

WE EXPECT EXCELLENCE**WE INNOVATE****WE EMBRACE EQUITY****WE COLLABORATE****Board Members Present:**

Susan Greenberg
Anne Bryan
Mary VanderWeele
Donna Tyner
LeeAnn Larsen
Jeff Hicks
Linda Degman

Budget Committee Members Present:

Carrie Anderson
Cindy Owen
Kim Overhage
Eric Liu
Evelyn Brzezinski
Simer Singh
Tim Garey

District Administration Members Present:

Jeff Rose, Superintendent
Carl Mead, Deputy Superintendent
Ron Porterfield, Deputy Superintendent
Claire Hertz, Chief Financial Officer
Sue Robertson, Chief Human Resource Officer
Steve Langford, Chief Information Officer
Maureen Wheeler, Public Communication Officer
Barbara Evans, Executive Administrator for K-5 Schools
Brenda Lewis, Executive Administrator for K-5 Schools
Carolyn Miller, Executive Administrator for K-5 Schools
Mike Chamberlain, Executive Administrator for High School/Option Schools
Matt Casteel, Executive Administrator/ABSA Representative
Robin Kobrowski, Administrator for Curriculum, Instruction Assessment/Secondary
Ginny Hansmann, Administrator for Curriculum, Instruction Assessment/Primary

Jon Bridges, Administrator for Accountability
Sho Shigeoka, Administrator for Equity and Inclusion
Jason Guchereau, Finance Manager
Gayellyn Jacobson, Administrator for Fiscal Services
Linda Hanson, Senior Budget Accountant
Marcie Davis, Assistant to CFO and Administrator of Fiscal Services
Susan Rodriguez, Administrator for Licensed Personnel
Ronda Haun, Administrator for Classified Personnel
Danielle Sheldrake, Administrator for Student Services
Wei-Wei Lou, Administrator for ELL Services
Sheila Baumgardner, Elementary Principal
Jared Cordon, Elementary Principal
John Peplinski, Title Elementary Principal
Claudia Ruf, Middle School Principal
Shirley Brock, Middle School Principal
John Huelskamp, High School Principal
Mary Jean Katz, Options Principal

I. Welcome and Opening Remarks

Kim Overhage
Budget Committee
Chair

Budget Committee Chair, Kim Overhage, called the meeting to order at 6:30 PM. Overhage identified this evening as the final meeting with public testimony, responses to budget questions and discussion by the Budget Committee.

II. Approval of Minutes from the April 6, 2014

Kim Overhage

Evelyn Brzezinski requests the following changes:

- Page 9 – Section IX – Carrie Anderson: Add “Academic” to “Chief Officer.”
- Page 11 – Section IX – Evelyn Brzezinski: Change “numbers” to “dollar figures.”
- Page 11 – Section XI – Kim Overhage: change “numbers” to “costs.”

District Goal: All students will show continuous progress toward their personal learning goals, developed in collaboration with teachers and parents, and will be prepared for post-secondary education and career success.

The Beaverton School District recognizes the diversity and worth of all individuals and groups. It is the policy of the Beaverton School District that there will be no discrimination or harassment of individuals or groups based on race, color, religion, gender, sexual orientation, gender identity, gender expression, national origin, marital status, age, veterans' status, genetic information or disability in any educational programs, activities or employment.

The meeting location is accessible to persons with disabilities. A request for an interpreter for the hearing impaired, or for other accommodations for persons with disabilities, should be made at least 48 hours in advance of the meeting. Please contact Community Involvement Office at 503-591-4360.

Overhage made the motion to approve the minutes as amended and the motion passed unanimously.

III. Responses to Budget Committee, Questions from Previous Meeting

Internal Budget Team

Superintendent Jeff Rose informed everyone that the Internal Budget Team (IBT) would not make additional presentations. The question and answer session was online, and he thanked everyone who participated. Superintendent Rose outlined a few responses, and encouraged everyone to ask further clarifying questions, as necessary.

- Beaverton's Story Relative to State School Fund (SSF): The reason the District's budget is positive, is support from the local community. The Local Option Levy continues to grow, and the bonds support local schools. The story is not common in Oregon, unfortunately. SSF will influence districts for years to come. Local dollars are not guaranteed in terms of sustainability. The local community wanted to fill voids in state revenue and lower class-sizes.
- Class-Size: It's important to know that the comparative State ratios in the proposed budget document were not accurate. The correct data was included in the responses to budget questions. The previous example of decreasing a class-size, by one student, doesn't tell the whole story. If the committee needs more granular detail, staff would provide it.
- Sustainability: This is very important and the District struggles with the concepts of sustainability for a variety of reasons. The Committee would like to make it very clear that the District is using the Local Option Levy on teachers. The District is not saving the dollars for multiple years, they will be used the very next year. It's unpredictable if it will increase or decrease, however, we will continue to be transparent from year to year.
- Collaboration Time and Instruction Time: This is an important component in the Strategic Plan. The District will be recommending a plan, if the SSF improves, and this will be a priority.

Overhage thanked District personnel who worked hard to bring this budget forward. Overhage requested to have the spirit of a good and thorough discussion and each committee member to give comment based on the following question: "Do you think the proposed budget supports the district goal and strategic plan given the amount of money available?"

IV. Public Comments

Students

Mackena Boynay: 1st grader at Raleigh Park who loves to read books and supports teacher/librarians.

Ram Somaxajula: Freshman at Westview High School and supports funding for music programs across the District.

Emmy Vonada: 6th grader at Raleigh Hills and supporter of teacher/librarians.

Jasmine Starr: 2nd grader at Jacob Wismer and library supporter. Expressed frustration that it takes more than a week to get new books.

Madeline Perry: Sophomore at Health & Science High School and supporter of libraries for electronic resources.

Amanda Amezcoa: Junior at Westview High School and supporter of library/librarians.

Makoto Jaakovsky: Junior at Westview High School and student in AP Computer Science class. Spoke on behalf of over 100 students who didn't receive a spot for next year since only 40 spots were available. Suggested a budget initiative: hire a dedicated teacher at WHS.

Tom Bryan: Also a Junior at Westview who applied for the AP Computer Science class. Due to over-enrollment, Tom was not accepted into the class. There are 150 students forecasted for next year, and this is the most requested class. He suggested the following alternatives:

- Make good use of technology BSD already has available;
- Create a class on BSD online, combining a teacher and the online class; or

- Suggested the transporting of students to various locations in order to attend the programming classes.

Community

Dawn Prochavnik: Advocate for adequate resources for school libraries, as well as resources toward the implementation of libraries/librarians.

Strong school libraries is supported by HB 2586.

Bob King: Spoke on behalf of the Beaverton Friends of Music, advocating for high quality music instruction.

Mitzi Sandman: Parent and supporter of school libraries and librarians. Spoke on school librarians in the proposed budget over the next five (5) years, but schools needed them now.

Debby Plonar: Parent and supporter of school libraries and librarians teaching literacy. Who will guide the implementation of the teacher/librarian position? The job description and supervision of the implementation needed to be improved to ensure a successful pilot program.

V. Questions and Discussion from the Budget Committee

Kim Overhage

Susan Greenberg echoed Debby Plonar's comments regarding the rollout of the position for the future-ready teacher librarians. She also supported the idea of offering A/P Computer Science classes to all students with regard to the testimony from the students from Westview High School.

Tim Garey thanked everyone for coming and apologized for missing the last meeting. He felt the library/media center is an extremely important subject as well as the leadership in implementing the new positions.

Cindy Owen agreed all the testimony was very meaningful and would like to echo the importance of the roll-out of the new library positions. It could potentially lose interest or funding if it isn't rolled out correctly. As much as everyone would like to have all the new positions now, the District could only do so much within the Budget. If there were additional funds left over, the best "bang for the buck" would be to roll the program out appropriately, and hiring the right people.

Donna Tyner stated the District has many challenges figuring what funding goes where. Expressed support of librarians and music programs. Acknowledged the wish the District had enough money to fully fund everything. The Committee was hopeful that through leadership in a collaborative/strategic fashion, as well as involving the community, we could bring everything back. The Committee may not have the full scope on the librarians needed in every single school, but may be able to come up with a solution that will provide assistance for all students.

Jeff Hicks stated appreciation for the response to question #9 on the English as a Second Language program giving an example of what equity is all about. Investing more due to certain student groups achievements showed it wasn't equal but equitable. Please explain the flow of students for the two-way immersion program. Expressed Future-Ready libraries use the purchased and curated books, rather than everything being electronic. **A: Carl Mead:** The intent was NOT to have students travel from Meadow Park to Beaverton High School. Staff made long-term plans for courses to be offered K-12 for two-way immersion programs in multiple schools. The pilot courses will be offered at Beaverton High School, and will be replicated at other high schools.

Eric Liu echoed the testimony and explained that it isn't just about having the funding, but how effectively it's used. Liu expressed concern regarding Computer classes in several high schools. He supported programming classes at the high school level, to assist students to enter programming careers. Liu questioned if AP Computer classes were addressed at the school level or the District level. He asked if the school was not allocating funds to the program or the district not providing the school with enough funds for the program.

LeeAnn Larsen expressed appreciation to the community for the Local Option Levy. She asked what kind of work can board members do to increase Gain Share funds?

Linda Degman appreciated the participation of the community. She submitted the following questions on the Future Ready program:

1. Is the job description for teacher/librarian still in draft form?
2. Does this help the District meet our College and Career-Ready goals and strategic plan?
3. Since there are only ten (10) positions available, how can the District meet the needs in the rest of the schools?

