

Policy Committee Meeting
Monday, April 29, 2024 4:30 PM

Dr. Matthew Prophet Education Center
501 N. Dixon St.
Portland, OR 97227

Agenda

1. Introductions
2. General Public Comment
3. Public Comment on Policies in the Public Comment Period
 - Junior Reserve Officer Training Corps and Military Careers 6.20.043-P - 4 *Two-Minute slots*
 - Districtwide Advocacy and Fundraising 7.10.020-P - 4 *Two-Minute slots*
4. **To sign-up for public comment email PublicComment@pps.net or call 503-916-3741*
5. Policy for Revision - Discussion Only
 - 6.50.010-P Field Trips, Foreign Travel, and Other Off-Campus Activities
6. Proposed New Policy - Discussion Only
 - Cell Phone Use in Schools Policy
 - Future AI Policy Discussion
7. Policies in the Public Comment Period
 - Diploma Requirements 4.20.042-P
 - Districtwide Advocacy and Fundraising 7.10.020-P
 - Junior Reserve Officer Training Corps and Military Careers 6.20.043-P
8. Adjourn

Public Comment on Draft Policies

Please provide your comments on policies currently proposed for revisions or rescissions, or new policies. Policies are open for public comment for a minimum of 21 days between the First Reading and the Second Reading, when a adopt the policy.

Email *

Name *

Email *

Your School Community *

Buckman Elementary

Do you provide permission to post your comments on the PPS website? *

- ☐ Yes, with name
- ☒ Yes, without name
- ☐ No. Share only with Board and District staff

Policy you are providing comment on *

Revision: Districtwide Advocacy and Fundraising 7.10.020-P (Formerly Parent Groups and the
Schools) ▼

Please provide your comments below *

Dear Dear PPS Board of Directors,

I am writing today to express my opposition to the Policy Committee's draft School Foundation Policy that came before the full board for a first reading on April 2, 2024 and vote at a future meeting. We are asking you to reject this harmful proposal and send it back to the Policy Committee for further consideration.

There are several flawed assumptions with this proposal. One is that you are all making assumptions that parents that are hard-working and don't make a great deal of money will have the time, money, and energy to spend on a general foundation. This is false, and I even cut my donation to PPS Foundation this year due to this specific policy proposal. I focused all of our money and time on our local school foundation.

Second of all, I am a public employee and not a rich parent (as some of the Board members want to assume about focus schools). I have to make choices where I spend my time and money in order to pay our bills. One of the areas that we focus on is our daughter's school.

I have been placed on a waitlist and not able to make public comments at your board meetings. Apparently, now I have been waitlisted for 3 or more meetings. As a public employee, I was frankly surprised and disappointed in your board and policies for limiting public testimony, which appears to be a strategy to avoid dissent. Further disappointed and frustrated by Juila Brim-Edwards comments that the controversy must mean you are doing the right thing, which is a very short sighted approach to a publicly held office and contradictory to your Board's own expressed values on community engagement.

You are approving this policy in a horrible budget year without a strategy or analysis on how your board and the district will overcome the shortfall in the decrease in funding. Your values on equity are in the right place, but your approach is significantly lacking in foresight and an impact analysis. We should be focused on increasing funding for schools that need more support, but we should NOT be doing that by punishing other schools. I have yet to see ONE PPS Foundation event held at my daughter's school in the last 5 years (NOT ONE!). The Buckman School foundation has been an incredible way to build community within our district, and we have been able to meet new friends and families through our joint volunteer and fundraising efforts.

Also, the majority of my daughter's friends don't even live in our elementary school district and live out in the eastern Portland area. So, you will also be taking an arts focused program away from these transfer students that are receiving an incredible experience.

There are three key reasons for this request:

1) This is not how you create policy, or build trust.

Now more than ever the district, and PPS Board, needs to build trust. A scheme to pass this proposal - hatched while parents and community members were distracted by a strike, school closures, budget cuts and lost superintendent - is the absolute opposite of how a board leads its community.

2) This proposal does nothing to help a single PPS student and it is clear it will actively harm many.

This proposal advocates for the elimination of critical funding that thousands of PPS students rely on. Additionally, it offers no immediate replacement funding source or executable plan to shore up a

districtwide fund. We are already facing a painful budget crisis, and this is absolutely the wrong time to impose further cuts that will cause harm to our students.

3) Hope is not a plan. Creating an effective districtwide foundation that replaces the millions of dollars currently raised at the local school level will require significant time, staff and resources. This proposal contains zero details of how or when such a difficult task will be accomplished. Importantly, there is no consideration given to how the district will convince the thousands of parents who currently give at the school level to switch to a districtwide foundation. Most of those parents have never even been asked.

Policy changes on such a complex and sensitive topic - like school foundation fundraising - deserves a thoughtful, collaborative process that includes all impacted voices in the community. Pursuit of this policy will only alienate community members and cause more division in an already fragile district.

The policy should at least be delayed to implement community engagement efforts in focus schools with a detailed impact analysis before it's adopted. Another option would be to consider a phased approach by allowing school foundations to utilize their funds up to a cap of \$100,000, and then the remaining funds go to district-wide efforts. A phased approach would be like implementing a pilot of the program to determine potential unforeseen consequences before full implementation.

We expect the PPS board to prioritize what is best for all PPS students, and to responsibly implement policies that do not leave any student worse off. Our children do not have the luxury of affording any more cuts to their education.

Respectfully,



Proud Buckman Parent

This form was created inside of Portland Public Schools.

Google Forms

Public Comment on Draft Policies

Please provide your comments on policies currently proposed for revisions or rescissions, or new policies. Policies are open for public comment for a minimum of 21 days between the First Reading and the Second Reading, when a adopt the policy.

Email *

Name *

Jessica Lahti

Email *

Your School Community *

ACCESS Academy, Beaumont MS, and Grant HS

Do you provide permission to post your comments on the PPS website? *

- ☒ Yes, with name
- ☐ Yes, without name
- ☐ No. Share only with Board and District staff

Policy you are providing comment on *

Revision: Districtwide Advocacy and Fundraising 7.10.020-P (Formerly Parent Groups and the Schools) ▼

Please provide your comments below *

Hello,

My name is Jessica Lahti and I am a parent to three PPS students in the Grant cluster. For the last several years, I have worked with other PPS parents to learn about PPS's funding model, the role of foundations, and help educate others on inequitable school-based foundation funding.

A few weeks ago, I had the opportunity to travel down to Salem with other PPS parents to talk to our state legislators and advocate for more state funding for our schools. It was an incredible experience and I appreciated learning about the challenges being faced by others in the district. For example, many of the parents I lobbied with in Salem have children who are the recipients of SPED services. I learned that these parents are often asked by their schools to keep their children at home because their school doesn't always have the staff and services available to meet their needs. I learned that half of the schools facing teacher cuts next year are Title I schools. Most importantly, I learned that our legislators are incredibly accessible and they are open to hearing what we have to say.

But, given all of our state's current challenges, PPS parents need to show up in large numbers to educate our legislators on the problems our students face and demand additional funding. This requires everyone, and I mean everyone (parents from ALL of our schools, the Board, and PPS administration to work together to help our legislators come up with revenue solutions that fully fund ALL of our schools. I am looking forward to going back to Salem with more parents.

A district-wide foundation model would be a great step toward bringing our voices together to advocate on behalf of ALL of the district's students and to uphold PPS's Mission:

Mission Statement

We provide rigorous, high-quality academic learning experiences that are inclusive and joyful. We disrupt racial inequities to create vibrant environments for every student to demonstrate excellence.

This form was created inside of Portland Public Schools.

Google Forms

Public Comment on Draft Policies

Please provide your comments on policies currently proposed for revisions or rescissions, or new policies. Policies are open for public comment for a minimum of 21 days between the First Reading and the Second Reading, when a adopt the policy.

Email *

Name *

Emily Walsh

Email *

Your School Community *

Scott Elementary

Do you provide permission to post your comments on the PPS website? *

- ☒ Yes, with name
- ☐ Yes, without name
- ☐ No. Share only with Board and District staff

Policy you are providing comment on *

Revision: Districtwide Advocacy and Fundraising 7.10.020-P (Formerly Parent Groups and the Schools) ▼

Please provide your comments below *

I support the adoption of this draft policy - reform of PPS district fundraising policy is long overdue. The approval and adoption of this policy would be an important step forward towards bringing our disparate school communities together in efforts to achieve the funding and staffing that all of our students deserve. I am hopeful that the board will move forward with approving this policy so that inequitable fundraising efforts are limited and so that we as a community can focus on working together to achieve our shared goals.

.....

This form was created inside of Portland Public Schools.

Google Forms

Public Comment on Draft Policies

Please provide your comments on policies currently proposed for revisions or rescissions, or new policies. Policies are open for public comment for a minimum of 21 days between the First Reading and the Second Reading, when a adopt the policy.

Email *

Name *

Email *

Your School Community *

Do you provide permission to post your comments on the PPS website? *

- ☒ Yes, with name
- ☐ Yes, without name
- ☐ No. Share only with Board and District staff

Policy you are providing comment on *

Revision: Districtwide Advocacy and Fundraising 7.10.020-P (Formerly Parent Groups and the Schools) ▼

Please provide your comments below *

Please do the right thing and approve district wide foundation fundraising. The current system is not the standard nationwide. It is clearly inequitable and not benefiting the school populations most in need of extra funds.

This form was created inside of Portland Public Schools.

Google Forms

Public Comment on Draft Policies

Please provide your comments on policies currently proposed for revisions or rescissions, or new policies. Policies are open for public comment for a minimum of 21 days between the First Reading and the Second Reading, when a adopt the policy.

Email *

Name *

Email *

Your School Community *

Do you provide permission to post your comments on the PPS website? *

- ☒ Yes, with name
- ☐ Yes, without name
- ☐ No. Share only with Board and District staff

Policy you are providing comment on *

Revision: Districtwide Advocacy and Fundraising 7.10.020-P (Formerly Parent Groups and the Schools) ▼

Please provide your comments below *

To the Directors of the PPS School Board:

We know you are receiving a flood of emails related to foundation reform policy, so we are sending one joint letter instead of [x] individual ones.

We support a district-wide foundation as an alternative to the inequitable local school foundation (LSF) system that has been in place for the last 25 years, resulting in huge disparities in the number of additional staff that schools have been able to pay for using fundraising dollars.

This policy has been in active school board discussion for more than four years (see highlights on this timeline). In that time, hundreds of parents from every school in the district have communicated with board members in support of a district-wide foundation (links to letter 1 and letter 2). At least 30 community members from over 30 schools, including parents, teachers, and students, have provided public comment in policy committee meetings sharing their thoughts. Many more have participated in PPS sponsored round tables and a community feedback session. There is no scheme, only the persistent desire to see this much-needed change finally come to pass.

PPS is an outlier in allowing individual school communities to raise funds for staff in their own schools. Districts across our region and across the country have taken a stand against this inequitable practice. In our school district, like so many others, where schools remain segregated both racially and socioeconomically, schools do not have equal opportunity to supplement their district-provided funding for staff. Now is the time to align action with PPS's stated beliefs.

On the other hand, district-wide foundation models are common. There are many examples of how to raise and distribute funds together as one united community. This model will create opportunities for fundraising that don't currently exist, as the majority of PPS schools do not have active LSFs but could participate in joint fundraising opportunities. But perhaps more importantly, this policy change provides an avenue for parents to align efforts to improve education funding where it really counts-- to our legislators in Salem and to our local community in support of levy and bond passages. This is advocacy that improves conditions for ALL students, not just the few in schools fortunate enough to raise significant fundraising dollars.

After more than four years, it is up to you, the board, to make the decision that this is our path forward. Because parents in LSFs are raising money right now to pay for staff for the 24/25 school year, there is a built-in transition year that does not cut off expected resources.

This is the role of policy and elected leaders--to provide guidance for our system, when individual decisions are not serving all kids. Please vote YES for a district-wide foundation policy starting in the 24/25 school year.

Signed,

- 1 Susan Carson, McDaniel High School
- 2 Beth Cavanaugh, Hosford and Cleveland parent, member of Cleveland Parent Equity Group
- 3 Jessica Lahti, Grant, Beaumont, ACCESS Academy
- 4 Martha Almendarez Langland. Parent at Atkinson Elementary member of PTA and Amigos Latine parent group.

- 5 Harmony Quiroz (Atkinson parent, former chair of CBRC)
- 6 Rashelle Chase-Miller, Kairos PDX
- 7 Kim Jarema, Mt Tabor Parent & Former Atkinson PTA President
- 8 Tara Rath, Atkinson Elementary
- 9 Abby Wood
- 10 Bethany Austin, Lewis Elementary
- 11 Amanda Pretti, Atkinson DLI parent
- 12 Renee Becerra, parent of students at Kellogg and Vestal
- 13 Isabel Johnson, Glencoe Elementary School
- 14 Cara Haskey, parent of Beaumont MS students
- 15 Laura Bartroff - Creston
- 16 Marisa Bryman, Harrison Park parent, former Southeast Guiding Coalition Member
- 17 Anonymous, Clark Elementary School
- 18 Jessica Farrell, Vestal Elementary
- 19 Bettina McEntyre, Clark Elementary
- 20 Ann Fitzgerald Clark Elementary
- 21 Janine Shockley, Atkinson
- 22 Jamie Ackerman-Harvie (parent in Atkinson Elementary)
- 23 Ellie Russell, Marysville and Kellogg parent
- 24 Molly Jones, Beverly Cleary School
- 25 Danielle Garcia, Atkinson Elementary parent
- 26 Sarah Whitney, Atkinson Elementary
- 27 Magalí Rabasa. Parent at Rigler Elementary, President of Padres Unidos de Rigler/PTA
- 28 Nate Freiburger, Parent at Rigler Elementary
- 29 Marty Stockton, Grant High School
- 30 Tina Wheatley (Atkinson parent)
- 31 Lindsay Wills, Atkinson
- 32 Anonymous, Lincoln hs
- 33 Padres Unidos de Rigler (Rigler Elementary PTA)
- 34 Sarah Cochran - Franklin High School
- 35 Melissa Blount, MLC parent and PPS staff
- 36 Kristin Pollock, parent of incoming Rigler student
- 37 Anne Jin, ACCESS Academy
- 38 Maarit Pulli, Laurelhurst K-8, Grant HS
- 39 Rachel Niedner-Boman, Dr. MLK Jr and Grant parent
- 40 Anne Cherry, Arleta Elementary
- 41 Elyse Cherry, Arleta Elementary
- 42 Teresa Barsotti, Harrison Park parent
- 43 Megan K. Kirsch-McMaster (Kellogg, Franklin)
- 44 Maruska Lynch, RCP parent
- 45 Jennifer Lee, Franklin Parent
- 46 Vena Rainwater parent at Rigler. ¡unidos podemos!
- 47 Laura Campbell, parent at Jason Lee Elementary
- 48 Susannah Reese, parent at Glencoe Elementary
- 49 Aurelia Galimberti, Rigler elementary parent
- 50 Caroline Schwiebert, Hosford parent
- 51 Korin Rasmussen Franklin and MTMS
- 52 Katherine Paxton-Williams, Teacher at Kelly Elementary, Lincoln HS alumna
- 53 Anonymous, Rigler elementary

- 54 Kit Murray, Lent Elementary
- 55 Emilie Lamson-Siu
- 56 Marcy Berkowitz, Clarendon
- 57 Devon Roulette, Atkinson Elementary parent
- 58 John McGowan
- 59 Jeff Gerwing, Rigler Elementary, parent and PTA member
- 60 Maren Kohl, Atkinson Parent
- 61 Mary Beth Snell, Harrison Park MS parent and Grant HS College Coordinator
- 62 Brian Landreth, MLK Jr and Jefferson parent
- 63 Ashley Beach, Atkinson Elementary School
- 64 Chad Dermann Rigler Elementary
- 65 Emily Crick- rose city park
- 66 Sam Fisher, Kelly Elementary
- 67 Anna Cox- parent Lane Middle School
- 68 Joanna Beatty
- 69 Caely Barrett, Rigler School parent
- 70 Emily Walsh, Scott Elementary School
- 71 Joanne Havran, Arleta and McDaniel
- 72 Laura Fisher, Roosevelt High School teacher
- 73 Sarah Kincaid, Arleta Elementary
- 74 Ryan Phillips, Grout Elementary and Hosford MS
- 75 Megan Mermis, Laurelhurst
- 76 Barry Wooffitt, Laurelhurst
- 77 Smyth Lai, Roseway Heights MS, McDaniel HS
- 78 Cozette Tran-Caffee, Rose City Park ES parent
- 79 Eriko Ono Beverly Cleary k-8 and Grant High School
- 80 Kathryn Juergens/parent of 7th grader at Robert Gray Middle School
- 81 Dr. Zena, McDaniel High School
- 82 Beth Robidoux - Atkinson parent
- 83 Mindy Stone parent of Roosevelt High School Student
- 84 Mike Westling, Faubion School
- 85 Trina Marmarelli, Grout ES, Hosford MS
- 86 Chelsea Powers, Woodmere Elementary Parent
- 87 Kerri Babin, Kellogg and Creston
- 88 Anonymous, Lent Elementary and Kellogg MS
- 89 Addie Humbert, parent Beach Elementary
- 90 Seth Otto, Creston, Kellogg, Franklin
- 91 Franklin Parent, former PTSA/Site Council member
- 92 Amy Dancoes, Lent Elementary Parent
- 93 Danielle Galat, parent at Atkinson Elementary
- 94 Naomi Cole, Beach
- 95 Andrew Lightman, Creston School parent
- 96 Kathleen Parker Winterhaven School
- 97 Christy Splitt, Hayhurst School
- 98 Jennifer Kerns McDaniel High School
- 99 Holly Groom, McDaniel HS
- 100 Lydia Kiesling, Glencoe Elementary
- 101 Anonymous, Peninsula Elementary
- 102 Marya Van Metre, Peninsula Elementary

103 Anonymous, McDaniel
104 Nora Bauman, Dr. MLK Jr. Elementary
105 Jonna Lynn Bransford, Astor School parent
106 Courtney Szper, Rose City Park Elementary
107 Becca VandeWalle, Rose City Park Elem
108 James Haskell, No school affiliation at this time
109 Amanda Graham, Alameda ES, Beaumont MS, Roosevelt HS
110 Susan Beal, Hosford & Cleveland parent & PTA volunteer
111 Ryan Mosier (parent of Grout Elementary 2nd Grade student)
112 Anne Hoang, Jackson Middle School and Ida B Wells High School
113 Ian Krist - Parent Rose City Park ES
114 Anonymous, Ockley Green, Jefferson, and Peninsula
115 Caroline Pope, Rigler
116 Erin Lopez (Atkinson Elementary parent)
117 Ron Werner, Scott Elementary and Roseway Heights Middle School
118 Suzanne Clarke, Roosevelt HS
119 Amy Iannone - Cleveland
120 Anonymous, McDaniel HS
121 Richard Belson, McDaniel HS, Portland, OR
122 Jay Klusky, PhD Social Service Provider for DHS
123 Elissa Dingus, former PPS teacher and current community member
124 Maya Pueo von Geldern, Vernon Parent & Vernon PTA VP of Communications
125 Anonymous, Scott School
126 Amanda Bird, Glencoe Elementary, Franklin High School
127 Clint Johnson, Glencoe Elementary, Franklin High School
128 Scott Eck. Hayhurst, Robert Gray and IBWells
129 Jennifer Dunmire Howe (Atkinson & Harrison Park)
130 Julia Schoonenberg, Beach ES
131 Katherine Hart
132 Sara Schultz, Sabin
133 Kate Koehler Lefco, Beach Elementary (parent) and Peninsula Elementary (staff)
134 Liz Erickson. Alliance at Meek H.S. & Beaumont M.S.
135 Dawn Miller, Grant High School
136 Tara Horn, Vernon Elementary
137 Melissa Sabga, RGMS and George MS
138 Hannah Love, Vernon K-8 parent
139 Ashley Schofield, Bridlemile Elementary
140 Pamela Johnson, Sellwood Middle School Parent
141 Darcy Wilde- Atkinson ES and Franklin HS
142 Danielle Meyer, Atkinson
143 Kate O'Donnell, Scott Elementary parent
144 Tiffany Koyama Lane, Sunnyside Environmental School
145 Alice West parent at Glencoe and Franklin
146 Sean Ahern - PPS special education teacher
147 Melissa Sircy, Arleta & Franklin school parent/PTA member
148 Robin Feidelson, Franklin High School, Mount Tabor middle school and Atkinson Elementary
149 Sarah Meme. Parent at Peninsula ES and Ockley Green MS
150 Dominic P. Lane (Beaumont)
151 Mitch Sally, Roseway Heights and McDaniel

152 Wesley Grout, Beach Elementary
153 Alison Ellsworth, Mt Tabor Middle School and Llewellyn Elementary School
154 Theresa Jahangir, parent of a Vestal 1st grader
155 Rhett Lawrence, Roosevelt HS
156 Angela Keeney- Bridger CSS
157 Matt Smith, Lee Elementary
158 Parent of Pennisula Elementary student
159 Eunice Kim, Creston parent
160 Kristin Pepper, Beaumont MS and Grant HS parent
161 Yasmin Correa, K-2 CB Para at Boise-Eliot/Humboldt
162 Amanda Haworth, Scott Elementary
163 Ana Araujo, Parent of Creston and Sunnyside Environmental School Students
164 Kelly Skellenger - parent of Vestal Elementary School student
165 Nadia Coronado, mother of former Head Start & Sitton students, current Benson & MLC students
166 Brenna Sheridan, Ockley Green MS
167 Jeff Walker, McDaniel
168 Laura Johnson Ockley Green and Peninsula
169 Anonymous, Bridger Creative Science School
170 Emma Koehler, Vestal
171 Elena Miranda, parent and employee
172 Sarah C Nelson, Glencoe Elementary
173 Molly Earle, current Atkinson parent & PPS parent since 2006
174 Louis, Lewis Elementary
175 Emily Schwartz-Dale Clark elementary
176 Brian Harper, Clark elementary
177 Rosy Boyer, Dr MLK Jr Elementary
178 Marla Doughty – Roosevelt High School
179 Peter Noordijk, Beach Elementary, ockley Green Middle School, roosevelt high school
180 Chiung-Chen Yu, mentor supporting 14 schools and live in the neighborhood of Sunnyside K8 school
181 Alisa Scudamore, Beverly Cleary School parent
182 Windsor Meyer, 5th grade parent, Rigler Elementary
183 Jed Roberts, Rose City Park Community Member
184 Shannn Kittrick glencoe
185 Robin Krill, parent Cleveland HS, parent Lane MS, former PPS teacher
186 Anonymous, Vernon
187 Ashley Sider, Rigler Elementary parent
188 Anonymous, Richmond
189 Rachel Allen, Glencoe Elem, Mt Tabor Middle School, Franklin HS
190 Joelle Murray, Grant High School parent
191 Molly Franks, Harriet Tubman Middle School
192 Erin Ocon, Chief Joseph Elementary Parent
193 Craig LeMay, Sunnyside Environmental School
194 Philberta Leung. Dr MLK Jr Elementary School
195 Anonymous, Marysville Elementary
196 Niki K. Atkinson Elementary School
197 Kimberly Brodtkin, Roosevelt HS and Ockley Green MS
198 Lee Ann Moldovanyi; Beverly Cleary
199 Cody Williams - father of two Vernon students
200 Laura Dorneman. Roosevelt high school

201 Casey Wallace, parent of Ockley Green MS kid
202 Mackenzie Weintraub, Glencoe Elementary
203 Becky Hillary, Woodlawn Elementary School
204 Ida Lombardozi, Marysville Elementary
205 Devon Healey, West Sylvan Middle School Parent
206 Muriah W Gerrard Roosevelt High School
207 Amy Hojnowski, Portland Village School
208 Carrie Cohen, Peninsula K-5 and Ockley Green
209 Kimberly Peterson, current parent at Roosevelt High School, former parent at Beach Elementary and Ockley Green Middle, employee at Sabin School and Rosa Parks School
210 Ali Briggs-Ungerer, Atkinson Elementary
211 Jennifer Winslow, Ockley Green
212 Tonilyn Cole, parent at Glencoe Elementary
213 Steve Faust, Roseway Heights
214 Jennifer McGowan, Grant High School
215 Jennifer Stewart, Ockley Green Middle School & Roosevelt Highschool
216 Zapoura Newton, MLC
217 Victoria Rodgers, Woodlawn parent, Roosevelt teacher
218 Jessica Fletcher, James John Elementary parent and volunteer
219 Gwen Martin, Rigler Elementary School
220 Craig Patterson - Ockley Green Middle School
221 Elizabeth Doerr, Faubion School
222 Laura Spidell, Roseway Heights MS and McDaniel HS
223 Lena Royale, Beaumont
224 Karen Fletcher
225 Andrew Bransford Astor Elementary
226 Heather Lenon (Vestal Kindergarten Parent)
227 Erika Collins, Retired Teacher, Bridlemile School
228 Sarah Gilmer, Rigler Elementary Parent
229 Heather Torain, Astor K-8 teacher and MLC and Sunnyside parent
230 Sloane Sally, student McDaniel High School
231 Anonymous, Atkinson Elementary
232 Paola Estrada - Atkinson Elementary parent.
233 Vanessa Morgan, Hosford Middle School parent
234 Zil Jaeger, Rigler
235 Dara Wasserman - godchildren at Ainsworth Elementary
236 Emily Goldberg, Alameda Elementary
237 Sarah Ross (Beverly Cleary School)
238 Aviva Schultz; Parent of Kellogg Middle School 7th grader
239 Stephani Hayden, Atkinson Elementary
240 Callie Barish - Atkinson Elementary and Harrison Park Middle School parent
241 Brenna McGee
242 Neon Brooks, Beverly Cleary School parent (MLC and Cleveland alum)
243 Jolene Dunlap (Scott School)
244 Kindly Castillo PTA member
245 Anastasia Zurcher, James John ES
246 Tina Lamanna, Markham ES
247 Megan Vaughn, Rose City Park Elementary Parent
248 Ben Weintraub, Glencoe elementary parent

249 Vigdis Bronder Haas, Atkinson Elementary School parent
250 Caylin Barter, James John Elementary
251 Robin Ruiz Sellwood Middle School
252 Laura Hall, Chief Joseph Elementary
253 Carolyn Charing, Ockley green middle school
254 Anna Garwood, Atkinson
255 Kristin Kuzda, da Vinci Middle School
256 Zachary Kuzda, da Vinci Middle School
257 Lynnae Burns, Roosevelt and Ockley Green
258 Juliana Slightam Chief Joseph Elementary
259 Anonymous, Grout Elementary
260 Anna Gordon Rigler School Parent
261 Amanda Lehinger, Chief Joseph Elem
262 Jan S Molinaro, Sunnyside Environmental School
263 Jamye Gleaves Ockley Green Middle School/Jefferson High School
264 Kara Johnson Chief Joseph
265 Lydia Ledgerwood-Eberlein, Harriet Tubman Middle School and Jefferson High School
266 Joyce Chow (Cleveland and Grout parent)
267 Kate Wilson, Astor
268 Patrice L. Helzer Chief Joseph Elementary
269 Joe Rowe Roosevelt High School
270 Natalie Tracy, Parent of Franklin HS Student
271 Sally Stauffer Grant/Roseway Heights
272 Denae Smith, Kelly Elementary
273 Alison Larsen, Atkinson Elementary and Kellogg MS
274 Anonymous, Atkinson School
275 James Lopez Ericksen Parent
276 Jamie Norwood, Atkinson Elementary
277 Theresa Liao, Cleveland HS
278 Tracy Larson, Kellogg Middle School PTSA president, Arleta
279 Joanne Edwards, Chief Joseph
280 Stacy Humphrey, OGMS/RHS
281 Grant Humphrey, OGMS
282 Joseph Eichenauer, Bridger Creative Science
283 Alison Tarka, Scott Elementary School
284 Mark Fox, Rigler
285 Jill Muhm, Hayhurst
286 Anona Gund, Dr. MLK Jr. Elementary
287 Brookfield Graham, Vernon Elementary
288 Leah Jacobson, Vestal Elementary
289 Tyla Dahlman, Dr. MLK jr. Elementary
290 Derek Fenwick, Scott Elementary
291 Jackson Mowe, All of PPS
292 Brian Busiek, Rose City Park and Roseway Heights
293 Carmen Shah, Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Elementary
294 Erica Vaughn, Ockley Green Middle School
295 Sarann Bielavitz, Boise-Eliot/Humboldt, and Harriet Tubman
296 Emily Henkle, Laurelhurst k-8
297 Melody Larsen, Vernon K-8

298 Marya DeVoto, Alliance Meek/Community Transition Program
299 Katie Freathy, Parent – Glencoe Elementary
300 Linda Nelson, Robert Gray Middle School & Ida B. Wells High School
301 Sondra Blair, Parent - Sellwood MS & Llewellyn
302 Katie Obriot, Rigler
303 Karen Liao, Grout ES, Hosford MS, Cleveland HS
304 Sara Brown, Abernethy Elementary Parent
305 Beth Burns, Abernethy
306 Jessica Nabavizadeh, Abernethy elementary
307 Kaia Austin, Atkinson
308 Stephanie Michel
309 Maria Wheeler, Vernon Elementary, K-8
310 Katie Haraguchi, Alameda/Beaumont/Grant
311 Sissily Sevenroot, Scott School
312 Rachel de Haan, Vernon
313 Adrienne So, Parent
314 Kari Lindstrom, Grout ES
315 Traci Friedl, CJES
316 Doug Elliott, Beaumont MS
317 Trena Klohe, Parent of recent Jefferson graduates
318 Jackie Haddon, Jackson MS, Ida B Wells HS
319 Jonathan Lee, Cleveland HS
320 Rosie Lingo, Woodstock Teacher & Parent
321 Elisabeth Fesler, Faubion School
322 Wendie Leaper, Vernon
323 Amy Fauver, Woodlawn
324 Karlyn Clark, Beverly Cleary School
325 Erin Ferree, Harriet Tubman Middle School
326 Laurel Swift, McDaniel High School
327 Adrienne Friend, Teacher and parent
328 Michael Solitaria, Grout Elementary
329 Steven Rosenbaum, BCS
330 Elsa Loftis, Vernon parent
331 Jessica Colby, Lincoln HS
332 Tom Kohl, Atkinson parent
333 Tonya Ray, Atkinson Elementary and Mt. Tabor MS parent
334 Dani Oates, da Vinci Arts Middle School
335 Jessica Garay, Atkinson Elementary
336 Mari Hosti, Vestal
337 Felipe Rodriguez, Atkinson Elementary School
338 Caitlin Quinn, Faubion neighborhood; have worked at RCP, SES, and several other schools in the district
339 McKenzie Miller, Atkinson Elementary Parent
340 Sarah Ash Evens Foltz, Alameda Elementary
341 Maria Holden Raboin, Beverly Cleary School
342 Mulysa Melco, Parent at DaVinci Arts Middle School
343 Siri Michel-Midelfort, Multiple Pathways to Graduation
344 Heather Kalowsky, Grout Elementary parent and PTA secretary
345 Kat Bonham, Lent PTA
346 Christy Hudson, Beach Elementary

347 Ian Gustafson, George Middle School
348 Rosalie McDougall, Cleveland HS
349 Cherrie Abraham, Cleveland HS
350 Ambar Olivas, George Middle School
351 Kai Steimle, Sunnyside Environmental School
352 Megan Archer, Kelly elementary
353 Paula Nett, Scott School
354 Betsy Bridge, Cesar Chavez K-8
355 Michael Hogan, Rose City Park Elementary
356 Whitney Stark, Glencoe Elementary
357 Celeste Grover, Scott Elementary
358 Ian, Roosevelt
359 Diane Lynch, Glencoe Elementary
360 Eloise Koehler, Irvington
361 Erin Kaad, Dr MLK Jr Elementary
362 Aili Deibert, Roosevelt High School
363 Roberto Moo-Julian, Roosevelt
364 Elowyn Gottsacker, Roosevelt
365 Ezra Caspary, Roosevelt
366 Nora Grod, Harrison Park Middle School
367 Julia Soto, Chief Joseph Elementary/Ockley Green Middle School
368 Gadi Golan, Martin Luther King Jr. Elementary
369 Katrina Miller, Parent of a current PPS student
370 Aviv Ross, Franklin High School
371 Sharon Stern, McDaniel High parent
372 Dacotah Nelson, Scott Elementary
373 Andrea Deeken, Scott Elementary, incoming at Roseway Heights
374 Juliann Squires, Cleveland
375 Dena Whipple, Ockley Green Middle School
376 Jody Anderson, Mcdaniel High School
377 Clint Johnson, Glencoe Elementary, Franklin High School
378 Kelly Carnevale, IBW
379 Paul Carnevale, Gray MS, Wells HS
380 Christine Spix, Roseway Heights MS & McDaniel HS
381 Ariane Hopman, Rose City Park Elementary and Roseway Height Middle School
382 Tracy Bowles, Former Rose City Park Elementary PTO president, Roseway Heights Middle School PTA co-secretary
383 Bryce Clambey, Scott School parent
384 Bridget Schum, Beverly Cleary School
385 Dan Slightam, Chief Joseph Elementary
386 Jamie P. O'Brien, Scott School
387 Samantha O'Brien, Scott School
388 Rose Gunn, Irvington Elementary and Harriet Tubman Middle School
389 Kristy McFarland, Vestal & Harrison Park
390 Luke McCann, Pioneer Special School and Bridger Creative Science
391 Tamara Taylor, Glencoe Elementary
392 Karlaina Brooke, Winterhaven, Cleveland High School
393 Rosa Yadira Ortiz, Atkinson
394 Theresa Scott Merrion, Atkinson ES

395 Jessica Gillard, Marysville Elementary, Da Vinci Middle School

396 Gwen Wilson, Marysville Elementary

397 Maralea Lutino, Kellogg Middle School

398 Sara Penner, Kellogg MS, Bridger Creative Science

399 Devon Roulette, Atkinson Elementary

400 Donald Fontenot, MLK Elem

This form was created inside of Portland Public Schools.

Google Forms

Public Comment on Draft Policies

Please provide your comments on policies currently proposed for revisions or rescissions, or new policies. Policies are open for public comment for a minimum of 21 days between the First Reading and the Second Reading, when a adopt the policy.

Email *

Name *

Suzanne

Email *

Clarke

Your School Community *

Roosevelt HS, Ockley Green MS, Beach ES

Do you provide permission to post your comments on the PPS website? *

- ☒ Yes, with name
- ☐ Yes, without name
- ☐ No. Share only with Board and District staff

Policy you are providing comment on *

Revision: Districtwide Advocacy and Fundraising 7.10.020-P (Formerly Parent Groups and the Schools) ▼

Please provide your comments below *

I would like to thank the five board members and the student board representative for opposing the effort to delay foundation policy reform. It is time to make systemic change in the way the PPS communicates with parents, students, business and broader community members about funding our public schools. I support reforming the foundation policy to end PPS's over 25 year practice of allowing a small number of schools to pay for teachers through private fundraising because that practice has been an extension of other racist systems that create opportunity gaps and opportunity hoarding with PPS. I support the June 2024 sunset of local school foundation fundraising for FTE at their individual schools as of June 2024 and the immediate creation of districtwide foundation (The Fund for PPS or a new 501c3) that will hold fundraisers for the entire district. It is hugely important that the districtwide foundation maintain a parent/community committee for determining the distribution formula and that the committee is balanced and representative of all 5 regions of our district: N, NE, SE, SW and NW. Looking forward to beginning a more consistently unified approach to fully funding our schools.

