

2015-16 Budget Committee Questions – May 4, 2015

	Question	Answer
1	<p>However, I would like to explore the possibility of tackling the issue from budgeting point of view at the district level.</p> <p>As I mentioned at the previous meeting, learning the basic programming skills at high school will be very helpful for the students' career readiness and a successful future life. And we can assist them to achieve the goal by using a little bit extra resource.</p> <p>Apparently the students would not have come to testify in front of the committee if the issue could be addressed at the school level. I also noticed the shortage of programming teacher at Southridge High School. As I mentioned during last meeting, the programming teacher, Velasquez, Dan, was overwhelmed by the work and he almost quit just not long ago. I understand why the Principals did not want to increase the headcounts of programming teachers given the budget. Honestly I don't believe the issue can be addressed at the school level.</p> <p>I am thinking of helping address this issue from the district level. Since there are only 5 high schools and each of them has 1-2.5 programming teachers (according to my survey), if we could add *one* more programming teacher to each of the high schools, there will be *big* increase of the programming teachers in terms of percentage increase. For example, currently Southridge has one programming teacher, adding one more will be a 100% increase.</p> <p>And the total cost to the district will be 5 teachers. Of course, we should earmark the extra budget for the positions.</p> <p>What do you think of the feasibility of the above proposal?</p>	<p>Looking at additional options to provide programming courses for students is a priority for the district. We are open to suggestions to realize this outcome for students. The suggestion to allocate additional staffing for schools to hire for these positions is a good one and yet we continue to face difficulties in finding quality candidates to teach the course. We faced this issue at one of our high schools this past summer and the principal had to finally pull the position and reallocate it to another area after several months with an active posting to solicit interested candidates. This will not stop us from working with universities and local employers to meet this need for the coming school year and will certainly support schools with appropriate staffing.</p>
2	<p>Also, roughly how much funding is needed for the 5 positions, relative to the question above?</p>	<p>It would be about \$500,000 for five teachers.</p>

	Question	Answer
3	Instructional time. There is no addition of instructional time at the 7.255B level, and from what I know about the proposed collaboration framework, no significant addition of instructional time at the 7.5B level. Please let me know if this is incorrect.	Any changes to instructional days and collaboration time must be negotiated and of course, funding must be available. The Beaverton Education Association is aware of our desire to add instructional days and collaboration time. It would require additional funding beyond the \$7.255 billion State School Fund level. It would need School Board support of a proposal made by the Professional Development Advisory Group.
4	Reducing class size. I understand the budget reflects an additional investment of \$5M that results in an average reduction of one student/class district wide. I still don't understand the other, additional investments dedicated to reducing class size. Do the total investments in reducing class size amount to at least \$13M, which is the increase in LOL (including LOL carryover)? Please clarify which of these investments would depend on Gain Share funding.	<p>We have added teachers to reduce class size:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 52 teachers added to reduce the student/teacher ratio by one student across the district • 13 music and P.E. specialists at elementary level; 6 will be used for Full Day Kindergarten and 7 at 1st - 5th grade • 26 classroom teachers for AVID, Certified Nursing Assistant (CNA), Field Biology, middle school staffing, TWI, PYP/MYP World Language, Intervention teachers at elementary; • 30 teachers for academic needs staffing; • 60 teachers added to the bank to address class size bubbles <p>None of the above would depend on Gain Share.</p>
5	Whole child instruction. There are some very positive additions in this area. Future Ready librarians (\$1M), Early College (\$___), CTE at HS level (Field Bio, CNA, Internship/job shadow) (\$___), and a small \$85k investment in PE.	See chart (below) for the Comprehensive Education Investment List.
6	Collaboration time to differentiate instruction. I understand this is a WIP for the future.	See Question #3.
7	Re question #7 and the relative increases between students, staff and administrators, thank you for the explanation, and I appreciate the limitations of space/context to fully explain such a complex issue. I also understand the need to add administrators at the new schools. At least 3 of those schools are relatively large; I would think the increase of these schools and the increase in the student population District-wide would increase efficiency at the administrator level so we would see a lower percentage, relative to students. I also appreciate the district is serving a higher number of ESL, poverty and Special Education students,	(See question # 7 from April 20 and question #49 from April 6 for context.) Based on the information about increases in student enrollment and staffing, staff would disagree. In the Proposed Budget, the District has invested a significant amount of resources directly to classrooms(teachers) in our schools.

	Question	Answer
	<p>who trigger higher (but less than adequate) levels of funding from the State/Fed. At the same time, however, we reduced many library staff. The relatively high percentage of administrators and staff during a time of increasing class size suggests we are hiring more personnel away from the classroom, which is troubling in light of the Board/community's stated priorities and generous LOL commitment.</p>	
8	<p>PERS. The committee would benefit from some comments from Jeff about how we plan to address between now and 2017.</p>	<p>We know there will be an increase to PERS expense in the 2017-19 biennium, however, we don't have specific information about the impact. The Board is discussing fund balance, a rainy day fund and planning for the future.</p>

Comprehensive Education Investments

	Amount	Elementary	Middle	High
Expand AVID to grades 7 & 10	\$ 425,000		X	X
ESL Research Group Outcomes	1,850,000	X	X	X
Data System/Early Warning System to track interventions	TBD	X	X	X
PCC - Increase Enrollment	250,000			X
PCC - CTE Options	200,000			X
Tech Support Elementary/Options	780,000	X	X	
Future Ready Libraries	1,500,000	X	X	X
Fully funded request of Active Students Task Force Pilots	85,000	X	X	
PBIS Supports/Restorative Justice and Counseling TOSA	200,000	X	X	X
Internship/Job Shadow	200,000			X
Translation Services moved to increase ELL staffing	500,000	X	X	X
Mentorship support for 1st and 2nd Year Teachers	200,000	X	X	X
Regional Licensed Clinical Social Worker	500,000	X	X	X
Full Day Kindergarten	5,200,000	X		
Increase Elementary intervention teacher to full time	1,650,000	X		
All Elementary School Counselors to full time	785,000	X		
Elementary PE/Music Teachers	510,000	X		
Increase Middle School staffing	1,200,000		X	
Middle School Secretary/Instructional Assistant staffing adjustments	410,000		X	
Two Way Immersion Staffing	400,000		X	X
High School - Testing coordinator at Option Schools	36,000			X
High School College & Career Ready Counselor at option schools	210,000			X
Year 2 of Field Biology	126,800			X
Health Careers expansion CNA	100,000			X
Young Audiences- Artists in Residence	200,000	X		
Academic Needs Based Staffing Allocation	3,150,000	X	X	X
4th Level Athletics Teams and transportation	500,000			X
Bus Driver/IA Support	450,000	X		
Lower student classroom teacher ratio	5,000,000	X	X	X
	<u>\$26,617,800</u>			