



Greater Albany Public School District 8J
718 Seventh Avenue SW
Albany, Oregon 97321-2399
Maria Delapoer, Superintendent

Budget Committee Meeting

November 6, 2013

7:00 p.m.

MINUTES

CALL MEETING TO ORDER

Board Chair Frank Bricker called the November 6, 2013, Budget Committee Meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

Present were:

Frank Bricker	Board Chair	
Jerry Boehme	Budget Committee Member	Arrived at 8:07 p.m.
Doug Marteeny	Budget Committee Member	
Chris Norman	Budget Committee Member	
Micah Smith	Budget Committee Member	
Will Summers	Budget Committee Member	
Lyle Utt	Budget Committee Member	
Jennifer Ward	Budget Committee Member	
Maria Delapoer	Superintendent	
Russell Allen	Director of Business	
Randy Lary	Director of Human Resources	
Ashley Netzel	Controller	

Assistant Superintendent Frank Caropelo, Committee Member Sandi Gordon, and Committee Member Julie Jones made previous arrangements to be absent from the meeting. A list of others present at the meeting is attached to the original minutes.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Mr. Bricker led those present in the Pledge of Allegiance.

BUDGET COMMITTEE OPERATIONAL TASKS

1. Seat new Budget Committee Members.

Mr. Bricker began by stating that Julie Jones and Doug Marteeny had been reappointed to the Budget Committee for new 3-year terms. He welcomed Mr. Marteeny back to the Budget Committee (Ms. Jones was not present).

2. Election of Budget Committee Chair.

Mr. Bricker then asked for nominations for Budget Committee Chair. Budget Committee Member Micah Smith nominated Will Summers for Budget Committee Chair. Mr. Marteeny seconded the motion. Mr. Bricker asked if there were any other nominations. There were none. He then asked for a vote of the Committee. **NOMINATION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.** Will Summers took over as Chair for the remainder of the meeting.

3. Approval of Budget Committee minutes for May 20, 2013.

Mr. Summers asked if everyone had an opportunity to review the minutes from the May 20, 2013 Budget Committee Meeting and asked if there were any amendments, questions or concerns. He commented that he had seen a correction that needed to be made on the second page, second paragraph Mr. Allen "wet" over some of the budget highlight.... The word should have been "went". He then asked if there were any more corrections. There were none. He then asked for a motion. Budget Committee Member Chris Norman made a motion to accept the May 20, 2013 as corrected. Mr. Summers asked if there was any discussion. There was none. **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

4. Revise Budget Calendar – if necessary.

Budget Committee Meeting

November 6, 2013

7:00 p.m.

Page 2

Mr. Summers then referred to the Budget Calendar included in the packet. Mr. Allen referred to the calendar stating that the Board had approved it already but he asked for formal adoption by the entire Budget Committee. Mr. Bricker stated that he would miss the meeting on the 14th due to a conflict with a meeting at the ESD. Discussion ensued. Budget Committee Member Jennifer Ward made a motion to adopt the Budget Calendar as proposed. Mr. Summers then asked for discussion. There was none. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

5. Establish Meeting Beginning and Ending Times if necessary.

Mr. Summers explained that in the past the Budget Committee meetings began at 7:00 p.m. and ended at 9:00 p.m. He asked if that was still acceptable to the committee. Everyone nodded affirmatively. He also stated that in the past, if there was discussion in process just before 9:00 p.m. the meeting could be extended in 15 minute increments with a vote of the Committee for each extension. He asked if there were any suggestions to change this process. There were none. Mr. Summers then asked for a motion from the Committee. Committee Member Doug Marteeny made a motion to keep the beginning time at 7:00 p.m., the ending time at 9:00 p.m., and the meeting could be extended in 15 minute increments with a vote of the Committee for each extension. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

FINANCIAL UPDATE

Mr. Summers directed the floor to Mr. Allen for the Financial Update. Mr. Allen began by referring to a print out of a PowerPoint presentation located at each place. Mr. Allen proceeded to go through the presentation for the Committee. Mr. Allen answered questions as they came up. Mr. Summers asked that if the courts say no to the limitation on PERS, would it take the district to more than \$2 million in additional costs. Mr. Allen stated that it would take more than that. He shared that as the PERS reforms go through the courts, the amount we are paying is at the reduced rates and are not even close to what it would be if the courts say no. Mr. Allen stated that the District would not be given a bill for the difference of what is owed, but PERS would have to look at what the new rates would be going forward which would be higher rates for a longer period of time.

Mr. Smith commented that some districts were continuing to make payments on the assumptions that the courts would strike down the law; however he had heard less about it since the last legislative session. Mr. Allen agreed that some local entities have determined that they would continue to set aside the difference in a separate fund as a contingency to hold until a final determination has been reached. He shared that this was frowned on by the legislature, and at this time, this district has not gone that direction. Mr. Allen went on with the PowerPoint presentation.

As Mr. Allen went over the cost in 2013/2014, Mr. Marteeny asked him to explain the one-time payment. Mr. Allen responded that these are negotiated agreements with the associations. The teachers, for example, were given the option of taking \$665 in cash or \$950 in a TSA. He explained it is part of the compensation package but it was processed in a one-time payment rather than a percentage increase.

In regards to the "85/15" rule, Mr. Summers asked what the Committee's opinion was on using the 85% as a guideline for budgeting. Mr. Norman asked if the district had ever been at 85%. Mr. Allen responded no, not since he had been with the district. He shared that the Budget Committee could establish that as an important guideline and ask the Superintendent to strive for that in the 14/15 budget as a guideline. If it is too much of a "rule" it can cause perverse decisions; for example hiring a plumber rather than bringing on staff even though the later was more cost effective. Mr. Bricker commented that in the current economic conditions, the 85/15 guideline functions well in that it keeps coming back up to show we are out of balance, but it shows where we are in comparison to the guideline. He stated it was good to keep thinking about it in that sense.

Ms. Ward asked why this was a healthy proportion. Mr. Allen responded that the 85/15 is generally what other districts use. It is clear when you get to 90/10 it is out of balance. Mr. Allen added that whether 80/20 is better than 85/15, he was not sure, but it has been a good barometer for this district. Mr. Bricker stated that he doesn't want to see it get any further than it currently is because staffing couldn't be cut any more to hit 80% so 85% is as low as he feels it should go. Mr. Marteeny asked about how districts around the rest of the state look at it. Mr. Allen commented that discussions regarding the non-staff side are necessary at times like these. Mr. Marteeny asked about the numbers for other districts. Mr. Allen responded that he doesn't know what those numbers are, but making sure not to let the other side fall is important.

Budget Committee Meeting

November 6, 2013

7:00 p.m.

Page 3

Mr. Summers commented that he has been one of those to champion to keep the non-staff areas in mind. He stated that with all the work that has been done with electronics and cabling so that schools are ready for the 21st century and all the things that go with it comes from that non-staff side and if that continues to dwindle, then those types of things go away quickly. When equipment is outdated and used up, they have to be replaced and not keeping close to the 85/15 guidelines pushes everything out to possibly another bond measure; keeping the guideline helps recognize issues coming in the future. Mr. Utt commented that things are hard enough for the time being, but trying to hold to an 80/20 guideline would be nearly impossible. Mr. Summers asked the group if the 85/15 guideline would be acceptable to the group. Everyone agreed.

Mr. Allen went on with the Enrollment section in the presentation. Mr. Utt asked how much of the enrollment decline is impacted by the depressed housing market in the local area and what would change if the market were to change. Mr. Allen responded that enrollments have been heavily impacted by what has been going on over the last year or two; if there were a large housing boom for the area, then it could have a large impact on enrollments. He explained that when the enrollment projections are done, current housing starts are taken into account.

Mr. Allen went on to the Forecast Expense Assumptions section and then asked for any questions the Committee might have. Mr. Utt asked how the financial forecast graph would look if the enrollment projections come in over or under 100 students. Mr. Allen responded that if the number of students increases then expenses will also increase, if the number of students decrease and the assumption is to maintain existing programs and staffing ratios, then your expenses will also go down accordingly. However it is difficult to have expenses go down at the same rate that the revenues go down. Mr. Allen commented that no one says class sizes are where they should be, they are better but not great. Mr. Norman asked for a clarification if there were any changes in enrollment with the upcoming 5th year enrollment (Advanced Degree program) or the development of the online school. Mr. Allen responded that Albany Online and Linn Benton Community College programs are new to the district and are not reflected in the projection. He added that currently Albany Online is under-enrolled and the Advanced Diploma program is over projected (which will generate a positive cash flow) but are not included in the enrollment projection numbers; which are just the bricks and mortar kids.

