Community Budget Review Committee (CBRC)
Meeting Minutes

Date:	Thursday, April 28, 2025
Time:	5:30 pm - 7:30 pm
Location:	(Virtual) The meeting will be streamed live under the provision of ORS 192.670 at: https://www.youtube.com/@ppsfinance/live

MATERIALS

[redacted]

CBRC Budget Materials and Report Development

ATTENDEES

[redacted]

CBRC Attendees
- Minyana Bishop
- Karanja Crews
- Aaron Cronan
- Dashiell Elliott
- Grace Groom
- Tasz Ferguson
- Natan Hadgu
- Sonya Harvey
- Mariah Hudson
- Stephan Lindner
- Adriel Person

Staff Attendees
- Tami Booth
- Alexandra Martin
- Michelle Morrison

Board Attendees
- Patte Sullivan

Public Comment
- None

MINUTES

[redacted]

5:35 pm
- Opening - Committee Chair
- Housekeeping

Mariah Hudson opened the meeting at 5:35p.
Staff provided brief updates and summarized the agenda.

5:40 pm

- Report Development

Mariah Hudson facilitated the development of the CBRC annual budget and Local Option Levy reports.

7:33 pm

- Closing - Committee Chair

Mariah Hudson adjourned the meeting at 7:33 pm.

TRANSCRIPT

WEBVTT

00:03:18.000 --> 00:03:24.000
Hi, Mariah. I think you're online. Are you able to unmute?

00:03:24.000 --> 00:03:25.000
Thanks for your patience here. I sure am. I appreciate it.

00:03:25.000 --> 00:03:28.000
Okay.

00:03:28.000 --> 00:03:29.000
All right.

00:03:29.000 --> 00:03:36.000
I'm not hearing your audio, but that might be my problem. Can others hear Maria's audio?

00:03:36.000 --> 00:03:37.000
Yes.

00:03:37.000 --> 00:03:38.000
I can hear.

00:03:38.000 --> 00:03:39.000
Okay, turn that up a little bit.

00:03:39.000 --> 00:03:45.000
Okay, it must be my setting.

00:03:45.000 --> 00:04:05.000
All right, so we've kicked off kind of our report writing and I appreciate everyone who's kind of started to work through our process and our document and tackle the areas that we're looking at together as a committee and considering.

00:04:05.000 --> 00:04:11.000
I know it's a lot to read through, hundreds of pages here with our budget documents.

00:04:11.000 --> 00:04:20.000
I think first we wanted to go back through some of the questions that were open for staff and the answers.

00:04:20.000 --> 00:04:30.000
That they've put together for us. So I will turn it back over to Alexandra and Tammy and others.

00:04:30.000 --> 00:04:41.000
That sounds good. Thanks. I'm in the background going to be fixing my audio. So just as an FYI, if Tammy comes off mute, you'll hear a little echo because we're in the same space right now.

00:04:41.000 --> 00:04:47.000
So great to have a status update. Thanks for opening up the meeting.

00:04:47.000 --> 00:04:58.000
Mariah. This link to your questions and answers document is included in the slide deck that I sent and it is the same link from last week.

00:04:58.000 --> 00:05:04.000
We did have… a handful of additional questions elevated to us yesterday.

00:05:04.000 --> 00:05:11.000
From Stefan and those have been addressed here these last few questions.

00:05:11.000 --> 00:05:18.000
I'm sure folks may not have had a time to attend to this and see these updates.

00:05:18.000 --> 00:05:26.000
Maybe at the beginning of the meeting, folks can click into that is what I would suggest and let us know if you have any follow-ups.

00:05:26.000 --> 00:05:45.000
And just to flag the outstanding items were some of these more programmatic questions where we didn't have the information immediately available to us on the finance side or in the budget document. And that's the same for some of these lingering program budget questions that we had submitted

00:05:45.000 --> 00:05:52.000
So we just need a little bit more time to get the information that we pulled together validated by our program side.

00:05:52.000 --> 00:06:11.000
Are there any… questions or areas of interest for now around the CBRC questions that have been answered.

00:06:11.000 --> 00:06:14.000
I don't see any questions.

00:06:14.000 --> 00:06:22.000
That's kind of, if we have just a moment, just kind of go through these here as a group.

00:06:22.000 --> 00:06:25.000
I'm just scrolling down by They're answered.

00:06:25.000 --> 00:06:29.000
Do you want to go through the ones that were recently submitted?

00:06:29.000 --> 00:06:39.000
Yeah, just recently submitted and answered here. Are we looking at the ones from April 24th?

00:06:39.000 --> 00:06:40.000
And…

00:06:40.000 --> 00:06:51.000
Right. Yeah, April 24th. These were the ones that say April 24th were either asked prior to the meeting or during the meeting and I recorded them.

00:06:51.000 --> 00:06:55.000
And we did ask our program team to respond to these.

00:06:55.000 --> 00:07:04.000
We had some questions submitted over email yesterday afternoon. And those are on the 27th.

00:07:04.000 --> 00:07:34.000

Okay.

00:07:47.000 --> 00:07:55.000
I wonder, Stefan, did you have any follow-up questions if you've had a minute to take a look at these responses? Is there anything outstanding?

00:07:55.000 --> 00:08:06.000
From your point of view.

00:08:06.000 --> 00:08:16.000
Yeah, what is… decline in bond proceeds mean? I'm just looking through them sorry so i'm Just trying to rip my head around that.

00:08:16.000 --> 00:08:19.000
Decline in bond proceeds.

00:08:19.000 --> 00:08:26.000
Yeah, this is with respect to, I think it's maybe on page 12, if I see this correctly.

00:08:26.000 --> 00:08:40.000
The budget resources decreased from 429 to 140 million. What was in there, why did it decrease? And then it said that the decrease was in bond proceeds I don't understand what that means.

00:08:40.000 --> 00:08:56.000
Mm-hmm. Bond proceeds This is our revenue object code for for bond for general obligation bond. Tammy, do you want to um

00:08:56.000 --> 00:09:10.000
Yeah. So whenever we about to sell a bond, we receive revenue in, we used to fund our projects and so as the 2020 bond.

00:09:10.000 --> 00:09:18.000
Has been down that we've kind of talked about this a little bit, that those proceeds that we would use would become less over time.

00:09:18.000 --> 00:09:31.000
And then . There's additional conversation about the 2025 bond and the timing of that but that's spread out over a period of time not necessarily all within the same year.

00:09:31.000 --> 00:09:51.000
And that's to be strategic about the debt that we would need to pay off in repayment and the interest rates earnings Which I can also defer to Michelle to fill in that the more details on, but at a high level, the district is strategic on rolling those out so that we're not paying

00:09:51.000 --> 00:10:02.000
Interest on projects we can't build just yet.

00:10:02.000 --> 00:10:03.000
Mm-hmm.

00:10:03.000 --> 00:10:12.000
Okay. Yeah. So, yeah, okay, good. That makes sense. So it's like, it's essentially revenue from from the bonds right when it will be paid. And then like my i think that two questions down. I had that question about like a decline in object 4000 facility acquisition constructions and that declined

00:10:12.000 --> 00:10:23.000
It's valuable about 400 million dollars and that seems to be fewer construction projects. So my understanding is that these two things are parallel.

00:10:23.000 --> 00:10:38.000

Doesn't make sense, right? So it's like you use the bonds for construction so you're born revenues, rights of the kind of like the inflow you have for when the bond is lower and parallel to that, your construction projects.

00:10:38.000 --> 00:10:39.000
Declined.

00:10:39.000 --> 00:10:44.000
Yeah, you would generally see a similarity along the two. There's some interest earnings and some other factors that kind of over time. But yes, you should see those aligned.

00:10:44.000 --> 00:11:00.000
Uh-huh. Yeah. Yeah. So I think where it's a bit of a, to me at least, I think there's a bit of a kind of like two things, two or three things happening here and that might confuse people. It might

00:11:00.000 --> 00:11:11.000
Perhaps for us to just clarify that or leave it out. So I think there is this kind of like I'm fairly large decline in the budget.

00:11:11.000 --> 00:11:19.000
70%, I think, right? But what's mostly driven, I think, by this bond decline.

00:11:19.000 --> 00:11:27.000
And when you look, for instance, at the projected and revenue from state funds were actually not declining.

00:11:27.000 --> 00:11:39.000
So I feel like that is some sort of like it might be useful to look at the budget net of kind of construction related revenue and expenditure flows.

00:11:39.000 --> 00:11:54.000
And then I think the budget looks like more stable between last year and this I think that's helpful. The other thing If I understand this correctly, and you can correct me if I'm wrong The other thing I think that might be worth highlighting is

00:11:54.000 --> 00:12:08.000
That some sort of like the continued reduction in central services and to send other ones is driven by the climate happened a year earlier If I understand this correctly, right? So if you had some sort of larger budget and then you get

00:12:08.000 --> 00:12:12.000
And then we said, okay, we have to, I think over three years or so.

00:12:12.000 --> 00:12:18.000
Reduce our expenditures to get in line with that. And I think this is this year.

00:12:18.000 --> 00:12:30.000
So when you look just from like last year to this year, it's a little bit like You don't necessarily see that because you're on that lower level in terms of spending, but we haven't gotten to that lower level on expenditures.

00:12:30.000 --> 00:12:34.000
Sense is that a good characterization What's happening here?

00:12:34.000 --> 00:12:47.000
Yeah, actually, I think you summarized that fairly well in the board presentation, there was a slide that referenced the different funding sources, general fund and capital projects that kind of highlighted that difference.

00:12:47.000 --> 00:12:57.000
Yeah. Yeah, yeah.

00:12:57.000 --> 00:12:58.000
Yeah.

00:12:58.000 --> 00:13:05.000
That you're calling out. And from the state school fund kind of revenue, I would look at that as like flat funding essentially As opposed to stable because there are some choices that, you know, kind of had to be made

00:13:05.000 --> 00:13:14.000
To mute that restricted revenue and you are accurate and that our expenditures are outpacing revenue.

00:13:14.000 --> 00:13:17.000
Ongoing.

00:13:17.000 --> 00:13:20.000
Yeah, okay, good. I think that's helpful. Thank you.

00:13:20.000 --> 00:13:28.000
Yeah, so Stefan, I had a question actually kind of related to this. And I looked back at the numbers on that because I remember that board slide.

00:13:28.000 --> 00:13:41.000
And last year we had, I think it's the general funds and looking at those that really helped me out to understand like that's really our pot of money to work with in terms of staff salaries and the things that we think of as operating budget.

00:13:41.000 --> 00:13:49.000
And that was $854 million approximately last year, and it's $868 million this year as our projected on that.

00:13:49.000 --> 00:13:57.000
For the general fund, right? So I don't know if I'm out of order, if there's somebody else has a question before.

00:13:57.000 --> 00:14:00.000
Has a question next.

00:14:00.000 --> 00:14:14.000
I do not see any other hands up. One other helpful point might be from those board slides, we also combined when we looked at the combined special revenue and general fund change from the current year.

00:14:14.000 --> 00:14:30.000
We saw that it was about a 1% increase and especially based on increased costs have described that as as approximately flat or language like that in our presentations.

00:14:30.000 --> 00:14:38.000
So I guess my question then is when I go to understand reserves and contingencies.

00:14:38.000 --> 00:14:43.000
Are those words interchangeable? Are they actually different?

00:14:43.000 --> 00:14:49.000
Thank you.

00:14:49.000 --> 00:14:50.000
Okay.

00:14:50.000 --> 00:14:55.000
So I can jump in here and it depends on the fund that you're talking about, because PERS Reserve Fund was a very specific set aside for a very specific purpose.

00:14:55.000 --> 00:14:57.000

That we're tapping into now. So in that context.

00:14:57.000 --> 00:15:00.000
I'm looking at fund 6000. On page 26.

00:15:00.000 --> 00:15:08.000
Or six Did you say fund 6,000 on page 26?

00:15:08.000 --> 00:15:10.000
Yeah, I think it's pages about 25, 26 is where I'm reading in the budget.

00:15:10.000 --> 00:15:15.000
Oh. Function 6,000.

00:15:15.000 --> 00:15:16.000
Yeah, sorry, functions.

00:15:16.000 --> 00:15:22.000
Okay, that's okay. And I'm new in the last couple of months, so I want to make sure I've got everything here.

00:15:22.000 --> 00:15:28.000
So yeah, so those contingencies And that looks like that.

00:15:28.000 --> 00:15:30.000
The general fund contingency. Which would be, yeah, so that's those would be interchangeable.

00:15:30.000 --> 00:15:35.000
Yeah.

00:15:35.000 --> 00:15:41.000
Okay, so that's what we have net at the end of the year. I mean, so if we spent, you know, everything.

00:15:41.000 --> 00:15:46.000
According to budget, that would be what we have net at the end of the year and what we consider reserve.

00:15:46.000 --> 00:15:48.000
Right? Okay.

00:15:48.000 --> 00:16:01.000
Yes. And that set aside is intentional for like unknown new things that happen during the year. It also helps to carry expenditures from year to year in between.

00:16:01.000 --> 00:16:06.000
But if they had something unexpected happen that wasn't anticipated today.

00:16:06.000 --> 00:16:12.000
Through a board resolution, we could tap into those funds to address that need.

00:16:12.000 --> 00:16:14.000
In that moment.

00:16:14.000 --> 00:16:24.000
Right. So the board has established a threshold, I think a few years back of between a minimum of 5% and more like a target of 5% to 10%.

00:16:24.000 --> 00:16:35.000
At one point, we were much closer to 10% and we've drawn that down. And the superintendent's budget this year appears to draw that down by percentage further.

00:16:35.000 --> 00:16:49.000

My question there is, if I just do the math. You know last year, 42,005 on you know 850 Five.

00:16:49.000 --> 00:16:54.000
854 million for is under 5%.

00:16:54.000 --> 00:16:56.000
There's a there's a slight technicality. Yeah.

00:16:56.000 --> 00:17:00.000
Their qualification to that like what's the What am I missing? I figure there's something.

00:17:00.000 --> 00:17:05.000
So yeah, beginning a fund balance is not part of that revenue reserve.

00:17:05.000 --> 00:17:14.000
Language. So if you take all of the revenue minus beginning fund balance and times that by 5%, You should land at that number.

00:17:14.000 --> 00:17:24.000
So then I guess what I'm actually trying to figure out is like what is the reserve? What percentage of reserve are we carrying?

00:17:24.000 --> 00:17:29.000
Or is the budget proposing to carry?

00:17:29.000 --> 00:17:40.000
The budget is what proposes the reserve to carry. So in there, that 41,179 is the reserve we're proposing to carry.

00:17:40.000 --> 00:17:47.000
And that should be 5% for the general fund portion, that would be 5%.

00:17:47.000 --> 00:17:54.000
Of the revenue. Except for beginning fund balance.

00:17:54.000 --> 00:18:03.000
I wonder if you go to the general fund. Paige Alexandra, that might

00:18:03.000 --> 00:18:09.000
Yeah, when we're… If we go to Did you want to look into the resources?

00:18:09.000 --> 00:18:10.000
So what are we considering? Are

00:18:10.000 --> 00:18:25.000
So if you… Yeah, 868-580. If we back out The… Beginning fund balance.

00:18:25.000 --> 00:18:46.000
We got you there.

00:18:46.000 --> 00:18:47.000
Oh, so you're taking out, you're taking out the starting fund balance

00:18:47.000 --> 00:19:05.000
I'm booked now. Yeah, because beginning fund balance, I was doing a quick tape here on the side. The beginning fund balance isn't new revenue, that's a carry forward so we don't need to chip into 5% of our starting point, it would just be the new revenue coming in.

00:19:05.000 --> 00:19:06.000
Were we actually carrying forward from? Let's see.

00:19:06.000 --> 00:19:10.000

Bye.

00:19:10.000 --> 00:19:15.000
We carry it forward from the prior year.

00:19:15.000 --> 00:19:16.000
Okay.

00:19:16.000 --> 00:19:25.000
In the actuals, but it doesn't present in the budget document that way because we show two years of budget.

00:19:25.000 --> 00:19:26.000
Yeah, Yeah.

00:19:26.000 --> 00:19:31.000
I'll tell you what, without me sitting here and doing the math, do you want to just give CBRC, you know, kind of the the breakdown and percentage on that. I guess what I think what we're interested in as a committee, and I'm seeing Director Sullivan's hand here is

00:19:31.000 --> 00:19:37.000
Yeah.

00:19:37.000 --> 00:19:45.000
How that has changed. From last year as a percentage and where we are at percentage wise.

00:19:45.000 --> 00:19:51.000
Because we are recognizing that as a drawdown. How close to that 5% threshold we're getting.

00:19:51.000 --> 00:19:55.000
Because it looks pretty close to me.

00:19:55.000 --> 00:20:00.000
Well, when we budgeted this, we intended for it to be an exact 5%.

00:20:00.000 --> 00:20:08.000
Knowing that there were cuts that were being made that were impacting student experience and the resources that we were able to deliver to students.

00:20:08.000 --> 00:20:23.000
So the intention was not to hold any additional in reserve because we were already having to make some pretty significant cuts to the you know to central office, to classroom, to cross the system.

00:20:23.000 --> 00:20:28.000
And so we would not want to have any more in there.

00:20:28.000 --> 00:20:33.000
Than the board required 5%. Given this condition.

00:20:33.000 --> 00:20:39.000
Michelle, if you wanted to add to that.

00:20:39.000 --> 00:20:50.000
Yeah, thank you. Our target is 5%, which is the same as last year. So it's a slightly different number because our revenue is slightly different, but we're targeting 5%.

00:20:50.000 --> 00:21:03.000
And you're right. Our target is five to 10. And we have It looks very deliberately drawn that down in order to preserve programming.

00:21:03.000 --> 00:21:08.000
This puts us at the end of the drawdown.

00:21:08.000 --> 00:21:14.000
Right. I think, you know, historically it's been budgeted as a contingency.

00:21:14.000 --> 00:21:18.000
But that is the target for a fund balance at the end of the year.

00:21:18.000 --> 00:21:26.000
It's not distributed among instruction or support services. It's not distributed throughout the budget.

00:21:26.000 --> 00:21:42.000
So it's our plan to have that there at the close of the year. And you can see for our actual columns, 21, 22, 22, 23, and 23, 24, then it like shifts down into appropriated fund balance as we do our reporting.

00:21:42.000 --> 00:21:52.000
But that is our target. And you can see that 40 856 is what's in the current adopted budget.

00:21:52.000 --> 00:21:57.000
Great question.

00:21:57.000 --> 00:22:10.000
Yeah, my question is along the lines of the a contingency as well. And like on page I guess I'm confused about the interfund transfers. What funds are they coming from?

00:22:10.000 --> 00:22:24.000
On 78, page 78 and 79. They talk about I guess it's 78 has the inner fund transfer 5,200.

00:22:24.000 --> 00:22:28.000
Where is that coming from?

00:22:28.000 --> 00:22:32.000
Yeah, thank you for your question. That is coming from our PERS reserve.

00:22:32.000 --> 00:22:33.000
So that's that set aside that is built up over time.

00:22:33.000 --> 00:22:36.000
Okay.

00:22:36.000 --> 00:22:45.000
That is there to help us with significant PERS increases, which is indeed happening in the upcoming biennium.

00:22:45.000 --> 00:22:57.000
Okay, so that's PERS, nothing to do with contingency. Okay. Okay. Thank you.

00:22:57.000 --> 00:23:07.000
Although on page 79. It shows contingency but i guess that's That's what you said we're still keeping. Okay.

00:23:07.000 --> 00:23:09.000
Almost the same as 2425.

00:23:09.000 --> 00:23:20.000
Yeah, well, we're looking at, on one, we're looking at resources and so that's the inner fund transfer from the PERS reserve coming into the general fund.

00:23:20.000 --> 00:23:33.000
And the requirements, those are outgoing transfers. So those are dollars that we are sending out for insurance and to our other funds that we use.

00:23:33.000 --> 00:23:43.000

Okay, thanks.

00:23:43.000 --> 00:24:08.000
And Tammy had, we developed a response to a question that was related to this and the questions and answers document we had the PERS stabilization fund transfer was about 24 million. And so that was the majority of the interfund transfers that we see in the reporting.

00:24:08.000 --> 00:24:20.000
Are there other questions? That we want to go more in depth on.

00:24:20.000 --> 00:24:40.000
In terms of the purr stabilization. If PERS continues on trend requires, it continues to increase next year. What's PPS's ability to support that again?

00:24:40.000 --> 00:24:44.000
For several years.

00:24:44.000 --> 00:25:00.000
Oh, great question, Maria. I will jump on that. So we are currently, you know, it's really early and there's a lot of really large variables pending right now but We've shared with the board that we are already expecting another $30 million reduction.

00:25:00.000 --> 00:25:14.000
In 26, 27, and that's primarily driven by the PERS rate

00:25:14.000 --> 00:25:29.000
And declining enrollment. So our revenue is shifting and our expenditures are shifting. Very similar story. So we will be we will be looking at reductions again.

00:25:29.000 --> 00:25:32.000
Yeah, and we're on trend for that for about three years.

00:25:32.000 --> 00:25:39.000
At this point, that's what the projections we've seen.

00:25:39.000 --> 00:25:40.000
I mean…

00:25:40.000 --> 00:25:51.000
Yeah, you know, it really depends on the decisions that we make in terms of one time use of funds, for example, the reserve, that's one time. That means it's automatically money we won't have the following year on the revenue side of our equation.

00:25:51.000 --> 00:26:03.000
But reductions such as staffing, if they're permanent reductions in staffing, that's a sustainable change on the expenditure side or contracts reduced or wherever those reductions might occur.

00:26:03.000 --> 00:26:10.000
Those are more sustainable than the one-time kind of budget gap.

00:26:10.000 --> 00:26:15.000
Strategies that we have.

00:26:15.000 --> 00:26:39.000
And our operating budget is 80%. People, we are a service business and so As long as we're shrinking, then I think we could expect our workforce to need to change.

00:26:39.000 --> 00:26:41.000
Director Sillivan.

00:26:41.000 --> 00:26:50.000

Yeah, I want to ask Michelle about this. I just had something come in the email today about Senate Bill 849.

00:26:50.000 --> 00:26:57.000
And it said the public employees retirement system has about 167 million in a fund that is phasing out of existence.

00:26:57.000 --> 00:27:03.000
Senate Bill 849A would apply that money to school district's PERS costs.

00:27:03.000 --> 00:27:06.000
For 2527. Lowering rates. Have you seen that?

00:27:06.000 --> 00:27:14.000
Yeah, yes. And we're very thankful for that. Our budget is already taking that into account.

00:27:14.000 --> 00:27:15.000
I know I testified on that a couple weeks ago. Please, please, please.

00:27:15.000 --> 00:27:19.000
Oh, darn. Okay. I got it.

00:27:19.000 --> 00:27:20.000
That's a really important one, I think, for all school districts at this point.

00:27:20.000 --> 00:27:25.000
Okay.

00:27:25.000 --> 00:27:36.000
I hoped it was extra.

00:27:36.000 --> 00:27:50.000
If we have staff for a few minutes can Can I continue with a few specific line item asks that have come up as I've been reading the budget and anybody else who has a few?

00:27:50.000 --> 00:27:58.000
I wanted to ask, let's see, I think it's around page 87.

00:27:58.000 --> 00:28:07.000
Oh, shoot. And my notes have put 91, but I think it's actually page 87 in the budget here. I wanted to just ask around some changes in transportation.

00:28:07.000 --> 00:28:18.000
You know, it looks like one thing went up, another thing went down. What's happening here? Can you give us the overall picture? Like, I don't want to focus too much on any one particular thing.

00:28:18.000 --> 00:28:29.000
But to kind of understand You know, if trips are going up in one area, what's the shift? What's happening?

00:28:29.000 --> 00:28:31.000
Kami, do you want to take that or do you want me to

00:28:31.000 --> 00:28:38.000
Yeah, I was just looking at the the specific lines.

00:28:38.000 --> 00:28:46.000
To look through. Some of this I know is just looking at historical trends and then future plans.

00:28:46.000 --> 00:28:56.000
And so like, for example, the taxi cab reimbursement, you can see trends a certain way. And then last year we budgeted a little differently.

00:28:56.000 --> 00:29:16.000
That 3.2 million on taxicab aligns a little bit better with historical trends and kind of over time what's over time A budget is a plan at a point in time. And so the actuals will come a little differently as the students show up and their needs.

00:29:16.000 --> 00:29:23.000
Present differently. So this appropriates a certain amount to go towards those activities.

00:29:23.000 --> 00:29:36.000
The reimbursable school bus as well. And so we receive 70% reimbursement on these. And so you'll actually see some revenue increase as well when we're expecting an increase.

00:29:36.000 --> 00:29:52.000
And so these would be kind of targeted working with the transportation department, but also acknowledging that they're there are some needs that our transportation department has that are not budgeted at this time.

00:29:52.000 --> 00:30:00.000
That will kind of be evaluated ongoing. Michelle, will you want to add anything to that?

00:30:00.000 --> 00:30:13.000
Yeah, I think I was looking at it more from the by function. So looking on page 87 You'll see similarly function 2550. So that's all of those things grouped together.

00:30:13.000 --> 00:30:27.000
They did overall increase and you know if you look back at our actual for 2324, are 2526 budget reflects that more closely because that's actual information we have.

00:30:27.000 --> 00:30:37.000
Than what's in the 2425 budget. It looks like there was quite a dip there in those line items, but our actual experience was quite a bit higher.

