

**Park Center – Budget Reduction Proposal
SHORT TERM**

STRENGTHS	WEAKNESSES
There are no strengths in this for the kids	Losing great staff
Keep (older, nicer) teachers!	Illness due to dirty classrooms
Proposal meets the budget goal	Lose our school activities
Meets FISCAL responsibility	Are we in trouble
Cuts are not focused as deeply on ELL as could be (i.e. 1 teacher for entire district)	Overloaded classrooms
Appears to be better for environment by saving more energy	Kids might be sad or mad
Willing to cut administration services	Field trip prices rise
Cut \$16.3 million from budget	Might not have the same fun
Greater community involvement	Lack of pro-active community input
Cutting the budget takes care of the deficit	Values Magnet schools over neighborhood schools
Repurposes Fair Oaks, which is a distressed school	The proposal itself seems to be short-term (there will be a continual deficit and require continued cuts)
Balanced capacity enrollment amongst the schools	Less ELL teachers and teacher support per student ratio will make learning difficult for students/especially new immigrants
Eliminating the facilities that will take more money to keep running	Students living close to schools will be bussed to schools far from home
Transportation Savings – Having 4-tier times is a good idea to save \$800,000	Lots of change for teachers, students and parents will have a short-term negative impact
Incorporating athletic plan between junior high and senior high kids can still participate	School Board’s key interests do not recognize the value of neighborhood schools
Energy Savings Plan	Expanding ECFE before receiving funding
All the time and effort spent on this proposal by community and district staff	Does not focus on core K-12 education. Instead focuses on the “extras” (i.e., Magnet, ECFE)
More efficient use of district facilities and resources	The process does not allow for new information gathered from the community to influence the “School Board’s Key Interests”
Broader access to self-contained special education classes across the district	Closing neighborhood schools when there are other options to save money
There are no benefits to having contiguous boundaries (not crossing major roadways)	School Board’s mission statement (Strategic Plan) is to support communities and neighborhood schools, yet you are displacing over 2600 students from their school directly in their neighborhood
Energy savings and transportation are being looked at	Significantly increasing class sizes (i.e. Fernbrook alone will increase 48%. Where is the individual attention for students?)
Making Administration cuts	Loss of teachers and staff and the result of larger class sizes
Increased desire for community participation since release of proposal	Not using natural boundaries to determine attendance areas (i.e. four lane roads/ponds)
Meets short-term budget constraints	Lack of multiple proposals

STRENGTHS	WEAKNESSES
Expanding STEM program	Does forced integration show effectiveness for those students
Save \$16,000,000 today!	Wording of key interest does not suggest moving
Sports and arts cut, not just arts	Splitting apart Fair Oaks families (K-3/4-6) support of older elementary students for younger siblings
Special Services (Special Ed, ELL, etc) are recognized as important	Lack of community input in designing key interests
Willing to look at transportation	Short time frame that compromises the district's core values
Willing to look at space issues	Desire to expand unproven Magnet program, with performance below that of the school and students it will displace
Budget is balanced in short term	Need to cut more in administration at the ESC
Expansion of Magnet program (STEM)	Need to know total percent of cuts in administration and for each category
EC benefit for children without access and those in need - see benefit in dispersing across district to utilize space in neighborhood schools – can directly compete with private sector	Teachers feel lack of support
Willingness to look at different delivery systems (i.e. pre-K thru 3)	Time frame of proposal
Benefits of contiguous boundaries	Expanding STEM, ECFE would be on a proposal even if funds were available--hidden agenda
They found \$163 million in reductions	Communication process – totally unacceptable
The passion of the parents and how to capture for future	How will Fair Oaks' students meet education goals in increased class size at Oak View if failing test scores already at Fair Oaks
ECFE at Fair Oaks is a good idea	"Neighborhood schools" closed
Enrollment Center out of a leased building into an "owned" building	Impacts 1/3 of all elementary students district-wide
Non-licensed staff such as custodians will not affect student learning and could be cut	Splitting up K-3 and 4-6 grades breaks up neighborhood schools and surrounding neighborhood (lack of consistency, parental involvement over time)
Parents will continue to drive students if changed to two miles for bus transportation	Larger class sizes
Primary and intermediate grades separated so no negative (limited) influences from older students	Losing staff (knowledge, one-on-one instruction)
Spread the Wealth!	Proposal gives no alternatives What else could be done
Cultural Diversity	Weaver Lake is one of the highest performing schools and proposal would break that apart
STEM is a great program	Higher transportation costs
The plan does meet the budget	One-half of all students moved to new schools
More kids will engage in physical activities – by walking to school	Less help for kids that have low test scores
The boundaries are more transportation	Closing neighborhood schools

STRENGTHS	WEAKNESSES
efficient and may reduce travel time	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • increasing transportation costs • breaking up neighborhoods
It eliminates racial isolation of EW	Bussing kids across the district
It helps AYP problems	Conflicting information
Bell change proposal	Feeling of this process being “done to communities” not “with communities”
Budget works for ‘08-‘09	Loss of neighborhood schools
Attempt at a quick reduction	Feelings of one or more programs are more important than others
K-3/4-6 model novel ideas	Causing division amongst district communities
Beginning to see cuts for administration at the ESC level	Forced into new models with unproven success records (i.e. Pre-K - 3, 4-6) and STEM program
Reduction of administrative staff, particularly at the school district level	Not addressing junior and senior high boundaries now
Tries to balance enrollment between buildings	Lack of community input in process--no collaboration only feedback opportunity--reactive versus proactive--should be consensus building--key inputs and interests were developed by administration
Expands opportunity for Magnet	Administrative cuts (i.e. senior high principals/assistant principals) don’t seem to be in proportion to other cuts made
Expands opportunity for early childhood education	Monumental changes in a short amount of time
Spreads diversity somewhat	ECFE is located at only centralized locations
	Only three people at the ESC are losing their jobs vs. 166 teachers
	Lack of community input in the process--reactive not proactive
	Already predicted to have fund balance in 2009-2010 to less than four percent
	Assumption that a large number of Weaver Lake students will attend the STEM Magnet program and Edgewood students will follow to the new location
	A loss of peer groups to look up to and work with when K-3 and 4-6 are separated
	Lack of proposal choices
	Behavior problems increase in classrooms when class sizes increase
	Decrease in staff development will affect/decrease teacher training
	Taking away not only classrooms, but counselors, social workers, etc will only make learning harder for children with special needs
	Having children travel further
	Divisional reductions--why take away the fastest growing disability resources
	Not enough time to transition students and staff to this new idea of schools--how will academics

STRENGTHS	WEAKNESSES
	suffer from this
	Not enough budget cuts at the administration level--cuts at administration should be proportionate to levels elsewhere
	The number of buses going to the Weaver Magnet will have significant traffic problems on Weaver Lake Road
	Weaver as a STEM is still under-utilized
	Cuts in wrong places
	Too focused on budget cuts over growing revenue
	Process is moving too fast
	Only meets short term objective of meeting '08-'09 budget
	Too many students in district are disrupted
	Not enough community input in budget cut process
	District administration not cut enough
	This is the only proposal being considered
	Much movement; large movement
	Process was weak on community involvement
	It doesn't seem to add up
	Doesn't seem to cut administration proportionately
	What expenditures are being cut--will we be in the same boat next year or the year after
	Island communities are being devastated
	Trust is broken
	Sense of community is slipping away
	Cutting teachers
	Increased class size
	Negative impact on surrounding community
	Displacement of too many students
	Cutting ESPs with the larger class sizes and needs teachers will have in classroom
	Overall--schools will see a decrease in minority population
	Closing of neighborhood schools
	Lose support for future levies
	Lack of community input
	23% of district families are being disrupted
	No room for growth
	Dedication of Weaver building to Magnet doesn't allow any flexibility in the long term
	Loss of trust in School Board/administration
	Splitting elementary schools (OV, CI, FO, GC)
	Short term band-aid
	Displacement of many students and staff
	ECFE housed in too many locations--breaks up

STRENGTHS	WEAKNESSES
	faculty/programs
	Closing neighborhood schools
	Restrooms/observation rooms may not be available for younger children in K-3 schools that are repurposed
	Transportation issues--Magnet bus situation at Weaver will be dangerous
	Timeframe for logistics of implementing this proposal/repurposing the schools