Mr. Utt asked if the projections account for all-day kindergarten. Mr. Allen stated that there is not an assumption for all-day kindergarten. He shared that he hopes that when it becomes required by the State, that there is money to come with it. He stated that we would need at least 13 new staff members just to provide all-day kindergarten; and that is assuming that we have the space. Therefore, if all-day kindergarten is added without additional revenue, other programs will have to adjust or expenditures will increase.

BUDGET GUIDELINES

Mr. Summers moved the meeting on to Budget Guidelines and turned the floor over to Superintendent Maria Delapoer. Ms. Delapoer addressed the committee and stated that there were two items in the packet that help focus on where revenues should be allocated: the District Accountability Plan which has been refined over several years, and the Achievement Compact which reflects new focus that is coming from the State. She emphasized that these were areas where the district should be directing some of its resources to show progress. Mr. Summers stated that he did not understand the percentage of disadvantaged students listed. Ms. Delapoer responded that 69.9 percent of students are separated out into disadvantaged subgroups like free and reduced meals, special education, English Language Learners, because they want to track these areas separately from the total graduation rate so they are broken down by subgroups. Mr. Summers asked if growth had been seen in these areas in the last five years. Ms. Delapoer responded yes.

DISTRICT FOCUS AND VISION

Ms. Delapoer moved on to discuss the district's focus and vision. She stated she was going to first talk about the areas where the district has been able to make progress in the budget this year. Ms. Delapoer shared that there were individuals in the audience to help answer questions if needed. She introduced Peggy Blair, Secondary Instruction Director; Tonja Everest, Elementary Instruction Director; and Heather Huzefka, part-time Student Services Director and part-time Principal at Central. Ms. Delapoer also introduced Matt Olson who is a teacher at Timber Ridge who is working on his administrator's license.

Ms. Delapoer began by talking about Albany Online which was originally a program for secondary level students but was expanded this year to a K-12 program. She stated that the hope is to have the program provide enough revenue to cover its costs. She then reported that there was a part-time teacher on special assignment assigned to TAG to see what the program looks like and to overhaul the policies and training for teachers. She stated that it is a work in progress. Ms. Delapoer added

Budget Committee Meeting

November 6, 2013

7:00 p.m.

Page 4

that there was additional certified staff targeted for reading and math in addition to more classified staff to reestablish small group learning opportunities.

Ms. Delapoe reported that there were 146 students enrolled in the Advanced Diploma program. She shared that the Coordinator for that program is a teacher who is paid out of the revenue generated from keeping the students an additional year. She also reported that another success has been expanding the options available at AOS where there is a special period of time for a program for students who have been expelled but provides essential skills and recovery program for reading, writing, and math (a tutoring intervention period). Ms. Delapoe shared that AOS became a GED testing site last year and will continue until January when the GED tests change. She also shared that AOS is using Odysseyware for credit recovery.

Jerry Boehme arrived 8:07 p.m.

Ms. Delapoe reported that this year there were Innovation grants available for teachers to apply for technology tools for use in class. She also reported that there were funds provided for computer replacements for staff. Ms. Delapoe stated that other additions in this year's budget were: an effort to reduce class sizes across the district by adding 10 teachers, expanded the middle school track program, reinstated the full calendar for the 13/14 school year, set aside funding for textbook adoption for Language Arts and catch up in other adoption areas, all three middle school assistant principals are now full-time administrators, four elementary schools still have part-time principals who are assigned other duties at the district level, a half-time Student Services Coordinator was added, \$1 million set aside for facilities upgrades, added a network technician, and the district contracted out with a consultant to investigate and discuss safety issues throughout the district. Ms. Delapoe stated she wanted to share what the district has been able to accomplish with the budget that the committee put together last year. She commented that although times are still not the best, it feels good to at least be able to move forward and see some positive outcomes. She then asked if there were any questions. There were none.

Ms. Delapoe then referred to the School Board Work Session Ideas page in the packet. She stated that the Future Goals listed are things the Board would like to see in the future. She shared that some of the items listed are already in progress but there are other areas that have not been started yet and will have to be prioritized. Ms. Delapoe stated that in order to take on some of the needs of our facilities, we will need to consider a bond in the near future. She asked if any of the Board Members would like to share any comments on the list. Mr. Bricker shared that some of the items on the list were practical that can be done in the next year or two and some of them would have to be out in the future after a successful bond or an increase in state revenues. Mr. Smith commented that it is clear that the Superintendent took direction from the work session on August 5th which will be reflected in the memorandum still to be addressed. It is one of those documents that it will be good to look back and see what has been accomplished. He also stated that other things mentioned at the work session a few weeks ago, mainly a strong emphasis on reducing class size and professional development that didn't make it on the August 5th list. Mr. Boehme added that this is not an inclusive list so the Board is looking for input on things as this is a broader picture of what they want to present as a roadmap to where we are going over the next 3-5 years.

Ms. Delapoe encouraged comments and ideas from the committee in a future portion of the meeting when they covered Agenda Item G, to talk about what has been done, and in what direction the district should move. She stated that she planned to share the same process with the Large District Leadership Team which has representation from the district level as well as each school level (elementary, middle, and high) and our associations at a meeting next week.

Ms. Delapoe finished up by going over her memo in the packet regarding 2014-2015 Budget stating that the district needs to be focused on investing in student learning; all of our time, talent, and resources need to go into helping students succeed. She also stated that the district needs to continue to prioritize and analyze what is the most effective return on our investment. Items Ms. Delapoe discussed were: improving quality of instruction in the classroom, reduce class sizes, implementing extended kindergarten, academic summer school for transitioning students in 6th and 9th grades, expansion of the Dual Immersion Program into middle school and beyond, the possibility of International Baccalaureate or STEM programs, and expanding technology learning tools. Mr. Summers commented that the Foundation has sponsored several projects which sent books home with kids; he asked if this has had any affect with students. Ms. Delapoe stated she would look into it. She shared that any time books are sent home and students either read or are read to, great gains are made in students being successful in future school years. Mr. Summers stated that having that information would be able to help a program like that move forward.

Ms. Delapoe finished up by referring to earlier discussions on facility upgrades and repairs needed out of annual budget, she shared that the District Facility Advisory Committee could be reconvened to take a look at the needs of the district and see if

Budget Committee Meeting

November 6, 2013

7:00 p.m.

Page 5

we are ready to ask the community for their support in continuing the bond after 2016. She stated that although there is a ways to go, the district is well on its path but needs to be really careful about how we spend every dollar we have and make sure it goes to have the greatest return on the success of students.

DISCUSSION OF INFORMATION PRESENTED

Mr. Summers commented that there had been a lot of information provided and asked for discussion. Mr. Smith commented that he liked the guidelines for 85/15 and what makes it up. He then asked about the ratio for class sizes and asked if that ratio was certified staff to student. Ms. Delapoer responded that currently the ratio of students to certified staff was 25.5:1. She clarified that some of those certified staff (teachers) are not classroom teachers. Mr. Smith asked what the purpose was of including those individuals in the ratio because it causes confusion. Ms. Delapoer responded that typically buildings are allocated certified staff based on their projected population and make decisions internally about how they want to allocate that staff. She added that Mr. Larry works closely with the buildings to be sure they don't over-allocate specialist time which could cause large class sizes. Some schools really depend on a counselor and others depend on specialists to help with prep time for classroom teachers. Mr. Lary commented that this is the model we have adopted, but not the only one in place. He stated that there is difficulty in pulling out certain groups of staff from the ratio, how the right number is determined, and how to deal with the ebb and flow of student numbers. He shared that Principals often make these decisions based on the staff and students that they have. He stated that the main question is: is this the hard and fast way to accomplish this? No. It is determining what the best way is to staff each building.

Mr. Smith asked if a number was being chased. He stated that it was difficult because the ratio now is 25:1 and if a 22:1 ratio is the target, even then there won't be 22 kids in desks because the building could choose more specialists. He commented that Mr. Caropelo made a compelling argument in the work session to reduce class sizes and provide more professional development but how is that magical number reached? Ms. Delapoer shared that she believed that the lowest ratio was 23.6:1 in the last 10 years using the same formula. Mr. Allen commented that he and Mr. Caropelo had discussions regarding class size and staff allocation, and he wanted to make a point that in an era where there are not enough resources, the question is, "Where are those decisions best made?" Ms. Delapoer commented that the schools are very unique in their student populations, and a particular parent population may value PE rather than Music, and the district has allowed principals, with guidance, to make those decisions at their schools.

Mr. Summers asked if there was a different guideline for student ratios in the elementary level compared to the secondary levels. Mr. Allen responded that unfortunately the answer was yes, and no. He stated that it is something that is always looked at and discussed as far as the right thing to do. Many years ago, the district staffed off of a stair-step where the elementaries had a smaller number than the high schools that was based off of the October 1 enrollments. He stated that the problem was that the October 1 enrollment is about the average enrollment that an elementary school will have and the high water mark for high school. The high schools would have a much lower number in May compared to October, but not so much for the elementary schools, so it really turned out to be the average number of student in the building over the course of the year. Therefore at that time the district moved to a flat ratio but based off the average number of students to be in the building.

Mr. Boehme asked if there would be a ratio of teachers in front of students to give an idea of what the real numbers show. Mr. Larry stated that average class size was in a Board Report a week or so prior, but emphasized that it was difficult to create a mathematical formula to take the number of kids in a classroom and pulling out specialists because there are other factors involved. Mr. Smith agreed that the numbers reported were a far cry from 25 students in a class and he felt that it would be important for the Budget Committee to know that moving forward that when smaller class sizes are being discussed, we don't really know if it will reduce the class size or not. Mr. Allen shared that when the ratio dropped from 26 to 25.5 it was clear that there were a lot fewer classes with 30 or more students in them this year compared to last year; there is a correlation between the ratio and the number of kids in each classroom. Ms. Delapoer shared that most schools don't add more specialist time, they have a minimum of specialist time that they maintain and then the rest goes into the classroom.

Mr. Boehme asked if there was an opportunity to have the specialists based out of the DO like the ESD where schools can "buy" specialist time and then allocate it throughout their building. Mr. Larry responded that the district has looked at similar models along with a model where the specialists would be assigned to the school by the district; it sounds simple but in application it is very complex. Mr. Boehme commented that his thought was that instead of 25.5 they would be allocated at 25 or 27 for FTE for instruction then they could get a .4 counselor and .6 PE. Mr. Lary responded that at the elementary level that is what the principals actually do. If they get an allocation of 12.7 FTE, their choice is to have 12 classes and .7 of a

Budget Committee Meeting

November 6, 2013

7:00 p.m.

Page 6

specialist or 11 classes and 1.7 specialist; they have to make that decision and buildings do that differently. Ms. Delapoer shared that the buildings were given parameters over the last couple of years about trying to avoid blends and putting as much of the allocation into the classroom as possible to reduce class size.

Mr. Bricker stated that this is a discussion that has been going on for years, but the Board and Budget Committee asked for them to be broken out so we got the numbers that Mr. Smith was asking for; the problem was that it came up with an average where there was 22 in one classroom and 32 in another with an average of 24. It still didn't mean anything if your student was in a classroom of 22 or 32 so we quit asking for it. Mr. Smith asked if there was anything like the 85/15 rule that drives the district to a student ratio goal and if there was a dollar figure attached to it. Ms. Delapoer stated that to get to a ratio of 24:1 it would take 21 teachers which is \$1.7 million. Mr. Allen emphasized that the \$1.7 million was teacher costs only, no additional staff development, additional supervisors, etc.

Mr. Utt asked how many of the larger classes are because the school doesn't want to blend classes. Ms. Delapoer responded that there are five 4/5 grade blends and one 3/4 blend this year; most times it depends on how the numbers come in by grade. Mr. Lary shared that in many cases parents and teachers have made decisions to have a larger class rather than to have a blended class. Mr. Summers asked if a ratio of 25.5:1 included a teacher's aid. Ms. Delapoer responded that there is a different formula used for educational assistants and classified staff.

Mr. Smith stated that a presentation on intervention programs at the high schools, the principals suggested that the Board and Budget Committee discuss a specific high school class size problem in core classes along with a drive for intervention. He explained that if there were 30 kids in a class and needed to break kids out who needed interventions, they were capping those interventions at 25 but that meant they had to pull staff FTE out to supervise the intervention which drove their class size up meaning there was less teacher to student time to deal with those students which meant more students to intervention. It seems that if there is a common core class of 30 students but have an intervention of 25 students, it seems like they are driving each other in the wrong direction...what if the common core class was capped at 25; could it counter the interventions with providing smaller classes in the beginning? Mr. Smith also asked if there were other things the Budget Committee should be considering as far as that type of play at the high school level with interventions while these kids are on the clock to graduate with rigorous graduation requirements and common core in front of them. Ms. Delapoer responded that she didn't know if there was a good answer other than previous discussions about whether to put all the eggs in K-2 and figure that those kids are going to have better skills as they progress on up; do you put all your resources into interventions so that you make sure those kids graduate; and are students that are higher achievers able to be in larger class sizes?

