

MINUTES

Equity Committee Meeting
Eugene Public Schools District 4J
200 North Monroe
Parr Room

January 24, 2011
4:30 p.m.

PRESENT: Marshall Peter, Chair, Chair; Carl Hermanns, Co-Chair; Guadalupe Quinn, Sarah Lauer, Raquel Wells, Tibor Bessko, Sara Cramer, Brie Stiller, Anne Marie Levis, members. Carmen Urbina, staff, Ali Groberg, guest.

ABSENT: Remie Calalang, Michael Carrigan, Ann Christianson, Sascha Cosio, Jim Garcia, Jennifer Geller, Andy Gottesman, Linda Hamilton, Alicia Hays, Misa Joo, Joel Lavin, Charles Martinez, Belinda McClain, Jerry Rosiek, Sarah Ross, George Russell, Linda Smart, Larry Soberman, Surendra Subramani, Maria Thomas, Peter Tromba, Jane Waite,

Welcome and Introductions

Mr. Peter called the meeting to order at 4:40 p.m. He noted that the cost of minutes would go up if more than one person spoke at once. He encouraged people to speak one at a time.

Mr. Peter welcomed Ali Groberg, a co-representative from the Natives Program.

Ms. Groberg thanked Mr. Peter and explained that her first name was pronounced like Mohammed Ali's last name.

Those present introduced themselves.

Mr. Peter referred to the invitations to the NAACP 2011 Freedom Fund Dinner and to the first annual Blacks in Government Black History Month celebration, distributed during the meeting. The school district would not be sponsoring Equity Committee members' attendance at these events as they had in the past. He encouraged all to attend either or both, anyway.

Ms. Cramer noted that the district was sponsoring students to attend.

Ms. Wells arrived at 4:43 p.m.

Mr. Peter referred to and reviewed the written version of the remarks he had made on behalf of the Equity Committee on January 19 at the 4J school board meeting.

Ms. Levis explained that Mr. Peter had been mentioned in the comments at the end of the meeting because he had put focus on equity issues. The board needed this.

Mr. Peter explained that he had been approached by **Nancy Willard**, who had asked if the Equity Committee was interested in receiving a presentation from her. He had told her he did not feel comfortable adjusting the agenda for the last meeting, and felt that because there was a pending **OCR** complaint, he was not sure it would be appropriate for the committee to receive her presentation. He invited her to speak during the public comment period at an Equity Committee meeting. Ms. **Willard** had seemed comfortable

with this suggestion.

Ms. Quinn thought this was an appropriate response.

Mr. Peter noted that the Equity Committee had hoped to speak with Celia Feres-Johnson from HR, but staff had been unable to connect with her. Hopefully, she would attend the February meeting.

Mr. Peter had also spoken with Dayna Mitchell from the Eugene Education Association and asked her to present to the group, and for the group to present to her. He indicated to Ms. Mitchell that it was the Equity Committee's interest to have a positive relationship with her and to communicate with EEA.

Ms. Wells encouraged Mr. Peter to repeat this before Ms. Mitchell appeared before the Committee.

Mr. Hermanns announced that he would have to leave at 5 p.m.

II. Bullying and Harassment in the 4J School District

Ms. Stiller distributed and reviewed a PowerPoint titled *Bullying and Harassment in the 4J School District: District Report for 2009-2010 School year November 2010*. She noted that there were three district reports – one for the whole district (all 12 secondary schools that took the survey); one that combined the four high schools and one that combined the eight middle schools.

Ms. Urbina asked for a history of how the surveys and reports came to be.

Ms. Stiller explained that during her first few years on the Equity Committee, when she became 4J's Behavior Support Coordinator, she had been trying to study bullying by examining office discipline referral data. She and her colleagues felt that this data vastly under-represented the number of incidents having to do with harassment and bullying. Therefore, she and her colleagues began lobbying for permission to survey students about harassment and bullying.

During the 2008-2009 school year, she and her colleagues did a pilot survey with four schools (one high school and three middle schools). This survey verified what many on the Equity Committee already knew – that harassment and bullying was a significant problem, from the point of view of students. Under the district's definition, which was provided to students who took the survey, over 40 percent of students indicated that they had been bullied or harassed one or more times in the previous year (if severe teasing was included as a form of harassment).

The survey was revised and improved, and administered in all four high schools and eight middle schools in June 2010. At each school, one- to two-thirds of all students took the survey. Each school received a report specific to their school. 4J asked Oregon Social Learning Center (OSLC) to combine the data so that district-wide data could be studied. The result was the report *Bullying and Harassment in the 4J School District: District Report for 2009-2010 School year November 2010*.

Mr. Peter asked about the samples of students surveyed – was it random?

Ms. Stiller said that the samples were pretty random.

Mr. Peter asked Ms. Stiller if she thought the sample was representative.

Ms. Stiller thought that it was. The sample was a little bit more diverse, ethnically, than the 4J student

population as a whole. In the high school survey, students were asked if they identified as LGBTQ (if they felt comfortable doing so). She was surprised that about nine percent indicated that they did.

Unfortunately, OSLC was having trouble separating the data out so that specific ethnic group's responses could be examined. OSLC was also having trouble separating out data and responses specific to students who identified as LGBTQ. OSLC was being very generous with their time and she appreciated this.

Ms. Groberg asked if completing the survey was optional for students.

Ms. Stiller said that it was.

Ms. Groberg asked how many students had opted not to participate in the survey.

Ms. Stiller said a very small percentage of students had opted not to participate. In most schools, it had been less than three percent. Up to five percent of students opted not to answer certain questions. In addition, parents had the option to request that their child not complete the survey. Students could also choose not to answer any question they did not want to answer.

Mr. Peter asked how many parents requested that their child not complete the survey.

Ms. Stiller said she was not aware of any.

Mr. Peter said this was important data for the Equity Committee to consider as they deliberated the future of the survey.

Ms. Stiller said that some parents had made suggestions about certain items to be added to the survey.

Ms. Groberg noted that the report noted that, for ethnicity, Native American was an option but Alaska Native was not. She explained that her children would identify as Alaska Native. She asked if it could be changed to "Native American/Alaska Native." This was how Alaska Natives were counted in the U.S. Census.

Ms. Stiller said that Multi-Racial was an option, and that she would provide Ms. Groberg with a copy of the survey.

Ms. Groberg said it was important to include Alaska Native so that data would be more fair and detailed. She said she encouraged all Alaska Natives to check that ethnicity since there were fewer Alaska Natives than there were Native Americans in the lower 48 states.

Ms. Stiller and Mr. Bessko noted that Mr. Bessko would write down comments and suggestions from the group to use to update the next iteration of the survey.

Ms. Stiller continued to review the report.

Ms. Wells encouraged Ms. Stiller to change the font color from white to black on the report charts so that it would not be washed out in the photocopying process.

Ms. Stiller said about nine percent of students indicated they were Multi-Racial.

Ms. Wells noted that one of the ethnicity options was "Other (please specify)." She asked Ms. Stiller to

share what students had written.

Ms. Stiller did not know.

Ms. Wells asked that she find that out from OSLC.

Ms. Stiller said it was hard to collect written responses, since all of the data had been analyzed electronically.

Ms. Wells stated that the data was important since the survey had given students the option to specify, and those students and their ethnicities needed to be counted.

Ms. Stiller noted that most students who chose “Other” had not specified their ethnicity.

Mr. Peter thought this was a good discussion. He said it was possible to get the written responses with SurveyMonkey, the website used to conduct the surveys. He said that the Equity Committee had to decide if they wanted the district to include comments fields on the survey in the future.

Ms. Cramer said that it was possible, with SurveyMonkey, to prevent a survey taker from progressing to the next question if they had not filled in a particular comment field. She thought this could help the district procure this type of information from students.

Ms. Wells noted that “No Response” was another option on the question. However, choosing “Other” was a response. Therefore, she wished to know what these respondents had written in the comment field.

