

Budget Committee Questions & Responses

4.7.16 Meeting

1a. Question

Investment Report (IR): Learning Teams -- In the row for Metrics Description, you mention a district survey. What were the response rates in 2013-14 and 2014-15?

1b. Answer –

The response rate for the certified staff survey was 57% in 2013-14 and 48% in 2014-15.

2a. Question –

Investment Report (IR): Educator Effectiveness -- In the row for Teach for Beaverton, are the percentages shown in the Metrics columns the difference between the overall percentage of students of color and teachers of color in the district, or are they the largest gap between one category of students of color and teachers of that same category?

2b. Answer –

It is the difference between the overall percentage of students of color and teachers of color.

3a. Question –

On Investment Report (IV below): Comprehensive Education -- Why are there no metrics for the Terra Nova Program and Comprehensive HS CTE Programs?

3b. Answer –

Currently, no Terra Nova students earn CTE credits as a part of this Program because it is not an official “Program of Study” recognized by the state. We are adding courses to the program and the teachers are working through the process to become CTE certified. For the Comprehensive High School Program, it’s simply the total number of high school students in BSD who have earned CTE credits over the previous two years.

4a. Question –

On IV: Comprehensive Education -- In the row for Elementary Visual Arts, there's mention of a Fine Arts Project Team. There's no funding shown. Is there truly no cost for that activity?

Budget Committee Questions & Responses

4.7.16 Meeting

4b. Answer –

We are currently building a schedule for future adoptions. We do not anticipate Elementary having a Visual Arts project team next year.

5a. Question –

On IV: Comprehensive Educ -- In the row for Elementary PE, all schools are listed in the 2013-14 and 2014-15 metrics, but then it goes down to 15 schools in 2015-16. Is that really correct?

5b. Answer –

In 15-16, 15 of the elementary schools received additional PE allocation.

6a. Question –

On IV: Comprehensive Educ -- In the row for standardized middle school opportunities, the 2016-17 metric says that MS staffs and communities will consider the proposal that is being developed in the current school year. That seems awfully weak. Is it not time to commit to ensuring that by the 2017-18 school year, there will be guaranteed and viable access to arts, PE and world languages at all middle schools? If so, it seems that the metric ought to be something more specific than simply the "consideration" of a proposal.

6b. Answer –

The Standardized Middle School Experience Committee is currently working through the complex issues of which elective options should exist at each school. Topics under discussion: whether students should be required to experience each or choose their own pursuits, how often and for how long each day each elective option should meet to ensure an appropriate experience, how to build in elective options for students who have additional required courses, how elective options should fit into a limited number of instructional minutes within a school day, and, how to honor school community specific desires. Historically, all of these decisions have rested at the school level and any move toward a more consistent program needs to be collaborative and allow for school communities to weigh in on the work.

Budget Committee Questions & Responses

4.7.16 Meeting

7a. Question –

Investment Report (IR): Standards Based Learning System -- In the row for Quality Curriculum Cycle, the Metrics Description relies on a teacher survey. What was the response rate for 2015-16, and when is the 2015-16 survey being administered?

7b. Answer –

The response rate for the certified staff survey was 48% in 2014-15. The 2015-16 surveys are currently open and will close at the end of April.

8a. Question –

IR: Stds Based Learning System -- In the row for Math/Science Interventions (9th grade), the metrics show a decline over time in the percentage of 9th graders taking math who earn a credit with a grade of C or better. What is the district doing to try to figure out the cause for that?

8b. Answer –

This is one of the biggest reasons we are realigning our secondary math curriculum to an integrated series of Algebra/Geometry/Statistics I, II, and III. Next year, all secondary schools will be transitioning to this sequence, including support classes or programs outlined for those students who need more attention and/or service. We have quite a bit of summer and fall professional development scheduled for math teachers to support this curriculum transition.

In addition, this is only the second year these dollars have been available and the 2015-16 data is for first semester only. These percentages could increase slightly as students earn or improve scores for first semester during the second semester time period (thus, a standards-based system).

9a. Question –

IR: Stds Based Learning System -- In the row for Evening Academy, there are no student numbers listed in the # of Students Affected by Program. Should there be?