Park Center – Budget Reduction Proposal
LONG TERM

ADVANTAGES	CONCERNS
Better use of school space and square feet	Kids not challenged in classrooms due to size
Possible opportunity for more integration within the district	Principals that don't care will stay
Long-term stability of the boundary plan	No more Tommy hi fives
Expanding early childhood program	Losing good leadership in our principal (Tommy Watson)
Continue to be creative and conscience of cost savings and solutions for our district	Loss of teachers and principals
Expanding the Magnet program and parent choices in education	Tommy won't be able to play games at recess with kids, Tommy keeps us positive
Continued savings in energy and transportation to result in funding for programs in the future	Kids might turn out dumb because classes are too big
Community will now be more involved in School Board meetings, etc.	We might lose school song Tommy wrote for us (this was written by kids at Palmer Lake who care)
Some boundary changes might be better	Making a quick decision that will have a long-term effect (i.e. last major boundary shift was a long time ago)
Extra curricular activities is an area to explore cutting costs	How are we going to get adjusted to the changes
Possible 6-8/9-12 grade schools	Experimenting with FO, CI, OV 4-6 solution
STEM expansion could bring people into the district	Parents leaving district and taking ADM with them
Pre K-3 great for early identification and intervention	Closing schools when there is imminent growth in NW suburbs
Increased desire for community participation since release of the TeamWorks proposal	Increased class size and classroom crowding ultimately affecting overall test scores
Centralized enrollment center with easy access	Future cuts
Student increase in academic achievement for those coming from lower socio economic status	The population growth in the west of the district is growing so rapidly, and you are filling up the western schools and closing schools
Increase relationship with people of color when students/schools merge	Will you need to build a new school(s) in 5-10 years
STEM – will give it room to grow!	Academically at-risk students falling through the cracks with increased class sizes and less staff to support those students
Parts of district student population needing help today will be better off	Decreased academic excellence--losing families from the district, families not moving to the community
Reflects progressive thinking	Loss of age appropriate facilities at Willow Lane for early childhood students
Parts of district student population needing help today will be better off	What are we going to do with the empty buildings (OE and EW)
Reflects progressive thinking	How will this impact our home values and community economics (job/spending)

ADVANTAGES	CONCERNS
More efficiencies from our capital infrastructure	Money issues over the past eight years-- where levy \$ are spent and now school closing; bussing contracts; re-purposed, re-structured, re-configured and expanded = more \$ to upgrade
The boundaries are more contiguous	K-3/4-6 – no research on effectiveness
Long-term cost savings	Closing schools--with growth (east side, as stated by the district, west side as stated by the Met Council) there will be need to keep our current schools, or build again
Close older buildings that need repair	Potential for long-term large class sizes
	STEM benefits at the expense of core K-6 students programming
	Adding/expanding programs creates expectation of those programs being offered to all
	ADM/per pupil funding is for mandated K-12 education – a budget crisis should not be the time to sacrifice K-12 education--this will increase the number of kids that leave the district
	EC constantly being moved = rising \$
	Magnet set up for desegregation--putting it at Weaver--in five years will it serve the purpose of desegregation
	Where will Magnet students go after sixth grade
	This proposal doesn't represent the district's long term goal of graduating 80-90% of students--will this proposal sacrifice this high percent
	Lack of room for future growth on west side (closing of Weaver Lake School pushes enrollment to outer boundaries)
	Does not address the balanced budget going forward
	Long term impact on communities formerly centered around neighborhood schools
	Does not address possible future successful referendums
	Larger class size impacts future educational benefits
	Exodus of students to private schools
	Save more money on transportation
	Revisit benefits for teachers and staff rather than cut them
	Moving kids out of neighborhood schools
	"No Child Left Behind"
	Losing federal and state aid
	Many parents will pull their kids out of district – we lose money

ADVANTAGES	CONCERNS
	How does busing Fair Oaks students to Oak View help our budget issue
	Child that's failing at one school will fail at a different school
	Loss of students to other districts/private/charter/home schools
	Expansion in the west suburbs when other western buildings (RC, FB, BW) will be at capacity
	Funding resources
	4-6 programs have no long term studies of effectiveness
	Loss of trust in board/administration = future funding
	Long term desegregation
	We are moving families too far from their community neighborhood school (i.e. 4-6 FO to OV – need to be there for younger siblings), and at too great a cost both financially and community impact--feels like forced integration vs. voluntary integration
	Use of taxpayers dollars from 2000 Bond referendum to upgrade EW STEM, Willow Lane EC, Osseo Elementary, and now closing or repurposing Where will funds come from in a budget crisis to repurpose CI, WVR, WL, FO and for moving expenses
	Clearer long term budget plans (i.e. steps for increased state funding, budget targets for transportation, bargaining agreements)
	Quality of education of our children being compromised with such a detrimental change
	Taking teachers out of classroom
	No long term data to substantiate the proposal
	Is the long term goal to maintain such large class sizes--under-utilization of buildings from 16-20% allows for class size to come back down or allow for unexpected growth
	The proposal doesn't take into account the cost of upgrading facilities for repurposing
	Future levies will have difficulty passing when supporters are not considered in the process
	No admitted proven track record for FO, CI and OV future 4-6 program
	Increase in school drop-out rate due to shortage of teachers
	Students academic achievement decrease
	Families leaving school district due to lack of school choice and increased class sizes
	Boundaries of secondary schools

ADVANTAGES	CONCERNS
	K-3 and 4-6 schools--since when? Philosophy changes? Research?
	We will be back in 2-5 years doing the same thing – let’s plan ahead
	Are we using ECFE efficiently both day and night?
	Closing Weaver is closing a school that is succeeding – why
	Always teaching to the low end of middle and not academic rigor
	How do you combine three schools (OAK, CI, FO) with different RIT scores with an additional five students and teach them
	This is really scary--we are not only cutting the budget, but changing the way we deliver services--this is really scary--when is there time to think and discuss--when do all affected get a time to talk
	Does this vision of the district reflect what the community wants
	Does not address systemic problems district has with managing money
	Loss of extra curricular and enrichment programs
	Will there be a process to include community input for future budget and spending priorities
	Impact on special needs students
	Will district be as marketable to incoming families
	Cutting our youngest “best and brightest” teachers will hurt the future quality of education in our district
	Are Magnets working--what makes our STEM Magnet successful--how about our other Magnet school
	Rip apart and possibly be the demise of communities (including economic)
	Trust takes a long time to be regained once broken
	Student populations are moving all over the place--student movement is a known factor that lowers student achievement
	Future referendums are in jeopardy of passing due to trust being broken
	Increased open enrollment out of district with higher class size
	Quality of education
	Not able to pass levies
	Loss of open enrollment to district
	Inability to maintain quality teachers

ADVANTAGES	CONCERNS
	Will be doing another budget reduction
	There is no long-range plan
	Will lose families from the district due to lack of trust with the School Board/district
	Reduced focus on core education
	School district "reputation" will decline
	Potential for separating school district MG/BP
	Home values will drop
	How permanent would these changes be
	Is there room for future growth/expansion
	Long-term funding--future levies

Park Center – Budget Reduction Proposal

IDEAS FOR IMPROVEMENT:

- If ECFE needs to be expanded, utilize open space at Oak View, Weaver and/or Fernbrook
- Co-locate the Magnet (STEM) at Weaver Lake until there is empirical evidence that the Magnet requires dedicated facility
- We could cut more extra-curricular activities instead of core education (i.e. teachers and schools)
- Re-vote
- Look at the several options community members have given (i.e. down-size/eliminate TAG other than closing schools, increase length of book cycle, re-bid bussing)
- Let the community see the other scenarios and the associated cost-benefit analysis so the community can see what else has been contemplated--why was the community given one proposal and no options
- How does the current proposal run like a business--why would you close or repurpose your most cost-effective facilities where the output goals are exceeding expectations--if you need to close schools--close them based upon the success of their programs and cost effectiveness
- Focus on CORE operations--not ECFE, daycare, Magnet schools--educate K-12 first
- Where are the choices for the parents
 - for enrollment, given open enrollment options
 - lesser education at Magnet school, lower test scores
 - not desegregated
- Lobby for changes in school funding--put pressure on our legislators
- Another levy referendum in November, or ASAP
- Need to offer being able to pay for transportation (inside two mile), scholarships, etc.
- Take \$800,000 from reserve fund to keep schools open for one year to give more time for a better plan
- Split Fair Oaks by the natural boundary of 694 south at Cedar Island, north to other schools
- Add 6th IB at North View to align more with International Middle School Program--this would help fill North View and takes them out of grade schools--decreases enrollment
- Community involvement up front (creation of key factors given to consultants)
- Develop a “Plan B” option that leaves schools open and focuses on academic achievement
- Expanding STEM program within several elementary schools (local, subset with in other schools)
- Develop a “Plan B” that includes a future referendum
- Run the school district in a fiscally responsible manner
- Is there land that could be sold/leased
- Maintain status quo for one more year; gather more information/ideas
- Keep “ELL” and “Special Ed” students in one school (maybe your closed schools)
- Revisit Magnet school purpose and is it really working
- When you close a neighborhood school, send kids to next closest school through boundary changes
- Cut more high school extra-curricular, not just junior high
- Inform parents and community about how to communicate with legislature
- Be proactive, not reactive with community and budget issues
- Improved communication in regard to referendum information
- Improved communication in all processes
- Look at busing at 1½ miles vs. 1 mile for K-6
- Children should have preschool experience at the elementary they will be attending in kindergarten

IDEAS FOR IMPROVEMENT:

- Use the Arbor View site location for birth-3 year short term classes
- Need info on junior high and senior high boundary changes – now
- All day kindergarten
- In a time of budget crisis the focus should be on K-12 and not expanding/reshuffling other programs at the expense of the core programs
- Eliminate field trips for students to save money
- Eliminate sports to save money, if parents want they can fund it separately; does not have to come from district funds
- Should redraw secondary schools at the same time to reduce issue which will occur in a couple of years do to this change
- Allow the walkers at Weaver to be able to stay at Weaver
- Convince state/federal to fund mandates
- Reduce special educate to the mandates
- Adjust administrative levels to coincide with percent cut in all other areas
- Close all Magnet schools – costs of transportation are absorbanent
- Close all community ed facilities if they aren't totally funded--Community Ed has administrative staff that oversees these programs
- Cuts need to be made in areas that are far away from students
- Keep CI K-6, FO as K-3 and put one class of 4-6 from FO at CI--two of each at Oak View
- Combine GC and FO at FO
- Stop spending money on consultants
- Bring community members into process
- Reframe discussion to focus on big picture/vision and what district should deliver to students “get out of the box”
- Keep current momentum going and channel some of it to state legislature
- Buy time with the reserve funds so more inclusive and thoughtful decisions can be made
- Freeze salaries
- More volunteers
- Study what other districts have done (i.e. St. Michael)
- New referendum
- Listen to and act with the community/taxpayers
- Outsourcing certain administrative positions
- Freeze salaries for one year
- More community and business involvement in all district processes, including with financial support
- More community collaboration with “realistic” timelines
- Put curriculum specialists back in the classroom to help costs and decrease class sizes
- New superintendent with real leadership skills
- New leadership from School Board
- Hold off on Magnet expansion
- Bring referendum back
- Pro-active in enrollment
- Combine some administrative people/curriculum specialists
- Shorten recess to shorten school day and save money on supervision time

IDEAS FOR IMPROVEMENT:

- Energy savings
- Have an alternate proposal to compare options
- Have more transparency in the process to improve trust

Park Center – Budget Reduction Proposal

Questions

- Fair Oaks currently has lower class sizes due to ELL/poverty. If these kids come to Oak View, will the class sizes stay that way to ensure that they can catch up to other kids?
- Why are the western areas ‘paying’ for the failure of the levy? We voted for it!
- If not this proposal, then what? Would we have input as parents?
- Capacity: With increasing class size, occupancy decreases. Is it our goal to keep these larger class sizes? Otherwise, why are we closing buildings?
- How many students will be bussed to new schools because of K-3/4-6 changes?
 - FairOaks K-6
 - Cedar Island K-6
 - Oak View K-3
- Where will funds come from in a budget crisis to repurpose Cedar Island, Weaver, Willow Lane, Fair Oaks and for moving expenses?
- How can you move forward with these proposals when voters were misinformed via the Vote Yes Committee? Their mailing said passage of levy question one would avoid teacher layoffs and crowded classrooms, diminished school bus transportation, school closings and more!!
- Many people feel the Board wants to “stick it” to the community for failing the levy!
- Scattergram of where the Magnet school children live currently?
- Where are the other options to save money that the community members come up with?
- Why are we hiring a chief technology officer? (which is a new position that we did without this year) Wait a year for this. It can save an additional \$143k plus benefits.
- How can the School Board support the Vote YES campaign when the levy questions were so misleading? As stated by the YES team #1 Renew – Renew current levies plus \$8.3 to adjust for past inflation. Avoid teacher layoffs and crowded classrooms, diminished school bus transportation, school closings and more.
- Why expand ECFE in times of budget cuts?
- Why expand ECFE in west side of district when kids now do well. More need in east side of district.
- Where is the check and balance of the School Board? How can six people determine the fate of the school district when there is such opposition?
- How will Fair Oaks kids do better academically in Oak View with larger classes and being bussed from younger siblings.
- From the public forum perspective, there is support for the cuts that comprise 95.2% of those needed for balancing the budget. Why don’t we agree to those and just re-visit the 4.8% dealing with school closing and repurposing?