Evelyn Brzezinski had questions regarding the question/answer document, however, it will not impact her vote.

1. Budget Committee Questions - #6: Does the \$85,000 each year build up? **A: Hertz:** It is an additional \$85,000 each year. It is \$85,000, \$170,000 next year and \$255,000 the year after that.
2. Budget Committee Questions - #11: As for adding music programs, it states the district will have 7 out of 8 full time middle school band programs – why not 8 out of 8? **A: Matt Casteel:** All elective programs are driven by student requests.
3. Budget Committee Questions - #24: Costs in function 1290: travel for International Baccalaureate Programs (IB), please explain what travel is involved. **A: Carl Mead:** IB travel covers teacher training (due to unique courses), bringing presenters to the District for specific training, as well as the costs for travel IB programs that are under evaluation. Several schools will be evaluated next year.
4. Budget Committee Questions - #28: Please confirm the CNA program will be offered at Beaverton and Aloha. **A: Mike Chamberlain:** Yes, that is correct.
5. Budget Committee Questions - #31: Please confirm the investments for health careers/field biology/CNA should only be listed in one place – not in both places as stated in the question/answers. **A: Hertz:** That is correct. They are the same investments and should only be listed as System Ed investments.
6. Budget Committee Questions - #34: In regards to the AVID program, why does the funding increase and then decrease (\$425,000 in the coming year/\$800,000 in the following year/\$400,000 in the year after that), why doesn't it stay at \$800,000 in the following year? **A: Sho Shigeoka:** This is an additional cost to the prior year. The increase is higher in year two due to the end of the Nike grant support.
7. Budget Committee Questions - #53: In looking at the ratios for 2014-15 (Kindergarten, Elementary, Middle, High), the numbers are not the same as what is listed on page 16, #53 This is referencing two (2) different years, however, can you please explain why the numbers are getting smaller if we are hiring more teachers? **A: Gayellyn Jacobson:** Budget Questions - #18: This is data calculated by the Oregon Department of Education and how they count classroom teachers including specialists. Question #53 lists student/teacher staffing ratios.

Mary VanderWeele expressed concern regarding the dollar amounts for the Active Student Task Force in future years.. The pilot of \$85,000 is only targeting three (3) elementary schools, however we have ten times (10x) that number of elementary schools. Estimates were what the task force requested and is a “work in progress”.

Sincere appreciation to the students and parents who testified. Conveyed concern over the class forecasting in relation to the AP Computer Science programs. Recognized this isn't a budget committee decision, and the committee is entrusting the Teaching & Learning leadership to look into solutions.

A lot of work and deliberation went into the proposed budget. Very positive initiatives for the District. Also appreciated the detail and comprehensive answers online.

1. In almost \$40 million of additions, why didn't we see an increase in instructional time and very little movement in class-size? Requested more information on class-size.
2. Increases in staff administration, over ten (10) years, have been greater than the increase in students. The District does a good job in keeping administrative costs down, which has been very persuasive when we have asked the community for help on our bond and Local Option Levy.

3. The addition of instructional time should not be conditioned. It should be made a priority since the Local Option Levy is not sustainable.

Carrie Anderson called attention to the meeting on Dec. 9, 2014. A list of priorities, comprised of four (4) bullet points for the “whole child” included both libraries and technology. These are two different things when talking about Future-Ready schools. The books themselves are incredibly important, not just installing more devices. The next Board meeting was on Dec. 15th and libraries were excluded from the list of the “whole child.” Bringing the librarians back is not a “new” program. When looking at the numbers for ELL students with their 3rd grade performance in reading, the effects will be noticeable.

1. In the Future Investments section of the Budget Message, the music numbers going forward are not listed.
2. The section for Future-Ready Schools is confusing. It lists \$1.5M for this year, \$1M for their staff and \$500,000 for training. Why is there only \$1M for the next two (2) years? There are 12 schools next year and 15 schools the following year. How is that going to work? **A: Steve Langford:** This year we’ll be piloting up to ten (10) schools. Will re-evaluate the dollar amounts in subsequent years as the program grows.
3. Why did the District send out a 3-year calendar when the goal is to increase instructional time?
4. Budget Committee Questions - #1 vs. #40: \$10M for teacher collaboration. Responses to the same question are different. Would like an explanation.
5. Budget Committee Questions - #7: Clarification needed. Revenue is \$441M with expenses of \$403M, Page 67 of Proposed Budget says revenue equals expenses at \$433M.

Anne Bryan expressed appreciation for the question and answer process. She would like additional information regarding #49 of the Budget Questions/Answers. Made a recommendation of prioritized instructional time (with or without collaboration) with any additional funds.

1. What determines if a class is too large or not? Multiple factors in making that determination – please help everyone understand the multiple number sets.

Simer Singh was concerned about measurable success metrics in this Budget.

1. Proposed Budget – Page 42: There aren’t any quantitative measures. Collaboration between teacher and parents: what method would benefit the whole community?
2. Proposed Budget - Page 175: Other uses of funds – why is this going up by \$2.5M – what is this for?
3. Proposed Budget – Page 80: Computer Software is going up by \$1M. The computer hardware expenditure is going down – why is the District spending more on software? **A: Steve Langford:** Yes, thanks to the Bond the District is purchasing hardware out of Bond funds. The software increase is due to several enterprise software contracts (i.e., Student Information Systems, Finance System, auto-dialing) The District has consolidated enterprise software into the IT budget.
4. How can the District ensure every student has an opportunity to take the AP Computer Science program? It would be beneficial for the student to take the class, at least by their senior year, before they go to college. It is a chance to have leverage. Is it possible to offer the class at a different location and if so, make sure school has enough staff to cover the additional students? **A: Mike Chamberlain:** No, the District will not be busing students to another high school for an AP or IB program.

Susan Greenberg is very concerned about class-sizes and instructional time. Why can’t we start adding days to the calendar now?

Kim Overhage is also concerned about class-size and instructional time.

1. If we were to spend the money to decrease class sizes, do we have the classrooms to accommodate?
2. Future-Ready Program: It is a great idea to rollout the program with ten (10) people in the beginning before hiring is done for all the schools. Is it possible to roll out sooner than over a five (5) year time frame?

3. Budget Questions - #9: All students vs. ELL students: do we have the right correlation factor?
4. Budget Questions - #43: Which school districts have local option levies/gain share and which ones are running solely on SSF? **A: Gayellyn Jacobson:** Beaverton and Portland have local option levies. Hillsboro and Beaverton have gain share.
5. Budget Questions - #51: Please clarify answer “Please see response to question #51.” **A: Hertz:** This should say #2.

Superintendent Rose would like to break down the questions into five (5) categories. Some questions can be answered this evening and the other questions will be answered online. The program questions that weren’t specific to Budget will also be addressed online.

Based upon the last round of questions and comments previously described, it is clear that making additions is just as difficult as making reductions. The decisions have to be strategic and everything is a specific trade-off. They aren’t “competing wants,” they are “competing needs.” Answering the question: “Did we fully fund our Strategic Plan?” Absolutely not, the District has years to go. Is the current budget in alignment with our Strategic Plan? That is our goal and there are many competing needs for kids.

The Committee was asked “Do you support the Budget for 2015-16 as proposed by District Administration?” Members wanted to make sure the proposed budget didn’t over-budget by comprising the investments with \$7.5B vs. the current SSF of \$7.255B. Possibly would like to see the budget at \$7.255B. The majority of the committee is supportive, with the following concerns:

- Would like more information specific to the trajectory of class-sizes and increased instruction time.
- Does it exceed anticipated revenues?
- Are we in alignment with HB 2586?
- Not only class size, but how efficient is the class when it is overcrowded?
- How stable is our budget? Is it long term – what if the economy goes South in a couple years?
- Is it possible to get creative with the calendar days that we currently have?
- How much progress does the Committee expect to see toward a “Rainy Day” fund out of funds from this year?
- When will the next state economic forecast take place?
- If necessary can we change the budget between the May 4th and June 1st meeting? **A: Hertz:** Yes

Overhage presented a poll of the Committee to see if the District should budget at \$7.255 billion funding level. The Committee preferred the \$7.255 billion funding level, however noted it was only a difference of 3%.

Superintendent Rose stated the conversations should not be about the Delta of \$7.255B. The conversation should be about movement to the national average for K-12 funding.

VI. Closing Remarks

Jeff Rose

Superintendent Rose was impressed with the testimony and how the Committee aligned with the community requests. The testimony aligns with the District’s Strategic Plan, over time. Prioritizing the needs will be a struggle, and is the right struggle to have. One day the District will talk about revenue, rather than competing needs. The District is advocating for what kids deserve, regardless of the Local Option Levy. Superintendent Rose asked staff and community to tell their story at the Ways and Means hearing at PCC Rock Creek the following night.

Overhage expressed appreciation to Staff and the Internal Budget Committee.

VII. Set Agenda for May 4th Meeting

**Kim Overhage
Gayellyn Jacobson**

Jacobson: Please send your questions as soon as possible to allow us enough time to get the accurate answers for you. Responses to your questions will be sent on Thursday, April 30th, rather than Wednesday, April 29th.

Overhage: The committee will approve the budget and tax rates at the next meeting.

Budget Meeting adjourned at 8:55p.m.

Kim Overhage
Budget Committee Chair

Marcie Davis
Recording Secretary