9b. Answer –

The numbers are listed. 2014-15 was the first year we had this money for Evening Academy and the student numbers are included on the report: 313 students served/52 credits earned. 2015-16 data, so far, is: 235 students served/62 credits earned.

Budget Committee Questions & Responses

4.7.16 Meeting

10a. Question –

IR: Stds Based Learning System -- In the row for Transition Summer School 5.5, the Metrics Description says the percentage of 6th grade students earning a C or better in humanities and math. I assume that means the percentage of 6th graders who participated in the 5.5 program. Correct? I have a similar question in the row for Elementary Intervention teacher . . . the percentages in the metrics are for the students served by the intervention teachers?

10b. Answer –

Yes, the percentage of 6th grade students earning a “C” or better who participated in the 5.5 summer school program.

Yes, the percentages in the metrics are for students served by Intervention Teachers.

11a. Question –

IR: Educator Effectiveness -- In the Update for Teacher Mentoring, am I correct in assuming that the State Beginning Teacher mentoring grant required Beaverton to provide services to smaller districts? If not, what is the explanation for why the district is also working in Vernonia and St. Helens?

11b. Answer –

The State Mentor Grant is highly competitive. Fewer than half of proposed projects were funded in the last round. This round’s Request for Proposals read:

As outlined in statute and rule if the funds are insufficient for all eligible proposals, the Department of Education shall award grants on a competitive basis taking into consideration:

(a) Successful or promising efforts to increase the number of culturally and linguistically diverse educators hired; and

(b) Closing the cultural and linguistic gap between demographics of the district’s teachers and administrators and the demographics of students served by of the school district; and

(3) Whether the school district is a small school district or serves a rural community.

Budget Committee Questions & Responses

4.7.16 Meeting

We have traditionally organized our mentor program to include neighboring districts both to increase our likelihood of funding and to support our neighboring districts who do not have enough beginning teachers to provide high quality mentoring. Partner districts provide additional funding just like we do to supplement state funding to provide a high quality mentoring program.

12a. Question –

Investment Report (IR): Future Ready Schools -- Metrics rely on a district survey. What was the 2014-15 response rate? Are the percentages shown for 2014-15 just for the 15 Future Ready schools, or for all schools? I hope it's just for the Future Ready schools, as that would be the real comparison: before and after the LITTs and other Future Ready PD.

12b. Answer –

The baseline data (2014-15) is for all schools. Starting in 2015-16, results will be reported separately for Future Ready schools and non-Future ready schools. Since we plan to increase the number of Future Ready schools over the next three years, it did not make sense to establish a baseline limited only to this year's Future Ready schools.

13a. Question –

IR: Future Ready Schools -- In the row for Future Ready Libraries, the 2014-15 Metrics columns show percentages for metrics 2 and 3 (percentage of students meeting academic growth targets and decrease in achievement gaps). I'm not sure how to interpret the percentages given. An English Language Arts (ELA) growth of 55.8% . . . is that the overall district percentage of students meeting academic growth targets? Or is it the percent of students in the 15 Future Ready schools in the year before they got their LITT? That would be the preferred measurement.

13b. Answer –

The baseline data (2014-15) is for all students in the district. Starting in 2015-16, results will be reported separately for Future Ready schools and non-Future ready schools. Since we plan to increase the number of Future Ready schools over the next three years, it did not make sense to establish a baseline limited only to this year's Future Ready schools.

Budget Committee Questions & Responses

4.7.16 Meeting

14a. Question –

IR: Future Ready Schools -- In the row for Future Ready PD, I understand that there is more professional development going on than just what comes from the LITT teachers. The metrics for the two rows in the Investment Report are identical, however. I'm not sure if you're trying to measure the effectiveness of ALL your PD, or trying to measure the value added by having an LITT teacher. If the latter, then I guess the metrics are OK as is. If the former, though, I don't think those metrics are the appropriate ones.

14b. Answer –

The result of all our Future Ready PD efforts should show an increase in teacher confidence and effectiveness in integrating technology to improve student learning. Stand-alone PD without ongoing support at the building level will typically not result in further learning of Future Ready strategies. The goal is for the two strategies to be combined as a best practice to support teachers in their learning new instructional strategies at the classroom level.

15a. Question –

Investment Report (IR): AVID -- I understand that students apply to be in the AVID elective, and that not all might be accepted for reasons other than capacity. Can you provide school-by-school figures for the number of applicants who qualify for acceptance vs. the number accepted? I don't care whether I can identify schools specifically . . . you can call them School A, School B, etc., if you want . . . I just want to see the order of magnitude of the unmet need.

15b. Answer –

Applications are collected at the school level, and many of the schools are still in the process of collecting and reviewing the applications for the 2016-17 school year. While the following data does not represent complete data from all schools, it provides a sense of how some grade levels have greater needs than capacity. The average class size for the AVID elective is 30 (note: AVID class size should mirror the average class size of each building).

Budget Committee Questions & Responses

4.7.16 Meeting

Average application received for each grade level (Interpret with caution: Schools are still collecting applications)

5th: 45

6th: 40

7th: 50

8th: 60

9th: 48

10th: 30

16a. Question –

IR: AVID -- What percent of students who were in an AVID class in 2014-15 continued in an AVID class in 2015-16? Do the percentages vary dramatically by school? Is there district direction regarding whether to allow students to have multiple years of AVID vs. involving as many students as possible in AVID over several years?

16b. Answer –

This data is also gathered at the building level. Based on the schools who provided the data, the average % of current AVID students who were in AVID last year is 70%. Interpret with caution: This percentage reflects the first cohort of AVID. This is only year 2 of AVID implementation, and we are still refining the identification, selection, and placement process. The goal is to retain as many AVID students and to involve as many qualified AVID students as possible in the AVID elective class. Research has shown that those who remain and succeed in the AVID elective class for the duration of their middle and high school careers have a higher chance of being accepted into and persist in 4-year colleges and universities.

17a. Question –

IR: AVID -- Is the district monitoring the performance and attendance of students after they are no longer in AVID class, to see if effects are lasting? (I realize the district is just in the second year of the program, so "lasting" is a relative term.)

17b. Answer –

The District is not monitoring this requested data at this point. This is only year 2 of AVID implementation, hence most AVID students have been in the AVID elective less than two years. The District goal is to maintain as many qualified AVID students as

Budget Committee Questions & Responses

4.7.16 Meeting

possible to see the impact on AVID regarding academic performance and attendance. (A good suggestion for further analysis.)

18a. Question –

IR: AVID -- Why are there no metrics for the school-wide program? If nothing else, might there not be some questions on the district teachers and staff survey that gauge the impact of that professional development?

18b. Answer –

This is only the second year of AVID implementation in the District, and the focus is now on implementing the AVID elective class with fidelity and training as many non-AVID elective teachers as possible. We will be adding metrics as our schools move to school-wide at the middle school (2016-17) and high school (2017-18).

19a. Question –

IR: Learning Teams -- What is the district doing to try to determine the cause for the decline in positive teacher response on the district survey?

19b. Answer – For the last year, the Professional Development Advisory Committee has invested in reviewing and researching specific areas of need to increase the effectiveness of K-12 Learning Teams. The two most significant areas of need are: 1) dedicated time for Learning Teams to meet, and 2) training and support for an effective Learning Team model. Both of these areas are contributing to the decline in positive teacher responses.

20a. Question –

Investment Report (IR): Community Partnerships -- The Metrics columns just say Year 1, Year 2 and Year 3. Could those be filled in with the actual academic years?

20b. Answer –

Yes. The years are 2016-17, 2017-18 and 2018-19. The position is being added next year (2016-17).

21a. Question –

IR: Community Partnerships -- The Year 2 metric for CPT mentions "developing deeper connections." Similarly, the Year 3 metric calls for "significant partnerships." Have you

Budget Committee Questions & Responses

4.7.16 Meeting

thought about how you might measure those? I'm not sure they can be . . . I'm just curious about whether you think you can.

21b. Answer –

Community Partnership Teams are still developing in the District. Each team conducts needs assessments on a regular basis to determine actions in a given year. There are quarterly progress reports that are sent to the School Board that show the projects/activities and partners. The reports are something we can quantify- how many schools complete a quarterly progress report. We also could add to the report a section about impact of the projects/activities.

