

Corvallis School District 509J
Board of Directors

BOARD MEETING DATE: November 3, 2008

FOR INFORMATION

SUBJECT: Vital Signs Report

Issue:

The 2005-06 PR2 Committee advised the Board to pay attention to data that could provide an early warning of the need to look at facilities usage including boundaries, reconfigurations, opening or closing of schools and to inform the annual budget priorities.

This report is provided to the board twice each year as the information is available.

Much of the November report is based on enrollment at each school and average class sizes. We use the information developed in the class size report, presented separately, as a basis for this update.

CONTACT PERSON(S): Kathy Rodeman and Linda Martin



Corvallis School District 509J

Vital Signs Update – November 2008

Vital signs are used to create a proactive view of relevant indicators that would cause the Corvallis School Board to initiate conversations and assessments that would indicate the need to look at facilities usage including boundaries, reconfiguration, opening or closing of schools, and inform annual budget prioritizations.

Vital signs are reported to the School Board in November and March.

Assumptions:

- Facilities Utilization Process Flowchart will be used
- Designated capacity as approved by School Board through boundary work
- Level = Elementary (K-5), Middle (6-8), High (9-12)
- K-8 considered Elementary
- Cost for maintenance: utilities and custodial services
- Overhead cost: Principal, secretary, office staff, and centrally funded building staff.
- Personnel costs are based on averages for each position

Prepared By:

Kathy Rodeman, Director of Business Services
Linda Martin, Budget Analyst
Jennifer Schroeder, AA3/OA

Vital Signs Directory – November 2008

- Vital Signs Summary – November 2008 1

- Vital Signs Reviewed Each November
- 1.1 District-Wide Average Class Size 2
- 1.2 School-Specific Average Class Size Changes 3
- 2.1 District-Wide Budgeted/Actual Enrollment 4
- 2.2 District-Wide Grade Level Enrollment Changes 4
- 2.3 School-Specific Enrollment Changes 5
- 3.1 Facility Utilization by School and Grade..... 6
- 3.2 Facility Maintenance by School and Grade 7

- Vital Signs Reviewed Each March
- 1.3 District-Wide Allocation per Weighted Student..... 8
- 1.4 School-Specific Staffing Allocations..... 10

- Appendix – November 2008..... 11

Vital Signs Summary – November 2008

Fall Term <i>(performance reviewed each November)</i>			
1. Funding and Allocations for General Fund			
	<i>Criteria</i>	<i>Performance Notes</i>	<i>Traffic Signal</i>
1.1 Page 2	District-wide average class size: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • K-5 > 25 • 6-8* > 28 • 9-12* > 30 <small>*Core subject classes only (math, language arts, social studies, science)</small>	Actual District-wide average class sizes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • K-5 = 23.4 • 6-8* = 26.2 • 9-12* = 29.8 <small>*Core subject classes only</small>	Green
1.1 Page 3	<i>School-specific classroom average class sizes > +/- 2 at the elementary level or > +/- 2 in core subjects at the middle and high school levels</i>	<i>Averages did not change > +/- 2 at either level except for Wilson Elementary School</i>	Yellow
2. Population Data			
	<i>Criteria</i>	<i>Performance Notes</i>	<i>Traffic Signal</i>
2.1 Page 4	District-wide actual enrollment by grade level changes between budget forecast and actual > +/- 5%	All levels were within the 5% range	Green
2.2 Page 4	District-wide by grade level cumulative change in students over a 3-year period of > +/- 10%	All levels were within the 10% range	Green
2.3 Page 5	<i>School-specific cumulative change in students over a 3-year period of > +/- 10%</i>	<i>Due to boundary changes, Adams, Mt. View and Wilson exceed this vital sign</i>	Yellow
3. Facilities			
	<i>Criteria</i>	<i>Performance Notes</i>	<i>Traffic Signal</i>
3.1 Page 6	<i>School and level specific capacity utilization falls outside of the target utilization rate of 75% - 90% of designed capacity</i>	<i>Decrease in class size increased classroom use and aggravated capacities</i>	Yellow
3.2 Page 7	<i>School and level specific costs for maintenance exceed:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Elementary schools per student costs > +/- 10% variance of average</i> • <i>Middle or high schools per student costs > +/- 15% variance of average</i> 	<i>Franklin operates outside the per student cost parameter</i>	Yellow
Spring Term <i>(performance reviewed each March)</i>			
1. Funding and Allocations for General Fund			
	<i>Criteria</i>	<i>Performance Notes</i>	<i>Traffic Signal</i>
1.3 Page 8	District-wide anticipated allocation per weighted student adjusts average class sizes > +/- 2 students		
1.4 Page 10	School-specific staffing allocations are insufficient to maintain educational programs without fund-raising for staff		

1.1 District-Wide Average Class Size

Item 1.1 Criteria	<h1 style="font-size: 2em; margin: 0;">1.1</h1> <p style="font-size: 1.2em; margin: 0;">Funding and Allocations for General Fund</p>
<p>District-wide average class size:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • K-5 > 25 • 6-8* > 28 • 9-12* > 30 <p><small>*Core subject classes only (math, language arts, social studies, science)</small></p>	
Item 1.1 Performance Notes	
<p>Actual District-wide averages were below the maximum targets:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • K-5 = 23.4 • 6-8* = 26.2 • 9-12* = 29.8 <p><small>*Core subject classes only (math, language arts, social studies, science)</small></p>	

Information for this response is from the District Class Size Report presented to the School Board October 6, 2008, prepared by Denise Cardinali.

Grade	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07	2008-09	2008-09
K	23.8	23.1	23.6	23.6	20.8	21.9
1	26.9	25.3	25.8	24.0	23.2	21.9
2	26.6	25.6	25.9	24.7	22.5	24.0
3	28.2	27.0	27.3	26.7	24.8	24.7
4	29.0	28.8	27.9	27.4	24.9	23.9
5	29.4	29.2	29.4	29.7	24.1	23.9

Table 1.1a: District-wide Average Class Sizes by Grade Level

Class sizes in grades 6-8 in the core subjects of math, language arts, social studies and science were evaluated to determine the percentage of classes where the sizes varied. Because of the overall class size reduction, three ranges were reviewed: ≥ 35 , 30-34 and ≤ 29 . Linus Pauling has 7 classes (7%) above 35 or more, Cheldelin has 3. At Cheldelin, 86% of the core classes have ≤ 29 students and 10% have 30-34 students. At Linus Pauling, 28% of the core classes have 30 – 34 students and 66% of the classes have ≤ 29 students.

High school class sizes in the core subjects of math, language arts, social studies and science were evaluated using the same parameters. Corvallis High School has 7 classes with 35 or more students enrolled. Crescent Valley High School has 18 classes in that range. Corvallis High has 24% at the 30 – 34 range and 70% at the ≤ 29 range. Crescent Valley has 28% at the 30 – 34 range and 49% at the ≤ 29 range.

1.2 School-Specific Average Class Size Changes

Item 1.2 Criteria	<h1 style="font-size: 2em; margin: 0;">1.2</h1> <p style="margin: 0;">Funding and Allocations for General Fund</p>
School-specific class size averages change $> +/- 2$ at the elementary level or average class size $> +/- 2$ in core subjects at the middle and high school levels	
Item 1.2 Performance Notes	
For the most part, school-specific class size averages did not change $> +/- 2$ at the elementary level or in core subjects at the middle and high school levels; Wilson Elementary was the only exception.	

As shown in Table 1.2a, most class size averages remained were within the stated range. Wilson has the same number of classrooms as last year, but added 28 students to its enrollment, or an average of 2 students per class. In addition, six of Wilson’s classes last year were 3.5 or more students below the District average, but this year Wilson’s classes average about one student more than the District average

School	2007-08	2008-09	Difference
Adams	23.63	22.94	-0.69
Franklin	27.75	27.00	-0.75
Garfield	23.88	22.41	-1.46
Hoover	23.94	24.24	0.29
Jefferson	23.69	25.31	1.62
Lincoln	21.42	22.37	0.95
Mt. View	22.11	22.18	0.07
Wilson	22.00	24.46	2.46
Cheldelin	24.94	26.18	1.24
Linus Pauling	24.70	26.08	1.38
Corvallis High	27.06	25.49	-1.58
Crescent Valley	27.72	29.27	1.55

Table 1.2a: Class Size

2.1 District-Wide Budgeted/Actual Enrollment

Item 2.1 Criteria	<h1 style="font-size: 2em; margin: 0;">2.1</h1> <p style="font-size: 1.2em; margin: 0;">Population Data</p>
District-wide actual enrollment by grade level changes between budget forecast and actual > +/- 5%	
Item 2.1 Performance Notes	
All levels were within the 5% range	

All levels were within the 5% range as shown in Table 2.1a, below.

Grade Level	Budget 2008-09	Actual 9-30-08	Difference
K-5	2,782	2,794	+0.4%
6-8	1,570	1,560	-0.6%
9-12	2,352	2,309	-1.8%

Table 2.1a: Enrollment Forecast Compared to Actual

2.2 District-Wide Grade Level Enrollment Changes

Item 2.2 Criteria	<h1 style="font-size: 2em; margin: 0;">2.2</h1> <p style="font-size: 1.2em; margin: 0;">Population Data</p>
District-wide by grade level cumulative change in students over a 3-year period of > +/- 10%	
Item 2.2 Performance Notes	
Forecasts for the next three years do not show significant cumulative changes.	

The forecast for the next three years shows a decrease of about 0.2% at each of the elementary levels, an increase of 1.4% at the middle schools, and a 2% increase at the high school level.

Grade Level	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	3-yr Change
K-5	2794	2799	2789	-0.18%
6-8	1560	1531	1538	-1.43%
9-12	2309	2329	2349	1.70%

Table 2.2a: Forecasted Enrollment 3-yr Change by Grade Level

2.3 School-Specific Enrollment Changes

Item 2.3 Criteria	<h1 style="font-size: 2em; margin: 0;">2.3</h1> <p style="font-size: 1.2em; margin: 0;">Population Data</p>
School-specific cumulative change in students over a 3-year period of > +/- 10%	
Item 2.3 Performance Notes	
<p>Adams, Mt. View and Wilson Elementary Schools exceed this vital sign due to boundary changes made by the School Board in 2007</p>	

The boundary changes adopted by the School Board in 2007 were designed to redistribute students from schools at the North and South ends of the district (where population is expected to continue to grow) to schools in the middle of the District where declining enrollment can be seen.

The reduction of students at Adams and Mt. View, as well as the increase in students at Wilson, was deliberate to bring the overall population into a better fit with school capacity.

At the middle and high school levels, transfers have been restricted into Linus Pauling Middle School and Corvallis High School for three years. We are seeing the difference between populations continue to shrink to fall within the Open Enrollment Guidelines of +/- 7%.

School	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	3-Year Cumulative Change
Adams	465	445	417	-10.3%
Franklin	350	333	324	-7.4%
Garfield	396	380	377	-4.8%
Hoover	413	406	410	-0.7%
Jefferson	324	322	347	7.1%
Lincoln	401	444	425	6.0%
Mt. View	420	421	376	-10.5%
Wilson	301	316	346	15.0%
Cheldelin	598	588	640	7.0%
Linus Pauling	693	704	692	0.1%
Corvallis High	1,360	1,330	1,263	-7.1%
Crescent Valley	1,039	1,037	1,046	0.7%

Table 2.3a: Enrollment Forecast Compared to Actual

3.1 Facility Utilization by School and Grade

Item 3.1 Criteria	<h1 style="font-size: 2em; margin: 0;">3.1</h1> <p style="font-size: 1.2em; margin: 0;">Facilities</p>
School and level specific capacity utilization falls outside of the target utilization rate of 75% - 90% of designed capacity	
Item 3.1 Performance Notes	
Elementary and K-8 Schools fall outside of the utilization percentage	

Utilization is the percentage of available classroom seats used by the current students, as noted in Table 3.1a below. District wide, elementary and K-8 schools are above the target utilization rate for buildings. With the anticipated loss of the School Improvement Fund grant, fewer classroom teachers are expected in 2009-10 and a reduction in capacity utilization should follow. Middle schools fall within the target range and high schools are four percentage points below the target.

Level	Utilization
Elementary	101%
K-8 Schools	93%
Middle Schools	82%
High Schools	71%

Table 3.1a: Facility Utilization

Further details concerning school capacity and utilization are included in Table A in the Appendix to this document.

3.2 Facility Maintenance by School and Grade

Item 3.2 Criteria	<h1 style="font-size: 2em; margin: 0;">3.2</h1> <p style="font-size: 1.2em; margin: 0;">Facilities</p>
School and level specific costs for maintenance exceed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Elementary schools per student costs > +/- 10% variance of average • Middle or high schools per student costs > +/- 15% variance of average 	
Item 3.2 Performance Notes	
Franklin operates outside the per student cost parameter	

The cost of maintenance overhead is measured by the custodial costs and utilities at each site on a per student basis. Table B in the Appendix at the end of this document shows the maintenance cost per student at each school. Elementary and K-8 schools vary from a low of \$306 per student at Lincoln to a high of \$388 at Franklin. The average is \$334 per student. Franklin operates outside the per student cost parameter. Lincoln, with the largest elementary enrollment, operates at 8% below the average.

Cheldelin and Linus Pauling operate at the same cost per pupil. High schools fall inside the target range, percentage wise. Crescent Valley costs \$408 per student, while Corvallis High costs \$422. The average is \$416 per student.

1.3 District-Wide Allocation per Weighted Student

Item 1.3 Criteria	1.3 Funding and Allocations for General Fund
District-wide anticipated allocation per weighted student adjusts average class sizes > +/- 2 students	
Item 1.3 Performance Notes	
Projected performance is discussed below; specific details related to this measure will be reviewed March 2009	

As seen in Table 1.3a on the next page, 2008-09 budget allocations maintained the average class sizes at grades 6-12 in core subject areas (language arts, social studies, math, and science).

The Local Option Levy and School Improvement Fund (SIF) Grant added a total of 31 teachers in 2007-08 to reduce class sizes. The SIF grant was a two-year grant from the State Legislature. At this point, it is unlikely to be extended in the 2009-11 biennium.

Funding for kindergarten through 5th grade will support a slightly smaller class size than we have had in previous years.

This section
will be reviewed
in March 2009

Academic Year	Allocation per Weighted Student	Budgeted Average Cost for a Teacher	Number of Weighted Students Needed per Teacher	Plus: Other Changes to Improve Class Size
2003-04	\$2,284	\$70,250	30.76	
2004-05	2,300	71,000	30.87	Additional \$401,500 to lower class sizes at grades K-3 not included in per student allocation
2005-06	2,348	72,500	30.88	
2006-07	2,469	74,600	30.21	Additional 2 Language Arts Teachers at middle schools not included in per student allocation.
2007-08	2,496	74,600	29.89	Local Option Levy = Additional 1.0 3 rd -5 th teacher at each elementary, 6.33 teachers at middle schools and 8 teachers at high school for class size reduction in core subjects. School Improvement Fund = Additional 1 teacher at each elementary for K-2, and 2 teachers at each middle and high schools for literacy.
2008-09 Restated	2,321	74,600	32.14	Beginning in 2008-09, some positions previously funded by the Allocation per Weighted Student are moved to the Basic School Budgets. If the funding changes had been in effect for 2008-09, the number of weighted students needed per teacher would have been 32.14.
2008-09	2,478	79,150	31.94	Essentially the same allocation as prior year.

Table 1.3a: Budgeted Average Cost for Teacher/Allocation per Student

1.4 School-Specific Staffing Allocations

Item 1.4 Criteria	1.4 Funding and Allocations for General Fund
School-specific staffing allocations are insufficient to maintain educational programs without fund-raising for staff.	
Item 1.4 Performance Notes	
Projected performance is discussed below; specific details related to this measure will be reviewed March 2009	

2008-09 budget allocations provide sufficient staffing allocations as noted in Table 1.3a.

Projections regarding the 2009-10 school year will be reviewed in March 2008.

This section
will be reviewed
in March 2009

Appendix – November 2008

Table A: School Capacity/Utilization ReviewPage 12

Table B: Overhead CostsPage 13

Appendix Table A

School Capacity/Utilization Review

School Capacity/Utilization Review

Formula: # of classrooms X # students X % (Specialized Instruction/Prep Periods)

Planning Assumptions:

K-5 Planning Class Size	23 Students
6-8 Planning Class Size	28 Students
% (Specialized Instruction/Prep Periods)	85%

Calculations:

<u>Elementary K-5</u>	Classrooms	Modulars	Planning Capacity	9/30/2008	Utilization
Adams	20	1	411	417	101.6%
Garfield	17	3	391	377	96.4%
Hoover	14	5	371	410	110.4%
Jefferson	14	2	313	347	110.9%
Mt. View	17	3	391	376	96.2%
Wilson	<u>19</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>371</u>	<u>346</u>	<u>93.1%</u>
Total Elementary	101	14	2,248	2,273	101.1%
 <u>K-8 School Capacity</u>					
Franklin Grades K-5	10	0	196	155	
Franklin Grades 6-8	<u>7</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>167</u>	<u>169</u>	
Franklin Total	17	0	362	324	89.5%
Lincoln Grades K-5	17	2	371	366	
Lincoln Grades 6-8	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>71</u>	<u>59</u>	
Lincoln Total	18	4	443	425	96.0%
Total K-8 Schools	35	4	805	749	93.0%
 <u>Middle School</u>					
Cheldelin	34	0	809	640	79.1%
Linus Pauling	<u>34</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>809</u>	<u>692</u>	85.5%
Total Middle Schools	68	0	1,618	1,332	82.3%
 <u>High School</u>					
CHS	72	0	1,714	1263	74%
CVHS	<u>65</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>1,547</u>	<u>1046</u>	68%
Total High Schools	137	0	3,261	2,309	71%
Overall Capacity	341	18	7,932	6,663	84%

Appendix Table B: Overhead Costs

School	Principals	OA	Admin Support	Enrollment 9-28-08	Site Admin	Site Admin Cost per Student	Diff to Average by Level	Campus Steward	Custodian	Site Custodial	Utilities	Site Custodial and Utilities	Maintenance/Utilities Cost per Student	Diff to Average by Level
Adams	127,970	49,485	118,628	417	\$ 296,083	\$ 710	-9%	58,611	22,487	81,097	55,328	\$ 136,425	\$ 327	-2%
Franklin	127,970	49,485	96,272	324	273,727	845	8%	58,611	19,788	78,399	47,370	125,769	388	16%
Garfield	127,970	49,485	128,247	377	305,702	811	4%	58,611	22,487	81,097	41,021	122,118	324	-3%
Hoover	127,970	49,485	118,628	410	296,083	722	-8%	58,611	22,487	81,097	56,745	137,842	336	1%
Jefferson	127,970	49,485	90,299	347	267,754	772	-1%	58,611	22,487	81,097	34,209	115,306	332	0%
Lincoln	127,970	49,485	200,683	425	378,138	890	14%	58,611	22,487	81,097	48,925	130,022	306	-8%
Mt View	127,970	49,485	104,464	376	281,919	750	-4%	58,611	22,487	81,097	36,795	117,892	314	-6%
Wilson	127,970	49,485	90,299	346	267,754	774	-1%	58,611	22,487	81,097	42,348	123,445	357	7%
				3,022	2,367,159	\$ 783						1,008,819	\$ 334	
Cheldelin Linus	236,667	57,769	285,579	640	580,015	\$ 906	4%	62,101	70,158	132,259	99,741	232,000	\$ 363	0%
Pauling	236,667	57,769	285,579	692	580,015	838	-4%	62,101	67,460	129,561	121,642	251,203	363	0%
				1,332	1,160,030	\$ 871						483,203	\$ 363	
CHS	369,291	57,772	683,059	1,263	1,110,122	\$ 879	-5%	59,956	179,892	239,848	292,620	532,468	\$ 422	1%
CVHS	369,291	57,772	603,909	1,046	1,030,972	986	6%	59,956	179,892	239,848	187,290	427,138	408	-2%
				2,309	2,141,094	\$ 927						959,606	\$ 416	

Site Administration is the sum of the principal, head secretary, centrally funded building staff.

Elementary schools receive additional support staff if they are larger. Lincoln and Garfield receive special allocations for transient populations

At Lincoln, a one-time allocation for an instructional facilitator adds \$125 per student to the administrative cost per student

At the middle and high schools, these costs include librarians, counselors, and other support staff.

Site Custodial and Utilities is the sum of all custodial staff plus utilities for the site.

Source: Basic School Budget for 2008-09

E Prin 127,970
 MS Prin 130,354
 Asst MS Pri 106,313
 HS Prin 143,491
 Asst HS Pri 112,900 at 2 per HS
 figures for site administration payroll plus benefits

Custodial Source: Average Salary & Benefits 2008-09

Utilities: Actual 2007-08 costs per school

Other Maintenance based on work orders completed