This form was created inside of Portland Public Schools.

Google Forms

Public Comment on Draft Policies

Please provide your comments on policies currently proposed for revisions or rescissions, or new policies. Policies are open for public comment for a minimum of 21 days between the First Reading and the Second Reading, when a adopt the policy.

Email *

Name *

Cara Haskey

Email *

Your School Community *

Beaumont MS

Do you provide permission to post your comments on the PPS website? *

- ☒ Yes, with name
- ☐ Yes, without name
- ☐ No. Share only with Board and District staff

Policy you are providing comment on *

Revision: Districtwide Advocacy and Fundraising 7.10.020-P (Formerly Parent Groups and the
Schools)



Please provide your comments below *

I support the draft policy, Districtwide Advocacy and Fundraising 7.10.020-P, in its current proposed state.

The system we have now, upheld for decades by the current policy, is broken and unjust. While I participated in LSF fundraising early on in my family's time in PPS, I have refrained from doing so for many years and have advocated for change. I stopped supporting our LSF because of the inequities it perpetuates and the message fundraising in silos, for the benefit of a few, sends to my kids and all our students that some are more deserving than others. This does not align with my family's values nor is it what we expect of a great public school system.

I want my students, and all students, to experience the power when we unite for the common good.

I believe this policy change can fuel our progress toward a new era of courageous and innovative collective action to create a better Portland for all. One where every student has what they need to evolve into a compassionate critical thinker, so they are fully prepared to lead a more socially just world, just as our community envisions and documented in the PPS visioning project.

Please see this reform through NOW, before the end of this school year. This will allow time over the summer to prepare an appropriate administrative directive covering the details of a districtwide model including the formation and role of the parent committee, potential distribution of fundraised dollars, and advocacy functions, so that we can start fresh next school year as One District working together for the well-being of all students and families.

Please know that I stand ready, willing, and able to support a districtwide fundraising model.

This form was created inside of Portland Public Schools.

Google Forms

Public Comment on Draft Policies

Please provide your comments on policies currently proposed for revisions or rescissions, or new policies. Policies are open for public comment for a minimum of 21 days between the First Reading and the Second Reading, when a adopt the policy.

Email *

Name *

Jennifer

Email *

Stewart

Your School Community *

Ockley Green MS & Roosevelt HS

Do you provide permission to post your comments on the PPS website? *

- ☒ Yes, with name
- ☐ Yes, without name
- ☐ No. Share only with Board and District staff

Policy you are providing comment on *

Revision: Districtwide Advocacy and Fundraising 7.10.020-P (Formerly Parent Groups and the Schools) ▼

Please provide your comments below *

I am writing to express that I am in favor of reforming the PPS foundation policy.

The fact that the Oregon legislature continually chooses not to fully-fund the state's public schools--and by extension, PPS specifically, is a shared problem in our district. Merely tinkering with the percentage of foundation-raised dollars that go to the PPS Parent Fund does not go far enough towards eliminating the stark disparities within our district. Without true reform, the inequitable foundation system would only become slightly less inequitable.

This form was created inside of Portland Public Schools.

Google Forms

Public Comment on Draft Policies

Please provide your comments on policies currently proposed for revisions or rescissions, or new policies. Policies are open for public comment for a minimum of 21 days between the First Reading and the Second Reading, when a adopt the policy.

Email *

Name *

Email *

Your School Community *

Do you provide permission to post your comments on the PPS website? *

- ☒ Yes, with name
- ☐ Yes, without name
- ☐ No. Share only with Board and District staff

Policy you are providing comment on *

Revision: Districtwide Advocacy and Fundraising 7.10.020-P (Formerly Parent Groups and the Schools) ▼

Please provide your comments below *

Dear Directors:

I am a parent and long-time parent volunteer of PPS students at three schools. I have worked on site-council at our elementary for almost a decade-> through 5 principals and 5 biennia.

One constant when trying to work with staff and community is the fact that there is never enough resources, PPS schools that do not have a wealthy parent base operate in a constant environment of scarcity. The central part of the issue is that the legislature does not adequately fund education, nor do they allow communities to raise local taxes to raise money equitably within the district.

PPS's policy of allowing private fundraising to supplement tax-derived revenue for teaching positions has exacerbated this problem. Effectively, creating a separate peace for the folks who can afford million-dollar fund raising campaigns annually.

I support PPS moving to a single pool fundraising model for staff positions and then a community-wide committee for allocating those resources. This side-steps the measure 5 constraints on local taxes while also providing capacity for PPS to direct resources to the students who most need them.

Thank-you.

Peter Noordijk.

Google Forms

Public Comment on Draft Policies

Please provide your comments on policies currently proposed for revisions or rescissions, or new policies. Policies are open for public comment for a minimum of 21 days between the First Reading and the Second Reading, when a adopt the policy.

Email *

Name *

Smyth Lai

Email *

Your School Community *

Roseway Heights MS, McDaniel HS

Do you provide permission to post your comments on the PPS website? *

- ☒ Yes, with name
- ☐ Yes, without name
- ☐ No. Share only with Board and District staff

Policy you are providing comment on *

Revision: Districtwide Advocacy and Fundraising 7.10.020-P (Formerly Parent Groups and the
Schools)



Please provide your comments below *

Thank you for your willingness to move forward this school year with creating a districtwide foundation. I fully support the draft policy, Districtwide Advocacy and Fundraising 7.10.020-P, in its current proposed state.

I first learned about school foundations 9 years ago when my older child was in kindergarten at Scott School. I was shocked to learn about school auctions that raised many tens of thousands of private dollars to supplement public teaching positions at individual schools. I am incredibly grateful that community building above fundraising was prioritized at Scott, and that parents and caretakers worked tirelessly to create an atmosphere of inclusion such that school participation did not hinge on the ability to contribute financially. At the same time, it was frustrating knowing that some schools were allowed to fundraise for extra EAs in crowded, chaotic classrooms while most schools, including Scott, lack the ability to quickly find solutions to budget shortfalls and staffing gaps.

Nearly 2 years ago when I participated in a roundtable discussion at McDaniel about school-based fundraising, a persistent theme was gratitude for the opportunity to talk with other community members in our cluster about potential collaboration between schools. There was a clear desire to abandon siloed fundraising and opportunity hoarding and instead move towards unifying as one district working in tandem to serve all students.

There is an eagerness among so many parents and caretakers to think beyond our own students' schools, and an appetite to share resources and collectively participate in advocacy efforts to improve the state of public education in Oregon!

This policy change is such an important opportunity to shift the culture within our district so that the norm becomes inclusion and collaboration, independent of a family's neighborhood, affluence, or access to resources.

This form was created inside of Portland Public Schools.

Google Forms

Public Comment on Draft Policies

Please provide your comments on policies currently proposed for revisions or rescissions, or new policies. Policies are open for public comment for a minimum of 21 days between the First Reading and the Second Reading, when a adopt the policy.

Email *

Name *

Email *

Your School Community *

Do you provide permission to post your comments on the PPS website? *

- ☒ Yes, with name
- ☐ Yes, without name
- ☐ No. Share only with Board and District staff

Policy you are providing comment on *

Revision: Districtwide Advocacy and Fundraising 7.10.020-P (Formerly Parent Groups and the Schools) ▼

Please provide your comments below *

As a member of the Reform PPS Funding group and the proud parent of a McDaniel HS student, I am writing in support of a districtwide foundation. Specifically, I want to share my viewpoint using the lens of a parent who has navigated the PPS special education system for over 10 years.

Advocacy from Pro-Foundation supporters has often included the narrative that Foundation funds are used to support students with the highest needs, including those with disabilities, and that foundation reform efforts will disproportionately harm these students. As the parent of a student with an IEP, I find this argument both disturbing and disingenuous. The right of students with disabilities to access a free and appropriate public education is federal law. It is not a special favor granted only when funds are available, or when private donors underwrite extra staff.

Some advocates also express concern that families will leave the district if they cannot continue to contribute directly to pay for staff at their children's schools. Over the years, I have witnessed many families pull their students with disabilities out of PPS because their needs weren't being met and they felt they had no other choice. These decisions are never made lightly and are almost always preceded by years of trauma. Therefore, when I hear "If we don't let parents raise funds for their children's schools, they will leave PPS" and that raises such alarm bells, it really stings. Where is the concern and advocacy when students with disabilities leave the district? Do they matter less than the children of Foundation donors?

It has always been my hope that PPS would truly see all students as "Our Students", regardless of whether they are placed in general education, receive learning center support, or spend time in a focus classroom or intensive skills class. Moving to a districtwide foundation and advocating together for funding and support at the state level could be a powerful step towards that goal. Applying a band aid in individual schools or classrooms in response to the most privileged or loudest voices does nothing to address the systemic issues facing the district's special education department. We in the special education community are used to being fierce advocates. But we need allies, and if everyone is in their own silo, we can't find each other. I urge you to move forward with the draft proposal on the table, so we can get started on a plan that will include all voices.

Respectfully,
Susan Carson

This form was created inside of Portland Public Schools.

Google Forms

Public Comment on Draft Policies

Please provide your comments on policies currently proposed for revisions or rescissions, or new policies. Policies are open for public comment for a minimum of 21 days between the First Reading and the Second Reading, when a adopt the policy.

Email *

Name *

Email *

Your School Community *

Do you provide permission to post your comments on the PPS website? *

- ☒ Yes, with name
- ☐ Yes, without name
- ☐ No. Share only with Board and District staff

Policy you are providing comment on *

Revision: Districtwide Advocacy and Fundraising 7.10.020-P (Formerly Parent Groups and the Schools) ▼

Please provide your comments below *

I support moving immediately forward with the revised fundraising policy, the creation of a district-wide foundation, and a collective advocacy model to push the state to fully fund our schools. LSFs are not in line with the district's equitable funding model or its RESJ lens. It is past time to act as a single district and align the policy with our shared values. The district, our schools, and our students will be stronger when we unite to advocate for the resources all our students need and deserve. The board needs to pass the new policy to uphold their promise to this district, its staff, and its students. Thank you.

This form was created inside of Portland Public Schools.

Google Forms

Public Comment on Draft Policies

Please provide your comments on policies currently proposed for revisions or rescissions, or new policies. Policies are open for public comment for a minimum of 21 days between the First Reading and the Second Reading, when a adopt the policy.

Email *

[REDACTED]

Name *

Callie Barish

Email *

[REDACTED]

Your School Community *

Atkinson Elementary and Harrison Park Middle

Do you provide permission to post your comments on the PPS website? *

- ☒ Yes, with name
- ☐ Yes, without name
- ☐ No. Share only with Board and District staff

Policy you are providing comment on *

Revision: Districtwide Advocacy and Fundraising 7.10.020-P (Formerly Parent Groups and the Schools) ▼

Please provide your comments below *

To the members of the PPS School Board:

I am a parent of students at Atkinson Elementary School and Harrison Park Middle School writing to support the draft policy to move PPS to a district-wide foundation that allows all schools to work together to raise funds for FTE and align advocacy for increased state funding.

I support this change because it creates a pathway for aligned advocacy for state funding, which is at the heart of the issue and eliminates disparities in the extra funds that schools get for hiring staff. The current system simply isn't equitable and a district-wide foundation respects the needs and dignity of all school communities.

After years of discussion, drafts, and community feedback, I am so glad that the time is finally coming for a district-wide foundation, so that fundraising practices better reflect PPS's stated values of social justice and racial equity. The timing couldn't be better, as we need all PPS community members to come together to send Salem a message about the increased education funding that we ALL need.

Thank you,
Callie Barish
Parent of Atkinson Elementary School and Harrison Park Middle School Parents
Co-President of the Atkinson Elementary PTA



Public Comment <publiccomment@pps.net>

Foundation Reform Policy

1 message

Beth Cavanaugh

Thu, Apr 11, 2024 at 8:26 AM

To: Public Comment <PublicComment@pps.net>

Hello,

I would like this submitted as public comment for the 21-day comment period on the draft Foundation policy, but it includes an image so I wasn't able to submit using the form. I am fine with my name being shared.

Beth Cavanaugh
Hosford Middle School and Cleveland High School

Yesterday, I saw the attached message that was shared with a school community using Konstella, a school communication tool. I don't know how many schools shared this message. I am a member of the organizing group Reform PPS Funding, and since we don't have access to schoolwide communications such as Konstella, I wanted to address some of the claims in this message publicly.

Claim 1: Passing this policy change will result in the loss of 100 positions in the 25-26 school year.

This year, foundation dollars and Parent Fund grants combined funded a total of **7.17** certified FTE (teachers and specialists), **19.46** classified FTE (EAs, study hall monitors, executive assistants for example), and .6 non-represented FTE, for a grand total of **27.23** FTE. One FTE = Full Time Employee, and when foundations pay for a portion of a position, that is counted as a part of an FTE. In PPS, Foundations have never funded anywhere near 100 FTE per year. It is misleading to say "100 positions" when the reality is, these dollars pay for small portions (some as small as .01 or .02) of many positions adding up to a total of **27.23 FTE**.

Assuming that any position paid for in any part by Foundation or Parent Fund dollars would be eliminated is misleading. Reducing a position from .8 to .7 FTE is not the same as eliminating it. This also assumes that the district-wide foundation would raise **zero dollars** to replace LSF funds—another misleading statement.

Claim 2: "The policy committee has intentionally advanced this proposal under the radar."

For the last 6 years, the policy committee has held publicly noticed meetings to discuss this potential reform. There have been community meetings, round tables, and administrator surveys. There has been newspaper, magazine, and radio coverage. There have been dozens of public commenters on both sides of the issue and hundreds of emails sent. Nothing about this proposal has ever been "under the radar."

Reasonable people can disagree on this issue. Please encourage board members and school communities to fairly discuss the draft policy regarding foundation fundraising on its merits, considering how the board might mitigate concerns, rather than allowing intentionally misleading information to go unchecked, stirring up fear and dissent.



IMG_7548002.jpg
269K

Urgent help needed for Foundation

[Translate Email](#)

We urgently need your help. The PPS School Board is close to passing a [proposal](#) that will eliminate School Foundation Fundraising by June of 2024 with no replacement funds in place, resulting in the elimination of over 100 student-facing positions in the '25-26 school year on top of the \$30mm in budget cuts. The Policy Committee has intentionally advanced this proposal under the radar of most principals, teachers, and community members, and continues to dismiss the alarms that have been raised by many, including if this policy is even legal.

Please add your name and school(s) to the using attached [petition link](#) demanding that the board not take away more funding *voluntarily* from our students without replacement funds in place.

We support change, but this is not the way to do it. We demand that the board uphold the integrity of their elected office, and create policies that are based on facts, are transparent, and have real, sustainable plans to ensure that no students are left worse-off.

If passed, [redacted] will lose even more front facing staff in the '25-26 school year.

Thank you for your help, our students deserve better.

Sincerely,
Your Volunteer Foundation Team

Public Comment on Draft Policies

Please provide your comments on policies currently proposed for revisions or rescissions, or new policies. Policies are open for public comment for a minimum of 21 days between the First Reading and the Second Reading, when a adopt the policy.

Email *

Name *

Edward Garrett

Email *

Your School Community *

Duniway Elementary School

Do you provide permission to post your comments on the PPS website? *

- ☒ Yes, with name
- ☐ Yes, without name
- ☐ No. Share only with Board and District staff

Policy you are providing comment on *

Revision: Districtwide Advocacy and Fundraising 7.10.020-P (Formerly Parent Groups and the
Schools) ▼

Please provide your comments below *

My son is a new student at Duniway Elementary School, in S.E. Portland's Eastmoreland neighborhood. My family arrived in Eastmoreland recently, but I grew up here and attended Duniway myself in the late 1970s and early 1980s.

Eastmoreland is a lovely neighborhood, but it is also well-off and not particularly diverse, even by Portland's standards. My impression is that the Duniway Foundation is effective at raising funds for the school - and to a lesser extent, for the district. Parents have the resources to give, and are motivated to do so for the benefit of the school.

Still, I find that the Districtwide Advocacy and Fundraising policy proposal has much to recommend it. Allowing schools with greater access to parental funding to disproportionately benefit from that funding is unfair. Schools with the greatest identified needs may well be the least able to raise funds within their local donor communities.

I like some of the specific requirements of the proposal. For example, it says that fundraisers should: "Provide ways for all members from the benefitting school or program who wish to participate in a fundraising event or activity to have an avenue to participate." The Duniway Foundation is organizing an upcoming event called the Duniway Auction on April 26. Tickets to the auction are \$125 per head, so \$250 for a couple - not to mention potential babysitting costs as well as potential winning bids and other expenses on the night. This makes the event seem rather exclusive, whereas I would prefer to think of school fundraising as a rather more grassroots activity - involving bake sales, book sales, summer fares and the like.

The proposal is not, however, without risk. It could alienate potential parental donors, who may be less willing to donate to PPS if they suspect that little of their donation will go to their own children's schools. The trick, one suspects, will be to provide enough payback to entice people to give, but enough equity to maximize the overall impact of the gift for the district as a whole. The proposal's statement that "A formula for the distribution of any funding to individual schools shall be developed in advance of the school year by a Parent Advisory Committee, shared with school administrators for feedback, and a recommendation made to the Board of Education for its approval" does not inspire total confidence that this issue has been thought through clearly. Much more could be said here about the composition of the committee, the distribution formula, and whether and how Local School Foundations will be rewarded for successful campaigns.

This form was created inside of Portland Public Schools.

Google Forms

Public Comment on Draft Policies

Please provide your comments on policies currently proposed for revisions or rescissions, or new policies. Policies are open for public comment for a minimum of 21 days between the First Reading and the Second Reading, when a adopt the policy.