22a. Question –

Investment Report (IR): Class Size -- The numbers in the Metrics column for 2014-15 don't always match the numbers provided in the first paragraph of the notes under the table. For example, the K teacher ratio in the 2014-15 column is 24.2, but it is 25.8 in the note. Should these numbers be the same in both places, or is there a difference due to a difference between "teacher ratio" (in the table) and "class size ratio" (in the note)?

22b. Answer –

The metric used in the table is “average class size”. So this is the real average of all class sizes at that level for that year. The figures given in the notes paragraph are about the staffing ratio used across all schools in early spring. We staffed schools at the higher ratio, then we used additional teacher allocations from our “bank” to address enrollment variations that caused higher class sizes. After staffing at the given ratio (early spring) and adding in the additional teacher allocations from the bank in late spring and summer, the resulting real class sizes averaged out at the numbers you see in the table.

23a. Question –

Investment Report (IR): Culturally Relevant Practices -- In the row for ELL Research Group Outcomes, the Metrics Description mentions two percentages (progress toward proficiency and students exiting within seven years). There's just one percentage given for 2014-15, though. Which one is that, and shouldn't there be a second percentage?

Budget Committee Questions & Responses

4.7.16 Meeting

23b. Answer –

The percentage of ELL students making progress toward proficiency was 60.5% (state target 48.5%) and the percentage of ELL students exiting within five years was 15.08% (state target 9.5%) for the 2014-2015 school year. The goal will be re-written to exit within five years, not seven years. The other measure to consider is ELL students exiting after being in the program five or more years which we were at 25.81% (state target 28%).

24a. Question -

IR: Culturally Relevant Practices -- The second row is about dual language staffing at middle and high schools, but the Metrics Description talks about third and seventh graders. Why are third graders included in the metric, and why are high school students not included?

24b. Answer –

The Aprenda assessment is only given at the third and seventh grade levels as this is a nationally-normed Spanish assessment and should not be given every year. We start at third grade as we do have three dual language programs at the elementary levels that feed into the middle school programs. Because we just added the dual language program at Beaverton High School this year, we will look at adding one year of Aprenda assessment in high school for the 2016-17 school year. The data we collect at all three levels will provide insight on the impact of our dual language programs as a K-12 system.

25a. Question –

IR: Culturally Relevant Practices -- In the row for Equity Teacher on Special Assignment (TOSA), what was the response rate on the 2014-15 district survey? Are the TOSAs expected to work with all schools equally? If not, would you not expect to see more teacher confidence in schools where the TOSAs have done the most work, compared to those schools' responses before TOSA involvement?

25b. Answer –

The response rate for the certified staff survey was 48% in 2014-15. The TOSAs are expected to support the work of all teachers by developing resources on culturally relevant teaching practices, including restorative practices, to enhance the success of historically underserved students. Their workload will not be distributed equally among

Budget Committee Questions & Responses

4.7.16 Meeting

all schools; rather their work will be focused on providing support for those schools and teachers who seek support in culturally relevant teaching practices.

26a. Question –

Major Function Variance Analysis report, function code 2410 -- Where are the four new assistant principals being placed, and what does a school management support person do?

26b. Answer –

The four new assistant principals are at: Chehalem Elementary, Hazeldale Elementary, Cedar Park Middle School, and Whitford Middle School.

School Management Support is a certified position. This teacher position supports instruction by providing support for student behavior and attendance issues. The school management support position may also assist with schedules, project management, oversight of activities and events, teacher trainings, parent outreach, student supervision, support for student academics, substitute or team teaching, committee leadership and other school-related tasks.

27a. Question –

Variance Analysis, function 3120 -- Enrollment is projected to increase in 2016-17, but there appears to be a reduction in food service staffing and food purchase expenditures. Seems counter-intuitive. Why?

27b. Answer –

Since many students bring lunch from home, changes in enrollment are not directly related to changes in participation (and thus changes in expenses) for the school meals program. For example, neighborhoods with more stay-at-home parents, tend to have lower meal participation rates than those with dual earner households.