Ms. Ward asked what the Board had in mind regarding the International Baccalaureate program mentioned in the School Board Work Session notes. Ms. Delapoer stated that there is a subcommittee studying the feasibility of starting that at the elementary level then going up through the grades. She stated that it fairly early in the study but staff knows that we need to offer attractive varieties to our customers so they want to stay in our school system. She also explained that the 3-5 year time frame was to have the program in place in 3 to 5 years and then move forward from there.

Mr. Utt asked if there was an online model of intervention for high school students to get extra help but not necessarily leave class. Ms. Delapoer stated that she believed both high schools use Odysseyware which is a replacement for Plato. Ms. Blair commented that the high schools still used an Alex online math program, and some teachers use Kahn Academy that gives students extra practice. She added that the textbook series purchased have technology elements included where students can log in and get additional practice; the problem is that not all students have access to it and it takes considerable amounts of time on the part of the teacher to set up. Ms. Blair stated that discussions around intervention have come about because of the increased accountability with essential skills requirements and state tests and that the interventions are targeted at the skills that the kids need for problem solving in math or writing. She stated that the district is doing more and more to catch students earlier and providing more opportunities for work samples to provide backup for graduation and fewer and fewer students in catch-up mode but it takes more people and time to make it happen.

Mr. Smith stated that in talking with Justin Crow, at the beginning of the year he has 82 – 88 students who have not met their essential skills in writing and has one semester to get them through the work sample process in order to graduate. He shared that this is a person who normally teaches advanced writing and language arts classes who is now teaching three sessions of intervention for seniors; which has an astronomical effect on staffing ratios for all the other language arts classes. Mr. Boehme stated that the partial issue at the high school is that there really needs to be that instruction time. He explained that when he had visited the Saturday Academy at South there were over 100 kids there. He shared that it was a great system to help kids get their homework done and turned in with things that they understand, but there is no instruction or help available

Budget Committee Meeting

November 6, 2013

7:00 p.m.

Page 7

at that time. Mr. Boehme commented that it is easier to use Education Assistants in first grade rather than in advanced algebra where you can have breakouts and can be effective, but not so much in the secondary level. Mr. Boehme commented that trying to get kids caught up is always an issue, what can be done for kids working at the baccalaureate level? He stated that there are more opportunities for them now than in the past but it seems late for a lot of those kids. He commented that there is a lot of time and money spent on interventions and seem to short opportunities for kids at the other end.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

Mr. Summers commented that it was approaching the 9:00 hour and asked if there were any questions or comments, or if there was anyone from the public who wished to say anything. Ms. Delapoe stated that those present in the audience wouldn't be considered "public" but would like to give them an opportunity to talk. Ms. Delapoe asked Elementary Instruction Director Tonja Everest to comment on TAG. She stated that the district has launched an overhaul to current TAG measure and review for best practices training. She reported that this training has been well received. She shared that a long-time high school counselor commented that this training was the best they had ever had, in that they could finally see what the kids really need. This type of training is only a tiny piece of the program though. Ms. Everest explained that getting the right kids to the table is really important but the need for constructive, precise, and clear ways to serve them in addition to which programs to provide. She stated that it will take a lot of teacher development to continue increasing instructional methods in helping teachers deliver the best instruction that they can. Ms. Everest emphasized that it takes people, time, and resources. She reported that great things are happening but the pace at which it can happen has to do with people and time.

Heather Huzefka, Principal and Student Services Director commented that she had an answer to questions on book purchases. She stated that schools have collected books that families can take to get into the hands of kids. She stated that it doesn't always have a change in reading ability, but the love of reading adds to richer meaning. The goal is to have books in the hands of kids all the time. Ms. Delapoe added that early learning outreach is ongoing and the district has applied with the ESD for an early learning hub to work with early learning and health.

Mr. Summers asked if there were any comments from the public. There were none.

ADJOURN

Mr. Summers asked if there was a reason to extend the meeting. Everyone agreed that the answer was no. Mr. Summers thanked everyone for their participation. He then asked if there were any additional questions. There were none. Mr. Summers adjourned the meeting at 8:57 p.m.

Will Summers, Committee Chair

Recorded by Kathie Caldwell