

**MINUTES OF THE
CANBY SCHOOL DISTRICT
WORKSHOP SESSION
November 1, 2012**

1.0 CALL TO ORDER

Chair Kraft called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. in the Canby School District office Meridian room on November 1, 2012. Board members in attendance were Ty Kraft, Tom Scott, Kristin Downs, Andy Rivinus, Brendan Murphy, Andrea Weber and Diane Downs. Also in attendance were Superintendent Steach, Linda Martin, Mary Knigge, Cindy Bauer, Rex Hagans, Naomi Gingerich, Wayne Layman, Kris Millar, Stacy Fults, Pat Johnson, Angie Navarro, Christine Taylor, Skyler Rodolph, Joe Morelock, Sam Thompson, Jim Anderson, Peggy Savage, Vicki Aguilar, Ellen Barrett, Danielle Reynolds, Elise Megale, Maritee Tellez, Yolanda Sanchez and Jahnet Diaz.

2.0 INTRODUCTIONS

The audience introduced themselves.

3.0 CHANGES TO AGENDA

None.

4.0 PUBLIC FORUM

Kris Millar spoke as a non Dual Language Immersion parent. As a volunteer in the vision screening she was astonished the Latino DLI students didn't know the letters. She feels if they are in this country they should know the letters. She also does not like receiving the Spanish translation along with the English and feels the non-DLI students are treated differently. After the beginning of school she transferred her students to Lee Elementary.

Stacy Fults is concerned that their neighborhood school, Trost Elementary, may become a DLI school only and if so she does not want her students attending Carus or Ninety-one. She applied for a transfer to Lee, however due to full classes, was denied. She has a daycare center and families are annoyed by the DLI program. Canby cares about their schools and feels the community will be let down by making Trost a full DLI school.

Superintendent Steach noted he sent a letter in September providing accurate information regarding the rumors that a decision had already been made. He stressed once again that these are strictly rumors and no decisions have been made and that tonight's budget discussion will give more details.

5.0 INFORMATION/DISCUSSION/ACTION ITEMS

5.1 Carus White Building Discussion

Facilities Manager Wayne Layman discussed and answered questions regarding the bids received on replacing or painting the lead based siding on the building. He was hoping for more bids, but only received those included

in the packet. Tom Scott has concerns about spending money on building used only as a treatment facility to daily check the PH and treatment of the well water. Diane Downs has concerns for student safety and notes we must be financially prudent. Andy Rivinus feels we need to do what we have to do to stop the paint from flaking and Kristin agrees, but we must keep the cost down. The board directed Wayne to follow-up on getting bare minimum bids to take care of the lead problem and bring them to the November 15 board meeting.

5.2 Budget-Possible Athletic/Activities

Superintendent Steach noted over the past several years the Canby School District has made significant reductions in nearly every program. In addition to cuts in academic areas these include eliminating all middle school athletics. In the event funding for next year requires the District to make further cuts, there has been Board discussion on the possibility of seeking input from the members of the community on their priorities in athletics and activities.

The Canby School District currently spends \$455,000 on the CHS athletic program, which generates \$145,000 in revenue for a total cost of \$310,000. CHS activities generate \$36,000 in revenue with \$96,000 in expenditures at a total cost of \$60,000. Past reductions have been made to these programs but any future reductions will require direct impacts to student participation.

John also noted increased expenses from PERS, current use of cash reserves to balance the budget and previous concessions for teachers and classified staff being added back, we will be \$5M in the hole unless we receive an increase from the state, which will mean additional cuts next year.

This evening discussion continued on whether the Board would like to proceed with a survey and what questions to ask. Chair Kraft noted this is a challenging and unorthodox topic and asked if a survey would change how each of the Board members feels individually?

High School Principal Pat Johnson noted the high school administration has made many cuts over the past several years and asked to Board to let them do their work once again.

Diane Downs appreciates what staff has done, but the community needs to feel the cuts. She noted the Board needs to know why we are surveying and what we will take into consideration.

Andrea feels if we need to ask the community how they will step up.

Andy Rivinus noted the community will let us know, they have a vested interest and a survey gives a way to hear from them and noted why are we afraid to hear from them? He feels the Board needs to provide John with how

to proceed.

Brendan Murphy noted even though this may be only 1% of the budget, we need to survey.

Tom Scott noted he is not afraid to hear from the community, but does not think this is the appropriate way to proceed. He said we don't have surveys for other reductions, so why this. It is already causing concerns & unknowns from several community members and the students.

Kristin Downs feels it should be two-way dialog and the community needs to engage in our schools. She is annoyed people are not getting involved and volunteering.

Ty Kraft is all about communication, but what are we getting from a survey. A survey needs to be informational, it's not just an athletic question. Elimination of athletics and activities would be a huge impact on students and he does not support.

A straw vote was taken on whether to survey the public with results as follows:

Andrea Weber – no
Andy Rivinus – yes
Brendan Murphy – yes
Diane Downs – no
Tom Scott – no
Ty Kraft – no
Kristin Downs – yes

If necessary, discussion may take place closer to budget preparation.

Budget – Class Size

Superintendent Steach reviewed the target class size numbers compared to the actual average. While this is a target, they worked to ensure there were not classes that significantly exceeded the target except in specific areas (ie. Choir, Band, PE, Foreign Languages). As some classes could not be filled to the desired level, the resulting averages are below the targets. Taken as a whole, the total difference between the average and target class sizes across the district is 296 students. This would equate to approximately 10 classrooms at the target class load or a possible cost savings of \$800,000. While it would be extremely difficult to accomplish this without significant disruption of the educational continuity of students, there are some areas where the imbalance is much greater than others which may provide opportunities for greater efficiencies.

He also provided the actual current elementary class sizes across the district. Performing a comparison between the target class sizes and the actuals produces an indication of which schools have the highest number of available space (empty seats). The numbers were provided along with the number of total classes in the school and the number of combination classes. The “empty seats” and overall school class size average both provide indicators of the relative cost of the six elementary schools.

In addition to “empty seats”, another variable cost that has emerged this year is related to the practice of creating combination classrooms. While these rooms allow for more equalized class sizes within a building, based upon the new CCSS math standards, it is becoming difficult to provide instruction for two grade levels in one class. This year, the district has added partial staffing for these classes to split the grade for math instruction. Each grade configuration will need approximately one hour per day of additional teacher support. Using a standard of \$80,000 per teacher and combining the empty seats with the combination class expense produces the following program cost analysis by building:

School	Classes	Empty Seats	Cost	Combo Cost	Total Cost	Cost Per Class
Carus	12	45	\$128,571	\$20,000	\$148,571	\$12,381
Eccles	17	43	\$122,857	\$10,000	\$132,857	\$7,815
Lee	15	27	\$77,143	\$-	\$77,143	\$5,143
Trost (DLI)	15	39	\$111,429	\$-	\$111,429	\$7,429
Trost (Non-DLI)	6	64	\$182,857	\$-	\$182,857	\$30,476
Knight	14	36	\$102,857	\$-	\$102,857	\$7,347
91 (K-6)	13	42	\$120,000	\$20,000	\$140,000	\$10,769
Total	92	296	\$845,714	\$50,000	\$895,714	\$9,736

Clearly, the highest cost per class occurs in the non-DLI program at Trost. The other two schools above the district average are Carus and 91.

At the secondary level, the middle school was the primary area of discussion at the previous meeting. With current enrollment, Baker Prairie has an average of 4.2 students per class more than 91. For the 27 sections at 91, this creates a total of 113.4 empty seats during the day. Based upon a six period school day, this averages to 18.9 seats per period or approximately \$52,000 of unfunded costs (as compared to Baker Prairie). The 91 6th and 8th Grade classes are of similar size so that the impact will be approximately the same next year. However, when the current large 7th grade class exits, the cost is expected to increase by \$19,000 to near the cost of one full teacher.

Another cost that is not factored into these calculations is the building overhead expense. As we say with Ackerman, these are a relatively fixed cost of between \$500,000 and \$600,000 per building. While enrollment would change the per

student cost of this overhead, without significant restructure the total cost would remain unchanged.

Several options exist for reducing the cost of this inefficiency. Board discussion took place and will continue at future meetings. John noted the Board may wish to discuss the pros and cons of the following options as well as any others:

- Adjust school attendance boundaries,
- Cap schools by grade levels and move new students to schools with space,
- Create magnet programs to attract students, or
- Create school pairs and allow the movement of students between schools as needed.

Budget – Dual Language Immersion

The Dual-Language Immersion (DLI) programs serves three primary purposes: 1) Provide core education to the students of Trost, 2) Implement a researched based system of teaching English to students who do not speak English as their primary language, and 3) Provide an opportunity for English speaking children to learn Spanish as part of the core education. Superintendent Steach discussed the effectiveness of the first two.

1) Provide core education to the students of Trost

Referring to the Budget - 2012-13 Class Size memo included in this same Board meeting, Trost can be seen as a tale of two programs. For the cost analysis of the DLI program, the non-DLI classes will not be considered. The current average class size for the DLI classes is presented in the following table. As compared to the district average by grade level, one can see that in all grade levels except 4th and 5th, the DLI classrooms have more students per class. This would also be the case in 6th grade expect for the unintentional low average class size at this grade.

Grade	Trost DLI	District	Difference
Kinder.	26.7	24.6	2.1
1st	30.0	27.5	2.5
2nd	29.5	26.6	2.9
3rd	26.5	25.9	0.6
4th	23.5	26.5	-3.0
5th	27.0	28.4	-1.4
6th	26.5	26.0	0.5
Average	27.1	26.5	0.6

From a program perspective, the lower class sizes at the higher grades occur due to attrition. As students leave either the program or Canby (for a wide variety of reasons), it is often difficult to replace these students with ones

that have the skills to be successful in a DLI program. Some students are placed in this program, but at times we are not always able to replace every student who leaves.

Due to attrition, the kindergarten classes have been started at higher numbers. As the table indicates, this has been a successful strategy to ensure that the overall program numbers are commensurate with other district classrooms. At this time, the program is not being subsidized and even operates more efficiently than the rest of the district.

2) Implement a researched based system of teaching English to students who do not speak English as their primary language

As part of the Oregon State School Fund (SSF) formulas, students who qualify for Limited English Proficiency (LEP) assistance are allocated an additional weighting. In layman terms, this means that additional funding is provided to support programs to assist these students in learning the English language while we are also working to teach them core subject areas. The district has a legal requirement to ensure that the teaching of English occurs above and beyond access to the core curriculum and does not restrict a student's access of this curriculum.

The amount of additional funding provided for LEP students is 50% of the average student SSF allocation. For Canby this past year, this amounted to just under \$3,000 per student. These funds are intended to provide teaching staff to provide instruction outside of the basic education classroom. In other Canby schools, these staff provides both Native Language Development (NLD) and English Language Development (ELD) services. This instruction often occurs during science, social studies and other instructional time outside of reading and math (as the schedule allows).

When the staffing model for this year's budget was developed, additional teaching staff was allocated to each building above the level of classroom teachers. This was done by formula for both LEP students and for the number of Free and Reduced (F&R) Lunch qualifying students (who also receive additional funding at a level of 25% of the average student SSF allocation). The formula used provided one teacher for every 50 LEP students and one teacher for every 120 students who qualify for F&R.

Based upon Trost having a F&R level at 69% and 256 LEP students, an additional staffing allocation of 3.07 FTE for F&R and 5.12 FTE for LEP were initially provided (See attached table 1). However, this formula allocation was used for an initial baseline. From that point, our administrative team looked at specific schools, class sizes, and programs. During this discussion, adjustments were made in what was felt was the best interest of the district as a whole. In this process, Trost staffing was reduced by 2.28 FTE. This

staffing was given primarily to Carus and 91 in order to minimize the impact of combination classes due to enrollment levels (See attached table 2).

Superintendent Steach also showed a comparison of the Trost DLI model to our other schools that implement a pullout NLD/ELD model. This also supports the statement that the DLI program is allowing the district to implement an efficient program and shift the equivalent of two teachers to support other district programs.

Andy Rivinus noted we need to optimize every classroom and Andrea Weber would like additional discussion on what features may draw people to other schools within the district. Tom Scott would like to see how the Trost non DLI students fit into Carus and not be split between schools. The Board asked Superintendent Steach to move forward on Dual Language Immersion process.

5.3 Magnet School Discussion

Superintendent Steach conducted an interaction with the Board with a learning target of their understanding of magnet school concepts and how magnet schools could benefit Canby. The questions and comments of this interaction are listed below:

What is a Magnet School?

Attract parents (free to choose) to school without boundary
Highlight focused area (ie. Foreign language, STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering and Math), performing arts

Magnet School Characteristics/Options:

Focus,
Perceived excellence
Lee emphasis on grade levels and more on performance levels
Transportation?
Could be district boundary or not district boundary

Current Issues Facing Canby:

Encouraging population shifts
Increase enrollment
Optimizing class sizes
Optimize use of building space
Carus, Ninety-one and Trost

Magnet School Opportunities for Canby:

iPad technology use
STEM
CTE *(9-12)
DLI *
Agriculture – High School, possible K-12

Performing arts
Look at grade levels

* Programs in place, could market now

5.4 STAR Protocol Update

Last spring, the district administrative team agreed to adopt the STAR Protocol as Canby's district wide instructional framework. Training has been underway since that time on effective use of the protocol as a tool for instructional practice improvement.

As part of the implementation, classroom observations were performed to provide feedback on the degree to which our current instructional practices align with the STAR protocol. The results showed a higher level of STAR aligned instruction than they have ever seen for a district that has not been focusing on STAR (ie. first time baseline collection). This was a real statement of the positive impact of the work everyone has been doing in the past and how aligned our efforts have been.

During the meeting Maureen Callahan, Director of Curriculum and Instruction and Angie Navarro, Trost Elementary Principal went through the process using the STAR planning guide on the Magnet School discussion. They took turns talking about the strategies they saw and provided samples.

5.5 Board Goals/Priorities

Due to a Board member request to revisit the discussion from a previous meeting, discussion took place from Diane Downs on the draft she presented of the goals and priorities. After discussion the changes were agreed upon and will be posted on the website.

5.6 Policy First Reading

CCG, Licensed Evaluation-Administrators
GCDA, Criminal Records Check- Fingerprinting
GCN, Evaluation of Personnel
IL, Assessment Program
JECC, Assignment of Students to Schools

The above policies were reviewed by the board and will be brought back for approval at the next meeting.

6.0 NEXT MEETING AGENDA

- 6.1 Canby Educational Foundation Presentation**
- 6.2 Volunteer Update**
- 6.3 OSBA 2012 Election**
- 6.4 Financial/Enrollment Update**
- 6.5 Policy 2nd Readings**
- 6.6 Budget-Athletics**

There will be no additional discussion on athletics and activities at this time and additional bids for the Carus White Building will be added to the agenda.

7.0 ADJOURNMENT

Chair Kraft adjourned the meeting at 10:06 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Linda Martin
Board Secretary

Ty Kraft
Board Chair

Approved: