

1. Call to order: 5:41
 - a. Overview of Scope and purpose (See Slide)
 - b. Welcome Visitors, overview of meetings structure and guidelines (See slide)
2. Celebrations
 - a. Very successful math night for parents- Thank you to Hanna, Christy, Liz and Katy for presenting, Linda for planning and Caroline for planning, presenting and organizing.
 - b. Quite a bit of interest in Denver at the Northwest expo- Thank you to Beverly and Stacy for presenting.
3. Public input #1
 - a. Will there be more public input after we hear about budget? Answer: Yes
4. Agenda Review and approval of minutes from December meeting- All approve of minutes.
5. All regular agenda items will be moved to a February meeting
6. Budget Presentation- See Powerpoint
 - a. UIP Major improvement strategies
 - b. Consensus Decision Making
 - c. Overview of Budget changes 2017/2018 compared to 2018/2019
 - d. Non-Salary budget set at \$0 vs district recommended \$400/student on the condition that CSC reaches consensus that carry forward \$ will be put into non-salary budget at fall adjustment
 - i. Question about intent of extended learning opportunity funding- The school day was extended 4 years ago to ensure students had an uninterrupted morning work period. The extended learning opportunity money was used to fund enrichments, required so all teachers could have joint grade level planning while allowing for 3 hour work period.
 - ii. Question- What was the former schedule? 9-3:45
 - e. Presentation of staffing list with required positions noted
 - f. Scenarios- discuss pros and cons of the suggestions, consider UIP priorities and school design, come to consensus on selected budget staffing scenarios.
 - i. Presentation of Non-required position page with position costs and responsibilities
 - ii. Scenarios presented- Recommendation from School Leadership Team (SLT) to reduce cultural/STL position.
 1. Reduce Cultural/Senior Team Lead (STL) position
 2. Reduce Restorative Approaches Coordinator
 - a. Question and clarification that STL must have teaching responsibilities
 - b. Clarification- STL responsible for teaching cultural and providing coaching to the elementary teachers, Restorative Approaches (RA/RJ) coordinator would increase community class offerings to include all lower el.
 - c. Discussion Points:
 - i. Benefits of RJ
 - ii. Benefits of Cultural
 - iii. Affects on classroom/students incorporating RA into the classroom vs incorporating cultural into the classroom
 - iv. UIP Goals (See slide)
 - v. Shift of responsibilities for position that is eliminated.
 - vi. Composition of School Leadership Team (SLT)
 - vii. Resources for training staff in RP
 - viii. Length of time for SLT to review scenarios
 - ix. Suggestion of Literacy interventionist position for reduction

- x. Budget costs represent district averages (what school budget is charged for position) versus individual actual salaries
 - xi. Review of discussion at SLT
 - xii. Personnel needed to manage Site Assessment Leaders (SAL) and Site Technology Representative (STR) responsibilities
 - xiii. Role of Literacy intervention
 - xiv. Role and importance of budget analyst, cost of Office Support 1, 2, and 3
 - xv. Maintain cultural, reduce STL/cultural to just cultural and RA (to half time), Principal and AP
 - xvi. Combination of family liaison and RA position/share RA with another school
 - xvii. Reduction of elementary paras
 - xviii. STL/Cultural position 35% paid by district
 - xix. Process for UIP creation
 - xx. Reduction of assistant principal (AP)
 - xxi. Capacity building for teachers and paras in RA
- d. Public comment
- i. Budget Assistance request possibilities
 - ii. Requirement for STL to have teaching caseload but not Admin.
 - iii. Full time psych and behavior
 - iv. Lower elementary team does not support reduction in literacy intervention
 - v. Support for additional RA training for teachers and paras
 - vi. Distribution of STL funds if position is cut- 35% back to district.
 - vii. AP, STL positions are new positions
 - viii. Strategize funds to minimize cuts in subsequent years
 - ix. Procedure if consensus is not reached
 - x. Concern about option removed between SLT and CSC
 - xi. Ensure focus is on position, not people
 - xii. Paras an option for reduction
 - xiii. New positions necessary to replace AP
 - xiv. Need to be student centered
 - xv. Role of STL and Parent Liaison
 - xvi. Responsibility to students to maintain RA coordinator and STL/Cultural
 - xvii. Role of STL
 - xviii. Detriment to students in scenario 1 and 2
 - xix. Elementary most impacted
 - xx. Time/Availability of teacher to address RJ issues in classroom
 - xxi. Loss of student time in classroom when with RA coordinator
- e. Return to CSC discussion, discussion points:
- i. Effectiveness of RA position
 - ii. Training of paras in RA
 - iii. Amount of time allowed for SLT discussion of scenarios
 - iv. Importance of administrative roles in organizations
 - v. Budget assistance possibilities and likelihood
 - vi. Budget assistance in the amount of \$50,000 that was cut.
 - vii. Awareness of future budget reductions

- viii. Reduction of lower elementary paras from 5 hours to 4, reduction of upper elementary paras from 7.5 hours to 7 hours.
 - ix. Eliminate STL, maintain cultural, reduce literacy intervention to 0.5
 - x. Children first at the forefront, hours reduction for paras makes communication difficult
 - xi. RA shared with another school
 - xii. AP shared with another school
 - xiii. Emotional, heart based support important
 - xiv. Cultural allows students to go deeper into a topic
 - xv. RA office/Peace Place very busy, handles a variety of situations, reduction in discipline problems compared to last year
 - xvi. Reasons why students are using the RA office/Peace Place, when are students there?
- f. Parent input discussion topics
- i. All three positions being discussed are new within last 8 years, rationale for creation
 - ii. Example of support received at a different school with more support
 - iii. Benefit of having someone outside of the classroom to talk with children about some concerns
 - iv. Re-iterate student centeredness and who interacts with students
 - v. Scenario of AP reduction unavailable
 - vi. Importance of people who are interacting with students and addressing their emotional needs.
 - vii. Budget assistance and grant writing, strategic around future
 - viii. Support for scenario 2 (reduction of RA coordinator)
 - ix. Need to be mindful of the AP and the future
 - x. Importance of administration contributing to underlying success of organization
 - xi. Vote-
 - 1. Cristina, Amanda, Katy, Ellie in support of scenario 1 (elimination of STL/Cultural)
 - 2. Thomas, Stacy, Juan Carlos, Liz, Jolee in support of scenario 2 (elimination of RA coordinator)
 - xii. Review of UIP, how RA coordinator and STL/Cultural support UIP
 - 1. RA Coordinator supports students of color, Ell, Special education goals, equity and opportunity gaps
 - 2. STL more all-encompassing, not targeted interventions.
 - xiii. Concern about losing Montessori aspect of cultural,
 - xiv. New Scenario- Reduce literacy interventionist to 0.8, reduce ST:/Cultural to 0.5 (keep cultural), Reduce enrollment savings to \$5,000
 - xv. All non-required positions as possibilities for reduction
 - xvi. Continued discussion of scenarios 1, 2, and 3.
 - xvii. Concern about staffing 0.5 cultural position
 - xviii. Reviewed procedure for impasse
 - xix. Consensus not reached

- g. Meeting adjourned at 9:30pm, to reconvene at 4:30 pm, Tuesday, January 30, 2018, invitation to instructional superintendent to act as mediator.