MINUTES OF THE
CANBY SCHOOL DISTRICT
BOARD OF DIRECTORS
REGULAR SESSION AND WORKSHOP SESSION
June 4, 2009

1.0 CALL TO ORDER

Marty McCullough called the Workshop Session to order at 5:35 p.m. in the Canby School District Office Meridian room. Board members in attendance were Marty McCullough, Andy Rivinus, Diane Downs, Guy Gibson, Rod Beck and Mike Harms. Dick Adams was absent from the meeting. Also in attendance were Jeff Rose, Ty Kraft, Tom Scott, Mark McDonald, Joe Morelock, John Ogden, Betty Rivinus, Maureen Callahan, Carol Meeuwsen, Hank Harris, David Moore and Kristin Downs.

2.0 INTRODUCTIONS followed.

3.0 CHANGES TO AGENDA
The following items were added to the agenda:
  6.6 Parent letter
  6.7 Superintendent Evaluation
  6.8 Professional Development Opportunity

4.0 PUBLIC FORUM/ANNOUNCEMENTS-None

5.0 CONSENT AGENDA

  5.1 Consent agenda: Rod moved to approve the consent agenda as presented with Andy Rivinus seconding the motion. Diane Downs commented that Linda Dorton would be missed as she was a fabulous teacher and great addition to the District. Unanimously approved 6-0 with Dick Adams absent.

  5.2 Community Prevention Program: Betty Rivinus presented information about the PreventNet Program implemented at BPMS for a year. Erik Johnston, Todos Juntos, and Mark McDonald, Clackamas County Juvenile Department, were present to explain the roles of their organizations in the program. Betty explained that PreventNet is a model for gang prevention via student interventions and to connect with families to cooperatively influence student behavior. Middle school is found to be the most influential time to make a difference in their lives. This program also fits with the responses for gang activity in place at CHS. Mark noted that the model at BPMS has been the best; one that would be a dream to have in the other locations. Funding for the program comes from a federal grant. The goal is to try to make the program sustainable as grant dollars go away.

  6.2 BPMS Model Update: Jeff and Betty updated the Board on process and discussions to review the three-year model at BPMS to
Betty reported that it was always intended to review the model after the first three years. The review began at the beginning of the school year along with the introduction of the PLC model district wide. Jeff and Maureen helped to develop the process for the review that included staff and initiatives. Staff saw the changes, a new principal, full staff collaboration, staff and budget cuts as having an impact on the BMPS model. Staff compiled a list of 18 initiatives they felt responsible for and then reduced to six. Data showed that the 6-8th grade wing model did not support the 6th graders well enough and that Carus 6th grade entering one year later was a problem.

A revised model in effect beginning 2009-10 would be organized with one 6th grade wing and two 7th-8th grade wings. Each wing will have endorsed teachers in all areas with specialists and share a single planning area. The zero-based budget process was the impetus for the new model. New teams are already working together for curriculum mapping. Betty said that everyone is moving to the new model, not at the same speed, but getting there. It was determined that new teachers would always need to gain an understanding of the process so that will be done first in this new model.

Diane expressed concern regarding the lack of information about the review in comparison to the extent of publicity surrounding the initial model in place when BPMS opened. Marty asked why the first model wasn’t a success. Betty said that it was a combination of different models versus a single model replicated. Areas of concern that caused the shift were the scheduling model versus reality; flat state testing scores; wing grade range too wide and recognizing need to teach 6th grade differently than a 6-8 classroom; and shifts causing a need for change.

6.3 Technology Conversation: Joe Morelock reviewed the reasons for proposed Board Policy updates regarding technology on the agenda for first reading. Recommended changes come as a result of new digital content available, audio books versus paper versions, changing methods of collaboration, etc. Joe commented the goal should be to teach kids to develop the skills of being an agile learner.

6.4 Policies First Reading: All proposed policy changes were reviewed with recommended edits suggested by the Board. Recommended changes were noted. Jeff will review Policy JHFE in light of Mandatory Reporter requirements and in comparison to paragraph four of this policy.

6.5 Budget Update: Jeff reported that the newest budget dilemma is that Oregon’s latest projected range for K-12 funding is between $5.6 and $6.0 billion and is based on new legislative tax initiatives with the actual revenue not known until March 2010. Questions remain about the future tax initiatives and impact of the economy.
Diane suggested that the district stay with $5.6 level funding to budget and rely on ending fund balance if necessary. Andy said it’s not a difficult decision to make as we can’t spend money we don’t have. If we get more money than we think, we will figure that out. Mike asked about the difference between the $5.4 level the budget is currently built on and $5.6 funding. This level would add two days back into the calendar for staff and the equivalent of 9 teaching positions.

**MOTION:** Rod Beck made a motion to “Direct administration to base its budget on $5.6 billion state K-12 funding level until we hear solid information from the state to move to a different number.” Diane Downs seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously 6-0.

Discussion was held regarding adding back from the proposed budget based on $5.4 billion. Jeff reported that the conversation was starting the next morning at 7am to look at potential additions. The majority of community feedback regarding budget reductions centered around K-5 music and PE as well as class sizes. The music/PE cut that was based on a hybrid model with fewer FTE rather than the current program. Mike asked about adding back the agriculture program. Jeff said that music/PE was the first priority and any remaining additions would likely be considered to support the K-12 system. Guy clarified that principals ‘built a new school model’ for music/PE so that’s the starting place, not the old model. It was noted that the hybrid model would return five staff.

**6.6 Professional Development Opportunity:** Maureen explained the professional development training based on the book “Focus on Results” will occur on June 22 and 23. The first day will entail taking the group from where our district is currently to the collaborative learning model. The second day small groups will meet for conversations centered on the book. Board members are invited to a session with the trainer on June 23. New board members are invited to participate.

**6.7 Draft Letter:** Marty presented an opportunity for board feedback regarding a parent letter she wrote in response to an earlier letter received by the board from the same parent. The board thought the letter was appropriate.

**6.8 Superintendent Evaluation:** Diane presented a handout with review questions outlined and asked if other participants beyond board members should be included in the evaluation. Jeff said he was interested in hearing from other people—the board is critical and thinks that other people in the district and community are as well, to know how he’s serving teachers, admin team, etc. Rod suggested they add the admin team this year and staff next year. Andy said no one should participate if they’re not willing to put their name on the evaluation. Marty said she made a commitment to admin team in March. Jeff asked that the board survey be done with admin team but that N/A answer option be added. Jeff was concerned that waiting until next year for other responders leaves out input on his performance under difficult circumstances, such
as his first year as superintendent, a new community, and the year. He thought principals could have two staff and two parents respond as a sampling. Marty suggested that the March survey be used.

The board agreed that the evaluation would be two-tiered: 1. Board and administrative team; and 2. Marty will work with principals to get more input that wasn’t necessarily connected to the same timeline as the first tier.

Calendar Update: A meeting was held with all kinds of employees to create a K-12 infrastructure to go further with the collaborative process and the need to carve out time to accomplish the goals of the process. Jeff was pleased with what came out to adjust the calendar/times on certain days. It was noted that the possible late start might be a hardship for parents. One of the items to check out still is the need for the high school to move from using Carnegie units for credit to awarding credit for proficiency if the district implements a late start model.

Jeff reported that a proposed plan will be provided to the board on June 9 most likely. He noted that getting K-12 time for this process is a monumental achievement. Maureen stated that the kind of work staff will be asked to do will alter student instruction. Other districts have shifted schedules but they haven’t done this K-12 model. Once remaining questions are answered in the development of the calendar shift, specifics will come to the board before being rolled out to the community.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:15pm and will convene into Executive Session after a short break.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Marty McCullough called the Executive Session to order at 9:20 p.m. Board members in attendance were Marty McCullough, Diane Downs, Guy Gibson, Andy Rivinus, Rod Beck and Mike Harms. Also in attendance were Jeff Rose, Maureen Callahan and Carol Meeuwsen. Dick Adams was absent from the meeting.

The meeting was held in accordance with ORS 192.660 (2) (a). It is requested information discussed in the Executive Session not be disclosed.

The session was held to consider the employment of a public officer.

The Executive Session adjourned at 9:50 p.m.

Signed, Carol Meeuwsen