00:30:37.000 --> 00:30:45.000
So this is our attempt of trying to make sure that our budget is accurately reflecting what our costs are doing.

00:30:45.000 --> 00:30:53.000
So just so that I understand, so we budgeted lower last year, but then the actuals are coming in higher. And so we're correcting for that.

00:30:53.000 --> 00:30:55.000
Yep.

00:30:55.000 --> 00:31:00.000
Thank you. That really helps.

00:31:00.000 --> 00:31:06.000
Adriel, I see you have your hand up.

00:31:06.000 --> 00:31:25.000
Sorry, that was actually a question and I brought it back But I'll say it now. I hear that we're looking to be in this same situation with reductions for next year because of students leaving like what are we doing to address that? I mean, some of that is maybe

00:31:25.000 --> 00:31:34.000
Children are just aging out and there's not a a pool of young children to come back into the system.

00:31:34.000 --> 00:31:41.000
And I guess I'm trying to figure out how do we prevent this from being, what are we doing to prevent this issue from reoccurring.

00:31:41.000 --> 00:31:47.000

For the next 10 years.

00:31:47.000 --> 00:32:02.000
Well, unfortunately, birth rates are down you know nationally. So, I mean, there is a course correction there. Our state as a whole has lost enrollment as well but portland continues to lose enrollment at a faster pace.

00:32:02.000 --> 00:32:15.000
So I know that our superintendent is working with the comms and family outreach to do their very best to rally and get kids to choose Portland over some other options that they have.

00:32:15.000 --> 00:32:20.000
But I don't think that plan is fully developed just yet.

00:32:20.000 --> 00:32:27.000
But it's definitely a focus of and a big topic for us.

00:32:27.000 --> 00:32:36.000
Are we getting… the right information about the reasons that families are leaving.

00:32:36.000 --> 00:32:45.000
I guess I'm just curious I hear you that there is a plan and that birthrights, I mean, birth rates, excuse me, are low.

00:32:45.000 --> 00:32:49.000
It's alarming. To me.

00:32:49.000 --> 00:33:04.000
As a parent and someone who works in in this city like i just I can't imagine what that means long term if we can't figure out a solution.

00:33:04.000 --> 00:33:05.000
I don't want to imagine.

00:33:05.000 --> 00:33:11.000
Yeah, we do have a pretty comprehensive report that's done annually by PSU.

00:33:11.000 --> 00:33:25.000
Portland State University. And in it, they have some you know bullet points But really the biggest cost driver is going to be decline in birth.

00:33:25.000 --> 00:33:34.000
Rates. And I'm not going to speculate on other areas, but housing is fairly expensive in Portland.

00:33:34.000 --> 00:33:51.000
And you know, I don't know that families are able to find the same amenities in Portland as they can find in the surrounding communities so that's that again is speculation. And I think it'd be good to probably bring some highlights of the report forward.

00:33:51.000 --> 00:34:04.000
And again, look at other cities and declining enrollment and seeing some of the strategies they're using.

00:34:04.000 --> 00:34:10.000
Sorry, Adriel, if that sounded like a non-answer.

00:34:10.000 --> 00:34:24.000
No, it didn't. I appreciate you. I know that you don't have a crystal ball. I just… also am feeling disheartened and discouraged by the fact that we'll be here again next year with another $30 million.

00:34:24.000 --> 00:34:50.000
Trying to figure out how to not harm the kids who are still here and still have equity and teachers that reflect communities and all of the things It's just saddening.

00:34:50.000 --> 00:34:53.000
Maria, feel free.

00:34:53.000 --> 00:35:11.000
I will always defer to somebody else who has a question. I've got a lot. So Director Sullivan jump in next.

00:35:11.000 --> 00:35:12.000
Director Sullivan, are you muted or do you have a question?

00:35:12.000 --> 00:35:18.000
Okay.

00:35:18.000 --> 00:35:34.000
Okay, I guess I'll ask um if we've got this right, it looks like the budget of the positions, it looks like a 150 maybe 55 or so are teaching positions. I'm not sure if I have that number right.

00:35:34.000 --> 00:35:44.000
I guess the question is. Like how much money so we're cutting the the cut is $40 million. How much is that saving?

00:35:44.000 --> 00:35:48.000
Like…

00:35:48.000 --> 00:35:51.000
Yeah.

00:35:51.000 --> 00:36:01.000
I don't know that I fully understand the question. So if we're cutting 40 million, we're reducing the amount we can spend by 40 million.

00:36:01.000 --> 00:36:10.000
Yeah, so if you're looking at, you know, kind of where where the savings are coming from, I guess.

00:36:10.000 --> 00:36:28.000
You know different areas if you're making a reduction I don't know, one budget supplies let's say you know what is the reduction what is the what is the savings that we're seeing by making that reduction in area of teaching positions.

00:36:28.000 --> 00:36:38.000
Because that's where you know the bulk of the bulk the bulk of the bulk of the And I know that's enrollment related, right?

00:36:38.000 --> 00:36:44.000
But… I was curious if we had kind of a figure for that

00:36:44.000 --> 00:36:51.000
We have some early estimates that we did in not in this document, but in the board slides that we shared.

00:36:51.000 --> 00:37:07.000
I think that Alexandra has shared those with you. There were two sets of tables. There was an initial recommendation and then Another iteration of that after some feedback. And so you can see there what changes were made due to enrollment?

00:37:07.000 --> 00:37:12.000
And even some of the programming that shifted due to enrollment decline as well.

00:37:12.000 --> 00:37:18.000
So I think that will probably be the best place to look.

00:37:18.000 --> 00:37:27.000

It's important too to understand that when we are talking about reductions, we are talking about reductions from our current actual staffing.

00:37:27.000 --> 00:37:57.000
And not necessarily what we planned in the adopted budget. It's varied throughout the year. We set our guideline For fiscal year 2425 and a lot has changed within our appropriations from that initial budget. If certain positions for example are vacant for a period of time, that FTE may be converted to either savings or to another type of position to fill the needs for our kids.

00:37:57.000 --> 00:38:08.000
So when we're talking to you about reductions in FTE, it's not necessarily going to be a straight line across from one adopted budget to the proposed budget.

00:38:08.000 --> 00:38:15.000
So just to make that very clear we had um had to explain that as well to the Oregonian staff.

00:38:15.000 --> 00:38:32.000
The one we're talking about, it's a little bit different. So the math straight across isn't probably isn't going to read the same as the impact to our current staff, which is what we're sharing.

00:38:32.000 --> 00:38:46.000
Yeah, that was the biggest kind of piece to clarify and the other point to highlight was when we look at these reductions in the costing, sometimes we have to use the average cost.

00:38:46.000 --> 00:38:54.000
And so there are contractual obligations for seniority and orders in which reductions happen.

00:38:54.000 --> 00:39:22.000
And so what that actually totals isn't quantifiable until the process has gone through for placement of all of those staff. And it just takes a little longer during the budget time so the representation in the slides is going to be a close estimate based on an average cost as opposed to exact cost.

00:39:22.000 --> 00:39:41.000
Thanks. I got it. I understood that that would be an estimate, but it helps me know that that's that um So the 157, as I understand it, is that including vacant positions that have been subsumed or that's the impact to current staff, not including the vacant positions that have been subsumed, but the budget would include

00:39:41.000 --> 00:39:49.000
Vacant positions plus impact current staff.

00:39:49.000 --> 00:39:58.000
The last year's budget or this current year's budget could be both vacant positions and filled positions.

00:39:58.000 --> 00:40:05.000
Depending on which positions were identified in the HR process.

00:40:05.000 --> 00:40:08.000
I guess maybe the bottom line is really the impact of students, right? I mean, it's both the impact of staff and to students right but um I guess we'd see that in class sizes.

00:40:08.000 --> 00:40:38.000
Mm-hmm. Right. Yeah. And that volume two Yeah, the volume two will kind of lead you to that with their target for staff in student teacher ratios in the building volume two.

00:40:38.000 --> 00:40:52.000
Speaking of staffing. And in understanding some of the blending that's happening with classrooms. I wanted to dig into that a little bit.

00:40:52.000 --> 00:40:56.000
I'm not sure that these are the same issues, so maybe separate it out.

00:40:56.000 --> 00:41:14.000
Do we know? I had a hard time trying to figure this out from budget volume two what the projected impact is like in terms of how many blended classrooms we're talking about and how many schools that is.

00:41:14.000 --> 00:41:15.000
Is it just a…

00:41:15.000 --> 00:41:24.000
I think that that's… That's a helpful rephrase of the question that was asked in the space on Thursday. And so I can add that.

00:41:24.000 --> 00:41:28.000
Almost like a clarification to the question we had on Thursday.

00:41:28.000 --> 00:41:40.000
But Michelle or Tammy, if you have anything else to add for now, let us know. But I had we've we've reached out to program folks who should be able to respond to that.

00:41:40.000 --> 00:41:54.000
Yeah, I think that, thank you, Alexandra. I think our initial estimate, and I hadn't seen the final numbers, but the initial estimate when we were doing our projections for staffing were There would be 18.

00:41:54.000 --> 00:42:03.000
Classrooms impacted. But I would definitely lean on what the final was with our program staff.

00:42:03.000 --> 00:42:06.000
That was an early estimate.

00:42:06.000 --> 00:42:24.000
Thank you. That gives some general idea out of what we have 740 classrooms approximately or something like that district-wide

00:42:24.000 --> 00:42:40.000
Yeah, I had a question about the impact of that when we're looking at TAG and the fact that it's now an expectation of teachers to differentiate, right? Like if you're dealing with blended classrooms.

00:42:40.000 --> 00:42:48.000
And the heightened performance of some youth in those classrooms.

00:42:48.000 --> 00:43:11.000
Have we thought about that impact and how that's going to be managed? I know that even now some schools and classes aren't able to differentiate because there is a huge gap in learning for the kids who are underperforming. So if you're blending a fourth grade and a fifth grade and you've got kids at or below benchmark and then

00:43:11.000 --> 00:43:26.000
You know significantly above. How is that going to be managed when TAG is no longer a pullout it's requiring teachers to differentiate and offer different levels how Has that been considered? I guess I'm just curious to know.

00:43:26.000 --> 00:43:33.000
What that's going to mean for kids and families that are enrolled in TAG.

00:43:33.000 --> 00:43:41.000
Yeah, thank you for that question, Adriel. It's not just TAG. It's the other students that may be impacted as well.

00:43:41.000 --> 00:44:00.000
So I think as those are rolling out, our principals have been working with senior directors to talk about the best way to identify The teacher that would be the teacher that you know, most adept at at managing that classroom and instruction for those kids.

00:44:00.000 --> 00:44:06.000
But also the target class size for those was lower than a straight classroom.

00:44:06.000 --> 00:44:21.000
So if you think about that going from 28 to 20, I want to say 26, that that puts kind of a limit on what the number of bodies that would be in that classroom, the number of children.

00:44:21.000 --> 00:44:32.000
Aside from that, I've heard a lot programmatically about what we would be able to offer teachers in terms of planning time and support and training.

00:44:32.000 --> 00:44:40.000
But that's not my area of expertise and we can definitely get some program staff to respond to that.

00:44:40.000 --> 00:44:46.000
And did I just hear you say from 28 to 26? So just two kids?

00:44:46.000 --> 00:44:57.000
Yeah, I think that was the cap. So I think, and we have probably more data coming about what what the actual is, but that was the limit.

00:44:57.000 --> 00:45:11.000
For those blended classrooms. So they were lower than the straight fourth or fifth.

00:45:11.000 --> 00:45:19.000
And Alexander, you need to step in and correct me if I'm not recalling correctly. There's been so many conversations.

00:45:19.000 --> 00:45:36.000
I agree. There have been a lot of conversations and so I didn't, I was hesitating to state any specific number of classrooms impacted because I know that our team through the staffing process is doing a lot of technical corrections and looking at the actual impact to schools and so

00:45:36.000 --> 00:45:43.000
I was hoping to have our program folks weigh in on that with some more.

00:45:43.000 --> 00:45:56.000
Fine-tuned details about it. Grace, I see your hand is up.

00:45:56.000 --> 00:46:03.000
Yeah, thanks. Just quickly on the blended classrooms.

00:46:03.000 --> 00:46:18.000
From a teacher's perspective. And then I have a bigger topic to address but um It's really important. I think I shared this last time to understand if these are split classrooms where the teacher is being asked to teach two different grade levels of curriculum or if it will be

00:46:18.000 --> 00:46:26.000
Looped and looped and So that you can blend the curriculum so everyone, you're not doing two sets of planning.

00:46:26.000 --> 00:46:32.000
Because you only have one planning period. They're not going to give you two more planning periods.

00:46:32.000 --> 00:46:38.000
So I'm hopeful that that's part of the conversation as well, because that will really impact the instruction of the students.

00:46:38.000 --> 00:46:46.000
So if the students don't stay with that same teacher or stay in that same sort of a rotation, whether it's with that teacher or a different teacher.

00:46:46.000 --> 00:47:00.000
We want to make sure that they're not missing any targets for their grade level when they're blended grades and also that that one teacher isn't held to constructing two separate levels of curriculum at the same.

00:47:00.000 --> 00:47:08.000
Of course, there's tons of differentiation that goes on. So there's a million things, but if that could be one less thing, that would be great.

00:47:08.000 --> 00:47:24.000
For the students. My big question that I had coming up top of mind as I was reviewing the budget was first of all very thankful that the equity allocations have have been maintained.

00:47:24.000 --> 00:47:35.000
I think that's a really important statement of the board's values and goes towards the All four of the board's goals very clearly.

00:47:35.000 --> 00:47:44.000
A concern I have and a question I have is with the Title I funding being an unknown.

00:47:44.000 --> 00:47:49.000
The plan going forward of cutting 25%.

00:47:49.000 --> 00:48:02.000
From the Title II. Budget. My question is how did that, what percentage of that is direct service student facing positions in those Title I schools.

00:48:02.000 --> 00:48:23.000
Because our four board goals to address the the achievement gap, which is largely based on not based on, but it aligns with racial, social economic status.

00:48:23.000 --> 00:48:32.000
So does title like those title monies go to those students and so It's great that we have our equity allocation at 8% flat.

00:48:32.000 --> 00:48:50.000
But knowing that there's a big cut to those same schools, what are we doing to sort of backfill any positions that are student facing that might be cut at the schools where the students have the highest needs based on their test scores and

00:48:50.000 --> 00:48:59.000
You know, based on the board goals.

00:48:59.000 --> 00:49:19.000
I can kind of jump in with starting to answer the question, which is i don't know quantifiably what that is and I would need to just verify the number, that's an area that I have a team that works on gathering that data and compiling it and they work with program managers within

00:49:19.000 --> 00:49:34.000
Funded programs and so it's a collective group and so to give kind of what that number is or direct service to students, I would need to confirm that.

00:49:34.000 --> 00:49:51.000
What I'm sharing on screen right now, I hope, is just as an example, we've talked about a title one reduction of 25%, and that's a federal grant and program that's within Fund 205.

00:49:51.000 --> 00:50:05.000
So I wanted to share in case it's helpful. You can see across the entire Fund 205, so not at the granular level of detail for Title I, but you can see how we're planning for for changes in this.

00:50:05.000 --> 00:50:13.000
Fund 205. I'm looking at page 103 in our document.

00:50:13.000 --> 00:50:26.000
But like I said, you won't be able to see if that was just based on a title reduction. It would be there would be other grants within that.

00:50:26.000 --> 00:50:32.000
Grace, do you have any follow-ups for now or should I turn to Deschel?

00:50:32.000 --> 00:50:48.000
I guess I just want to put a pin on that because the You know, I haven't had enough time to look through all of the Title I schools reports to see their reductions in staff.

00:50:48.000 --> 00:50:55.000
But from a cursory look, it did look it did look to me like some schools that are not Title I.

00:50:55.000 --> 00:51:09.000
With, you know, much lower percentage of direct certification for free meals we're staying relatively flat with their staffing.

00:51:09.000 --> 00:51:14.000
And their enrollments were either going down slightly or staying flat.

00:51:14.000 --> 00:51:20.000
And then some other schools were getting a bigger hit that were Title I identified.

00:51:20.000 --> 00:51:25.000
And in some of those cases they're enrollments were going up.

00:51:25.000 --> 00:51:41.000
So, um. Just something to flag and to to look at more closely is how how the Title I cuts are impacting staffing at specific schools.

00:51:41.000 --> 00:51:47.000
And then I'm done.

00:51:47.000 --> 00:51:53.000
That was helpful to hear you describe how you approached that, Grace.

00:51:53.000 --> 00:51:55.000
Michelle, do you want to jump in?

00:51:55.000 --> 00:52:12.000
Sure. I just wanted to bring back up my questions from the email that I sent. And I was wondering, I looked at the CBRC Q&A And I didn't see those in there. Should I add those questions into the form or will those be added in?

00:52:12.000 --> 00:52:21.000
Jachelle, were those relevant to the community engagement question that was discussed about the integrated grant application statement.

00:52:21.000 --> 00:52:26.000
Yeah, but I didn't see my actual questions in the document to like keep track of them.

00:52:26.000 --> 00:52:27.000
They weren't in there.

00:52:27.000 --> 00:52:36.000
Okay. Yes, I can add that. Sorry for that oversight. I think that I… spoke to that at the beginning of our meeting that was on Thursday.

00:52:36.000 --> 00:52:44.000

So I just, I happen to recall that your question was about the size of the sample for PPS, among some other, right?

00:52:44.000 --> 00:52:45.000
Yeah.

00:52:45.000 --> 00:52:55.000
Okay, so I clarified that. During the beginning of our last meeting, which I believe you were not in the space or not able to attend, at least for that portion.

00:52:55.000 --> 00:52:56.000
Mm-hmm.

00:52:56.000 --> 00:53:01.000
So I'll add that and add a written response in our questions doc. Thank you.

00:53:01.000 --> 00:53:05.000
Thank you.

00:53:05.000 --> 00:53:09.000
Director Sullivan, go ahead.

00:53:09.000 --> 00:53:16.000
Yeah, I understood that this budget is showing We're figuring 25%.

00:53:16.000 --> 00:53:24.000
Cut from Title I. Is that correct?

00:53:24.000 --> 00:53:30.000
So if we get it, we'll be adding positions in?

00:53:30.000 --> 00:53:35.000
Is that true?

00:53:35.000 --> 00:53:51.000
Yeah, I think that's to be determined. We had many conversations about other supports for students aside from staff positions knowing that the title funding is probably going to be pretty tricky the next couple of years.

00:53:51.000 --> 00:54:02.000
So I think that there's probably some strategic thinking by our instructional folks to figure out the best way to target those funds.

00:54:02.000 --> 00:54:10.000
Okay, so and we have no idea when we're going to know for sure how much tidal money we're getting, correct?

00:54:10.000 --> 00:54:11.000
Not at this time.

00:54:11.000 --> 00:54:18.000
Okay. And I thought that the equity percent was 4% now.

00:54:18.000 --> 00:54:23.000
Not 8%.

00:54:23.000 --> 00:54:29.000
Is that right, too? That we had to cut it last year.

00:54:29.000 --> 00:54:36.000
It's 4% and 2% and 2%, right? It's additive.

00:54:36.000 --> 00:54:39.000
Oh, okay. If you get all the titles in there. Okay.

00:54:39.000 --> 00:55:05.000
It is, yeah. I suppose you could not qualify for each of those, but I believe most, if not all schools do. If you qualify for one, you qualify for all.

00:55:05.000 --> 00:55:06.000
Oh, sure.

00:55:06.000 --> 00:55:24.000
Patty, can I ask a question of the board? Has there been any discussion about that 25% cut to schools qualifying for title in any ways to backfill for staffing cuts or to hold those schools harmless.

00:55:24.000 --> 00:55:29.000
As a in alignment with the board goals.

00:55:29.000 --> 00:55:42.000
No, I'm figuring staff is probably doing that I know people are trying to to do the best they can with what they've got.

00:55:42.000 --> 00:55:50.000
I hadn't understood that we were figuring We did not have that 25%.

00:55:50.000 --> 00:55:57.000
Hoping it comes yeah

00:55:57.000 --> 00:55:58.000
Right.

00:55:58.000 --> 00:56:04.000
Right. Right. The plan is that you're budgeting for 25% less So that's what that's what staff has worked out.

00:56:04.000 --> 00:56:05.000
That you're going to budget for 25% less. My question is.

00:56:05.000 --> 00:56:07.000
Mm-hmm.

00:56:07.000 --> 00:56:17.000
Knowing that, are you making, is there any conversations about adjustments to to fill that gap, especially for student-facing positions.

00:56:17.000 --> 00:56:25.000
No, not beyond what we've already done to try to cut everywhere else before doing student facing.

00:56:25.000 --> 00:56:26.000
So. Yeah.

00:56:26.000 --> 00:56:41.000
Okay, thank you.

00:56:41.000 --> 00:56:43.000
I don't see anyone else with their hand up.

00:56:43.000 --> 00:57:03.000
I wanted to ask a question. It's been kind of bothering me since the last meeting and and um watching the video of the hearing or the hearing I just, I wanted to know if there's any… ideas around mental health

00:57:03.000 --> 00:57:14.000

Moving forward because moving forward It's a huge need. And I know I feel so bad bringing this up because I'm like hearing about money, this, that. And I'm like, it's so important, I understand. But like.

00:57:14.000 --> 00:57:19.000
I'm very concerned about mental health in the schools.

00:57:19.000 --> 00:57:34.000
And when that's eliminated, and I was looking at the mission statement to educate all children to their highest potential and It started having me wondering about the trainings for the educators.

00:57:34.000 --> 00:57:50.000
And I was looking at the SEL, social emotional learning programs, but then I also learned that It varies. It's not a requirement. So I'm a little concerned with the supports that will be provided This year or next year, sorry.

00:57:50.000 --> 00:57:58.000
With that being removed. I don't know if you have an answer to that. But then I also was thinking about like.

00:57:58.000 --> 00:58:03.000
The models that have been used that I know of. And how they haven't really stuck.

00:58:03.000 --> 00:58:22.000
For example. There will be mental health services that come into the school. There'll be a contract And then it seems like it doesn't follow through for the whole year or I'm just hearing from a lot of families. I do a lot of engagements with the family. So we talk about this stuff.

00:58:22.000 --> 00:58:33.000
But one of my concerns also was about the billing. I know billing was an issue or paying for a school psychologist was an issue.

00:58:33.000 --> 00:58:53.000
It was suggested, I don't know if this model is used, where families can use their personal insurance to support this, or even if we're providing wraparound services where families these children can get referrals, but I'm just, I don't have the answer. You may not have the answer, but when I think about a cut next year and we're already experiencing a cut.

00:58:53.000 --> 00:59:06.000
I am very concerned. And then we look at the numbers declining of families that engaged in the Portland schools, I do think it does have something to do with the supports that are being provided on that type of level.

00:59:06.000 --> 00:59:10.000
So sorry, that was all over the place. I was holding that in for a while.

00:59:10.000 --> 00:59:14.000
But that's it.

00:59:14.000 --> 00:59:31.000
Thank you so much for that question. I'm trying to kind of characterize it and record it here, Mignana, maybe after this session, I can send you an email letting you know how I interpreted the question and you can provide me with feedback and we'll look to get that answered.

00:59:31.000 --> 00:59:32.000
Great. Thank you.

00:59:32.000 --> 00:59:43.000
Yeah, and I did want to mention some information that's already been shared around flexibility of supports in that area for middle schools.

00:59:43.000 --> 00:59:55.000

So that was shared in our board slides. Already, but I don't know if it was the level of detail that you're looking for in terms of what the programming will look like.

00:59:55.000 --> 01:00:03.000
Mariah, I think you had your hand up next, but Director Sullivan does also have her hand up.

01:00:03.000 --> 01:00:07.000
I'll jump in with question. Just looking forward, we're about halfway through a meeting here.

01:00:07.000 --> 01:00:16.000
What I'd like to do is take a few more questions. I've got one, of course. But then come back and kind of look through where we are.

01:00:16.000 --> 01:00:21.000
I think we have a few decision points as a committee, things that we may need to weigh in on.

01:00:21.000 --> 01:00:40.000
Some decisions to make, things like, do we want to speak to mental health as a part of our statement as a committee or do we want to call out um you know maybe something around the third, fourth split. I put a few things in here, but I'd love for us to make some of those decisions.

01:00:40.000 --> 01:01:04.000
So let's come back to that after questions. My question is around on page 88, we can see the PAT overload pay stipend So my understanding of that is when you have a large classroom you receive a stipend for having an over large class. Is that primarily what that is for?

01:01:04.000 --> 01:01:11.000
Rather than being overtime pay proper. Like you would see with classified staff

01:01:11.000 --> 01:01:12.000
We have…

01:01:12.000 --> 01:01:21.000
Yeah, you get an increase. Whatever per paycheck. It's not like a paycheck We're not paid hourly.

01:01:21.000 --> 01:01:36.000
Right. Okay. So that is, yeah, that's what it's that's what it's for. So when I'm looking at that as a trend So since over the past five five cycles, that is more than doubled.

01:01:36.000 --> 01:01:53.000
So what we're seeing is we're having larger classes I mean, teachers are appropriately being compensated more, but it's a reflection of larger class sizes that they're teaching. And so we're investing more resources as district into that overload pay.

01:01:53.000 --> 01:02:00.000
We're at the point now where it's about $4 million, if I'm reading this correctly.

01:02:00.000 --> 01:02:15.000
I just want to note that 26, almost 27 teachers If we were looking at the average cost of $152,000 that we use with the levy.

01:02:15.000 --> 01:02:26.000
And staff can check my math on that.

01:02:26.000 --> 01:02:44.000
Is, you know, is kind of kind of are there you know Can staff comment at all on that kind of trend line? Am I interpreting that as we're seeing larger classes. It must be in some areas, even as we're seeing smaller classes in other schools.

01:02:44.000 --> 01:02:49.000
I can jump in, but just know that I've only been here for a few months.

01:02:49.000 --> 01:03:00.000
And so that is an area that I'm looking into and the team's looking into and evaluating It's not a straight line as the math.

01:03:00.000 --> 01:03:14.000
Might appear so that's an oversimplification at best, but just conceptually knowing that like some schools are going to be just a little bit over here.

01:03:14.000 --> 01:03:33.000
A little bit over there. You've got a grade band or a classroom And there isn't really a good solution because if you hire that other staff member, then you're really pushing a two classroom to a three classroom situation. Again, this is oversimplified and I don't know

01:03:33.000 --> 01:03:56.000
All of the specific scenarios, but that's kind of one of the main kind of conversation points. I know that as a team, there's significant review and reporting that's happening. They're constantly reviewing class sizes as a district And looking to eliminate that. But when you have a large system with a lot of little nuance at a lot of different locations.

01:03:56.000 --> 01:04:01.000
It isn't quite as easy. I would love for it to be as simple.

01:04:01.000 --> 01:04:09.000
As just hiring. Staff that cost equal to the same and having lower class sizes.

01:04:09.000 --> 01:04:17.000
Across the board but it's a little more nuanced than that but it is something that I'll be digging into as well.

01:04:17.000 --> 01:04:24.000
Yeah, I certainly recognize you can't just hire 26 more teachers and, you know, divvying them up and point twos here and there.

01:04:24.000 --> 01:04:36.000
That it's probably systemic. But I just want to note that, and I think it might be worth noting in our report that that seems to be a strategy that's being more heavily relied on.

01:04:36.000 --> 01:04:41.000
Or it's trending up.

01:04:41.000 --> 01:04:54.000
And I think that the original may have changed since, but the original language and the contract that set those triggers for thresholds of when to get overage.

01:04:54.000 --> 01:05:12.000
The way that I understood it was it was an either or either an EA would be added or time for an educational assistant in the classroom added or teacher would get increased pay and it's pretty exclusively been just increase pay and that's not the

01:05:12.000 --> 01:05:18.000
The teacher doesn't get to decide that. It's… that's a district decision.

01:05:18.000 --> 01:05:34.000
And… for myself and I know many colleagues, they would much rather have another adult in the classroom when the class sizes are that large. But again, you know, staffing is not free.

01:05:34.000 --> 01:05:41.000
So would we see that reflected in a flat number of EAs, Tammy Or something like that.

01:05:41.000 --> 01:05:46.000
I'm not sure how EAs are broken out. They're probably lumped in with other staff.

01:05:46.000 --> 01:06:10.000

I think it's actually that that's actually conversation has triggered another concept where this might you may not see it because if it's an unfilled position we're paying overages because we can't fill an open vacancy, right? So that's another where we budgeted for that staff member to be there. So you're not really going to see an up or down in the budget because we're planning on hiring a person.

01:06:10.000 --> 01:06:13.000
So I don't know that it's going to be a straight line.

01:06:13.000 --> 01:06:31.000
Across because we should be budgeting the right, you know, the staffing needs based on the core staffing to fill that and that conversation kind of trigger that other talking point that it's also possible these overages are happening just because

01:06:31.000 --> 01:06:38.000
Were not able to fill that position during a certain period of time.

01:06:38.000 --> 01:06:43.000
And sometimes it's because there just isn't physical space. There's not a classroom.

01:06:43.000 --> 01:06:44.000
Mm-hmm.

01:06:44.000 --> 01:06:48.000
Another section.

01:06:48.000 --> 01:06:55.000
That fully answer your question.

01:06:55.000 --> 01:07:04.000
I think one other detail that wasn't stated is that we would naturally see it trend up due to compensation increases as well.

01:07:04.000 --> 01:07:10.000
I think they shall…

01:07:10.000 --> 01:07:33.000
Yes. So I think I'm just going back to um the sections in the report. And I think it might be helpful if we do really talk about the enrollment in our CBRC report Specifically, because given that the enrollment decline is also driven by family dissatisfaction.

01:07:33.000 --> 01:07:47.000
Gentrification and increased competition for private and charter schools, not just the lower birth birth rates. Like I know that's like a national trend that's happening, but it's not just that. Right. And so I think it's kind of hard to kind of fall back on that. So what specific strategies

01:07:47.000 --> 01:08:02.000
Are we going to be using to implement rebuilding trust in our communities with our families and reengaging them so they actively want to come to PPS and to attract new enrollment. So I think we really do need to focus on that in our report because it

01:08:02.000 --> 01:08:17.000
It's without students and what what can we possibly um really focus on. So I think that and then the diversification of revenue, I feel like I've asked that question a couple of times.

01:08:17.000 --> 01:08:34.000
In the sessions and I feel like it kind of it kind of gets answered, but not really. So I think when we're structuring the report, if we could also touch on taking that a little bit further of diversification of revenue, I think that would be helpful for the overall report.

01:08:34.000 --> 01:08:56.000

This Michelle, can you expand on that a little bit would we Because we haven't typically had the opportunity to diversify our revenue other than You know, we do have some income streams from local option and the art tax. So what are you thinking there?

01:08:56.000 --> 01:09:09.000
Has the district ever explored leveraging district-owned assets or public-private partnerships or even operational innovations such as like shared services or energy efficiencies.

01:09:09.000 --> 01:09:14.000
To reduce the future reliance on budget cuts.

01:09:14.000 --> 01:09:31.000
Yeah, no, we've explored some of those things and I know that we are part of a community school initiative that brings services into school to offer to students, but I think that's on a limited basis. As you can imagine, without additional funds to source it.

01:09:31.000 --> 01:09:36.000
Then you have to have partners that are willing to come in and serve and not charge you.

01:09:36.000 --> 01:09:56.000
And I don't know that that is actively happening. But those shared spaces, and I know that with our examination of in preparation of this bond ask on the May ballot, looking very carefully at our assets is going to be important too.

01:09:56.000 --> 01:10:17.000
And in the event that the bond doesn't pass Maybe I missed it. I feel like you might have touched on this earlier about the alternative risk mitigation and capital improvement strategies. And just in case it doesn't um Did you already touch on that at the beginning of the meeting?

01:10:17.000 --> 01:10:18.000
Okay.

01:10:18.000 --> 01:10:26.000
No, I think it was a prior meeting, but I think that, you know, if it does not pass in may those modernization efforts will be delayed.

01:10:26.000 --> 01:10:36.000
I do anticipate that our board would ask us to put it out on the ballot again and the next election.

01:10:36.000 --> 01:10:44.000
Potentially retooled a little bit based on feedback from the community so I think it's a matter of when.

01:10:44.000 --> 01:10:59.000
Not if. But until that time, we continue to you know do maintenance projects and um try and repair and extend the life of our schools.

01:10:59.000 --> 01:11:17.000
Okay. Yeah, I think… I think kind of just like all Somehow I feel like what the two questions I'm asking kind of intertwine a little bit but I think maybe even from the communication perspective, maybe in the budget too, is like the perceived instability

01:11:17.000 --> 01:11:34.000
Of the district. And I'm not calling the district unstable. I'm saying it's the perception right And so how How is that being conveyed to the public that these changes are happening and that people restores faith in the public school system here?

01:11:34.000 --> 01:11:49.000
I think that'll be something that would be really important is just a really good PR campaign or something along the lines of what the contingency plans might be for the bond, how you're going to be attracting new students and like active and even you don't

01:11:49.000 --> 01:12:05.000

I know you said you have to be able to pay people, but I feel like at least in my line of work with public and private partnerships a good plan like for programming for programming that has the potential to be funded. So are you all using your philanthropic partners?

01:12:05.000 --> 01:12:23.000
I mean, I just feel like we're kind of relying, like we're kind of going in this circle for the past three years I've been on this committee And it doesn't feel like the long and the long-term strategies are actually being put in place. I feel like we have a lot of short-term fixes and I did make that comment.

01:12:23.000 --> 01:12:38.000
A couple of meetings ago, but I'm still kind of standing by it. And I know everyone is working towards these, but I feel like it's just not getting conveyed to the public properly, perhaps, or there's just some avenues that we haven't explored. And so I guess I'll just stop there.

01:12:38.000 --> 01:12:53.000
At least in the report, I do think we should highlight some of the things that I've talked about.

01:12:53.000 --> 01:13:00.000
Michelle, do you have any response to that or should we go to folks with their hands raised?

01:13:00.000 --> 01:13:16.000
No response from me. I think, Deschel, that that kind of conversation needs to be elevated. I don't know that this is and and And this report is a good way to get that started. So I haven't been a part of those conversations to date, but

01:13:16.000 --> 01:13:21.000
I appreciate the creative thinking.

01:13:21.000 --> 01:13:30.000
Can you repeat that, Michelle? Sorry, did you say that you don't think that this report is a good place to get this started or you're saying it is?

01:13:30.000 --> 01:13:31.000
Okay, sorry, I just, I couldn't hear you cut out for me a little bit.

01:13:31.000 --> 01:13:38.000
It is, yeah. Okay, sorry.

01:13:38.000 --> 01:13:49.000
Yeah, I totally agree with that. And I don't think we do enough to tell about the good things that we do do.

01:13:49.000 --> 01:13:59.000
I just watched a bond accountability meeting last Wednesday. And it just was talking about all the things we are doing, but nobody knows.

01:13:59.000 --> 01:14:10.000
And who wants to sit and watch bond accountability? Meeting for two hours but um I think that's really exciting to think about that.

01:14:10.000 --> 01:14:18.000
And then I also wanted to say I had something, an answer. Oh, yeah, about the overload paste stipend.

01:14:18.000 --> 01:14:23.000
When I look at 105, it doesn't show any budget for that.

01:14:23.000 --> 01:14:31.000
And yet I'm sure we have it. It sounded like other people were seeing it somewhere.

01:14:31.000 --> 01:14:41.000
On page 88 in the general fund detail we can see we can see we can see the object code 315.

01:14:41.000 --> 01:14:45.000

350.

01:14:45.000 --> 01:14:48.000
Okay.

01:14:48.000 --> 01:14:54.000
Director Sullivan, it's because on page 105, that's listing FTE, but overload wouldn't have FTE.

01:14:54.000 --> 01:14:56.000
Oh, I see. So that… Yeah.

01:14:56.000 --> 01:15:00.000
I'm sorry, I just probably noted the wrong page on that. It's 88.

01:15:00.000 --> 01:15:09.000
Okay. And so 88. Shows what's it what is the title?

01:15:09.000 --> 01:15:12.000
Called PAT overload pay stipend.

01:15:12.000 --> 01:15:19.000
Oh, right there. Oh, okay. So it has it nice and big and fat okay Thank you. That clears it up for me.

01:15:19.000 --> 01:15:25.000
I also wanted to say, I forget who was talking about making sure we had mental health services.

01:15:25.000 --> 01:15:30.000
But I'm looking in the i'm looking in the Volume 2.

01:15:30.000 --> 01:15:38.000
I've looked at quite a few schools. It seems like they have carried the counseling services over at least as much as they had last year.

01:15:38.000 --> 01:15:47.000
On almost everybody. Well, no, here's one that went down a little bit But definitely our budgeting for the counseling services.

01:15:47.000 --> 01:15:51.000
Which I'm very glad to see.

01:15:51.000 --> 01:16:00.000
We certainly still need those. Okay, thank you. That's all.

01:16:00.000 --> 01:16:04.000
Ranja, you had your hand up.

01:16:04.000 --> 01:16:16.000
Yeah, thank you. I just had a question about In the last board meeting, I overheard one of the board members mentioned we had a very high maintenance costs.

01:16:16.000 --> 01:16:27.000
For each year. And I was just wondering, have we considered selling off any of the buildings that are not being used within PBS to kind of cut some of the maintenance costs?

01:16:27.000 --> 01:16:36.000
And how would that help with the overall general budget?

01:16:36.000 --> 01:16:45.000
Michelle and Tammy, I'll turn to you, but I'll just share that we did have a short session where this question was asked around sale of assets.

01:16:45.000 --> 01:17:09.000

And we had our chief operating officer, Dan Young, join CBRC to share some of the carrying costs of carrying costs of of closed schools specifically And described… you know possible one-time revenue from from sale of assets. It was just uh

01:17:09.000 --> 01:17:18.000
High-level information about that. Michelle and Tammy, what else should we add?

01:17:18.000 --> 01:17:22.000
Well, I definitely think it could be included in your report.