Ms. Stiller reviewed the LGBTQ survey data (how many students had indicated that they identified as LGBTQ).

Ms. Wells asked if the term “LGBTQ” had been defined in the survey.

Ms. Stiller said that the question read something similar to “We are interested in knowing whether our schools are safe for students who identify as lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer or questioning. If you feel comfortable doing so, please indicate if you identify as lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer or questioning.” Nine percent of survey respondents chose not to answer the question. Eighty-three percent identified as heterosexual.

Ms. Stiller continued to review the report.

Referring to the “Safety and Respect” slide, Mr. Peter asked if the first bar meant that 744 students stated on the survey that they “rarely feel safe from physical harm, intimidation or threats at school.”

Ms. Stiller said that this was true.

Mr. Peter asked if there was anything that would cause anyone to believe there had been an attempt to manipulate the responses.

Ms. Stiller said she had no reason to believe that, and that the proctors had been instructed to read the survey directions verbatim. Proctors had been given detailed written instructions on paper. These detailed instructions were also embedded in the survey.

Ms. Wells asked if the questions outlined on the first “Safety and Respect” slide were either/or questions.

Ms. Stiller explained that there were four response options for each question. For the report, “always” and “often” responses had been combined, as had “never” and “rarely.”

Mr. Peter asked if this meant that in the “rarely” category on the slide, there was a subgroup that “never” felt safe.

Ms. Stiller said that this was correct, although those who responded that they “never” felt safe made up the smallest group of respondents. Those who responded that they “always” felt safe were also small in number. The largest groups were made up of students who felt safe either “rarely” or “often.”

Ms. Stiller continued to review the report. She noted that, when the data was broken up by grade level, high school data was generally more positive than middle school data across all questions. This explained why middle school level bullying prevention was more prevalent than bullying prevention at the high school level. However, bullying was still a significant problem in high schools.

Ms. Cramer noted that the “n” numbers were helpful to know, referring to the “teasing” column on the second “Safety and Respect” slide, as 29.21 percent of respondents at the high school level equaled 969 respondents, whereas 19.07 percent of respondents at the middle school level equaled 320 students.

Ms. Wells, referring to the first “Bullied or Harassed” slide asked if “rarely” meant that respondents never observed what the question asked about, and “often” meant they observed it.

Ms. Stiller said that this was correct (I believe “rarely” meant “rarely OR never”). She noted that the use of profanity was a problem.

Ms. Wells asked if the phrase “that's so gay” was defined as profanity.

Ms. Stiller said that the phrase was not included as a statement of harassment toward gay people. The examples students were given with respect to harassment based on LGBTQ status (or perceived status) were the anti-gay slurs “d***” and “f**.” This had been intentional, because 100 percent of students used the phrase “that's so gay.”

Ms. Wells said the expression was directed not only toward LGBTQ youth, but also toward the children of LGBTQ parents. This created a particular climate.

Ms. Stiller agreed that it was not acceptable, and that adults had to intervene.

Ms. Urbina asked if using the word “retarded” in a derogatory way was included in the data.

Ms. Stiller said that that data was shown in a later slide. She continued to review the report.

Ms. Urbina asked how many students took the survey.

Ms. Stiller said between 7,000 and 8,000 students completed the survey.

Ms. Lauer asked how many of those who took the survey were high school students.

Ms. Stiller explained that about 1,600 to 1,700 high school students took the survey, and about 5,000

middle school students took the survey. She noted that about half of survey respondents had reported being either bullied or harassed in the previous academic year.

Ms. Urbina said that the data amplified what district staff was hearing from students.

Ms. Stiller noted that what occurred between students when they were off their guard was a constant stream of insults. It was hard for them to understand when their words hurt their peers. Children “shook off” most of what they heard.

Ms. Cramer noted that the ages studied were ages at which students struggled with understanding what was appropriate and what was going too far.

Ms. Groberg attributed this to media. She said it was increasing.

Ms. Stiller stated that adults were not modeling good behavior or skills, or effective skills for how to handle it in appropriate, healthy ways.

Ms. Urbina agreed.

Ms. Quinn asked if the report showed where the harassment or bullying came from.

Ms. Stiller said that some parents had asked that staff-on-student bullying questions be included on the next survey. She asked that she, Ms. Urbina and Mr. Bessko work together to craft a question about this for the following year's survey.

Ms. Quinn agreed. She did not think it was okay for students to be afraid of adults in the school environment. Students were less likely to report this type of bullying, especially if they were a Latino and or immigrant student.

Ms. Stiller noted that the question on the existing survey that came closest to this was a question about whether or not “adults treat me with respect.” Most students indicated that they did, but more than she had hoped had answered “no.”

Ms. Groberg asked if a question could be asked about teachers or staff members harassing each other.

Ms. Stiller knew that staff members harassed each other, but wondered if they did it in front of students.

Ms. Groberg explained that some of her four children, all of whom were in the 4J school district, had witnessed it.

Ms. Wells wondered if there should be a staff climate survey.

Mr. Peter announced that Equity Youth Educators, student groups in all four high schools (EYEs), would not be able to attend the meeting.

Mr. Bessko noted that Minority Student Achievement Network was now called “courageous conversations.” It was a class.

Ms. Wells asked for a list of all acronyms used at the 4J district. She also asked for a list of student groups and the purpose and objective of each.

Ms. Urbina said she would get that to her. She said she would include it to the Equity newsletter. It was currently sent to staff. She would send all five issues to the Equity Committee.

Ms. Levis requested to see them as well.

Ms. Stiller continued to review the report.

Ms. Cramer and Ms. Wells thought the number of students who had been technologically bullied would have been higher.

Ms. Stiller noted that technological bullying was more vicious than other forms.

Ms. Levis noted that if bullying occurred in one format, it was probably occurring in others as well.

Ms. Wells noted that some of the survey questions were gendered – girls bullied differently than boys did. Girls’ bullying was non-verbal, and included indirect bullying and exclusion.

Ms. Stiller noted that these activities were given as examples on the survey under “verbal.”

Ms. Stiller noted that OSLC had used a collapsed scale to portray the percentages on the survey, which was deceptive.

Mr. Peter agreed and wondered if OSLC could change it.

Ms. Stiller said she would work on it.

Ms. Levis and Ms. Cramer left to attend the 4J Budget Committee meeting at 5:30 p.m.

Ms. Stiller said that she and Mr. Bessko had been working on a district action plan that systematically addressed consistent adult interruption and response to bullying. She noted that students did not receive a mixed message about the inappropriateness of using racial slurs. Therefore, the fact that the survey indicated that 32 percent of survey respondents indicated that they observed this type of harassment once a month or more was not a good thing.

Ms. Cramer indicated that “that’s so gay” needed to be included in what counted as harassment against LGBTQ individuals.

Ms. Stiller said she would include it, and said it would make the harassment numbers in that category go “way up.”

Mr. Peter wanted stable benchmark data to compare over the years so that it could be determined whether things were getting better or worse. Some of this would be lost if survey questions were changed each year.

Ms. Stiller explained that she had not included it initially because she wanted to differentiate between the more vicious harassment and bullying and the “every day” language used.

Ms. Urbina noted that the district was not saying that the phrase was not hurtful.

Ms. Wells thought allowing this phrase created a culture where more vicious attacks were used. However, consistency across time was also important, to determine whether interventions were working.

Ms. Stiller agreed. She said that in the action teaching plan she and her colleagues were working on, adults would be taught that the phrase was absolutely unacceptable and adults needed to interrupt students they heard using it. If the survey was changed to match this, it would just mean that the baseline data would start next year.

Ms. Lauer suggested differentiating questions so that the phrases “that’s so gay” and “that’s so retarded” were specifically asked about rather than as part of a more general question about harassment. The more general question could also be asked. This would let students know that those phrases were also considered harassment.

Ms. Stiller and Ms. Quinn thought this was a good suggestion.