Email *

Name *

Mackenzie Weintraub

Email *

Your School Community *

Glencoe Elementary School

Do you provide permission to post your comments on the PPS website? *

- ☒ Yes, with name
- ☐ Yes, without name
- ☐ No. Share only with Board and District staff

Policy you are providing comment on *

Revision: Districtwide Advocacy and Fundraising 7.10.020-P (Formerly Parent Groups and the Schools) ▼

Please provide your comments below *

Please vote to reform the Foundation fundraising system to be more equitable and better serve children throughout PPS. I'm a parent of two children at Glencoe Elementary and I currently choose not to support our school's Foundation. It's a decision that was hard to make and I still struggle with. At our school the Foundation pays for a reading specialist and has in some years, depending on how much is saved from previous years or raised, funded additional grade level teachers. Loosing these positions will have a negative impact on many students, one of my own children included, but I can't support a system that brings in disproportionately large amounts of money to wealthy, predominately white schools while schools with children of color receive less funds. Allowing this system to continue goes directly against the PPS Equity Funding Model and isn't what is best for our community. I believe there are more people like myself who would contribute to the Foundation if it was reformed to a more equitable funding model. Thank you for your consideration.

This form was created inside of Portland Public Schools.

Google Forms

Public Comment on Draft Policies

Please provide your comments on policies currently proposed for revisions or rescissions, or new policies. Policies are open for public comment for a minimum of 21 days between the First Reading and the Second Reading, when a adopt the policy.

Email *

[REDACTED]

Name *

[REDACTED] Student

Email *

[REDACTED]

Your School Community *

Roosevelt High School

Do you provide permission to post your comments on the PPS website? *

- ☒ Yes, with name
- ☐ Yes, without name
- ☐ No. Share only with Board and District staff

Policy you are providing comment on *

Revision: Districtwide Advocacy and Fundraising 7.10.020-P (Formerly Parent Groups and the Schools) ▼

Please provide your comments below *

I am a student at Roosevelt High School. I strongly support the draft policy 'Districtwide Advocacy and Fundraising 7.10.020-P'. I think that a districtwide foundation is a much better idea compared to the current policy because it strives to remove, or at the very least decrease inequity and wealth disparities between schools. To me, it does not seem very fair that certain schools within the same district should have better access to staff just because of their connections with wealthy individuals/organizations. If we want to create a more equitable future, we must strive to create an equitable education system, and this is an excellent step in the right direction. I think that it is also crucial to have student representatives involved on the committees that would be created by this policy, to let the people actually affected by these disparities share their input.

This form was created inside of Portland Public Schools.

Google Forms

Public Comment on Draft Policies

Please provide your comments on policies currently proposed for revisions or rescissions, or new policies. Policies are open for public comment for a minimum of 21 days between the First Reading and the Second Reading, when a adopt the policy.

Email *

[REDACTED]

Name *

Isabel Johnson

Email *

[REDACTED]

Your School Community *

Glencoe Elementary School

Do you provide permission to post your comments on the PPS website? *

- ☒ Yes, with name
- ☐ Yes, without name
- ☐ No. Share only with Board and District staff

Policy you are providing comment on *

Revision: Districtwide Advocacy and Fundraising 7.10.020-P (Formerly Parent Groups and the Schools) ▼

Please provide your comments below *

I am a parent of a 5th Grader at Glencoe Elementary School, which has a foundation. I am in complete support of the the draft policy, Districtwide Advocacy and Fundraising 7.10.020-P, in its current state. I have seen first-hand how divisive fundraising is at our school, how much energy is expended for so little dollars. I have been shocked recently at the combative and half-truths coming from foundation supporters. I was the recipient of such an email today and it was so disheartening. Please support this policy change.

I appreciate the high-level nature of this policy, and hope that implementation steps and specifics around details such as the formation and role of the parent committee, potential distribution of fundraised dollars, and advocacy functions are clarified in administrative directive. This summer provides an excellent opportunity to work out those details in preparation for the next school year. It is such an important time for parents and school communities to come together to support students across the whole district, both by raising funds together and coming together to advocate for what all students need, rather than continuing to focus on bridging the gaps for the handful of schools who have the resources to do that.

Please see this reform through NOW, before the end of the 23/24 school year, so we can start fresh with a united district in the next school year.

This form was created inside of Portland Public Schools.

Google Forms

Public Comment on Draft Policies

Please provide your comments on policies currently proposed for revisions or rescissions, or new policies. Policies are open for public comment for a minimum of 21 days between the First Reading and the Second Reading, when a adopt the policy.

Email *

[REDACTED]

Name *

Michelle DuBarry

Email *

[REDACTED]

Your School Community *

Beach Elementary School

Do you provide permission to post your comments on the PPS website? *

- ☒ Yes, with name
- ☐ Yes, without name
- ☐ No. Share only with Board and District staff

Policy you are providing comment on *

Revision: Districtwide Advocacy and Fundraising 7.10.020-P (Formerly Parent Groups and the Schools) ▼

Please provide your comments below *

I am a the mom of two students at Beach Elementary School writing to support the draft policy to move PPS to a district-wide foundation that allows all schools to work together to raise funds for FTE and align advocacy for increased state funding.

I/We support this change because:

- It unites our district instead of leaving schools to fend for themselves.
- It creates a pathway for aligned advocacy for state funding, which is at the heart of the issue.
- It eliminates disparities in the extra funds that schools get for hiring staff.

It isn't fair or equitable for a handful of schools to be able to protect themselves from cuts that all schools are facing, like losses to library and art FTE.

It respects all school communities with dignity, rather than dividing schools into inappropriate stereotypes like "wealthy" schools that fundraise and "needy" schools that receive charity.

After years of discussion, drafts, and community feedback, I am so glad that the time is finally coming for a district-wide foundation, so that fundraising practices better reflect PPS's stated values of social justice and racial equity. The timing couldn't be better, as we need all PPS community members to come together to send Salem a message about the increased education funding that we ALL need.

Public Comment on Draft Policies

Please provide your comments on policies currently proposed for revisions or rescissions, or new policies. Policies are open for public comment for a minimum of 21 days between the First Reading and the Second Reading, when a adopt the policy.

Email *

[REDACTED]

Name *

Maya Pueo von Geldern

Email *

[REDACTED]

Your School Community *

Vernon k-8

Do you provide permission to post your comments on the PPS website? *

- ☒ Yes, with name
- ☐ Yes, without name
- ☐ No. Share only with Board and District staff

Policy you are providing comment on *

Revision: Districtwide Advocacy and Fundraising 7.10.020-P (Formerly Parent Groups and the
Schools)



Please provide your comments below *

Good evening, my name is Maya Pueo von Geldern. I'm here again to reinforce the need for foundation reform, and express my gratitude to those of you who have worked toward this for years, and are determined to see it through.

We have an obligation to the children of PPS as a whole. This means expanding our values past our property lines, to reach every child in this district. Right now almost every school in the district is facing cuts. So this is a hard time for every school community, as things stand, only a select few are able to soften that blow. It's just not ok.

I know that it would be ideal to put forward a policy that has unanimous support. But taking big steps in order to remedy an inequitable policy, sometimes means making the hard decision to just move forward. Can you imagine a world in which we waited for unanimous consensus to desegregate schools, or address redlining?

We simply need to change the norm. Next year and in the years to come there will be new families entering PPS that are completely unaware of past fundraising norms. Imagine what it will be like another 7 years from now, when all people know is that we work together as a greater community, for the betterment of all students! When it's the norm to plan community events together. When a more balanced, collaborative and equitable system is the norm. Fantastic! That's what this district needs. A sense of unity.

Stalling the process fuels years and years of more debate, years of more inequity, and years of more division. 30 years of a policy that doesn't work is enough.

In an old book called The Book of Sands, it says "If you want your people to build a ship, you don't simply gather the people and assemble the wood, but you make them long for the edge of the sea."

We need people to want to head to the sea, to do big things and create meaningful change, and I promise - we will have hundreds and hundreds of families who want to work together to build the ship. To collaboratively build a better experience for our children.

And we need this policy to change now to fuel the motivation to head to the sea.

Thank you for your time and for helping make this happen.

This form was created inside of Portland Public Schools.

Google Forms

Public Comment on Draft Policies

Please provide your comments on policies currently proposed for revisions or rescissions, or new policies. Policies are open for public comment for a minimum of 21 days between the First Reading and the Second Reading, when a adopt the policy.

Email *

Name *

Holly Groom

Email *

Your School Community *

McDaniel

Do you provide permission to post your comments on the PPS website? *

- ☒ Yes, with name
- ☐ Yes, without name
- ☐ No. Share only with Board and District staff

Policy you are providing comment on *

Revision: Districtwide Advocacy and Fundraising 7.10.020-P (Formerly Parent Groups and the Schools) ▼

Please provide your comments below *

If enacted, this policy would represent a commitment to working toward equitable funding and allocation of resources for all PPS students, regardless of where they attend school. Rather than using parent resources to bolster academic and extracurricular opportunities at select schools, we can bring our voices together to advocate for more state-allocated funding that will serve all students equitably. I am strongly in favor of this policy and deeply appreciate the hard work that has gone into moving this idea forward.

This form was created inside of Portland Public Schools.

Google Forms

Public Comment on Draft Policies

Please provide your comments on policies currently proposed for revisions or rescissions, or new policies. Policies are open for public comment for a minimum of 21 days between the First Reading and the Second Reading, when a adopt the policy.

Email *

[REDACTED]

Name *

Anne Hoang

Email *

[REDACTED]

Your School Community *

Jackson Middle School

Do you provide permission to post your comments on the PPS website? *

- ☒ Yes, with name
- ☐ Yes, without name
- ☐ No. Share only with Board and District staff

Policy you are providing comment on *

Revision: Districtwide Advocacy and Fundraising 7.10.020-P (Formerly Parent Groups and the Schools) ▼

Please provide your comments below *

I am in support of amending the district policy in regards to fundraising. Despite best intentions, I believe the current policy is misguided. It is inequitable to staff schools with PTA fundraising. It also diverts attention from the need for foundational budget reform and divides schools against each other. Even if my daughter's school has to change the way it thinks about fundraising, I think the long term benefit will be great.

This form was created inside of Portland Public Schools.

Google Forms

**Public Comment Received via the Draft Policy Survey:
Revision: Districtwide Advocacy and Fundraising 7.10.020-P
(Formerly Parent Groups and the Schools)**

Received between April 12-16, 2024

--Permission to Post--

Glencoe Elementary School
Isabel Johnson

I am a parent of a 5th Grader at Glencoe Elementary School, which has a foundation. I am in complete support of the the draft policy, Districtwide Advocacy and Fundraising 7.10.020-P, in its current state. I have seen first-hand how divisive fundraising is at our school, how much energy is expended for so little dollars. I have been shocked recently at the combative and half-truths coming from foundation supporters. I was the recipient of such an email today and it was so disheartening. Please support this policy change.

I appreciate the high-level nature of this policy, and hope that implementation steps and specifics around details such as the formation and role of the parent committee, potential distribution of fundraised dollars, and advocacy functions are clarified in administrative directive. This summer provides an excellent opportunity to work out those details in preparation for the next school year. It is such an important time for parents and school communities to come together to support students across the whole district, both by raising funds together and coming together to advocate for what all students need, rather than continuing to focus on bridging the gaps for the handful of schools who have the resources to do that. Please see this reform through NOW, before the end of the 23/24 school year, so we can start fresh with a united district in the next school year.

McDaniel
Holly Groom

If enacted, this policy would represent a commitment to working toward equitable funding and allocation of resources for all PPS students, regardless of where they attend school. Rather than using parent resources to bolster academic and extracurricular opportunities at select schools, we can bring our voices together to advocate for more state-allocated funding that will serve all students equitably. I am strongly in favor of this policy and deeply appreciate the hard work that has gone into moving this idea forward.

Vernon K-8
Maya Pueo von Geldern

Good evening, my name is Maya Pueo von Geldern. I'm here again to reinforce the need for foundation reform, and express my gratitude to those of you who have worked toward this for years, and are determined to see it through.

We have an obligation to the children of PPS as a whole. This means expanding our values past our property lines, to reach every child in this district. Right now almost every school in the district is facing cuts. So this is a hard time for every school community, as things stand, only a select few are able to soften that blow. It's just not ok.

I know that it would be ideal to put forward a policy that has unanimous support. But taking big steps in order to remedy an inequitable policy, sometimes means making the hard decision to just move forward. Can you imagine a world in which we waited for unanimous consensus to desegregate schools, or address redlining?

We simply need to change the norm. Next year and in the years to come there will be new families entering PPS that are completely unaware of past fundraising norms. Imagine what it will be like another 7 years from now, when all people know is that we work together as a greater community, for the betterment of all students! When it's the norm to plan community events together. When a more balanced, collaborative and equitable system is the norm. Fantastic! That's what this district needs. A sense of unity.

Stalling the process fuels years and years of more debate, years of more inequity, and years of more division. 30 years of a policy that doesn't work is enough.

In an old book called The Book of Sands, it says "If you want your people to build a ship, you don't simply gather the people and assemble the wood, but you make them long for the edge of the sea." We need people to want to head to the sea, to do big things and create meaningful change, and I promise - we will have hundreds and hundreds of families who want to work together to build the ship. To collaboratively build a better experience for our children.

And we need this policy to change now to fuel the motivation to head to the sea.

Thank you for your time and for helping make this happen.

Michelle DuBarry
Beach ES

I am a the mom of two students at Beach Elementary School writing to support the draft policy to move PPS to a district-wide foundation that allows all schools to work together to raise funds for FTE and align advocacy for increased state funding.

I/We support this change because:

- It unites our district instead of leaving schools to fend for themselves.
- It creates a pathway for aligned advocacy for state funding, which is at the heart of the issue.
- It eliminates disparities in the extra funds that schools get for hiring staff.

It isn't fair or equitable for a handful of schools to be able to protect themselves from cuts that all schools are facing, like losses to library and art FTE.

It respects all school communities with dignity, rather than dividing schools into inappropriate stereotypes like "wealthy" schools that fundraise and "needy" schools that receive charity.

After years of discussion, drafts, and community feedback, I am so glad that the time is finally coming for a district-wide foundation, so that fundraising practices better reflect PPS's stated values of social justice and racial equity. The timing couldn't be better, as we need all PPS community members to come together to send Salem a message about the increased education funding that we ALL need.

Anne Hoang
Jackson MS

I am in support of amending the district policy in regards to fundraising. Despite best intentions, I believe the current policy is misguided. It is inequitable to staff schools with PTA fundraising. It also diverts attention from the need for foundational budget reform and divides schools against each other. Even if my daughter's school has to change the way it thinks about fundraising, I think the long term benefit will be great.

Rigler ES

By creating a district wide foundation, we will help communities like Rigler be able to overcome systemic disparity in fundraising and provide resources to fully staff/support our students. We need those in the highest income brackets in our city to help support ALL schools in the city, not just a

precious few, as this is public education after all and the ultimate goal is to provide the best possible education to ALL students.

Alameda, Beaumont, Grant

The school foundation system is outdated, inequitable, and ineffective. Instead of uniting families to advocate for better funding from the state legislature, it pits schools against each other to scrap for local resources. It allows schools who "win" that scramble to ignore systemic failures that hurt all students in the district. When families across different schools unite for common purposes, their collective advocacy has more power and influence. It's bad enough that the district's school boundaries are the legacy of racist policies that exacerbate inequities by concentrating wealth and power in some schools and poverty and marginalization in other schools. When schools privately fundraise from their inequitably bound school communities, they deepen the advantages for the wealthy and disadvantages of the poor. It's time for PPS to end private foundations for individual schools and start making significant progress toward fundraising justice.

Jeffrey Sprague
Roosevelt HS

To the members of the PPS School Board:

I am a parent of a student at Roosevelt High School writing to support the draft policy to move PPS to a district-wide foundation that allows all schools to work together to raise funds for FTE and align advocacy for increased state funding.

I support this change because of the reasons carefully outlined by the reform group after careful study of the issue over many years:

It unites our district instead of leaving schools to fend for themselves.

It creates a pathway for aligned advocacy for state funding, which is at the heart of the issue.

It eliminates disparities in the extra funds that schools get for hiring staff.

It allows schools with LSFs to use the funds they are raising right now to pay for staff next year, helping ease the transition to fundraising alongside the majority of schools who do not have foundations starting in the 24/25 school year.

It isn't fair or equitable for a handful of schools to be able to protect themselves from cuts that all schools are facing, like losses to library and art FTE.

It respects all school communities with dignity, rather than dividing schools into inappropriate stereotypes like "wealthy" schools that fundraise and "needy" schools that receive charity.

After years of discussion, drafts, and community feedback, I am so glad that the time is finally coming for a district-wide foundation, so that fundraising practices better reflect PPS's stated values of social justice and racial equity. The timing couldn't be better, as we need all PPS community members to come together to send Salem a message about the increased education funding that we ALL need.

Sincerely Jeffrey Sprague
Roosevelt High School Parent

Llewellyn

The proposal to limit school foundations' ability to fundraise is naive.

It is naive to think that parents and neighborhood businesses will continue to donate anywhere near the same level without assurance that it goes to their local schools. Families and neighborhood businesses are motivated to help their families, neighbors, and local community. People simply won't donate to some black box fund that will likely benefit someone else's school.

It's naive to think that the volunteers that are the backbone of the school foundations will continue to donate their time at the same level. Organizing auctions and other fundraises take a tremendous amount of work-- all of it uncompensated. It's a labor of love, and the volunteers do it out of a sense of duty to their neighbors, their own children, and their community. Very few volunteers will continue to donate their time at that level when the benefit is accrued to unknown communities.

The result will be that donations to the school foundation will crater. ALL schools will receive less money. You will take away staffing from some schools without adding staffing to others. Efforts to improve equity should focus on solutions that bring lesser-resourced schools UP to a better level, not bring more affluent schools DOWN. That is not a recipe for achieving any sort of good outcome for our students.

Capital Hill

Thank you for considering this important change to PPS policy. Fundraising at the school level creates a separate and unequal environment on many levels. Schools should not be pitted against one another, trying to adequately staff and resource their schools, vying for private dollars. Nor should our students' families be bombarded with requests for funds. (In one PPS school where I worked, families were expected to give \$900, per child, to the foundation.)