01:17:22.000 --> 01:17:32.000
So highest and best use of our assets, I think is going to be critical And so that could be noted.

01:17:32.000 --> 01:17:56.000
I know that I know that we have our older schools. We have so many older schools, turn of the century schools and Mid-century schools that they just need a lot. And so just being really thoughtful about how we put our investment dollars into the schools, especially if they are

01:17:56.000 --> 01:18:26.000
You know, declining enrollment and and projected to do so for the next however many years so many years I think it's a great thing to mention. I think it's on a lot of people's minds. We've heard it in other feedback sessions as well.

01:18:26.000 --> 01:18:41.000
Yes. I asked, I was the one who asked that question when the facilities and operations person joined us and I think my hand was raised because i was going to bring it up again.

01:18:41.000 --> 01:19:04.000
Just because I think we're at this point of like making these cuts and it's like, do we lose valuable families and teachers and all of this information and knowledge as well this plethora of knowledge or do we let go of some of these buildings that have very high maintenance costs, such as maybe even like cohabitating the buildings or doing partnerships through the building or some leasing or something

01:19:04.000 --> 01:19:23.000
But I just feel like there is to be the second largest property owner, I think there should be some wiggle room for PPS, especially with knowing that there still are going to be cuts the next year and probably for the next couple of years, can we mitigate that?

01:19:23.000 --> 01:19:35.000
Through some of these properties leasing or selling strategies.

01:19:35.000 --> 01:19:45.000
So could we Does Jachelle?

01:19:45.000 --> 01:19:46.000
No, I don't. Sorry.

01:19:46.000 --> 01:19:57.000
Do you have another question? Or I was wondering if we could transition this into transition this into Okay, so actually in the document here And kind of I'm thinking about how we can combine some of these.

01:19:57.000 --> 01:20:04.000
So maybe we have a section here. I actually don't think I have anything really to say on the federal funding piece.

01:20:04.000 --> 01:20:13.000
It's kind of in the title one I don't know that there's a lot this committee can advise the board on around that.

01:20:13.000 --> 01:20:20.000
So I would propose kind of pulling that out of there. The only thing I have, yeah.

01:20:20.000 --> 01:20:34.000
But let's put a section in on revenue. And that seems like something perhaps around asset management. So maybe asset management Slash revenue.

01:20:34.000 --> 01:20:42.000
And was I hearing Karanja and maybe Deshell, I don't know if either of you want to weigh in on that and Add some thoughts in there.

01:20:42.000 --> 01:20:46.000
I don't mind.

01:20:46.000 --> 01:20:49.000
I see Grace.

01:20:49.000 --> 01:20:51.000
Maya, can you have my name to that too?

01:20:51.000 --> 01:20:53.000
Yeah, absolutely. And if your name's not in here and you just want to jump in and add to it, also feel free.

01:20:53.000 --> 01:21:02.000
Thank you.

01:21:02.000 --> 01:21:06.000
I just wanted to say I think it's important to address, as I mentioned earlier.

01:21:06.000 --> 01:21:22.000
The impact of the federal funding cuts. Yes, we don't have control over that, but we we as a district have made a plan for cutting 25% of the funds from our Title I schools.

01:21:22.000 --> 01:21:31.000
You know you know that we would be anticipating so what I would write in that section is, so how are we backfilling?

01:21:31.000 --> 01:21:44.000
The loss of especially student-facing positions at those schools Because that is directly in doing so would be directly in alignment with the board goals.

01:21:44.000 --> 01:21:53.000
Can we address that in the top section? I'm wondering under protecting our classroom staffing and add a little bit in there.

01:21:53.000 --> 01:22:02.000
Yeah, we could. I think it's a unfortunately a new topic.

01:22:02.000 --> 01:22:05.000
For us to even address.

01:22:05.000 --> 01:22:10.000
It is.

01:22:10.000 --> 01:22:16.000
I just had something to kind of add to what Grace just said. I wonder if in this section.

01:22:16.000 --> 01:22:32.000
Because this is a document that gets shared, I wonder if we could also talk about the compounding effects of of COVID and then also the federal cut so we can really try to tell that story just a little bit better because

01:22:32.000 --> 01:22:45.000

Those two things back to back, I think were huge blows to the district and being able to kind of talk to that and then talk about maybe some of the other things that we've been bringing up about diversification of revenue or the

01:22:45.000 --> 01:22:57.000
Properties, I think may also speak to some suggestions of like future plan planning moving forward.

01:22:57.000 --> 01:23:05.000
Do you see that as kind of a background? We want to frame that in terms of this is the financial climate that we're operating in?

01:23:05.000 --> 01:23:06.000
And then…

01:23:06.000 --> 01:23:34.000
I think so because my concern I guess that i have is that with this being like the third report that I've been a part of, I'm trying to see where like the movement has really happened. And I feel like if someone, the new folks that are coming on, because I think some of us may turn off after this year, it might help to show that background a little bit for them to know like this is why we are where we are today.

01:23:34.000 --> 01:23:41.000
So it's just a suggestion, but I think it could be helpful for it if in the more public facing review.

01:23:41.000 --> 01:23:44.000
Okay.

01:23:44.000 --> 01:24:07.000
I'm just trying to like… Again, trying to tell like good news about PPS, right? Like I know there's some growth, but like trying not to also like dog pile on PPS because of all these things that have happened. And so just trying to paint a better picture PR wise, I guess.

01:24:07.000 --> 01:24:21.000
Routine on that, I would love, and I've put in here on the stabilizing enrollment and attendance piece I think that's an area where we can put some focus on this year.

01:24:21.000 --> 01:24:27.000
There are lines in the PPS budget around not just attendance officers.

01:24:27.000 --> 01:24:46.000
And the research is around all those support professionals that help students stay in school, right? I think we all kind of know this intuitively, whether it's librarians or social workers or mental health supports that help students be there.

01:24:46.000 --> 01:24:58.000
But I think weighing in has a committee on those pieces that we feel are really valuable in the budget to help support attendance and attendance and stabilizing enrollment.

01:24:58.000 --> 01:25:02.000
Because kids that are missing a lot of days may leave our system.

01:25:02.000 --> 01:25:12.000
As well as that piece of attracting families. To stay within PPS or return to PPS, hopefully.

01:25:12.000 --> 01:25:16.000
So I welcome, you know, I welcome folks to jump in on that.

01:25:16.000 --> 01:25:24.000
Especially if there are programs or lines in the budget that we can tie to that.

01:25:24.000 --> 01:25:30.000
I'm sorry, I see Grace's hand up for a while. I apologize.

01:25:30.000 --> 01:25:32.000
Just forgot to drop it.

01:25:32.000 --> 01:25:38.000
Oh.

01:25:38.000 --> 01:25:46.000
I'm going to pull, unless anybody has something further they want to say on transportation, I feel like I had my questions answered around that.

01:25:46.000 --> 01:25:53.000
Especially with the reimbursed piece on transportation and, you know, kind of the flux in that budget.

01:25:53.000 --> 01:26:01.000
I'm going to pull that off of there.

01:26:01.000 --> 01:26:06.000
I don't think I have anything further to weigh in on there. I'll let Aaron and Stefan.

01:26:06.000 --> 01:26:12.000
Take that piece.

01:26:12.000 --> 01:26:20.000
I genuinely don't understand what I'm looking at with that. And this takes me to kind of a follow-up question I have, which is.

01:26:20.000 --> 01:26:33.000
Why is there no delta shown in these budget numbers? I'm literally plugging numbers into a spreadsheet so I can see what the change in any sort of meaningful way.

01:26:33.000 --> 01:26:38.000
And then some interesting things are coming out of it. But I guess my first question is.

01:26:38.000 --> 01:26:47.000
Why don't we see a change at least a year over year, some way to see what the delta is?

01:26:47.000 --> 01:26:48.000
Okay.

01:26:48.000 --> 01:26:55.000
Or is there a master spreadsheet or like a big spreadsheet we can have where that can be like the raw numbers can be looked at.

01:26:55.000 --> 01:27:01.000
Yeah, I can answer that question. The presentation in the budget book is directed by Oregon Budget Law.

01:27:01.000 --> 01:27:12.000
I agree with you. Like when I'm analyzing, I'm often just typing numbers into a spreadsheet real quick to come up with some differences or variations.

01:27:12.000 --> 01:27:28.000
There are some Excel versions that we could prepare as part of that, but as they're presented in the book, this is the that additional column is not part of the document that we are to present.

01:27:28.000 --> 01:27:31.000
For the committee and for the public.

01:27:31.000 --> 01:27:36.000
And that is dictated by law. That there's no number shown?

01:27:36.000 --> 01:27:49.000

We can add to it. One of the things that the that I can kind of tell you offhand is that at some point it will make the the font unreadable when we start to add a lot more information.

01:27:49.000 --> 01:27:52.000
Sure.

01:27:52.000 --> 01:28:06.000
Not to say it's not valuable or it's not useful. But going through each one with that kind of information would probably make it a little harder to read.

01:28:06.000 --> 01:28:14.000
Erin, I will note in the last board meeting where the superintendent presented her budget and went through that presentation.

01:28:14.000 --> 01:28:23.000
There was a question from the board, I forget which board member, but essentially asking staff for the contract savings.

01:28:23.000 --> 01:28:44.000
And the name of contract, like the total cost or estimated savings and type of service So I don't know if staff is responding to that or has the time to do that right now. But if you get that and as you get that, would you pass it on to CBRC as well?

01:28:44.000 --> 01:28:49.000
I don't even know if I'm looking in the right place for that.

01:28:49.000 --> 01:28:50.000
But I...

01:28:50.000 --> 01:29:04.000
That's the information we actually have in any of the budget budget documents that we've been past like an overview of specific contracts it was just a board request.

01:29:04.000 --> 01:29:17.000
And then, you know, as I'm plugging in some numbers just out of curiosity i Just started comparing what the increases between 2026 proposed budget in 2022.

01:29:17.000 --> 01:29:25.000
Year ending and just seeing what changed and you know like licensed staff went up 14%.

01:29:25.000 --> 01:29:34.000
Administrative license went up 16.2%. And Board of Education Services went up 50%.

01:29:34.000 --> 01:29:51.000
47.4. No, it's a drop in the bucket because it's not very much money on the whole thing, but like I mean, these ratios matter and I don't like, why would that be Just curious.

01:29:51.000 --> 01:30:09.000
So some of the staffing increases are just going to be contractual over time And those do compound over time as the agreements are set so whatever increase in cooler stuff in year one would then become the base for year two.

01:30:09.000 --> 01:30:26.000
In year three. And so you will see some compounding that happens As far as like individual line items, though, we would need to go and research kind of what transactions outside of salary and benefits, what transactions made up those actuals

01:30:26.000 --> 01:30:44.000
Can the budget kind of is a plan at a point in time so it's possible that some of the variances you're seeing were There were less need in that specific area and then there was a greater need in another area and so

01:30:44.000 --> 01:30:50.000

That's also possible. But without looking into it, it would be kind of difficult to tell from here.

01:30:50.000 --> 01:31:00.000
Which, yeah, so this is, I kind of want to put my flag in the ground on this one in general. This isn't directed towards you because, damn it, you've had no hand in this forever.

01:31:00.000 --> 01:31:13.000
It's just, you know, this is the thing you're doing this. What happens is we spend many months just waiting around and then this gets dropped in our lap and there's zero opacity. I mean, it's 100% opaque.

01:31:13.000 --> 01:31:21.000
We can't see through, I can't drill down to anything. Without asking a bunch of questions that We have to wait around for and we only have a week.

01:31:21.000 --> 01:31:30.000
And this is maddening. I don't understand how we're supposed to give any sort of intelligent thought to this without killing ourselves over the course of a weekend.

01:31:30.000 --> 01:31:45.000
And so I would like to make this a point. That I raise in the in the in the report. I feel like i'm just Again, it's like, you know, my job is to try to convey very complex information to people that are going to make a decision about somebody's life.

01:31:45.000 --> 01:31:53.000
And to show information in this format is maddening.

01:31:53.000 --> 01:32:06.000
I appreciate that feedback and I would encourage you to note that in the report as part of the guidance, you know, as we collectively are doing this together that can be helpful.

01:32:06.000 --> 01:32:13.000
For the board to hear. And it is certainly helpful for me as i consider how my team moves forward.

01:32:13.000 --> 01:32:24.000
And how I support Michelle. In her work as well.

01:32:24.000 --> 01:32:26.000
Thank you. I'll put my hand down.

01:32:26.000 --> 01:32:36.000
Okay, can we go to Grace and then come back to the document and go through? I think we have a few decisions to make here as committee.

01:32:36.000 --> 01:32:53.000
Thank you. I just wanted to share that It's not by… amount spent, but it is by FTE allotments. There is one place that I find useful to show you know.

01:32:53.000 --> 01:33:01.000
It doesn't do the math for you, but you can look clearly at FTE by major function and employee type.

01:33:01.000 --> 01:33:08.000
On page 194 and 195. My couple of years here.

01:33:08.000 --> 01:33:22.000
I guess it's working on three now of CBRC. That's one of the places I go to to see like in terms of the people you know we we aren't a business We work with people.

01:33:22.000 --> 01:33:31.000
Who are the people that are the people that are getting cut or added in terms of their employee type.

01:33:31.000 --> 01:33:50.000

I just want to call out at some point in the in the document that the classified represented classified employees are taking the hardest hit in terms of percentage of layoffs.

01:33:50.000 --> 01:34:01.000
And some of the areas where it doesn't it doesn't look like the licensed teaching staff and the administrators who supervise them.

01:34:01.000 --> 01:34:12.000
The reductions are not equal. Which I mentioned last year doesn't make sense to me because the job of the administrators at the school is to support the teachers. So if you have fewer teachers.

01:34:12.000 --> 01:34:21.000
Then those should be the same. But definitely our classified representative staff are taking the biggest hit in terms of the layoffs.

01:34:21.000 --> 01:34:33.000
And those are going to be, like you mentioned, like the library assistants the you know um ea that has that special Jolly Rancher for the kid every day, you know, just to perk them up and make them want to get there.

01:34:33.000 --> 01:34:42.000
These are real people making real differences in the lives of kids. It's going to be felt for sure.

01:34:42.000 --> 01:34:43.000
Thank you for pointing out that Paige.

01:34:43.000 --> 01:35:00.000
Grace, I really appreciate, I really appreciate your comments here and just a reminder too that What we're looking at here in this chart is the adopted 2425 staff. So again, it's not a straight line to what our current staffing levels are.

01:35:00.000 --> 01:35:05.000
In some areas, they will go up or down depending on what our actual experience was this year.

01:35:05.000 --> 01:35:10.000
I just want to point that out because it's not a straight line here.

01:35:10.000 --> 01:35:20.000
And reflecting back on the information that was shared with the board, those were really where the targeted reductions were.

01:35:20.000 --> 01:35:27.000
And that's not clear in this chart. So I just wanted to note that.

01:35:27.000 --> 01:35:36.000
Okay, can we go to Karanja and then we'll go through

01:35:36.000 --> 01:35:42.000
Oh, I thought I saw a hand. Okay, looking through the document here, I think there's some Oh, go ahead.

01:35:42.000 --> 01:35:47.000
Oh, sorry. I was on mute. I was talking. I was like, oh.

01:35:47.000 --> 01:36:04.000
I wanted to volunteer my name to put on the contribution document under maps testing and um And I think you just crossed it out the specific programming There's a House bill and a Senate bill that was going to require

01:36:04.000 --> 01:36:25.000
School districts to have interim assessments And my recommendation would be to use the free interim assessment that the state provides rather than paying for a service where we can cut some of the costs.

01:36:25.000 --> 01:36:26.000
That was it. Thank you.

01:36:26.000 --> 01:36:45.000
Awesome. Well, let's put that with map testing and assessment. I crossed that out. I actually wanted to suggest that we put tag if there's anything we want to say around that position that's eliminated in with differentiated supports.

01:36:45.000 --> 01:36:53.000
So I'm just going to roll through this a little bit here and ask for some committee input here.

01:36:53.000 --> 01:37:04.000
So we've got Grace and Adriel Looking at classroom staffing and minimizing student impacts. We're going to talk around the federal funding here.

01:37:04.000 --> 01:37:10.000
And impacts of Title I.

01:37:10.000 --> 01:37:26.000
Do we want to characterize the superintendent's budget I'll suggest it looks like there's an attempt to keep things fairly spread across.

01:37:26.000 --> 01:37:41.000
Cuts fairly spread across as Grace has identified, a lot of it falls on on not teaching positions, but on our represented folks.

01:37:41.000 --> 01:37:50.000
So I think there's really kind of that attempt to spread it across and not have that direct impact on students. And we saw that in the budget presentation.

01:37:50.000 --> 01:37:55.000
Where initially it was more heavily weighted toward schools and classrooms.

01:37:55.000 --> 01:38:01.000
And there was a shift back towards central services in terms of the weighting of the budget cuts.

01:38:01.000 --> 01:38:09.000
So I think maybe an acknowledgement there.

01:38:09.000 --> 01:38:23.000
Wraparound supports for students and mental health. We might include probably social workers and counselors in that

01:38:23.000 --> 01:38:37.000
Did Mignana want to… want to weigh in on that and maybe take a look at Where I think with a lot of it's high schools and middle schools in particular that have some flexibility around those positions, if I recall.

01:38:37.000 --> 01:38:42.000
If that's been a change from last year.

01:38:42.000 --> 01:38:52.000
I don't recall. From reading in the budget if there's been a significant change in that or not.

01:38:52.000 --> 01:39:12.000
And then I think on equity funding. I'd like to recommend our committee make a strong statement in support of, you know, and just acknowledging that the the superintendent has prioritized maintaining that 442, 8% equity allocation.

01:39:12.000 --> 01:39:22.000
That seems really aligned with board goals. I think that might be something to call out in kind of our initial summary as well.

01:39:22.000 --> 01:39:41.000
And if there's other differentiated supports we want to look at. Pastures, we've looked at special ed. That wasn't one that popped out that we had for changes this year. That changed in 2023 to 2024, I believe.

01:39:41.000 --> 01:39:55.000
It looks like it looks like Aaron and Stefan insofar as we can are looking at kind of the operational efficiencies and central services

01:39:55.000 --> 01:39:59.000
Can I just make a comment on this? I'm not sure I have much to say about this.

01:39:59.000 --> 01:40:00.000
Okay.

01:40:00.000 --> 01:40:10.000
I looked at the central service part and I didn't see a lot there. I saw some overall numbers of cuts so that's there, but I don't think there's a lot more information on the floor so i don't think there's

01:40:10.000 --> 01:40:18.000
Nobody can say about it. I don't know what the efficiencies of that

01:40:18.000 --> 01:40:31.000
I think that might be the piece where, you know, to that point on the board question And to Erin's point on we don't have the information that we need to evaluate some of that.

01:40:31.000 --> 01:40:41.000
At least not in this time frame.

01:40:41.000 --> 01:40:52.000
Okay, on asset management I think something that's been just kind of on my radar for a long time and this this group is addressed a number of times is just calling out maintenance.

01:40:52.000 --> 01:40:56.000
It's something that we're aware of. We know the district is always behind on it.

01:40:56.000 --> 01:41:02.000
Hopefully the bond will help us catch up in some areas.

01:41:02.000 --> 01:41:11.000
But we know that kind of the operating budget, the general fund is never enough to keep us even with the needs that are there.

01:41:11.000 --> 01:41:15.000
I'll probably spend a couple sentences on that, but not too much.

01:41:15.000 --> 01:41:20.000
And then we have Deshelle and Sonia. Talking about diversification of revenue.

01:41:20.000 --> 01:41:28.000
I've got lower in the document ish. I'll maybe pull it up a little bit on revenue on the CUB funds.

01:41:28.000 --> 01:41:39.000
And if you want to expand on use of property, we have those two schools that are currently open for they're looking to lease out.

01:41:39.000 --> 01:41:47.000
Anything else you want to say there?

01:41:47.000 --> 01:41:54.000
All right. Let's see the bond evaluation Grace and Aaron.

01:41:54.000 --> 01:42:03.000

I had just a couple of notes on that. I don't know if you want to say anything for the committee at this point, if you've had a chance to look through that.

01:42:03.000 --> 01:42:06.000
I haven't been able to get to that yet.

01:42:06.000 --> 01:42:10.000
There's a little bit in this budget, right?

01:42:10.000 --> 01:42:36.000
Yeah, I haven't gotten to deep dive into it. I think just the comment I put in the document so far was that it's like the that staff was able to respond quickly to the concerns about preserving funding for classroom positions with this budget, but then it seems like

01:42:36.000 --> 01:42:52.000
The response about making cuts to the cuts to the high school builds, there wasn't as much responsiveness to that.

01:42:52.000 --> 01:43:00.000
Yeah, feel free to note that. A couple of things I wanted to call out.

01:43:00.000 --> 01:43:10.000
And I think maybe just might be worth either examining in your your analysis here is on page 185.

01:43:10.000 --> 01:43:25.000
Talks about the budget's effect on the average homeowner bond tax rate. I know this was framed as a renewal But it actually is an increase if you look at it from here to year.

01:43:25.000 --> 01:43:39.000
Of that average amount. And it just strikes me as odd So… I don't know how we want to kind of address that.

01:43:39.000 --> 01:43:50.000
I mean, every piece of media that I've seen from BPS has talked about it as is not increasing stuff but not On page 185.

01:43:50.000 --> 01:43:56.000
It sure looks like an increase to me.

01:43:56.000 --> 01:44:06.000
I just would always want to be transparent with the public as a you know citizens review committee

01:44:06.000 --> 01:44:18.000
So it's a tax rate. Yeah, page down though. So it's the rate

01:44:18.000 --> 01:44:26.000
So when we maybe you can help us isolate where you're seeing that. So when we look at the table, we have a few different rates

01:44:26.000 --> 01:44:31.000
So there's the permanent. But look at your tax burden.

01:44:31.000 --> 01:44:40.000
So the bottom line, I'm just looking at the bottom line. So I see the tax rate the permanent tax rate, local option rate.

01:44:40.000 --> 01:44:48.000
And the bond tax rate looks to me like it's going up from 2.3363 to 2.4724.

01:44:48.000 --> 01:44:53.000
I'm reading that as an increase.

01:44:53.000 --> 01:44:58.000
So I will leave that to the bond folks who are working on that.

01:44:58.000 --> 01:45:10.000
The way I look at that is it's the rate that we are having to pay because of economic changes. It's not that we are increasing the ask.

01:45:10.000 --> 01:45:13.000
Am I thinking of that right? I don't quite understand it.

01:45:13.000 --> 01:45:17.000
That is absolutely increasing the ask.

01:45:17.000 --> 01:45:21.000
So, but we didn't increase who increases the rate

01:45:21.000 --> 01:45:23.000
So, yeah.

01:45:23.000 --> 01:45:24.000
Yes, please.

01:45:24.000 --> 01:45:39.000
Can I interject here? Or Tammy. I know we're thinking probably along the same lines here so When we went out for the last bond renewal. We were authorized by voters to target an amount that was up to $2.50.

01:45:39.000 --> 01:45:59.000
Cents per thousand of assessed value. And so as we build our budget, that's what we are assuming we're going to be targeting. But the assessed value of the property changes every year at a different rate as well so Again, where the authorization is currently

01:45:59.000 --> 01:46:07.000
250 per thousand and we it's been less. Than that the last few years. So that's what you're seeing here in evidence.

01:46:07.000 --> 01:46:30.000
It's also information that's in our annual financial report. But we do project that 2.47 and that's assuming that the current bond sale occurs and that you know our may 2025 bond, if that's authorized, the debt service on the sale of that bond won't

01:46:30.000 --> 01:46:43.000
Be impactful until 2627. And again, it's targeting that renewal rate of 250 per thousand of assessed value. So it's going to fluctuate a little bit.

01:46:43.000 --> 01:46:50.000
So it's based on the authorized rate. I think that's worth calling out.

01:46:50.000 --> 01:46:53.000
Thank you, Mariah. That's a great

01:46:53.000 --> 01:46:59.000
I mean, for me, I suppose the average bear, I didn't read the full financial report and catch that.

01:46:59.000 --> 01:47:10.000
Bye.

01:47:10.000 --> 01:47:16.000
All right.

01:47:16.000 --> 01:47:30.000

Other things, it popped out at me that there's looks like 440 some million for a building acquisition and improvements.

01:47:30.000 --> 01:47:47.000
And I would just be curious what that is to see if you guys can figure out figure that out in your bond analysis. It looks like it's on page like 157 or so.

01:47:47.000 --> 01:47:53.000
I wasn't aware that there was any building acquisition going on with this bond.

01:47:53.000 --> 01:47:58.000
Maybe that's Jefferson?

01:47:58.000 --> 01:48:07.000
Potentially, I think we built this budget based on a detailed project list from our facilities folks.

01:48:07.000 --> 01:48:14.000
So again, they're assuming that the new bond would be authorized and continuing on with current projects.

01:48:14.000 --> 01:48:33.000
That's what that number represents and it's Because it's kind of rounded up, you can see the actuals again that those costs kind of trickle down throughout based on what projects are actually done. And that's kind of the placeholder for the total amount that we should expect to

01:48:33.000 --> 01:48:38.000
See?

01:48:38.000 --> 01:48:47.000
The other comment was the full object code says building acquisition slash improvement.

01:48:47.000 --> 01:48:57.000
That doesn't really clear it for me, but Adrill.

