BRIC ARCHITECTURE

1233 NW NORTHRUP STREET, SUITE 100
PORTLAND, OR 97209

T 503 595 4900

Meeting Notes

**PROJECT:** Beaverton School District Long-Range Plan
**DATE:** August 7, 2025
**PROJECT NUMBER:** 24020
**SUBJECT:** Long-Range Facilities Planning Committee: Meeting #5
**ATTENDEES:** Carina Santoro-Quintanilla, Karina Ruiz, Ken Bell (BRIC); Robert McCracken, Shellie Bailey-Shah, Karla Barrett-Curtis, Kerry Delf, Steven Sparks, Dr. Shelly Reggiani, Mike Schofield, Jessica Jones (BSD); and Long-Range Facilities Planning Committee members

---

**Session Overview**

This was the sixth meeting of the Long-Range Facilities Planning Committee. The session included presentations from Mike Schofield and Jessica Jones (BSD Business Services) and Dr. Shelly Reggiani (BSD Teaching and Learning) on key topics requested at prior meetings. Karina Ruiz, Carina Santoro-Quintanilla, and Ken Bell then presented the North Stars and Planning Implications, facilitating a committee vote to consensus.

---

**Welcome & Introduction**

Stephen Roberts (Committee Chair) welcomed the group, shared meeting expectations, and opened the session by giving an overview of the agenda. He noted that while the public is welcome to attend, they are not able to give verbal testimony during the meeting. Written testimony is welcome to be submitted.

**Overview of North Stars & Planning Implications**

Karina reviewed the North Stars agreed upon at the last meeting and explained how the BRIC team developed Planning Implications based on prior feedback. These implications will be used to evaluate future scenarios. At the end of the meeting, the committee would vote on each implication with the goal of reaching consensus.

**Questions/Comments & Responses:**

- Q: *Why are we doing the North Star work when similar language already exists on the District website?*
  A: The North Stars reflect values specific to the long-range planning process. While aligned with the District's Strategic Plan, they are not identical. The Strategic Plan covers a broader scope, while the North Stars guide recommendations specifically for facilities.

**Presentation from Dr. Shelly Reggiani: Teaching & Learning Overview**
Dr. Reggiani presented survey results from students, parents, and staff on belonging, satisfaction, academic performance, and attendance. The presentation compared results between the District's five smallest and five largest elementary schools. She stressed the importance of relationships in student experiences, sharing personal anecdotes as both parent and educator.

**Presentation from Mike Schofield and Jessica Jones: School Size and Cost**
Mike explained how BSD staffs schools, focusing on elementary-level challenges and clarifying that this was not a school closure discussion. He noted that schools with fewer than 300 students become less efficient and provided enrollment trends and projections.

Jessica overviewed the SAM model, detailing staffing methods and per-student costs at each elementary school.

**Questions/Comments & Responses:**

- Q*: Is "Direct Cert" tied to Title I funding?*
  A*:* Yes, though since the pandemic, Free and Reduced Lunch data is less reliable; Direct Cert percentages now include other qualifying factors.
- Q*: Oregon's average cost per student is $19k; BSD elementary schools are below that. What is our target?*
  A*:* There is no fixed target, but more resources for students would be ideal. The local option levy supports nearly 300 teachers. We have to consider what needs must be met for our students with the resources we have.
- Q: *What variance in per-student cost is acceptable?*
  *A:* A difference between $18k and $12k per student is significant enough to warrant discussion about tradeoffs and equity.
- Q: *Can we see the net financial impact by cost category? When we talk about getting that average down, we look into laying off staff.*
  A: Declining enrollment reduces staffing proportionally; no layoffs have occurred yet due to class size ratios. As enrollment declines, so does FTE.
- Q: *Why focus only on elementary schools and not consider option schools like BASE?*
  A: The work of the LRFP Committee began with elementary schools in the southeast but has broadened. Middle and high schools will likely be reviewed as well.
- Q: *What's included in "additional supports"?*
  A: Music/PE specialists, counselors, success coaches, library assistants, and similar non-classroom staff.
- Q: *Is the goal to balance extra costs and resource allocation?*

A: The focus is on student experience, equity, and meeting needs consistently across the District.

- Comment: *The public may primarily be concerned about closures; transparency is important.*
  A: Consolidation is one possible option, but not the only one. The larger question is how to maximize limited resources.
- Q: *Are boundary adjustments being considered?*
  A: They are not excluded; current options are preliminary.
- Q: *Where are transportation costs reflected?*
  A: In operational costs, estimated by student count and mileage.
- Q: *What is the urgency for decisions?*
  A: The District ended last year with a $6M deficit, is projecting a $20M deficit next year, and could reach $33M if no action is taken.
- Q: *Do facilities have capacity to absorb other schools?*
  A: Capacity data will be provided; past bonds aimed to reduce portable use.
- Q: *Will there be weighted criteria for scenario evaluation?*
  A: Yes. Planning Implications serve as the filter, balancing quantitative and qualitative priorities.
- Q: *How do maintenance costs factor in for older schools?*
  A: Facility data is in the 2020 LRFP, seismic reports, and condition assessments. Deferred maintenance is a major issue.
- Q: *Is there a link between declining enrollment and rising paraeducator needs?*
  A: Paraeducator spending has increased significantly, though the strongest correlation with enrollment decline is low birth rates.
- Q: *Could budget numbers worsen with recent tax changes?*
  A: Yes; statewide property tax revenues, including those from Portland, affect BSD funding.
- Comment: A credible target might be within 10% of the average cost per student.
- Q: *Why do student perceptions show little difference between school sizes, but parent/staff perceptions do?*
  A: A deeper qualitative study could explore these differences.

**Summary of Comments from LRFP Videos**

Shellie provided an overview of comments that were left under the videos posted online regarding the Long-Range Facilities Planning process.

**North Stars & Planning Implications: Final Voting & Edits**

Carina presented each North Star and Planning Implication. Committee members voted using thumbs-up, thumbs-sideways, or thumbs-down. There were no thumbs-down votes, indicating consensus to move forward. Sideways votes reflected reservations but not opposition.

**Closing & Next Steps**

Karina noted the next meeting would aim to bring all committee members to the same baseline understanding, then begin discussing scenario creation, evaluation processes, and integrating quantitative data.

Steven noted that a doodle poll would be sent out to ask about availability for the next meeting, likely to be scheduled for October.

**Discussion on Scope (K–5 vs. K–12)**

- Q: Will the information include K–12 or just K–5?
  A: Initially, this work is focused on K–5. Broader impacts are noted but not yet explored.
- One committee member emphasized multiple times the importance of considering middle and high school, citing clean feeder patterns, the inclusion of option schools, and the long-term effects of early literacy on overall outcomes.
- District staff responded that to keep the work manageable, the scope may need to be temporarily limited; looking at the full system at once can be overwhelming. However, if clean feeder patterns are a goal for this work, it will require reviewing at all grade levels eventually.
- Other members responded that when middle school boundaries were set, the committee focused on a specific area first, then revisited decisions for alignment. They stressed returning focus to elementary now that the North Stars are set, warning that too wide a focus could slow progress and erode trust.

**Additional Questions/Comments & Responses**

- Q: *How can we provide feedback on implications we semi-agreed on?*
  A: Send feedback to Steven, he will then forward to BRIC.
- Q: *What are committee tasks vs. staff/consultant tasks?*
  A: BSD/BRIC will define next steps internally; the next meeting will review prior work and add quantitative data.
- Q: *Can we see the same cost-per-student graphs but for middle and high school at our next meeting?*
  A: Yes.
- Q: *Can we include the elementary enrollment-to-capacity for the next meeting as well as the District seismic and building health study?*
  A: Yes.
- Q: *Why do we have to wait until October for the next meeting? Why not September?*
- A: There are a lot of events happening as the new school year starts. The team will need to speak internally first just to avoid setting a date that is later postponed.

- Q: *In current deficit spending, how many years before we're falling behind the threshold of 5%?*
  A: Three years roughly.
- Q: *Will we continue to have Teaching & Learning at future meetings?*
  A: Likely not. However, we can invite them on a need's basis.

These meeting notes are a record. If there are any errors and/or omissions in the foregoing notes, please advise our office immediately; otherwise these notes will be considered correct and complete as written.

Submitted by

Carina Santoro-Quintanilla, Planner
BRIC Architecture, Inc
Attachments: