

Efficiency Review Reactions, Comments, Considerations

Principals January 9, 2009	Principals & Staff January 12, 2009	Budget Review Committee January 13, 2009
<p>General Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Many recommendations that schools could implement have no budget impact ▪ Perception that we are going to hit something big ▪ Anger ▪ Recommendations run counter to values ▪ Proactive message ▪ Mixed message – Time for MGT response – Budget now! 	<p>General Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Process clear, transparency appreciated ▪ Think about achievement, how it affects individual schools, not just division. ▪ How do schools use the support and resources to get where they want to be? ▪ Working on balancing and sense of value when headlines come out. ▪ Have seen rollercoaster before ▪ Worries that people will get up at podium with their cause – their own people and costs ▪ Community brings out the worst in us – justice issue ▪ This too shall pass. Just do it in civilized way. ▪ Division is tasting success. Have resources to help. Moving in the right direction ▪ Been in other divisions that didn't have same value for education ▪ Principals will be ones to bring community together ▪ First level of anxiety-shock. Braced for more bad news. ▪ Staff has worked so hard and so well and not done yet. ▪ Little over 50% of staff in one school want full implementation of 	<p>General Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Why 50% of recommendations? ▪ Seems comprehensive and appreciates manner in which firm was selected ▪ Headlines should have been on revenue shortfall ▪ Why so much focus on MGT when focus should be on budget ▪ Likes commendation and recommendations ▪ Highlighted CCS staff and admin ▪ Have paid much attention to numbers ▪ Strong community with values and won't get consensus ▪ MGT continues discussion – can we continue the way we have been if we can afford it or do we have to change? ▪ Need long term trends in the enrollment numbers broken to show free/reduced meals, trends even if enrollment is declining, budget numbers, ethnicity trends, ESL ▪ Are there any openings that we know of? ▪ These things need to be on the table but we need to remember that we are where we are because of lots of work and value.

Efficiency Review Reactions, Comments, Considerations

Principals January 9, 2009	Principals & Staff January 12, 2009	Budget Review Committee January 13, 2009
	<p>every recommendation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Some said long overdue ▪ Some staff have no idea about costs and values – e.g. after school bus run 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Additional information about other gains not included – transportation, etc. Should be a multimillion dollar savings than the specified amount included ▪ For next few years we will have to do more with less because of several year financial fiasco ▪ Is there a way to combine services with the city? ▪ Explain bidding recommendation.
<p>Peer School Divisions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Comparable school divisions questionable (disadvantaged, ESL, group homes, challenges) ▪ Shouldn't they have looked differently at peer school divisions? 		<p>Peer School Divisions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ MGT said our peers are about 1% lower – that's about 20% higher for us ▪ Questioned the peer divisions
<p>Process:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Costs measured, not quality of services ▪ Process, Product, Implementation (consider job descriptions) 		<p>Process:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Some are surprised about methodology
<p>Media Coverage:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Televised sound bites; our voices – where are we right? 		
		<p>1-1 Paperless Meetings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Positive ▪ Allows public to watch online and partake similarly to City Council ▪ What does paperless include? ▪ Has seen it work and opens up the process to the community ▪ Community sees documents that

Efficiency Review Reactions, Comments, Considerations

Principals January 9, 2009	Principals & Staff January 12, 2009	Budget Review Committee January 13, 2009
		<p>Board gets to see</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Creates ownership and goes beyond just the initial savings ▪ Downside – cost ▪ Wonder about doing this during this year ▪ Has backup system been considered for problems ▪ Even if cost neutral may not be the time to do it ▪ Can we measure the costs now for paper, time, courier, printing, postage, etc.? ▪ If we spend \$30,000 here and have to cut instructional amount, how will community feel about cutting instruction for this paperless efficiency?
<p>1-3 Restructure Central Office: Perception of CO as top heavy not substantiated</p>	<p>1-3 Restructure Central Office:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Us-them. CO vs. schools ▪ 1 ½ positions at CO slated for elimination ▪ Teachers don't see the behind the scenes functions like they used to ▪ See coordinators a lot 	<p>1-3 Restructure Central Office:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Wants CO defined ▪ Is there a student to CO ratio? Four functions – teachers, buildings, transportation, food services. Everyone else is CO
<p>1-6 Assistant Principals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Numbers are prominent – 6! 		<p>1-6 Assistant Principals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Is it an apples to apples comparison? ▪ Definition of AP and functions
		<p>2-2 Locking file cabinets:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Need to have more sensitive documents locked

Efficiency Review Reactions, Comments, Considerations

Principals January 9, 2009	Principals & Staff January 12, 2009	Budget Review Committee January 13, 2009
		2-5 Bar Code Equipment: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Since we have bar codes, this would allow software to more closely maintain inventory ▪ There is a cost of \$3000 but would save time in the long run and will probably help with locating equipment ▪ Questions about the process ▪ Shows we are being good stewards
		4-1 Professional Development Facilitator: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Has already been frozen and is recommended for elimination
4-2 Instructional Assistants: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Numbers are prominent, 62! 		4-2 Instructional Assistants: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Speaks directly to small class sizes and support ▪ Is it all or nothing? Can we do some without doing all?
4-3 Class size: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Adult to student ratio; Was it observed frequently, occasionally? ▪ Reason for success is small class size ▪ Small classes best practice 	4-3 Class size: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Still have to figure out ways for better staffing and schedules. ▪ 54 sections with less than 15 students. ▪ We can increase class size by a couple of kids. 	4-3 Class size: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Concern that when they visited, it was during CORE when all are teaching and the numbers are down in those classes ▪ Doesn't give a true picture Reflects that the community has valued smaller class size and given its resources ▪ Directly reflecting student/teacher ratio ▪ MGT used different staffing formulas than ours ▪ Their recommendation is that

Efficiency Review Reactions, Comments, Considerations

Principals January 9, 2009	Principals & Staff January 12, 2009	Budget Review Committee January 13, 2009
		Walker and Buford needed corrections?
4-4 Restructure class offerings at CHS: Restructure CHS – de-leveling budget neutral		
5-3 PREP: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ May cost us ▪ Sped numbers out of division includes foster care 		
5-4 Disability-related instructional strategies and differentiation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ May have cost to implement – teachers, PD, budget neutral, maybe swap teacher service 		
7-3 Closing a school: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Johnson? Walker? Clark? Jackson-Via? ▪ Reason for success is small school 		7-3 Closing a school: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Lots of focus on closing a school ▪ Rumors for fifth grade ▪ 10 years ago same process. Looked at closing and pairing ▪ Absence of financial crisis won't get away from community schools and small class sizes ▪ If and when we have a crisis, may have to revisit ▪ Reminded of the movement of K-5 vs. K-4 then and how people backed off that ▪ Closing of school – that is the way to draw attention from everything else and not look at other recommendations ▪ Teachers speculated 5th goes to elementary, 6th to Buford – what

Efficiency Review Reactions, Comments, Considerations

<p align="center">Principals January 9, 2009</p>	<p align="center">Principals & Staff January 12, 2009</p>	<p align="center">Budget Review Committee January 13, 2009</p>
		<p>happens to Walker?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Doesn't seem to cover all the costs ▪ Take out emotions and it makes sense ▪ Neutral 3rd party to facilitate ▪ Is this semantics? Everyone has a favorite or do we need to revisit configuration which may be more positive ▪ Would principals have room for 5th grade? ▪ Can we nickel and dime and then close when the closing could have been solved? ▪ The program needs to change. ▪ Move 5th grade back would be more popular. ▪ Vision of administration. People would listen.
	<p>8-9 Transportation Routes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Within 1 mile, walk ▪ Have more students walk to school 	
	<p>9-9 Phones in classrooms:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Loved idea 	
<p>10-5 Customer satisfaction on meal participation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Students to eat more school meals 		<p>10-5 Customer Survey for Meal Participation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Talked about nutritious options