The decreases in the budgeted amounts for labor and food from school year 2015-16 to 2016-17 are mostly due to an effort to better reflect actual vs. budgeted costs.

Operational changes that can decrease labor and supply costs include a reduction in overall meal or a la carte participation, changes in menu, reduction of special programs such as after-school Supper or Snack programs, Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Program, Head Start, etc., changes

Budget Committee Questions & Responses

4.7.16 Meeting

With the implementation of the new meal regulations from the Healthy, Hunger-Free Kids Act of 2010, participation in school meals has dropped, not only at BSD, but nationwide. Between school year 2011-12 and school year 2014-15, participation in school lunch at BSD decreased by an average of 1,435 lunches per serving day and a reduction in a la carte sales from 2013-14 to 2014-15 of \$124,806.

The Nutrition Services department is continually analyzing labor assignments to ensure that the correct number of labor hours are assigned at each site. Our goal is to have consistent work-loads per site, so that staff are efficiently performing their work, but are doing so in a safe manner and that they have sufficient time for all required breaks. When we notice that there is an on-going imbalance (either too much or too little work for the hours assigned), then we increase or decrease hours as needed.

28a. Question -

Variance Summary, function 1460 -- What is the summer school, special progs, and what accounts for the large increase this year?

28b. Answer –

The District entered into a Voluntary Resolution Agreement with the Office for Civil Rights which related to the untimely transportation for students who were enrolled in a specialized program in 2014-15 and/or 2015-16 school years. All students enrolled in a specialized program during these years are eligible to receive compensatory education services. The increased cost in 1460 is directly related to the expense of hiring licensed and classified staff to provide 15 hours of compensatory education services during the summer of 2016 for approximately 1,000 Students with Disabilities. This is a one year cost increase.

29a. Question –

Variance Summary, function 2130 -- What accounts for the large increase in health services?

29b. Answer –

The Internal Budget Team decided to add 6 Health Assistants and a 0.25 APU District nurse to support the increased medical needs of students. At this time there are currently 4,816 students with Health Management Plans within the district with 4,678 students served in the General Education Setting. There are currently only 12.25 District Nurses to support these students and all the remaining students who may have a

Budget Committee Questions & Responses

4.7.16 Meeting

medical incident occur. The Health Assistants will support District Nurses and building secretaries with the administration of insulin, tube feedings, and other medical tasks that students require while in school.

30a. Question –

Variance Summary, function 2620 -- What accounts for the large increase in Plan/R&D/Eval/Grants/Stats Serv?

30b. Answer –

Increased one classified position to support analysis of student data as well as increased costs for software and other expenses for student data collection and demographic data collection.

31a. Question –

General Fund Major Function Variance Summary, function 0139 -- Why do you anticipate such a large increase in the amount of extended pay - single pay?

31b. Answer –

Increased investment in professional development costs for new curriculum adoptions and Future Ready implementation.

32a. Question –

Variance Summary, function 0332 -- Is the large increase in non-reimbursable student transportation due to the need to transport Vose students to the new middle school all year, or do other things factor into the increase? Can you provide a short explanation of what the state reimburses in transportation costs vs. what they don't?

32b. Answer –

The variance is due to the increase in cost associated with transportation for athletics.

The state reimburses 70% of the cost for transporting students to and from school and for transportation costs associated with instructional field trips. The expenditures include salaries, fuel, parts supplies and services as well as depreciation expense for buses and transportation buildings.

Budget Committee Questions & Responses

4.7.16 Meeting

33a. Question –

Variance Summary, function 0422 and 0423 -- Will you please explain the difference between T&L (Teaching & Learning, I assume) funded textbooks and T&L use only textbooks?

33b. Answer –

In the past, funds were transferred to the schools from Teaching & Learning and the schools purchased their own textbooks (object 0422 - Textbooks T&L Funded). Currently, almost all textbooks are purchased by Teaching & Learning and then distributed to the schools which is why the switch has been made from 0422 to 0423 (Textbooks T&L Use Only).

34a. Question –

Variance analysis - general fund 100 - object 0110: What is the purpose of the sustainability fund? Where in the budget can I find budget information on the amount and how it will be/has been used?

34b. Answer –

The sustainability fund is a new fund in 2015-16. The board policy concerning this fund (DBA) requires the fund to equal 5% of total general fund revenues. The Board may authorize use of the General Fund Balance to address unanticipated, non-recurring needs and may authorize use of the Rainy Day Reserve to address adverse economic conditions which negatively affect the District's revenues and ability to meet the needs of students.

35a. Question –

Variance analysis - general fund 100 - object 0700 What is allocated person unit (APU)? Is it similar to full time employee (FTE)?

35b. Answer –

APU is similar to FTE. Certified APU is based on a 193 day calendar, classified APU is based on a 260 day calendar and administrative APU is based on a 255 day calendar. All APU assumes an eight hour day. Therefore, a 1.0 APU for certified is an 8 hour a day 193 day position. If a teacher is hired for half the year at 8 hours per day, the APU would be .5 and the FTE would be 1.0.

Budget Committee Questions & Responses

4.7.16 Meeting

36a. Question –

Variance analysis - general fund 100 - object 0400 What is Gain Share?

36b. Answer –

Gain Share was a source of revenue the District received from Washington County from an agreement made with Intel in lieu of property taxes. Income taxes produced from increased employment from Intel development was collected by the state and returned to the county. There was a change made in the 2015 legislature, and Gain Share is now allocated through the State School Fund to school districts across the state. Beaverton no longer receives this revenue from Washington County.

37a. Question –

Variance analysis - general fund 100 - function 2410 \$2,568,596 is for the wages and benefits of just 7 employees? (two principals, 4 assistant principals, and one school management support)

37b. Answer –

The increase of \$2,568,596 includes approximately \$1.3M for salaries and benefits for these employees but also for increases in non-salary expenditures as identified by principals. This includes the 25% carryover of budget from 2015-16 to 2016-17 at the schools.

38a. Question –

Budget message - Strategic investments table: How can we link/tie these investment numbers to the proposed budget?

38b. Answer –

The Investment Summary Reports are the best source of information on the amount of investments made in the proposed budget. These reports will be incorporated into the final adopted budget for 2016-17. The District will add budget coding in the final version of the investment summary reports to help identify where the investments are incorporated in line items in the budget.

Budget Committee Questions & Responses

4.7.16 Meeting

39a. Question –

Is there a page in the proposed budget packet that shows how the \$998,501,566 is broken down by pillar / priority / key investment areas?

39b. Answer –

No. The District has not tied every expenditure to a specific pillar or priority.

40a. Question –

Budget message p.2 - A-ROI to evaluate strategic investments. What is the current A-ROI? What is the target A-ROI by the end of FY17 and multi-year plan?

40b. Answer –

The District is beginning to use Academic Return on Investment to evaluate the effectiveness of specific investments. In the Investment Summary reports, the District has listed student achievement metrics and the cost per student of the investment. The District will evaluate investments regularly, and after two to three years decide whether or not to continue the strategy using A-ROI as part of the analysis. This analysis will be included in future Investment summaries.

41a. Question –

On the Investment Report, the Standards Based Learning System, under the category Evening Academy-Extended Day Credit, 2015-16 there is not an allocation for \$/Student. Why not?

41b. Answer –

If we were to divide the amount allocated by the number of students served to date, it would be \$1702.00 per student. But it's important to remember that more students will access Evening Academy second semester so this amount will decline per student. The calculation is made at the conclusion of the school year.

42a. Question -

Investment report - class size: In 15-16, we added 70 teachers. However, in 16-17, we only budgeted adding 12 teachers. Why such a decrease when class size is a top priority?

Budget Committee Questions & Responses

4.7.16 Meeting

42b. Answer –

In 2015-16 the district used one time funds of beginning fund balance of the Local Option Levy fund to reduce class size. This increased the number of teachers we were able to add.

43a. Question -

Investment report - class size: Metrics column show class size for 14-15 for various grades, but there is no information on what the targeted class size will be in 16-17. With additional investment of \$1,210,418 in 16-17, what will be the outcome in class size?