Ms. Quinn agreed that asking that question would let students know that those phrases were also considered harassment and were not acceptable.

Ms. Lauer referred to the meeting with the principals during which some principals had balked at allowing students to identify as LGBTQ at the middle school level.

Ms. Stiller said that it was not only the principals who had felt this way. Some principals accepted it. Some of the directors objected to it. Superintendent Russell’s Student Advisory Committee did not think it was a good idea. They had pointed out that many students at the middle school level might not even know if they identified as LGBTQ.

Ms. Lauer strongly recommended allowing middle school students to identify as LGBTQ, at least at the eighth grade level.

From Mr. Peter’s perspective, the Equity Committee had to consider three things: whether to modify the survey and who would do it; whether to add comment fields and what to do with the comments data. Last year, the Equity Committee had unanimously supported adding comments fields, but it had been too late. There was also the feeling that some might feel ambushed by such a late addition to the survey.

Ms. Stiller said that the survey had been administered in June of 2010. A finalized survey needed to be completed by May 1, 2011. Appropriate groups (the Equity Committee and Instructional Leadership) needed to have input.

Ms. Urbina thanked the Equity Committee for their patience in the process. She thanked Ms. Stiller for her work on the survey. No other school district was doing this type of work. Now, the opportunity to expand the survey existed. One of the students of the Superintendent’s Student Advisory Committee, **Armando**, had come up with a beautiful phrase to suggest **including the question about LGBTQ status** in the survey administered at the middle school level. She asked Ms. Stiller what he had said.

Ms. Stiller could not recall. The phrase was similar to what ended up in the high school version of the survey. She thought including the question in the middle school version of the survey should be revisited.

Ms. Lauer noted that many students were starting to come out as LGBTQ at the middle school level. She thought many students would know by the time they were in sixth or seventh grade whether or not they were LGBTQ.

Ms. Wells thought middle school students were more in the questioning stage.

Mr. Peter did not think there were enough people present at the meeting to make a decision on a recommendation. He wanted to discuss strategic ways to move forward.

Ms. Urbina proposed continuing the presentation. She, Mr. Bessko and Ms. Stiller would bring forward an appropriate proposal in terms of capacity and staff in the district. She said that the district was fortunate to have OSLC and Ms. Stiller performing the work.

Mr. Peter asked what OSLC was doing for the district.

Ms. Stiller said that she had given them the original data files from each of the schools, and OSLC had been analyzing them.

Mr. Peter thought SurveyMonkey could produce similar reports.

Ms. Stiller agreed. She believed help would be needed on grouping responses per group (i.e. ethnicity, LGBTQ status, etc.)

Mr. Peter thought SurveyMonkey could also do this. He thought Ms. Lauer's suggestion was a good one.

Ms. Lauer left at 5:42 pm

Ms. Wells said it was important to ask the question because it normalized it. It was less important in terms of the responses received. Normalizing LGBTQ people and people with differing abilities was one of the strategies of the survey. She noted again that if a student chose "straight" it did not mean they were not harassed because of perceived sexual orientation or the sexual orientation of their family members. Perhaps a question could be written that addressed this.

Ms. Stiller agreed. She thought the Equity Committee should come up with proposals for changes to the survey. She thought the survey should remain the same to the extent possible, with a few modifications. This needed to be done within the next month, because it needed to go through Instructional Leadership. This group would approve it or direct staff to take it through principal groups. She suggested having it ready by March 1.

Ms. Wells suggested leaving most of the core questions as is. She also suggested that, if it came back to the Equity Committee, that they be encouraged not to add too many more questions. Some students would not complete the entire survey if it was too long.

Ms. Wells, referring to the "When Bullying Occurs in School" slide, asked if bullying occurred after school off campus or on campus.

Ms. Stiller said that it occurred both on school grounds and off campus (including on the bus).

Ms. Wells asked for more clarity on this question in terms of location.

Ms. Stiller referred to the slides related to "Where Bullying Occurs."

Ms. Quinn said this was good information.

Ms. Stiller said that bullying occurred in the classroom more than would be expected.

Ms. Wells asked if it was true that most bullying occurred at lunch, in the hallways, at bus stops and on the bus.

Ms. Stiller said this was true.

Ms. Urbina said that bullying occurred when students perceived that adults were not observing them or not present.

Ms. Wells noted that fewer adults were available with 4J budget cuts. She thought this story needed to be told. She anticipated a growing incidence of this as staffing cuts continued to be made.

Ms. Urbina said that the district was trying to make clear that any of this behavior would not be tolerated, and that there would be consequences. At some schools, students were taking action. This needed to happen for school cultures to change.

Ms. Stiller said that she was anxious to see the data from Arts and Technology Academy at Jefferson Middle School, Madison Middle School and Kelly Middle School at the end of the year, since each of these schools were making major efforts to stop bullying and harassment.

Ms. Urbina noted that the economic hardships occurring in the country were affecting students' home lives, and they were manifesting this in the classroom.

Ms. Stiller stated that students should be encouraged to have a clear "stop" signal when they felt upset by another person's behavior. That was part of what the program she and Mr. Bessko were developing would do.

Ms. Stiller, referring to the "Reporting Bullying" slide, noted that 67 percent of respondents had indicated that "staff members would listen and support" them if they reported bullying.

Ms. Wells thought this was developmentally appropriate. Sometimes, students reported that they would talk to a parent.

Ms. Stiller said that the question about talking to parents about bullying had about the same result.

Ms. Wells asked if there was a question asking respondents if they talked to each other about bullying.

Ms. Stiller said that there was, and that the same results occurred for the question about whether or not students felt it was helpful to talk to friends about bullying. They also indicated that it was not as helpful as talking to an adult.

Referring to the "Bystanders and Bullying" slide, Ms. Wells noted that "walk[ing] away or say[ing] or do[ing] nothing to encourage the person who is doing the bullying" was a form of participation in bullying.

Mr. Peter thought it "horrible" that 21 percent of respondents indicated that they "join in with the person who is doing the bullying or harassing."

Ms. Wells thought it would be interesting to try to anticipate how many students would answer particular

questions a particular way. She also thought it interesting that a minority of students felt that “tell[ing] the person who is bullying to stop” would most likely solve the problem.

Ms. Groberg thought that this might depend on how many other students were telling the person who was bullying to stop.

Ms. Stiller thought that this might be due to the fact that a culture that supported this action had not been built.

Ms. Quinn and Ms. Wells agreed.

Ms. Stiller said that the program she was developing included detailed coaching steps for adults to follow so that students did feel more supported.

Ms. Wells asked if individual schools had received their survey report, and whether or not certain schools seemed to have a higher prevalence of bullying and harassment than others.

Ms. Stiller said that schools had received their reports. Schools in the south region had significantly lower rates of harassment than others. The rest of the schools had about the same level of bullying and harassment. Most staffs were “surprised and dismayed” about their school’s data.

Ms. Quinn thought this might encourage staff members to try to change their schools’ climates.

Ms. Quinn and Ms. Stiller noted that the entire community had to be involved in working to change school climates.

Ms. Quinn said that many students reported to her that teachers didn’t do anything when bullying occurred. She said that the reason for this needed to be determined in order to change it.

Ms. Stiller again mentioned the district action plan she, Mr. Bessko and Ms. Urbina were working on in order to address these issues systematically. It was a matter of getting approval to move forward with this. She knew Mr. Hermanns was very supportive.

Ms. Quinn said that the messages students received needed to be consistent across the district. This was currently lacking.

Ms. Stiller agreed. She hoped to help staff and teachers learn how to be consistent about addressing bullying and harassment.

Ms. Stiller referred to the slide titled “Comparison Pilot Year v. 2009-2010: Bullying and Harassment.” She said that she had compiled the chart. She noted that the samples used in the two years were not the same. The 2009-2010 sample was representative. The pilot year’s sample was based on only four schools, with about one third of the sample made up of Kelly Middle School students. Therefore, there was a sampling bias towards worst results in the pilot year. Part of the proposed action plan would be to ask schools to use this data to analyze whether their programs were effective year after year. She noted that harassment observed on the basis of race had gone up significantly between the pilot year and 2009-2010.