01:48:57.000 --> 01:49:10.000
Sorry, I may have missed this. I was in transition from car to house. Can you read… pray why we're deleting different things from the master document.

01:49:10.000 --> 01:49:16.000
I saw that. Yeah, what are we striking through?

01:49:16.000 --> 01:49:20.000
We combined. We combined a couple of things and just moved them up. We didn't actually remove them.

01:49:20.000 --> 01:49:24.000
Okay, very good. Thank you.

01:49:24.000 --> 01:49:32.000
We were thinking that moving tag in with differentiated supports. I'm sorry, that was one you're on, might make sense.

01:49:32.000 --> 01:49:35.000
Perfect. I just didn't know the rationale. Thank you.

01:49:35.000 --> 01:49:48.000
And same with federal and state changes in funding that we kind of split that out into looking at the staffing piece or the

01:49:48.000 --> 01:49:59.000
Which one was it? Protecting classroom staffing around title one And then what was the other piece on it?

01:49:59.000 --> 01:50:06.000

I lost my train of thought on that. Sorry.

01:50:06.000 --> 01:50:16.000
Moving down just a bit to get us through here. Continuation of one-time investments We had a couple things on that.

01:50:16.000 --> 01:50:33.000
We had instructional coaches, we had nutrition programs. I did a little bit of looking and there is currently a house bill 34, 35, it's in ways and means. We don't know if it'll pass or not. Hopefully the district will get money to backfill

01:50:33.000 --> 01:50:39.000
What they're currently paying for on general funds. Again, it's just an unknown.

01:50:39.000 --> 01:50:49.000
I think it might be something just that we want to note as a committee But these are things that are paid for on one-time funds.

01:50:49.000 --> 01:50:53.000
And I don't know, to me, it's a little bit of a caution as a budget committee.

01:50:53.000 --> 01:51:05.000
They can absolutely be worthwhile things and just noting it's a decision.

01:51:05.000 --> 01:51:14.000
We've got PPS reputation and outreach to families. Great. And budget document presentation and format transparency.

01:51:14.000 --> 01:51:19.000
So that kind of wraps it up. I've started with a preamble a little bit here.

01:51:19.000 --> 01:51:22.000
Oh, I know the last thing I wanted to ask on.

01:51:22.000 --> 01:51:28.000
On reserves.

01:51:28.000 --> 01:51:36.000
The superintendent's budget does again recommend drawing those down to 5%. It would be a little more than that.

01:51:36.000 --> 01:51:51.000
Without the use of those one-time funds. Again, those one-time funds are being used to kind of defer, push down the road a cut to other things.

01:51:51.000 --> 01:51:55.000
Personally, I would caution on that and just add a note for the board.

01:51:55.000 --> 01:52:09.000
I don't know how others feel about it. We're looking at tough choices in all cases.

01:52:09.000 --> 01:52:15.000
Can you share why you would caution? Just for the group yeah

01:52:15.000 --> 01:52:24.000
You know we're we're in a structural deficit and we're looking at this at least three years running.

01:52:24.000 --> 01:52:33.000
And as Michelle and Tammy and others have noted here, when we make a position cut as painful as they are.

01:52:33.000 --> 01:52:40.000

Or some kind of structural budget cut. Say, I don't know, travel.

01:52:40.000 --> 01:52:44.000
That's a cut that goes through. And reduces in the future, right?

01:52:44.000 --> 01:52:52.000
Whereas if we spend one time money to defer that, we have to deal with it again next year and next year and next year.

01:52:52.000 --> 01:53:01.000
So given the uncertainty in the financial future. I mean, we're not talking about a large sum of money to continue on.

01:53:01.000 --> 01:53:07.000
I think the more flexibility that we have In future years, probably the better.

01:53:07.000 --> 01:53:16.000
It's not a lot anyway. The board's already made the decision in the past years to draw it down from 8% to 5%.

01:53:16.000 --> 01:53:19.000
This is less than a tenth of a percent, I think.

01:53:19.000 --> 01:53:26.000
Maybe less than that.

01:53:26.000 --> 01:53:28.000
I think it's worth making a statement on.

01:53:28.000 --> 01:53:34.000
And this is the money if we draw it down now, we automatically are not able to utilize next year, right?

01:53:34.000 --> 01:53:46.000
It's gone, it's gone.

01:53:46.000 --> 01:53:58.000
For context, like the difference is a couple hundred thousand dollars.

01:53:58.000 --> 01:54:10.000
I'll put that out there. If others feel strongly on it, you can edit it in the document.

01:54:10.000 --> 01:54:19.000
I think that's all of our kind of decision points here.

01:54:19.000 --> 01:54:20.000
I think there, I know we just have a few minutes, but there were some other rows that we just added.

01:54:20.000 --> 01:54:25.000
Yeah, go ahead.

01:54:25.000 --> 01:54:27.000
If we want to affirm that folks who brought these up can work on them.

01:54:27.000 --> 01:54:31.000
Do you want to follow then?

01:54:31.000 --> 01:54:38.000
Mignana, I think, or maybe… Deschel.

01:54:38.000 --> 01:54:43.000
One of our members was describing the PPS reputation and outreach to families. Deschel, I think that was actually you.

01:54:43.000 --> 01:54:44.000
Okay. Were you… interested in taking this on.

01:54:44.000 --> 01:54:50.000
Yes.

01:54:50.000 --> 01:54:57.000
Yeah, sure.

01:54:57.000 --> 01:55:10.000
And then the nutrition topic came up last meeting. Is that still something that would be interesting for this committee to comment on.

01:55:10.000 --> 01:55:12.000
Probably not.

01:55:12.000 --> 01:55:23.000
I would propose just rolling that as a note into the use of one-time funds.

01:55:23.000 --> 01:55:30.000
Can you say more, Mariah, about why you would associate it with use of one-time funds?

01:55:30.000 --> 01:55:43.000
So, um. In the same vein as instructional coaches without making a value judgment on the worth worthiness of either program.

01:55:43.000 --> 01:55:52.000
Adopting and supporting and continuing staffed programs that are created on one-time funds.

01:55:52.000 --> 01:55:58.000
We create a structural deficit, right? We are shifting.

01:55:58.000 --> 01:56:14.000
One-time programs onto general funds. And it's a decision But it's a strategy that's long-term has proved to be unsustainable for PPS. So without judgment on either program, I think it's just worth noting as a budget strategy.

01:56:14.000 --> 01:56:15.000
And a caution. I see Director Sullivan.

01:56:15.000 --> 01:56:19.000
Okay.

01:56:19.000 --> 01:56:26.000
I think the nutrition program happened because of the number of students we had on Medicaid.

01:56:26.000 --> 01:56:34.000
That we got that. I don't think that I think that money will keep coming.

01:56:34.000 --> 01:56:45.000
That's the reason everybody got free lunch. Is that right, Michelle?

01:56:45.000 --> 01:56:57.000
Yeah, I think I need to get more data around that. But, you know, it had to do with our kind of the community school qualification Community Eligibility Program.

01:56:57.000 --> 01:57:06.000
So I need to get more information about that. But it is subsidized by a federal program.

01:57:06.000 --> 01:57:08.000
So…

01:57:08.000 --> 01:57:17.000
I think we're only talking about the amount that is not. And hopefully, the hope is that the state's going to pick it up here in the session.

01:57:17.000 --> 01:57:22.000
Got it. Well, there… That's a good hope.

01:57:22.000 --> 01:57:31.000
All right. If we have anything else, in terms of process here, so it's Monday.

01:57:31.000 --> 01:57:37.000
We have… We're going to come back together on Thursday.

01:57:37.000 --> 01:57:46.000
And hopefully do our last run through the document and turn it into the board on Friday morning.

01:57:46.000 --> 01:57:47.000
Yes, you are correct.

01:57:47.000 --> 01:57:53.000
I have the timeline right, Alexandra? Okay, so we're hopefully going to make mostly copy edits.

01:57:53.000 --> 01:57:58.000
Anything we need to move around, anything we want to vote on or take out.

01:57:58.000 --> 01:58:04.000
If I can get a draft from everyone by Wednesday night.

01:58:04.000 --> 01:58:23.000
I won't dedicate my late Wednesday night and all of my Thursday to combining this polishing it out and having a draft by Let me try to have that to you guys by 1 p.m.

01:58:23.000 --> 01:58:32.000
On Thursday so we can read through it before our meeting.

01:58:32.000 --> 01:58:34.000
See you Deshelle.

01:58:34.000 --> 01:58:53.000
Yes, and my question, maybe Alexandra, it can go into the document, but it's just about the line item 548000, the computer equipment. It just has If I can get a little bit of if we can get a little bit of clarity around that line item of the fluctuations and

01:58:53.000 --> 01:59:13.000
Just thinking about some of the cuts that went around with the students and their computers and not being able to have them anymore individually so It would just be um nice to hear why from 4.15… 68621.

01:59:13.000 --> 01:59:15.000
Can you let me know which page or fund you're

01:59:15.000 --> 01:59:33.000
Oh, sorry. Yeah, it's page. Oh, 157.

01:59:33.000 --> 01:59:35.000
Yeah, that top one. And then it says that the right there. Sorry. Yeah.

01:59:35.000 --> 01:59:48.000
Mm-hmm.

01:59:48.000 --> 01:59:49.000
Mm-hmm.

01:59:49.000 --> 01:59:57.000
The 54, 8,000. So it says the 2024 was 68621, but then the proposed is 4180 So I just wanted to get a better understanding of why such a increase and then such a drop it back down.

01:59:57.000 --> 01:59:58.000
So we're looking. Sure.

01:59:58.000 --> 02:00:13.000
I think I can help with. I think I can help with that. Yeah, we're looking in the um the general obligation bonds. So this is in our capital projects budget And that was, I think, a refresh planned for student devices

02:00:13.000 --> 02:00:18.000
That is in process.

02:00:18.000 --> 02:00:25.000
So it was part of our bond ask before.

02:00:25.000 --> 02:00:26.000
I'm sorry.

02:00:26.000 --> 02:00:33.000
So it's not our general fund. So it's on a replacement cycle, I guess is what I'm trying to get to.

02:00:33.000 --> 02:00:44.000
Does the rest of CPRC understand that or am i just I'm not, I'm sorry, I may not be getting it.

02:00:44.000 --> 02:00:56.000
So if I'm understanding, Michelle, there was a computer, a large computer equipment purchase that was as a part of the last bond Is that right? And it all happened this past year.

02:00:56.000 --> 02:01:00.000
And then it gets smaller next year because we spent the money.

02:01:00.000 --> 02:01:01.000
Is that right?

02:01:01.000 --> 02:01:14.000
Yes. Yeah, we're in the process of a replacement cycle So you can see that, you know, 21, 22 there was an initial And without talking to our CTO, I don't have the details, but you can see that it's like

02:01:14.000 --> 02:01:28.000
Comes in like kind of almost like bursts in terms of um replacement.

02:01:28.000 --> 02:01:42.000
So is the question, knowing that we have the reduction in students, why are we still having what seems to be a high replacement Number? Is that the question?

02:01:42.000 --> 02:02:00.000
I think, yeah, a little bit and then also just like also understanding just, well, my question about the fluctuation was just answered. Thank you, Michelle for that but Adriel, you bring up another question, though, about, yeah, the students as well. So I think it's just another question that speaks to that too.

02:02:00.000 --> 02:02:01.000
So… a layfish.

02:02:01.000 --> 02:02:07.000
I think we, sorry, Maria.

02:02:07.000 --> 02:02:20.000
I think we have a technology plan and we can bring that back to you so you can see more details around that, the replacement cycle and plans.

02:02:20.000 --> 02:02:32.000
I want to acknowledge we're at time here and a little after, and I want to thank staff for answering our endless questions here and really for a great inquiry session here.

02:02:32.000 --> 02:02:39.000
So in terms of process, if you have any further questions or you have questions that you haven't had answered.

02:02:39.000 --> 02:02:50.000
I know Alexandra will send this link around again where we can access the document and find those questions, find the answers to those as best staff can answer them in the time that we have here.

02:02:50.000 --> 02:02:59.000
And also jump in to the document feel free to use a different color of, you know.

02:02:59.000 --> 02:03:03.000
Edibbing or markup in there.

02:03:03.000 --> 02:03:10.000
And again, if you can get your edits in there by Wednesday evening, I'm going to jump in.

02:03:10.000 --> 02:03:26.000
Probably Wednesday as soon as I'm off work and start kind of bringing things together, tightening up language if we need to and get that back to you. Thursday is just as quickly as I possibly can.

02:03:26.000 --> 02:03:27.000
Thanks, everyone. I think we're going to have some great recommendations for the board here. I appreciate it.

02:03:27.000 --> 02:03:31.000
Thanks.

02:03:31.000 --> 02:03:33.000
Thank you, Mariah.

02:03:33.000 --> 02:03:38.000
Good night.

[redacted]

Submitted by:
Alexandra Martin
Finance Program Manager