43b. Answer –

The staff allocation ratios have not changed from 2015-16 to 2016-17 so we expect the outcome for class sizes to be similar to 2015-16. There are no targeted class sizes just staffing allocation ratios. Individual class sizes will be reviewed in the fall, and the District will allocate teachers to reduce class sizes to the lowest level possible with the resources available.

44a. Question -

Investment report - class size allocation ratio: What was the ratio at the beginning of this multi-year budget plan? What is the ratio now in FY15-16? What will the ratio be by the end of FY16-17? Any comparison data with State and/or national average?

44b. Answer –

Allocation ratios from 2013-14 including Levy funds were 26.5 for kindergarten and 29.03 for grades 1-12. In 2014-15, the K class size allocation ratio was 25.8. Ratios for grades 1-8 were 28.33 and for grades 9-12 were 27.53. The allocation ratio for Kindergarten in 2015-16 is 24.8. In grades 1-5 the allocation ratio this year is 27.33. Grades 6-8 (middle school) allocation ratio is 26.33 and grades 9-12 (high school) ratio is 26.53. The ratio will not change by the end of the year since it is a staffing ratio used to staff the school year at the start of the budget process. The allocation of personnel (teachers) is made in the spring for the following school year. Adjustments may be made in the fall and at times mid-year. The state and national averages are not comparable as they look at the total number of certified staff (including counselors and other non-classroom positions) to the total enrollment not actual class-size averages.

Budget Committee Questions & Responses

4.7.16 Meeting

45a. Question -

Budget message - Strategic investment table on p.4 Why there are no investments on instructional time?

45b. Answer –

The District's goal to add instructional time is to add student days to the school calendar. The District is in negotiations with employee associations this spring. Negotiations is the appropriate process for this goal to be accomplished, and wouldn't be included in the budget process until negotiations were completed.

46a. Question -

Investment report - comprehensive education: Besides Hillsboro Chamber of Commerce, are we working with other cities' chambers to develop internship and job shadow opportunities for students? Ex. Beaverton Chamber of Commerce, etc.

46b. Answer –

No, we have a contract with the Hillsboro Chamber of Commerce and they have increased their employee numbers to handle the workload with our District students. This is a Washington County service, so their reach is wide within our local area.

47a. Question -

Investment report - comprehensive education: What about coding? It is becoming more and more important for elementary/middle/high school students to learn how to code. Are there any funding for coding in comprehensive education investments?

47b. Answer –

We have some Computer Programming (and like courses) in our secondary schools, but not nearly enough. We are trying to address this need with more emphasis, funding and marketing around districtwide CTE offerings for students. No doubt, it's an area for us to work on.

Budget Committee Questions & Responses

4.7.16 Meeting

48a. Question -

Investment Report - Instructional Time: Updates state “actively involved in conversations to increase instructional time over the next three to five years.” What is the target instructional time for each grade in the next 3-5 years? How much funding will we need?

48b. Answer –

An increase of instructional time is a priority for our Board. The District is in negotiations with our employee association this spring. Adding a student day to our system is approximately \$1.4M in additional cost.

49a. Question -

Investment report - SBLS: Academic needs based staffing allocation section. Academic achievement funding has been decreasing in the past three years, from \$494/student to \$376/student. Please explain this decrease.

49b. Answer –

The dollar amount of academic funding allocation has remained the same but because the number of students being served has increased the cost per student has decreased each year.

50a. Question -

Investment report - future ready schools. Which schools are the 15 pilot schools in year 1?

50b. Answer –

You’ll find the pilot schools in the timeline for the Future Ready effort: <https://www.beaverton.k12.or.us/depts/tchlrn/future-ready/Documents/Future-Ready-timeline-graphicv2d-cs6.pdf>

51a. Question -

What are the scholarships? It says "tuition", but I would like to know if there is any sort of formal scholarship program that is available for review?

Budget Committee Questions & Responses

4.7.16 Meeting

51b. Answer –

There are seven District-managed scholarships and numerous smaller school-managed scholarships that are accounted for in the Scholarship Fund, each with its own criteria and program. These are generally paid to the colleges or trade schools attended to cover tuition and fees, but may be applicable to other costs based on the particular scholarship. Scholarship opportunities are made available through our College and Career Centers and/or counseling departments in each of our high schools.