chair Bishoff reviewed the proposed Board representation:

- Springfield Education Foundation: Mr. Bessett
- Facilities Advisory Committee: Mr. Bishoff
- Wildish Theater: Mr. Bishoff
- LCOG: Mr. Bessett

5. OTHER BUSINESS

Dr. Rieke-Smith confirmed the District would participate in the *Teaching with Purpose* Conference this fall. There would also be additional opportunities with the National Equity Project.

In response to Mr. Bishoff, Ms. Bowden confirmed that Chromebooks would be available for all Board members.

Mr. Bishoff said the Board wanted to work on wrap around services with Stand for Children this year.

6. NEXT BOARD MEETINGS: August 28, 2017, 9:00 am, Summer Planning Session
September 11, 2017, 7:00 pm Business Meeting

7. ADJOURNMENT

With no other business, Mr. Bishoff adjourned the meeting at 7:40 pm.

(Minutes recorded by Linda Henry)