The only way to correctly fund public schools is through the use of tax dollars. Advocating for stable school funding at the state level is vital to ending the practice of asking people who are already paying state taxes to give money to schools.

The first step to fixing the problem of individual schools raising money for staffing and other needed resources is to pool all of our donations into one central fund. The next step will be eliminating the need for fundraising in public schools in Oregon, and in the US, all together. Thank you, again, for taking this incredibly important first step.

Alameda ES

In the name of PPS' values and commitment to equity, it is the right (and the harder) choice, to centralize foundation dollars for a more equitable distribution of funds and investment in our future. That we may experience a dip in initial fundraising dollars is to be expected and should not sway the board from making the right and harder choice. We all know this - we can do it... if + when we all decide to work together. The current and recent local school foundation leaders ought to be recognized for their incredible impact and offered seats at the table to help reimagine how we'll transition to this new model. We must carry over any and all learnings, success stories, processes, etc. that can be repurposed in the new model.

McDaniel

I am a parent of a student at McDaniel High School. My child previously attended Scott Elementary and Roseway Heights Middle School. I am writing in support of a district-wide foundation to support

all schools and to end the inequity of local school-based foundations. When my daughter entered PPS as a kindergartner, I was so worried about her well being, wanting to protect her, and make sure SHE had a really positive experience in school. As such I understand the drive to raise funds for your student in your specific school. However, during my almost eleven years in PPS, as a volunteer in and out of the classroom, I have been able to see firsthand that public schools are about ALL of our children not just my child, and the inequity of local foundations do not benefit all of our students. I have witnessed the unequal distribution of opportunities and services that have been perpetuated by foundations. Many students in child's school are also well aware of these discrepancies and have expressed being perceived as needy and less than their peers at these more "advantaged" schools. I believe now is the time to change the model. Clearly PPS needs more funding across the board, and I believe moving to a district wide foundation model would allow schools to unite and advocate at the State level for better funding. It would also eliminate the inherent inequity that has occurred as a result of the local school-based foundations. I will be advocating for all of our schools at the State level, and I do believe a change to a district wide advocacy and funding model will UNIFY our district around funding.

Public Comment on Draft Policies

Please provide your comments on policies currently proposed for revisions or rescissions, or new policies. Policies are open for public comment for a minimum of 21 days between the First Reading and the Second Reading, when a adopt the policy.

Policy you are providing comment on *

Revision: Districtwide Advocacy and Fundraising 7.10.020-P (Formerly Parent Groups and the Schools) ▼

Do you provide permission to post your comments on the PPS website? *

- ☒ Yes, with name
- ☐ Yes, without name
- ☐ No. Share only with Board and District staff

Name *

Casey Wallace

Email *

[REDACTED]

Your School Community *

Ockley Green MS

Please provide your comments below *

My family supports changes to PPS policy to ensure school fundraising efforts are distributed equitably. We see a lot of basic educational & cultural opportunities that aren't even remotely possible for Ockley Green MS kids because funds need to be prioritized to meet core needs. I understand that schools with foundations may say the same, but the data supports that the gap in resources is very different.

I choose public schools because I want my kid to go to school with kids from different backgrounds. Parents of means can supplement their kids' experiences at home and after school. There are plenty of other ways they can boost their own kids up the ladder of success. But while they are in school, all our kids should be equally supported. This is the social contract that public school promises.

This form was created inside of Portland Public Schools.

Google Forms

Public Comment on Draft Policies

Please provide your comments on policies currently proposed for revisions or rescissions, or new policies. Policies are open for public comment for a minimum of 21 days between the First Reading and the Second Reading, when a adopt the policy.

Policy you are providing comment on *

Revision: Districtwide Advocacy and Fundraising 7.10.020-P (Formerly Parent Groups and the Schools) ▼

Do you provide permission to post your comments on the PPS website? *

- ☒ Yes, with name
- ☐ Yes, without name
- ☐ No. Share only with Board and District staff

Name *

Harmony Quiroz

Email *

[REDACTED]

Your School Community *

Atkinson Elementary

Please provide your comments below *

Independent school foundations while providing minimal staffing, rarely in the form of a full FTE, create a structural barrier to equity. ISFs fund positions are primarily wealthy, primarily white schools. It assumes that schools that don't have foundations or the capacity to raise funds don't want to mitigate budget cuts. Moving to a districtwide foundation is an opportunity to tear down a fundamentally inequitable and frankly racist institutional structure. PPS must act in accordance with their values and change the foundation policy.

This form was created inside of Portland Public Schools.

Google Forms

Public Comment Received via the Draft Policy Survey:

Revision: Districtwide Advocacy and Fundraising 7.10.020-P

(Formerly Parent Groups and the Schools)

Received between April 18-19, 2024

--Permission to Post--

Abernethy Elementary School

I am the mother of a kindergartener at Abernethy Elementary, and I am writing to oppose Board Policy 7.20.010-P, Districtwide Advocacy and Fundraising, which would eliminate local school foundations.

Eliminating LSFs will cut millions in funding across the board for our already underfunded schools.

For years, PPS has been underfunded, and for years, local school foundations have helped make up the funding gap, both at their own schools and at other PPS schools through the one-third equity share. Funds from LSFs and their equity contributions to the district-wide fund provide significant financial support for supplementary staffing across all PPS schools. For instance, in the 2022-23 school year, LSFs raised \$2.5 million, funding 31.89 full-time equivalent positions at schools with LSFs and 9.57 FTE at schools receiving parent fund grants from the LSFs.

This proposed policy change at a time when PPS is already facing major budget cuts will result in even less funding for staff when our students need them most. For instance, in the next school year, PPS is poised to eliminate 2.10 FTE from Abernethy. Our LSF should be allowed to continue to raise funds that would help retain FTE positions at our school, meet our students' basic learning needs, and ensure our school is operating at the same baseline as other PPS schools.

Eliminating LSFs will disproportionately and unfairly impact schools that already receive less funding per student than other schools.

In the 2022-23 school year, Abernethy received \$9,036 per student in funding, while other K-5 schools received significantly more per-student dollars. For instance, Rosa Parks received \$16,265, Vestal received \$13,412, and Peninsula received \$12,791. The ability of Abernethy's foundation to fund positions outside of the PPS budget with private dollars allows PPS to continue to direct funding to these other schools while also helping Abernethy make up for its low per-student funding.

It should also be noted that eliminating LSFs hurts historically underserved students at schools like Abernethy – who receive zero added equity FTE – the most. PPS considers 30% of Abernethy students to be historically underserved, and our LSF helps these students, whom PPS overlooks in its continued efforts to direct additional funds elsewhere through its equity budgeting process.

Eliminating LSFs will reduce donations and parent engagement. Discontinuing a decades-long practice of community and family support to local schools will result in fewer donations and more families opting out of PPS. This will exacerbate the district's declining enrollment, state funding, and equity issues. Donors give where they feel their money makes the most impact, and parents who already feel that their students are receiving less than their fair share are not going to continue to give the same level of support and engagement to a districtwide foundation that will provide them even less in return.

PPS Board members in favor of this policy change seem to think that eliminating LSFs will cause so-called "rich" parents to fight harder to secure funds for all PPS students, both through fundraising and political advocacy. However, the likelier outcome is that these parents will choose to simply leave PPS for private schools who will welcome them with open arms.

Lincoln HS cluster

I oppose the Districtwide Advocacy and Fundraising 7.10.020-P (Proposed New Title. Formerly Parent Groups And The Schools) policy for its lack of true and fair public engagement and its fiscal impacts on teachers and other educational resources for students.

I am a public employee and not wealthy. My single mom was a part-time PPS teacher and I learned early to budget by my values. One of the areas that we hugely value and invest in is our daughter's education and school.

I read the PPS relevant policies and materials available, the Reform PPS Funding website, and watched the board and policy committee meetings. Based on that, I believe:

1. PPS has not conducted sufficient community engagement to determine a policy with this magnitude of fiscal and student impacts. PPS should pause this policy to hire an expert to "consult" and "involve" the entire district in this essential conversation.

Why: As a public employee, I recently engaged thousands in-person and online at community and culturally specific events and held a community vote of 1,665 people in Washington County for just \$2.3M of one-time capital funding; this policy has a much greater impact to thousands of students, families, and teachers. The estimated loss of \$3M annually and the elimination and/or significant reduction of hours of 106 student-facing jobs strictly funded by School Foundations in the 25-26 school year is a painful and unnecessary cut on top of \$30M district wide budget cuts.

How: Board member statements seem to indicate that they believe public testimony constitutes "community engagement"; this is patently false. Public testimony is a public reaction to "ignore", or at best, "inform" on the spectrum of family and community engagement for educational equity: <https://www.oregon.gov/ode/students-and-family/equity/AfricanAmericanBlackStudentEducation/Documents/Spectrum-of-Family-Community-Engagement-For-Educational-Equity.pdf>

Who: According to the timeline on the Reform PPS Funding, just two events could be considered “consulting” about this policy with a total of 30 people in a district of thousands of students and families. For the June 2022 report, PPS district staff only met with 17 people in Roosevelt and McDaniel HS clusters, many of which receive additional title 1 funding and therefore, do not have foundations. In April 2023, Dir. Hollands led community engagement meeting of 13 people. PPS also did not engage with the most impacted stakeholders, active local school foundations, and school leaders, teachers and students across the district and seems to be relying on one advocacy group, Reform PPS Funding.

2. It is unacceptable to eliminate Local School Foundation fundraising, with no replacement funds earmarked nor an executable plan in place to secure funding. As Dir. Michelle DePass mentioned in her March 28, 2022 OPB interview, some of the local school nonprofit foundations host highly successful fundraising events similar to most successful nonprofits. As a public servant, I have attended similar sparkly events for non-profits that provide education and social services like Centro Cultural, Adelante Mujeres, and Self Enhancement Inc. Multi-million dollar professional fundraising takes time, expertise and significant financial investment. To successfully fundraise the equal amount of funds currently brought in by School Foundations, the board will need to consider personnel for the financial, administrative and fundraising efforts necessary to attract dollars from corporate donors, grant-giving foundations in addition to the community.

3. During the teacher strike in November 2023, I emailed PPS board and leaders, state leaders, and national leaders to adjust statewide funding. I continue to urge PPS to strongly advocate for a change in statewide funding policy.

Thank you for your service, time and consideration!

Hattie McDonnell

Sellwood MS

If we decide to change the rules for foundations providing funds direct to their schools, we will lose a lot of our generous donors and see a MAJOR decrease in overall funding. This also makes the efforts of foundations worthless. Why fundraise when you only see a small, small portion of the effort? We will lose all volunteers and again see a huge decrease in funding.

Michael McDonald

Sellwood MS

Allowing my donated funds to be spread across all schools will not motivate me to donate more but less. Much, much less. I donate through events, drives and the blue bag program and I will halt all of those unless they benefit my local school.

Llewellyn

Due to funding cuts, my elementary school will lose a class section in half of the 6 grades. Depending on enrollment numbers, it's possible that next year, half of our classrooms will have over 30 children in them.

Our Foundation does not raise enough money to hire teachers, but we are able to hire some educational assistants, which are vital support to teachers when classes are that large.

The proposed policy would eliminate our ability to provide teachers and students with this vital support. Meanwhile, the proposed policy will do nothing to help other schools. It is a net loss, not a net gain.

Rather than spending efforts on changing the Foundation policies and attempting to fundraise district-wide, Board members should focus on legislative action that will achieve the funding we need to properly staff our schools in the first place.

Irvington ES

The suggested revisions to this policy essentially remove all incentive for school communities with financial resources to make contributions to the fund. Without guaranteeing a return of some (significant) portion of funds donated to the specific community that made the donation there really isn't any compelling reason for communities to direct limited resources that can otherwise be deployed in more immediate and impactful ways. This policy revision will effectively wipe out most financial support of this fund.

Lincoln HS cluster

I oppose the Districtwide Advocacy and Fundraising 7.10.020-P (Proposed New Title. Formerly Parent Groups And The Schools) policy for its **lack of true and fair public engagement and its fiscal impacts on teachers and other educational resources for students**.

I am a public employee and not wealthy, as some board members assume of high-performing schools. My single mom was a part-time PPS teacher and I learned early to budget by my values. One of the areas that we hugely value and invest in is our daughter's education and school.

I read the PPS relevant policies and materials available, the Reform PPS Funding website, and watched the board and policy committee meetings. Based on that, I believe:

1. PPS has **not conducted sufficient community engagement** to determine a policy with this magnitude of fiscal and student impacts. **PPS should pause this policy to hire an expert to “consult” and “involve” the entire district in this essential conversation.**

Why: As a public employee, I recently engaged thousands in-person and online at community and culturally specific events and held a community vote of 1,665 people in Washington County for just \$2.3M of one-time capital funding; this policy has a much greater impact to thousands of students, families, and teachers. The estimated **loss of \$3M annually** and the elimination and/or significant **reduction of hours of 106 student-facing jobs** strictly funded by School Foundations in the 25-26 school year is a painful and unnecessary cut on top of \$30M district wide budget cuts.

How: Board member statements seem to indicate that they believe public testimony constitutes “community engagement”; this is patently false. Public testimony is a public reaction to “ignore” or at best, “inform” on the [spectrum of](#) family and community engagement for educational

equity: <https://www.oregon.gov/ode/students-and-family/equity/AfricanAmericanBlackStudentEducation/Documents/Spectrum-of-Family-Community-Engagement-For-Educational-Equity.pdf>

Who: According to the timeline on the Reform PPS Funding, just two events could be considered “consulting” about this policy with a total of 30 people in a district of thousands of students and families. For the June 2022 report, PPS district staff only met with 17 people in Roosevelt and McDaniel HS clusters, many of which receive additional title 1 funding and therefore, do not have foundations. In April 2023, Dir. Hollands led community engagement meeting of 13 people. PPS also did not engage with the most impacted stakeholders, active local school foundations, and school leaders, teachers and students across the district and seems to be relying on one advocacy group, Reform PPS Funding.

2. It is unacceptable to eliminate Local School Foundation fundraising, with no replacement funds earmarked nor an executable plan in place to secure funding. As Dir. Michelle DePass mentioned in her March 28, 2022 OPB interview, some of the local school nonprofit foundations host highly successful fundraising events similar to most successful nonprofits. As a public servant, I have attended similar sparkly events for non-profits that provide education and social services like Centro Cultural, Adelante Mujeres, and Self Enhancement Inc. Multi-million dollar professional fundraising takes time, expertise and significant financial investment. To successfully fundraise the equal amount of funds currently brought in by School Foundations, the board will need to consider personnel for the financial, administrative and fundraising efforts necessary to attract dollars from corporate donors, grant-giving foundations in addition to the community.

3. During the teacher strike in November 2023, I emailed PPS board and leaders, state leaders, and national leaders to adjust statewide funding. I continue to urge PPS to strongly advocate for a change in statewide funding policy.

Public Comment Received via the Draft Policy Survey:

Revision: Districtwide Advocacy and Fundraising 7.10.020-P

(Formerly Parent Groups and the Schools)

Received between April 19-22, 2024

--Permission to Post--

Ainsworth

I believe the proposed policy to eliminate the ability of parents to direct 2/3rds of donations to their children's school is misguided for several crucial reasons and should not be implemented. Such a substantial and abrupt change to this policy would be a mistake, and requires further thought and input from the different PPS school communities.

The proposed model fundamentally misunderstands the role of, and motivation for, donations in the K-12 school environment. Donations by parents to schools are made with specific goals, often parents looking to change or improve some aspect of schooling received by their children. To remove the targeted nature of this donation would have a straightforward outcome on overall donations - to drastically reduce or eliminate donations made by parents.

Eliminating the ability of parents to impact their children's education via donating for specific purposes will not only reduce direct donations, but is likely to have unintended consequences that the district must consider. If parents with the means to donate to their school cannot, this will simply drive well-resourced parents to other options, including private schools, charter schools, or moving to other districts. This will further exacerbate budget issues at PPS.

There is no question that schools should be funded equitably and offer opportunities for enrichment and individual instruction to all students - regardless of their place of residence within Portland. That PPS is facing a funding shortage is a problem that must be addressed via the primary funding mechanism - namely funding schools via income and property taxes paid by our community. PPS should redirect its efforts towards improving equity by focusing attention where it matters and has impact - the funding model for schools supported by income and property taxes. Further, there exist myriad programs that attempt to address historically underserved students that are operated through the district and at the federal level. How would those programs be adjusted in a model where parent fundraising is not allowed?

I challenge PPS to demonstrate and share their projections for district-wide funds received via donations under the proposed model vs. the current model. A new model for redistributing a decimated donation

base does not improve inequities, and to project that this funding mechanism can address such inequities is disingenuous. Instead, the outcome of such a change is more likely to further exacerbate funding issues by 1) eliminating programs supported directly by donations, and 2) driving away student enrollment, and associated dollars, from PPS. It also deprives parents of a mechanism for direct involvement in their children's education - it is likely that parents donating money are also donating their time and other intangibles.

In short, I urge you to hold off any changes to this system, and expand listening sessions and feedback opportunities. In recent years, we have seen repeatedly in Portland and more generally in Oregon, the impact of hastily made measures with serious harm to the community. I urge you to not follow those footsteps and consider the impacts of this proposed program holistically and with due consideration of the history of this donation structure at PPS.

Mike Farrell

Vestal ES

I am writing in support of the draft policy to form a district wide foundation as soon as the 24/25 school year. Education is a collect effort. We all benefit when education is provided equitably across the district. Too much our school funding is neighborhood based. This results in schools and communities with the most resources getting more resources. Schools and communities that need the most support then have access to the least resources. This structure leads to a community that is concerned about itself only. This does not improve the community. A district wide foundation will ensure that all schools have access to funds in an equitable way. It will help to reduce the education gaps between schools. This will lift up those communities and schools that need the most support. Overall this improves the education experience for everyone.

Ainsworth

Closing local school foundations, expecting parents to put their fund raising efforts only behind the PPS Foundation is a very poor idea. It is sure to greatly diminish fund raising energy and will be a failure on every level. Why make this change which would be only detrimental? Years ago, local foundations were expected to make a % contribution to the larger PPS Foundation. Perhaps increasing this % would be a far better solution.

Please post detailed reports on how Portland Arts Tax is implemented by PPS: specific listings of schools' arts teachers & programs funded by the Portland Arts Tax. Full transparency is essential.

Public Comment Received via the Draft Policy Survey:

Revision: Districtwide Advocacy and Fundraising 7.10.020-P

(Formerly Parent Groups and the Schools)

Received between April 22-24, 2024

--Permission to Post--

Abernathy ES

I am the parent of a student at Abernethy Elementary. At the board meeting on April 2nd, Andrew Scott mentioned his concern with unintended consequences in regards to his hesitation to support a policy change at this time. Abernethy Elementary exists as an example of the unintended consequences of the current fundraising model for a school with a successful "LSF".

Abernethy doesn't actually have an LSF because sometime around 2016, the Abernethy PTA decided to take over the fundraising for the Fund for PPS. In the PTA budget, there is the line item "Fund for PPS (FTE)", which makes up 51% of the current school year budget. On average, this line item is 60% of the total PTA budget each year. The rest of the budget, the other 40%, consists of traditional PTA programming such as community events, various supplies funding, capital improvements, etc.

Prior to this school year, the money the PTA raised was all put into one bucket. Unlike other schools, the PTA had a single donation link and did not direct donors to the Fund for PPS. Whatever funds they raised were then allocated at the board's discretion to the Fund for PPS or to traditional PTA programming. What began to happen is the Fund for PPS line item was funded above all else, while traditional PTA programming was neglected. I joined the board for the 2022/2023 school year and found that the focus of the PTA board and the Abernethy community members who attended board meetings, was mostly on fundraising for an extra teacher. Furthermore, the board would not agree to funding line items in the budget (the very budget that members voted to follow and then donated towards) out of concern for how much money they would have at the end of the school year to pay for FTE.

Fundraising for the Fund for PPS effectively cannibalized the Abernethy PTA. The percentage of funds donated to the Fund for PPS by the Abernethy PTA actualized as 86%, 81% and 71% of the annual expenditures for the past three years respectively. Meanwhile, the budget line items for traditional PTA programming were underfunded by 74%, 88% and 65% over the same three year period. Additionally, at the end of the 22/23 school year the PTA board got the membership to vote for an amendment to the standing rules that allowed the PTA to save up to 150% of the budget (outside of the amount earmarked for the Fund for PPS) for a "reserve". There is no requirement that the PTA board attempt to actually spend money on approved budget items before diverting funds to this "reserve"; the only requirement is that the funds be "unspent". The Abernethy PTA then ended the 22/23 fiscal year with a net cash gain of \$56,000 despite only funding 35% of PTA programming. Programming that was in the budget and that donors voted for and donated towards.

Foundation fundraising has utterly corrupted the Abernethy PTA.

Consequently, Abernethy's enrollment declined over these years at a greater rate than the district average. There are a few reasons for this, but it is my opinion that the lack of focus on community building through PTA programming absolutely plays a part. During my time as an Abernethy parent, events throughout the year have been focused on fundraising, save for maybe one or two meetups. It is my understanding that Abernethy once had a thriving and inclusive community focused on the garden program. During this time, Abernethy Elementary was a highly desirable neighborhood school. What I've been told is that at some point a principal convinced the community to abandon the garden program by diverting its funding to the Fund for PPS. This is how the Abernethy PTA and the Abernethy LSF became one entity and how the sense of community at Abernethy deteriorated.

There is a second unintended consequence of the fundraising for the Fund for PPS and FTE at Abernethy that is even more disheartening than the erosion of robust community; a consequence that should be concerning to the school board: the complete lack of advocacy around state funding for education. I can credit one Abernethy PTA board member who holds an annual postcard campaign to advocate for statewide school funding, however this is the only mention of government funding in public schools from Abernethy. Period. This year, the Abernethy PTA and the principal have sent out emails fearfully detailing the funding cuts expected for the 24/25 school year. There is no mention about how important it is for parents to become engaged and organize to push state lawmakers to commit to fully funding our public schools. The only fix is to donate to the Fund for PPS so Abernethy can pay for an extra teacher next year.

The Abernethy PTA board's focus on fundraising for FTE is in direct conflict with the mission of the National PTA, which is to advocate for government funding in schools over private funding. It is sad to me that my school community is distracted by money that amounts to crumbs exclusively for Abernethy students, rather than organize and rally efforts around lobbying for state funding of all schools.

For all that I've witnessed at my son's elementary school around fundraising for FTE, I am a big supporter of reform to the Fund for PPS. There is far too much room for the unintended consequences of corruption and lack of interest in lobbying for state funding when parents are able to raise money to pay for an additional teacher at their children's school.

Magalí Rabasa

Rigler ES

Dear Directors of the PPS School Board,

I'm writing to you as the President of Padres Unidos de Rigler (the Rigler Elementary PTA) in support of the draft policy to move PPS to a district-wide foundation that allows all schools to work together to raise funds for FTE and align advocacy for increased state funding. Members of our PTA have been part of the conversation about foundation policy reform for nearly four years, participating in the roundtable listening sessions, providing public commentary on numerous occasions, and attending our zone representative Gary Holland's forum last year.

We support this change for many reasons, including the fact that it unites our district instead of leaving schools to fend for themselves. The current system exacerbates the existing inequities in PPS, by undermining the district's equity funding model. The proposed draft policy is also essential because it creates a pathway for aligned advocacy for state funding, which is at the heart of the issue.

One of the biggest reasons we at Rigler, a Title I DLI school in Cully, so strongly support the proposal for a district-wide foundation is that it respects all school communities with dignity, rather than dividing schools into inappropriate stereotypes like “wealthy” schools that fundraise and “needy” schools that receive charity. When the most highly resourced families and schools are allowed to privately fundraise to add staff to their school through their foundations, the district’s program for equity is directly undermined. And furthermore, it contributes to a deeply troubling mindset that creates silos rather than solidarity, breaches rather than bridges, pitting “good schools,” like our neighbors at Alameda, against “bad schools,” like Rigler. As you all know, Alameda and Rigler students come together briefly for middle school, and the complexity of funding at Beaumont, which has both a Foundation and parent fund grant awards, is evidence of this tremendous divide.

We need a district-wide model for fundraising that complements and elevates our district’s commitments to and policies for equity. And a crucial first step for that is eliminating the ability to use foundation fundraising to staff schools. If the board is concerned that foundation reform will hurt the neediest students in our district, we, Padres Unidos de Rigler/PTA, want to make clear that this is not true. The grants from the parent fund are not enough, and increasing the contribution from wealthier schools will not solve the problem. We need a district-wide approach to fundraising in combination with a district-wide commitment to fighting for our schools to be fully funded, to ensure success for every student.

Thank you for your work on this incredibly important issue that has the potential to create meaningful transformation and greater equity in PPS.

Sincerely,

Magalí Rabasa

President of Padres Unidos de Rigler/PTA

Simon

Laurelhurst

This is such a horrible and flawed idea that really makes no sense. You will be taking away the power of localized fundraising (which people are passionate about and can see work before their very eyes, while still sharing a large portion with the district) and you will be attempting to replace it with a district wide model — that will certainly dilute the current effort made by parents and is not even close to being the same as local fundraising (no matter how you spin it). This new model would essentially equate the money we raise in the future to being just another of the many taxes Portlanders pay (including the 5th highest property tax in the country) to subsidize the district’s shortcomings. Your goal is equity but the burden in this model will not be shared equally. And the results of such a flawed move will directly hurt our children.

And while you’ve been working on passing this “reform” for seven years, the majority of of newer parents (4th grade and under) in our community were unaware of this proposed policy change (until recently) and the negative impact it will have on our community. So while the idea of this policy change has been around for a while, it has not been so front and center for a lot of us. However, every parent I know is incensed about this change when they hear about it. I would suggest that you give those of us who are new to this discussion more time to express our concerns before voting on such a drastic change. Or to look for a better solution to the district’s funding shortfall instead of destroying something that is already generously generating money for schools in a time of budget cuts.

Glencoe ES and Franklin HS

I support the revisions to the local school foundations policy. It is time for this change, and you're courageous to take this on. Please consider strengthening language to prevent affluent schools from skirting the policy by setting up non-profit accounts to support extra staffing and bypass this new policy.

Richmond ES

At this moment of severe budget cuts, I urge the board to table this proposal until further planning has been done to ensure that the same level of funds will be raised for this new district-wide foundation as are needed to replace the funds that will be lost when school communities are no longer involved in raising funds for their schools. How will funds be fairly apportioned to each school - and will it honestly change year-to-year? Will the board be leading district-wide fundraiser activities? If so, it would be best to describe the specific plan for those fundraising activities, with dates, descriptions of activities, and volunteers who will be leading these fundraisers. The district and board will need to take on a lot of effort to replace the fundraisers individual PTAs would do. I fear that if this action is taken by the board, then its consequences will be blamed on the board and the district. At a time of steep budget cuts, it seems hasty to shut off a reliable stream of support for our schools. Please pause this proposal until it can be fully thought through and a clear plan is in place.

Ainsworth

There is already a large discrepancy in per-student funding seen between Title 1 schools and schools situated in wealthier districts. Additionally, initiatives focused on racial equity have already provided significant per-student funding differences between schools. Foundation money that is raised allows for schools to offer similar levels of programming as Title 1 schools and schools that receive further racial equity support, but is still a very small fraction of the total school budget, especially when considering that 1/3 of moneys raised go to a districtwide fund. In effect, foundations are closing the budget gaps to allow for a similar level of educational opportunities within wealthier schools. Not allowing parents to close those gaps in educational experience is counterproductive to PPS's mission and also a disservice to the students that attend these schools that may not have the means to obtain extracurricular enrichment activities. This proposal seems to be advocated for by a small portion of the community without input from schools that will be impacted the most.

Public Comment Received via the Draft Policy Survey:
Revision: Districtwide Advocacy and Fundraising 7.10.020-P
(Formerly Parent Groups and the Schools)

Received between April 24-26, 2024

--Permission to Post--

Isabel Johnson
Glencoe

I provided comments previously but I would like this comment to replace my earlier comment.

I am writing today to express my strong support for the policy change that will replace the local school foundation model with a district wide foundation model. A model in which our communities can work together to fundraise and share in dollars raised.

As the parent of a 5th grader at Glencoe Elementary, a school with a foundation, a PTA leader, a member of Reform Funding PPS, a frequent volunteer in the Glencoe building, and an accountant, I am well versed in the ins and outs of local school fundraising, school funding in Oregon in general, and how it plays out in our individual schools.

Unifying our private dollar fundraising under one entity will allow for greater collaboration and support across the district. I recall hearing Chair Hollands talk at last year's April foundation meeting about ideas for city wide fundraising events such as a PPS night at a Blazers game. I see city wide events in support of PPS as a great way to remind our city that we value our public schools. I would love to see a 'Dine Out for PPS Night', similar to the restaurant partnerships many PTAs do during the year. For example, see the Dine Out for Education (<https://iccsdfoundation.org/dine-out-for-education/>) that Iowa City hosts in the spring and fall. Once this policy change passes, there's so many collaborative fundraising ideas we can implement. I am excited by the idea of working collectively with other schools to lift up all our students.

Librarians and library assistants come up often in the justification for local school foundations. I have seen many versions of the 'our school receives less funding per student (but we support the PPS equity model) and our foundation pays (in part) for valuable student facing positions such as our librarian / library assistant'.

As a parent that has volunteered in the Glencoe library for the past 6 years, I see first-hand how important our librarians and library assistants are for our students and our school communities. It breaks my heart that we are losing our beloved longtime library assistant at Glencoe. Does that make me want to contribute to the Glencoe foundation to 'save' her position? Unequivocally, NO. Almost universally across the district, there are cuts to librarian and library assistant hours for the 2024-2025 school year. Only a select few schools can afford to fundraise to pay for those much-needed library hours. I cannot, on any level, see the justification for local school foundations based on this flawed logic.

For example (all numbers from 2024-2025 Proposed Budget Volume #2), LSF school ACCESS is going from 1.05 overall Library FTE to 0.40 and staff directly told students that unless they fundraise, the librarian would lose her job. Vestal, a Title 1 school, is experiencing a very similar cut going from 1.0 Library FTE to 0.40 without the ability to fundraise from their school community. And the argument that Vestal will receive a parent fund grant so that's why we need to keep LSF's? It makes no sense. Whatever Vestal would receive as a parent fund grant would not come close to the amount ACCESS retains under the current LSF model. Whitman and Rosa Parks are two other examples of Title 1, non LSF schools going from 1.0 Library FTE to 0.40.

In the face of what I imagine is an overwhelming amount of 'save our foundation' emails, I want to remind you that the current local school foundation policy is inequitable and does not serve all our students and all our communities.

Please vote yes on May 7th in support of the policy change that will bring about a district wide foundation. A change that will allow all our PPS schools to contribute and share in fundraising dollars.

Anna Marquez
Ockley Green

My name is Anna Marquez, I am the parent of a student at Ockley Green MS and a member of the RESJ Community Advisory Committee and I'm writing to support the draft policy to move PPS to a district-wide foundation that allows all schools to work together to raise funds for FTE and align advocacy for increased state funding.

I support this change because our district needs to work on unity and collaboration to support equitable outcomes for all our students. Reforming school foundations will be the first step in helping the whole community see every single PPS student as OUR students, and investing in each and every ones' future. One of the infuriating aspects of the system as it currently exists is the school stereotypes that exist around the "wealthy" schools and the "poor" schools" and this kind of thinking doesn't respect schools, families or educators in the way they all deserve. I want to see the disparities eliminated and some schools being able to insulate themselves from cuts is unfair and unacceptable. Let's move forward and support one another as a larger community to commit to equity and sustainable funding options for each and every student in this district.

I couldn't be happier that the time is finally coming for a district-wide foundation, so that fundraising practices better reflect PPS's stated values of social justice and racial equity. The timing couldn't be better, as we need all PPS community members to come together to send Salem a message about the increased education funding that we ALL need.

Sincerely,

Anna Marquez
RESJ CAC
Ockley Green MS

Jen Miller
Ainsworth

As a teacher, I find this proposed policy revision to be a sad and misguided attempt at equity. Equity is not about reducing everyone's resources to the lowest common denominator. Instead of taking away our individual communities' ability to fundraise for important teaching positions we

should be focused on finding ways to make sure that these positions get funding at other schools, too.

Laurelhurst

It is a mistake to dissolve local school foundations without first resolving the funding shortfall for K12 education at the state level.

Sunnyside

I am the co-chair of the Sunnyside Environmental School Foundation and have been involved in fundraising for the last three years. This is the first time I am seeing written notice of a policy change that would completely disrupt the fundraising momentum we've been building at our school. I am a huge advocate for well-funded, equitable public education. This policy change in itself seems like a move in the right direction, HOWEVER, at no point were we contacted to provide input. I think this is quite disheartening. We raise a very modest amount of money among a modest income school community. We have very real challenges in our school community that PPS funding does not cover and quite frankly our hard earned fundraising barely scratches the surface. Before change occurs, I would like to see a real opportunity for input from all current Foundation chairs and to really understand and prepare for how these changes may impact our unique school. I have put in hundreds of hours of volunteer time over the last three years to raise just enough money to support our school's unique added choice curriculum and the fact that we are a K-8 school that does not receive full funding for its middle school. On top of that, many of our families are struggling. These changes could quite possibly be beneficial to our school, but there seems to be no guarantee and quite frankly, the loss of our meager additional \$50,000 that we raise through our small but mighty Foundation volunteer would be devastating.

Public Comment on Draft Policies

Please provide your comments on policies currently proposed for revisions or rescissions, or new policies. Policies are open for public comment for a minimum of 21 days between the First Reading and the Second Reading, when a adopt the policy.

Email *

Name *

State Representative James Hieb

Email *

Your School Community *

Canby & Estacada / Clackamas County

Do you provide permission to post your comments on the PPS website? *

- ☒ Yes, with name
- ☐ Yes, without name
- ☐ No. Share only with Board and District staff

Policy you are providing comment on *

Revision: Junior Reserve Officer Training Corps and Military Careers 6.20.043-P (Formerly Military Recruitment) ▼

Please provide your comments below *

The Junior Reserve Officers' Training Corps offers numerous benefits for young individuals. It instills valuable leadership skills by providing practical training in teamwork, communication, and decision-making. Through its structured curriculum, JROTC promotes discipline and responsibility, essential qualities for success in any endeavor. Additionally, the program fosters a sense of patriotism and civic duty, encouraging participants to become active and engaged citizens in their communities. Moreover, JROTC provides opportunities for personal growth and self-improvement, helping students develop confidence and resilience. Overall, JROTC equips youth with the tools they need to excel academically, professionally, and personally, making it a valuable program for their development.

I urge a YES on JROTC. Thank you.

This form was created inside of Portland Public Schools.

Google Forms

Public Comment on Draft Policies

Please provide your comments on policies currently proposed for revisions or rescissions, or new policies. Policies are open for public comment for a minimum of 21 days between the First Reading and the Second Reading, when a adopt the policy.

Email *

[REDACTED]

Name *

Sylvia McGauley

Email *

[REDACTED]

Your School Community *

Buckman

Do you provide permission to post your comments on the PPS website? *

- ☒ Yes, with name
- ☐ Yes, without name
- ☐ No. Share only with Board and District staff

Policy you are providing comment on *

Other (Please indicate which policy in the comments section below)



Please provide your comments below *

I urge you to vote against the proposed policy change which would allow JROTC into PPS high schools. Although I am a Portland resident, I taught for many years in a school with a JROTC program (Reynolds HS in Troutdale, OR). I witnessed first-hand the on-campus weapons training and regular drill practice and countless other problems detailed below. In fact, one of our students honed his marksmanship skills in the JROTC classroom and then, with a guitar case full of guns and ammunition, proceeded to attempt a mass shooting in our school on June 10, 2014. Tragically, two students died that day, and a teacher was injured by a bullet. Guns and military training simply do not belong in our schools.

I urge to read the following information. It comes from years of ongoing research and personal experience. I look forward to your response.

The Junior Reserve Officer Trainings Corps (JROTC) was originally developed under the National Defense Act of 1916 as a tool to recruit and train young people to increase U.S. readiness in the face of World War I. In the 1990s, the program experienced rapid expansion, which continues to this day. The military courses are taught in high schools by retired military personnel and are a highly successful recruiting and public relations tool for the military. As William Cohen, then Secretary of Defense, said in 2000, "JROTC is one of the best recruiting devices that we could have."

Financially, JROTC is a net loss for school districts. PP is facing a \$30 million budget shortfall. Staff will be laid off and programs cut. JROTC is actually a costly program for districts. While schools may take on a JROTC unit hoping to gain resources, in fact, JROTC drains resources from other educational programs because of the unequal cost-sharing formula and a requirement that at least twice as many JROTC instructors be hired than are normally needed to support the number of students in the program. There are also costs to the school district for special equipment and facilities requirements of the program. (See addendum 1)

The JROTC instructor's salary is determined by a complicated formula based on what each JROTC teacher's active-duty military salary would be, minus his or her military retirement pay. Half of this difference is the maximum amount the DoD will pay the school district. The district then pays the rest even if the instructor's final pay outpaces the salaries of experienced educators in that district. Furthermore, the district must pay for all the normal benefits and employer-paid taxes that it provides for other teachers, with no DoD help. (See Addendum 1)

JROTC teachers are not certified in the same way as other school district teachers. In some states they are not required to have more than a GED. The military decides who is qualified to be a JROTC instructor and then presents them to the school district for hiring. In Oregon, according to TSPC, they are only required to have a Bachelors' Degree and pass a test about diversity in Oregon history. Additionally, they must meet the Pentagon's requirements, which includes a minimum of 15 years of military experience. There is no requirement to take classes in education or teaching methodology or have a basic or standard teachers' license.

JROTC personnel have been convicted of sexual harassment and abuse at a disproportionately higher rate than trained non-JROTC teachers according to both the Military Times and the New York Times. a New York Times investigation — which included an examination of thousands of court documents, investigative files and other records obtained through more than 150 public disclosure requests — has found that the program has repeatedly become a place where retired military officers prey on their teenage students.

In the past five years, The Times found, at least 33 J.R.O.T.C. instructors have been criminally charged with sexual misconduct involving students, far higher than the rate of civilian high school teachers in jurisdictions examined by The Times. Many others have been accused of misconduct but never charged. (Mike Baker, New York Times, July 7, 2022.)

In November 2022, "Defense Department officials confirmed the number of substantiated allegations of sexual abuse since 2017 was nearly double that, at 58. Several other allegations are still pending." (Leo Shane III and Davis Winkie, Military Times, Nov. 16, 2022) It is irresponsible to subject our students this potential danger.

There is no evidence that JROTC helps keep students in school, as some have claimed. The statistics cited by the JROTC program have been incomplete and offer no evidence that the program reduces the number of students leaving school before graduation. Rather, many of the other programs that schools are cutting—like music, arts, counseling, library staffing and specific programs designed to keep students in school—reach more students and are more effective in motivating them to stay in school. Even when districts permit JROTC students to receive CTE credit, they are no more likely to graduate than students who complete other CTE programs. (Statistically, there is about a 10% increase in graduation rates for students who complete any CTE program, including JROTC programs that have been classified as CTE programs.)

JROTC is not Career and Technical Education (CTE). According to the ODE website, "CTE programs use 21st century technology to support students in acquiring technical skills, professional practices, and academic knowledge critical for career success in high-wage, in-demand careers."

None of these high-wage, in-demand career areas include drill, shooting practice and shooting competitions, and military training. Nor should they. Beyond the military, JROTC instructors simply are not qualified to provide technical training for any civilian career, including careers in "Law, Public Safety, and Security Programs of Study" – part of the Human Resources Cluster. For students interested in this area, training by licensed and experienced attorneys, social workers, and law enforcement professionals would provide our students with broader and more equitable and relevant learning opportunities. Even if the school district says they want the JROTC program to include presentations by professionals in civilian security and public safety programs, the overall curriculum and allocation of time devoted to various elements of the curriculum, as well as curricular materials such as textbooks, are still under the control of JROTC.

The military is not an economically viable career. According to a recent Military Times article by Retired U.S. Army Maj. Gen. John G. Ferrari, a senior nonresident fellow at the American Enterprise Institute think tank, most fast-food workers in California make about 18% more than an Army E-3 or E-4 enlistee with less than 2 years' experience. Additionally, the Blue Star Families' Annual Military Family Lifestyle Survey revealed that the likelihood of military families to recommend the military has dropped significantly. In 2023 only 32% of active-duty family respondents were likely to recommend military enlistment.

Regardless of the public relations materials, JROTC is designed as a pipeline for enlistment in the U.S. military, not as a conduit for "career success in high-wage, in-demand careers."

Is this really the kind of career option we want to promote for our students? By installing JROTC programs in our schools, we give the military not only a cloak of legitimacy, but a signal of approval. We send our students and their families the message that military enlistment is a worthy choice for our students' growth and development and success in the world. The statistics show otherwise.

Most JROTC programs occur in schools in working class or impoverished schools and communities, which, due to structural racism in our society, have a higher percentage of students of color. Officially, JROTC is not considered a recruiting tool by the Department of Defense (DoD), but the DoD encourages the relationships between JROTC instructors and military recruiters. Despite the DoD's claim, more than 50% of JROTC cadets with two or more years of JROTC experience join the military as enlisted personnel. More often than not, those schools are also predominately populated by youth of color. Most affluent families do not

choose the risks of military enlistment as an option. Therefore, recruiters and JROTC programs rarely appear in more affluent schools. (JROTC requires a minimum number of enrolled students, and more affluent schools struggle to meet that minimum without forced enrollment in the program.) If such programs are not good enough or safe enough for the privileged in our society, is it equitable to promote them for the poor and disenfranchised? (See Addendum 2)

JROTC is not leadership training. While our schools focus on teaching students to develop critical thinking and democratic leadership skills, and how to resolve conflicts through democratic and nonviolent means such as restorative justice and peer mediation, the JROTC practices and teaches a top-down command structure in which students are taught to give and obey orders according to rank and without question. In my high school, I observed a JROTC instructor teaching students to close ranks and boldly lie when faced with unwanted questions and critique.

The JROTC leadership model requires students to lead and practice drills. Non JROTC teachers complain about JROTC students out on the field or in the hallways and common areas with no staff supervision.

JROTC is such an effective recruitment tool that one Dept. of Defense official told Congress that the proportion of JROTC graduates who enlist is "roughly five times greater than the proportion of non-JROTC students." This aspect of the program may not be apparent to administrators since many JROTC students who join the military do so after leaving high school. (See Addendum 3)

JROTC curricula, including the textbooks, are created by the Pentagon, which contracts with Pearson Publishers. The local school district has no control over their content. The local school district does not review materials for content appropriateness, accuracy, and conformity to academic standards. The texts contain numerous inaccuracies and distortions. JROTC teachers aren't required to have a college degree and rarely have credentials to teach many of the subjects the curriculum covers—e.g., history, civics, literacy skills such as reading and writing and speech, political science, etc. JROTC propagandizes students—A review of JROTC materials reveals that students are being presented with a one-sided, partisan view of political and historical events. Schools have an educational, moral and legal responsibility to refrain from giving support to only one side in such controversies.

JROTC includes weapons training and contradicts school-based initiatives that encourage students to settle disputes nonviolently. At a time when schools across the country are employing a variety of methods, such as restorative justice and peer mediation, to curb incidents of violence in the schools, create safe learning environments, and teach peaceful means of conflict resolution, JROTC's introduction of weapons training, its partnership with the NRA to sponsor marksmanship matches, and its modeling of top – down militaristic solutions to problems contradict the schools' stated opposition to violence.

Critics have been successful in getting JROTC to discontinue the use of live weapons in schools on a national level, but units continue to use air rifles, which use lead shot, for target practice on school grounds. At Reynolds High School in Troutdale, Oregon, the shooting range was inside one of the JROTC's classrooms. The school shooter at Reynolds HS in 2014 honed his marksmanship skills in RHS's JROTC program. Weapons have no place in school.

JROTC does not comply with trauma-informed policy. Too many Portland students and / or their families and friends have been victims of gun violence. Many of our refugee students have experienced the violence of war. Having guns and marksmanship training on campus could too easily trigger PTSD in students.

JROTC is not Wellness / Physical Education. JROTC instructors are not trained physical education / wellness teachers.

JROTC can limit students' chances of getting into college and vocational education programs. JROTC is not an "academic" subject and unlike subjects like math and foreign languages, JROTC credits are not counted towards entrance requirements for many state universities and colleges. Students in some states can hurt their chances for college acceptance if they waste their time in JROTC classes instead of taking academic electives. In states like California, JROTC grades are excluded when computing grade point average for student aid eligibility.

Although students never should be coerced or tracked into JROTC classes, in some districts, students are involuntarily enrolled in JROTC, or it is offered as an alternative to real Wellness / P.E. classes, taught by trained teachers, or required Career Technical Education (CTE) classes taught by trained practitioners in various fields. JROTC should always be voluntary.

The school district should never allow JROTC to fulfill core requirements like P.E. or CTE courses. JROTC is not college / vocational prep, and as school districts divert precious resources to JROTC's needs for FTE, space in the schedule, and classroom real estate, it robs students of equitable opportunities to access classes which truly prepare them for post-secondary education and training programs.

In 2010, San Diego Unified School District shut down the JROTC program at Mission Bay H.S. after students argued that the program interfered with students' opportunities to take academic coursework and therefore limited their ability to access 4-year colleges after high school.

The college benefits offered to cadets (i.e., ROTC scholarship money and possible military academy appointments) require them to join the military. Students are promised that if they join JROTC—which does not count for most college admissions—for at least three years, they can enlist in the ranks at a slightly advanced pay grade.

JROTC is military training and does not belong in our public educational system. The military is not in the business of being altruistic. The sole mission of the United States military is to prepare for and fight wars. All military programs – recruitment programs, JROTC, ROTC, ASVAB test, military partnerships with schools, research and development programs – are designed as tools for fulfilling this goal. In a free country, our students should have the option of becoming a part of this mission when they graduate, should they so choose. However, our schools must teach and encourage students to make fully informed choices. Unfortunately, due in part to the fact that their job security relies on meeting certain enlistment quotas, military recruiters and JROTC personnel are notorious for not disclosing the whole truth and for making promises – verbally and in writing – that can be broken at any time. As educators, it is our duty to insist on a system of full disclosure. It is our duty to not embrace a program that uses propaganda and coercion to push young and vulnerable youth to make life altering decisions before they have even reached adulthood. When our students enlist in the military, they lose their constitutional rights. Rather they are governed by the Uniform Code of Military Justice – UCMJ. When our students sign the military contract, they agree, usually unknowingly, to do what is ordered of them, regardless of promises, written or oral, that recruiters made.

FOR ALL ENLISTEES OR REENLISTEES:

b. Laws and regulations that govern military personnel may change without notice to me. Such changes may affect my status, pay, allowances, benefits, and responsibilities as a member of the Armed Forces REGARDLESS of the provisions of this enlistment/reenlistment document.

c. In the event of war, my enlistment in the Armed Forces continues until six (6) months after the war ends, unless my enlistment is ended sooner by the President of the United States. [Source: see U.S. Military Enlistment / Reenlistment Document, Part C, Section 9b, 9c]

When our students enter the military, they too often become cannon fodder subject to high-risk situations

which all too frequently cause lifelong trauma and mental and physical disability, if not death. As Michael Eschete, former marine, who testified at a Student Success Committee meeting in December, noted in an interview with the Oregonian, a significantly high percentage of unhoused persons are vets suffering from PTSD. Evidence shows that domestic violence and high suicide rates are especially prevalent in households with veterans. "Through Central City Concern and the Portland Rescue Mission, where he also works as a volunteer, he began to recognize that veterans make up a stubborn subset of the homeless or at-risk population. Now fifty, he's beginning to see veterans of the new wars show up on the streets. He says he's talked to young veterans who came home, changed by war and eventually wore out their welcomes with parents, spouses or friends. They've burned through their cash, have trouble holding a job and have dwindling options."

When our students of color enter the military, they face insidious racism which leads to a disproportionate majority of officers being white, while most people of color remain cannon fodder. See: Cohen, Zachary and Boschma, Jani. CNN. "Military data reveals dangerous reality for black service members and veterans" Sun June 14, 2020 Military data reveals dangerous reality for black service members and veterans | CNN Politics Do you really want to promote JROTC, with its goal of military enlistment, as a career pathway, for our students?

Sincerely,
Sylvia McGauley

Some questions to ask about JROTC units and JROTC military academies:

How much will the school district spend this next year on JROTC? How much will it spend in future years?

How much is the military funding the program? Will the military's share decrease over time?

Will other elective programs and student services experience budget cuts (e.g. social studies electives, music, sports, P.E., CTE, art, career guidance, counseling, school nurses, bus transportation)?

Will other programs be displaced?

Will JROTC textbooks be reviewed in the same way as other new curricula? Does the curriculum meet school district and state academic standards?

Will the JROTC curriculum, including the textbooks, be reviewed by the local school district for content appropriateness, accuracy, and conformity to educational standards? When? And what will be the process and timeline for doing so?

How do licensure requirements for military instructors compare to those for other teachers? Are military instructors "highly qualified" under NCLB?

If the program is touted as appropriate for "at-risk" youth, who can participate? Will the program be closed to students who do not meet minimum standards for grades and behavior? Does it really target those youth most at risk?

Do students with special educational requirements and students with physical disabilities and immigrant students without papers have full access to the program?

Can openly gay and lesbian students access the college benefits offered through the program?

Do the hiring practices of the U.S. military conform to nondiscrimination policies of the school district, since the school district cannot choose the instructor who they employ (especially hiring of women, gays and lesbians, immigrants)?

Are JROTC facilities comparable to those available to other classes? If there are special facilities, are they available to non-JROTC students?

How does the JROTC unit conform to the school district's military recruitment policy? Are options besides the military promoted equally?

Will there be lead abatement for the on campus shooting ranges?

Sources:

Baker, Mike. "I felt Trapped': Sexual Abuse of Teens in the Military's JROTC Program" New York Times, July 9, 2022. <https://www.nytimes.com/2022/07/09/us/sexual-abuse-jrotc.html>

Baker, Mike. "Military Acknowledges More Sexual Abuse in J.R.O.T.C. Programs" New York Times, November 16, 2022. <https://www.nytimes.com/2022/11/16/us/jrotc-sexual-abuse-house-oversight.html>

Baker, Mike and Nicholas Bogel-Burroughs. "J.R.O.T.C. Textbooks Offer an Alternative View of the World," New York Times, December 11, 2022. <https://www.nytimes.com/2022/12/11/us/jrotc-textbooks.html>

Baker, Mike and Nicholas Bogel-Burroughs and Ilana Marcus. "Thousands of Teens Are Being Pushed Into Military's Junior R.O.T.C." New York Times, Published Dec. 11, 2022; Updated June 20, 2023. <https://www.nytimes.com/2022/12/11/us/jrotc-schools-mandatory-automatic-enrollment.html>

Blue Star Military Families' Lifestyle Annual Survey, 2023.

Cohen, Zachary and Boschma, Jani. CNN. "Military data reveals dangerous reality for black service members and veterans" Sun June 14, 2020 Military data reveals dangerous reality for black service members and veterans | CNN Politics

Congressional Research Service. Defense Primer: Junior Reserve Officers' Training Corps (JROTC), December 15, 2021. CRS Reports ([congress.gov](https://www.congress.gov))

Department of Defense. Title 10, US Code Section 2031; DODI 1203.15; AR 145-2; CCR 145-2; Contract Department of Defense. JROTC Education Briefing. (December 2009)

Department of Defense. JROTC, "What's New?" Brochure (2009)

Department of Defense. Department of Defense Instruction 1205.13, JUNIOR RESERVE OFFICERS TRAINING CORPS (JROTC) PROGRAM (February 6, 2006) [Note: As of February 20, 2011, no changes have been issued to DoDI 1205.13.]

Ferrari, John G., U.S. Army Maj. Gen. (ret.). Military Times, March 19, 2023. "Fast food or the military? Recruiting solutions overlook the obvious" <https://www.militarytimes.com/opinion/2024/03/19/fast-food-or-the-military-recruiting-solutions-overlook-the-obvious/>

Shane III, Leo, and Davis Winkie. Military Times, November 16, 2022. "Sexual misconduct in JROTC programs higher than previously reported" <https://www.militarytimes.com/news/pentagon-congress/2022/11/16/sexual-misconduct-in-jrotc-programs-higher-than-previously-reported/>

United States Military Enlistment / Reenlistment Document

Jahnkow, Rick. "How JROTC Contributes to the School Funding Crisis." Project YANO. (January 2010)

McGauley, Sylvia. "The Military Invasion of My High School: The Role of JROTC" Rethinking Schools, Vol. 29, No. 1, Fall 2014. <https://rethinkingschools.org/articles/the-military-invasion-of-my-high-school/>

Stafford, et.al. Deep-rooted racism, discrimination permeate US military. AP News. May 27, 2021 <https://apnews.com/article/us-military-racism-discrimination-4e840e0acc7ef07fd635a312d9375413>

Project YANO (Project on Youth and Non-military Opportunities). 2020 JROTC Textbook Report.