Mr. Peter asked if this could have something to do with the sample being made up of a less diverse population in 2009-2010.

Ms. Stiller noted that, actually, bullying and harassment was reported less at South Eugene High School, Spencer Butte Middle School and Roosevelt Middle School. Roosevelt had implemented some effective programs. She assumed there was a carryover affect of this into South Eugene High School.

Ms. Urbina noted that there was intentionality around respect for others related to race and other factors at Roosevelt Middle School. She referred to their “RMS” motto: “Responsible Choices, Modeling Respect and Successful Learning.” South Eugene had also had intentional conversations about race, and had engaged parents, teachers and students.

Ms. Wells noted that these were all south schools. She asked where most of the students of color attended.

Ms. Urbina said that most students of color attended North and Churchill.

Ms. Wells said that it was of concern that predominantly white schools were focused on race whereas the schools students of color attended were not.

Ms. Urbina said that Kelly Middle School and North were also doing programs related to equity and race.

Ms. Wells said that most of the examples people heard about were predominantly white schools.

Ms. Stiller said all of the middle schools were focusing on bullying prevention. She said that programs were effective only when student bodies were mobilized and involved.

Ms. Quinn agreed.

Ms. Urbina reiterated that the entire community needed to be involved. She wanted the community norm of acceptability to shift.

Ms. Wells said this was happening through the Interagency Diversity and Equity Coalition (IDEC).

Ms. Groberg asked how many of 4J’s elementary schools had programs related to bullying and harassment.

Ms. Wells and Ms. Stiller said that most did.

Ms. Urbina noted that, usually, more people attended Equity Committee meetings than were present at this one. She said she proposed inviting Equity Committee members to see Ms. Stiller’s presentation of the ***Bullying and Harassment in the 4J School District: District Report for 2009-2010 School year November 2010*** before the next meeting. A summary of the comments made at this meeting would also be presented.

Ms. Groberg suggested that members who saw the presentation next time could write comments as the presentation was made, and give them to staff.

Ms. Stiller thought this was a good idea.

Mr. Peter said that Equity Committee recommendations were important, as was time to discuss and make them.

Ms. Stiller said a subcommittee of people who were interested in the survey could work on

recommendations.

Ms. Urbina proposed making the following Equity Committee meeting 30 minutes longer.

Mr. Peter was not sure this was a good idea. He asked that EYES be invited to present at the March meeting.

Ms. Urbina needed a subcommittee to help work on equity data and report with Matt Hayes, because Jim Conahan had resigned.

Ms. Wells volunteered to help. She left at 6:21 p.m.

Mr. Peter was willing to help, but was very busy. He asked for Mr. Conahan's contact information.

Ms. Groberg suggested having a card for people to sign at the next meeting to thank Mr. Conahan for his work. She noted that Native American academic levels have dropped since **the consortium** had broken up. Tutoring services no longer existed. She asked if the Equity Committee could address that.

Ms. Urbina and Mr. Peter suggested she ask that it be put on a meeting agenda, and that it could be addressed by the Committee.

Ms. Quinn and Ms. Urbina thought it was an important issue to address.

Mr. Peter said that part of the data the Committee would address would be disaggregated academic performance and other data broken down by ethnicity. He asked if she was interested in working on this.

Ms. Groberg asked that this opportunity be presented to **Brenda Brainard and Laura**.

Mr. Peter said that each group only had one representative.

Ms. Groberg said that she had been told that groups always had two.

Mr. Peter said that his recollection was that unless there were specific topics, a single representative represented each group. He asked her to check with Mr. Brener. He worried that the program would suffer if knowledge was spread over more than one representative. He thanked her for her participation and impact on the Committee.

Mr. Peter adjourned the meeting at 6:28 p.m.

(Recorded by Katie Dettman)