Schwab, Janine. AFSC National Youth & Militarism Program. (July 2009)

Addenda:

1. How JROTC is a net drain on civilian school funds:

(For further documentation, see

https://www.usarmyjrotc.com/jrotc/dt/5_EstProg/ProgramInformation.html, JROTC Education Briefing and JROTC White Paper April 2010)

Under the standard JROTC contract, the Department of Defense provides students with books, uniforms and special equipment such as pellet rifles. The school district must provide insurance, building facilities and maintenance, and must assume responsibility for paying instructors' salaries and all the normal

employment taxes and benefits that cover regular teachers. JROTC instructors must be retired military officers approved by their military branches. They are not required to meet the same qualifications as other teachers.

The school district receives from the DoD only a partial contribution toward instructors' salaries and nothing toward the substantial cost of employment taxes and benefits. The subsidy amount for each instructor is calculated based on the military pay and housing allowance the officer would receive on active duty, minus his or her military retirement pay. This difference is then cut in half and the result is the maximum amount the DoD will pay the school district.

Public and private educational institutions apply for JROTC units and commit to share costs and meet standards.... Services reimburse schools for a percentage of instructor pay and provide uniforms, equipment, and an accredited and rigorous curriculum. (Source: JROTC White Paper April 2010 and Congressional Research Service. Defense Primer: JROTC, 2021.

- ☐ Instructor Pay - 05 retired w/ 20 yrs AFS
- ☐ BP + BAS + BAH (5000 + 170 + 1300) = 6470
- ☐ Minus Retired Pay (50% of BP at 20 yrs) = 2500
- ☐ Equals MIP (6470 - 2500 = 3970)
- ☐ MIP x 50% (3970 x 50% = 1985 (Army reimburses the school))

(Source: JROTC Education Briefing

https://www.usarmyjrotc.com/jrotc/dt/5_EstProg/ProgramInformation.html)

The JROTC contract requires the hiring of a minimum of two retired officers (one a non-commissioned officer) for the first 150 students enrolled as cadets at a school. After 150, another instructor must be hired for each additional increment of 100 cadets (e.g., three instructors for 151-250).

A minimum of 100 cadets in grades 9 – 12 organized into a chain of command make up a JROTC unit. Two instructors, normally consisting of one retired officer (the Senior Army Instructor, or SAI) and one noncommissioned officer (the Army Instructor or AI) teach a rigorous curriculum and supervise cadets in all their activities. Additional staffing may be authorized for enrollments above 150 cadets. Services reimburse schools for a percentage of instructor pay and provide uniforms, equipment, and an accredited and rigorous curriculum.

(Source: JROTC White Paper April 2010)

It's important to note that only one (or less) non-JROTC classroom teacher would normally be hired to teach 150+ students. Furthermore, JROTC cadets are generally allowed by schools to take the class in place of physical education, and a single PE teacher would normally support 250+ students. So if JROTC were eliminated in a school district, less than half as many teachers would need to be hired to replace them. In other words, to have JROTC, a school district must more than double the staff normally required for the number of students involved. Because the federal subsidy amount will likely cover less than half the total salaries and none of the employment taxes or benefits for two (or more) JROTC instructors at each school, schools wind up using extra money from their budgets to, in effect, subsidize a high school military training/recruiting program for the Pentagon.

For example, when Air Force JROTC was introduced at Vista High School in Vista, California, the projected net cost to the district for two JROTC instructors to teach 95 cadets was:

Salary, plus taxes and benefits \$79,386

Federal subsidy -28,305

Net JROTC expense 51,081

In comparison, one PE teacher was allocated for an average of 250 students at Vista HS, therefore .38 of one PE teaching position would have been required for those 95 cadets. The total cost for that portion of a PE teaching position, including taxes and benefits, was \$52,250 x .38 = \$19,855.

The projected net loss to the Vista school district was:

Net JROTC expense \$51,081

Net cost for .38 PE allocation -19,855

Net loss of funds 31,226

(Data source: Vista Unified School District)

While it is certain that the numbers for salaries and benefits have increased since 1995, the basic formula for calculating the true cost of JROTC is the same today: determine the total net cost for all JROTC staff and subtract the total net cost for alternative teaching staff needed to support the number of students in JROTC. The difference will reveal how much additional money would be freed up for other uses if JROTC were cut from the district's budget.

School board members are often given budget summaries from district staff that include the net cost for JROTC, but without the critical comparison to the cost for substituting JROTC with classes like PE or other electives that meet graduation requirements. This makes it difficult for them to make fully informed decisions about which programs to eliminate when they need to make budget cuts.

According to JROTC Education Briefing

[https://www.usarmyjrotc.com/jrotc/dt/5_EstProg/ProgramInformation.html],

the school must provide:

- Credit for coursework
- Classrooms (including desks/tables), office space (including desks, cabinets, etc.), storage, telecommunications, drill area
- Partial instructor salaries
- Like benefits for instructors and students (teacher / student parody).

The Army provides:

- Educational / audiovisual materials
- Classroom equipment
- Student textbooks, curriculum guides, instructor materials
- Unit support and maintenance funding
- Uniforms and organizational equipment (though sometimes students are required to contribute to the costs of uniforms)
- Special team equipment (Color Guard, Drill Teams, Marksmanship Teams)
- Partial instructor salary reimbursement

[Title 10, US Code Section 2031; DODI 1203.15; AR 145-2; CCR 145-2; Contract]

2. By law, participating host schools are required to maintain participation levels of 10% of the student body, or 100 students, whichever is less. The military departments establish criteria for unit placement. For example, the Army maintains an Order of Merit List, based on a point system that awards credit to institutions for categories such as Title I status under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (P.L. 89-10, as amended), local indicators of need (e.g., high unemployment or illiteracy), student enrollment, school financial solvency, and fair and equitable distribution of JROTC programs among states.

3. Documenting the way JROTC has been used as a recruiting tool, Memorandum #50 (1999), from U.S. Army Cadet Command, ordered JROTC instructors to help the military recruit students into the Army. A more recent memorandum dated Oct. 6, 2008 rescinded Policy Memorandum #50. However, it is important to note that for years prior to the issuance of Memorandum #50, and during the nine years it was in effect, proponents of JROTC continuously claimed it was not a recruiting program. Memorandum #50 was not, in fact, the only proof of JROTC's recruiting function. For example, DoD officials have repeatedly boasted of its success as a recruiting tool in testimony given to Congress. The rescission of Memorandum #50 does not change this.

This form was created inside of Portland Public Schools.

Google Forms

Public Comment on Draft Policies

Please provide your comments on policies currently proposed for revisions or rescissions, or new policies. Policies are open for public comment for a minimum of 21 days between the First Reading and the Second Reading, when a adopt the policy.

Policy you are providing comment on *

Revision: Junior Reserve Officer Training Corps and Military Careers 6.20.043-P (Formerly Military Recruitment) ▼

Do you provide permission to post your comments on the PPS website? *

- ☒ Yes, with name
- ☐ Yes, without name
- ☐ No. Share only with Board and District staff

Name *

Alison Taylor

Email *

[REDACTED]

Your School Community *

Rose City Park Elementary

Please provide your comments below *

My son is going to be in 3rd grade next year. Right now, his class has 32 students. Third grade is arguably the most important year for students. A study by the Annie E Casey Foundation found that “the ability to read by third grade is critical to a child’s success in school, life-long earning potential and their ability to contribute to the nation’s economy and its security.” Gail Robinson writes, “being at grade level is meaningful at any age, but third grade is the crucial year when students make the leap from learning to read to reading to learn.” For seasoned educators, we know and are reminded of how this year can be a predictor of fortunate or unfortunate future consequences.

If the district okays funding for a JROTC program instead of making sure that there is adequate classroom staffing, it shows a commitment to raising soldiers over critical thinkers. Creating rule followers over visionaries. And while I am a good rule follower, I think this world needs a visionary over someone to accept their role and obey commands.

I do think participation in the armed forces can help many young adults. But if we're facing a budget shortfall and it's the US Army over teachers, I will choose teachers every time.

As the quote goes: “It will be a great day when our schools have all the money they need, and our air force has to have a bake-sale to buy a bomber.”— Robert Fulghum

Thank you for your time.

This form was created inside of Portland Public Schools.

Google Forms

Public Comment Received via the Draft Policy Survey:

Revision: Junior Reserve Officer Training Corps and Military Careers 6.20.043-P

(Formerly Military Recruitment)

Received between April 19-22, 2024

--Permission to Post--

Nathalie Paravicini

Arletta and Franklin

My family and I are deeply opposed to military curriculum in schools. The federal government allocates over 53% of our taxes to the military industry, sucking resources off education and healthcare. We cannot and should spend ZERO resources on any further militarization of our education or economy, focusing instead on other much more pressing and productive educational opportunities such as vocational schools. That is what our legislators and educators need to focus on/.

This is all the more pressing because the challenges in the next 10-15 years will come from Climate Change and not from Russia. That our economy continues to rely on energy-intensive sectors like the military is beyond absurd; it can only be explained by greed and lack of vision/spine to change the status quo.

Why isn't the military recruiting and targeting private schools? Instead, the military is targeting public schools, particularly in poor and BIPOC communities to recruit "cannon fodder" with glossy promises.

Recruiters - if allowed to recruit at all which we are firmly opposed to - must be REQUIRED by contract to spend EQUAL TIME and SPACE on displays outlining the promises AND the costs and dangers of military service, with photos and data showing success rate and health status of former military personnel in every day life.

They must be required to spend equal time mentioning economic and social advancement AND death, injuries, fighting, battles, weapons, violence, killing, being killed, PTSD, sexual assault, toxins, exposure, torture, soldiers' and former soldiers' poverty, US militarism or foreign policy. It is well known that a high percent of homeless and addicted people are former veterans. Not mentioning the costs is unethical and immoral.

My family and I are opposed to any space or resources being allocated to ROTC - it is completely counter to the purpose of schools in preparing students for the future.

That future will be all about making our economy less energy intensive and our population more civically engaged; not about obeying orders and committing acts of violence to control other people's resources. Climate Change will require action at home and not an empire.

Sylvia Hart-Landsberg

Maplewood, Robert Gray, Wells, Peninsula, Ockley, Roosevelt, Alliance

JROTC is a waste of funds. PPS could get way more power from dollars spent for our own teachers and counselors, for aides, mentors and tutors, for building maintenance, repair. And funds being so short, the Board should drop its attention to this inferior program and direct attention to the legislature, joining with other districts to press our representatives to raise more taxes in equitable ways.

Mike Hastie

Retired

I was an Army medic in Viet Nam. I was raised in the military, as my father was a career Army officer and World War II combat veteran. I was very patriotic throughout my early youth. When I came back from Viet Nam, I eventually realized the entire American war in Viet Nam was an absolute total profound lie. That realization completely dismantled my core belief system. The deepest long-lasting moral injury that I suffered from was Betrayal by my own government, or the Fatherland, who used me like a pawn in a deadly chess game for U.S. Corporate Profit. The war had absolutely nothing to do with freedom and democracy and stopping the spread of Communism. When I see the word W A R I see the words: "Wealthy Are Richer." The feeling of Betrayal is like being shot in the back with a rifle that has an American flag attached to it. I will say this very slowly: The United States Government committed mass murder in Viet Nam on a daily basis. It is the great truth that has great silence. The reason most people do not believe what I am saying is because whenever the truth threatens one's core belief system there is an urgent need to deny it reality. The last thing you want to do is introduce Junior ROTC into the Portland Public School system, and expose military culture into the lives of teenagers. The military has no accountability. They cover their lies as fast as they are committed. More Viet Nam veterans have committed suicide than were killed in Viet Nam. Two of my veteran friends committed suicide, and three other veterans I served with in Viet Nam did not die in Viet Nam, but as a result of being there. Because of my experiences in Viet Nam, over the course of the past 50 years, I have been admitted to three psychiatric facilities for severe PTSD symptoms, with suicidal ideation. Whenever the United States Government bombs another third world country for corporate profit, my PTSD symptoms are severely activated. Young boys' brains are deeply effected by early education and indoctrination into military training long before a boy's brain has matured. I know this because I was raised in the military, and I thought going to war for my country would be cool, the ultimate passageway to manhood. Once you see death up close, you finally realize that going to war is not cool. And, what you experience in war, has a profound impact on your family, especially if you get married and have children. Your PTSD is for life, and has to be monitored constantly. What I have written here is not unusual with most Viet Nam veterans I have met. In no way am I an aberration. I have met countless Viet Nam veterans who's story is the same as mine, or much worse. I have spoken to many Iraq and Afghanistan veterans who feel the same way I have described. All of this information, for the most part is unknown to the American public. According to VA statistics, 20 American veterans and active duty personnel commit suicide every single day. Rarely do I meet a war veteran who doesn't know a friend or acquaintance who has not committed suicide. The military is a closed system, and the military does its best to keep things very quiet within that closed system. If I were to write the worst things I know, people would emotionally struggle with the truth that is outside of their coping skills. Most people would say: "I don't believe it." And, they would do that to protect their own core belief system.

I will close with this: When politicians and the rich start sending their kids to war, I'll start believing in noble causes.

Mike Hastie

Army Medic Viet Nam

Retired R.N.

Mark Darienzo

Roseway Heights Middle School

I oppose JROTC in schools

Herscel Soles

Grant HS

Vice Chair Herman Greene's solution for the low graduation rates is the injection of Junior Reserve Officer Training Corp (JROTC) into high school curriculum. Mr. Greene refers to JROTC as an offer of a Career Path to those students who have poor attendance or are not on a path to graduate. The likely targets Jefferson, Roosevelt and Franklin, are the low income schools. Reserve Officer Training Corp (ROTC) is University Curriculum leading to a commission as an Officer in the military. Junior ROTC is military indoctrination and grooming that leads to enlistment in the military, an opportunity available with or without having JROTC in a resume.

The eligibility requirement for a JROTC instructor is to be "retired from the military." Having JROTC instructors in high schools provides recruiters access to students with their car salesman charm and integrity used to sell military benefits. Their presence also implies the righteousness of US foreign policy and approval of foreign policy by the school district.

Vietnam War, however, cost 58,000 lives with another 100,000 soldiers injured. This is a costly expense for a High School Diploma and a severe penalty for being poor.

Low graduation rates are a social problem which the military is incapable of resolving. The military solution is carried out with guns, grenades and bombs in missions executed by personnel trained to obey orders. The Mai Li Massacre is a grievous example of soldiers not trained in critical thinking.

JROTC has been presented as a bargain because we only have to pay for one instructor (a BOGO): Pay for one and get one free. In actuality, JROTC is pay for one get none because neither JROTC instructor is trained in education.

JROTC is an institution where students are given orders and some pass on the orders. This is not "leadership" training or good citizenship training but rather Fascism training, which is all too reminiscent of the Hitler Youth Movement.

I plead with you as a Board member to not treat students as expendable pawns to be funneled into the US killing machine. Do not kick the "low graduation rate" can down the road but act in the best interest of the students. Reject JROTC!

Public Comment Received via the Draft Policy Survey:

Revision: Junior Reserve Officer Training Corp and Military Careers 6.20.043-P

(Formerly Military Recruitment Policy)

Received between April 22-24, 2024

--Permission to Post--

Sylvia McGauley

Portland Resident

JROTC Fact Sheet.docx

1 / 2

FACTS ABOUT JROTC

JROTC is expensive.

It will cost the district money (a net monetary loss) at the same time PPS is cutting teachers, SPED, libraries and other critical programs. While school boards may take on JROTC units thinking they will gain resources, in fact, JROTC drains resources from other educational programs because of the unequal cost-sharing formula and a requirement that at least twice as many JROTC instructors be hired than are normally needed to support the number of students in the program. U.S. Code 10 dictates that there be two full-time JROTC instructors for up to 150 students. After 150, another full-time instructor must be hired for each increment of 100 students. In other words, while most classroom teachers have upwards of 180 students, and P.E. teachers even more, JROTC requires three full-time instructors for between 150 and 250 students.

Furthermore, only the senior instructor must have a bachelor's degree; junior instructors merely need to pursue an associate degree within 5 years of employment.

U.S. Code 10, section 2031 dictates that school districts pay JROTC instructors the same rate as certified teachers plus benefits and employer taxes. The military branch reimburses the district according to a complicated formula based on what each JROTC teacher's active-duty military salary would be, minus his or her military retirement pay. Half of this difference is the maximum amount the DoD will pay the school district. The district then pays the rest even if the instructor's final pay outpaces the salaries of experienced educators in that district. The school district must also pay for special facilities requirements and special equipment.

How can PPS justify paying for a military program that teaches our students to shoot guns on campus while laying off teachers and cutting already underfunded programs such as SPED, libraries and the arts?

JROTC discriminates.

How can this board justify voting to fund a program that does not accept undocumented immigrant students, students who are not deemed “physically fit,” and students who are struggling academically and / or behaviorally? According to DOD Instruction 1205.13, all JROTC students must adhere to “acceptable standards of conduct,” as defined by the military branch, and be full-time students in good academic standing and on target for graduation within 4 years. Such requirements discriminate against our struggling students. JROTC violates PPS policy of nondiscrimination.

School Districts lose local control.

JROTC is controlled solely by the military branch and the Department of Defense; the school district has no say.

The school board cannot put band aids on JROTC to try to make it palatable. Once the district signs on the dotted line, you lose all local control. No number of guardrails can control it. The military branch must follow U.S. code and DOD Instructions. Under limited circumstances, a flexibility clause allows them to make certain changes regarding hiring and compensation, but, as in the military enlistment document, those promises can just as easily be broken at any time.

2 / 2

JROTC violates PPS district trauma- informed policy. (PPS 4.30.010-P)

Too many Portland students and / or their families and friends have been victims of gun violence. Many of our refugee students have experienced the violence of war. Having guns and marksmanship training on campus could too easily trigger PTSD in students.

JROTC teaches students to follow and give orders. It is not leadership training.

While our schools focus on teaching students to develop critical thinking and democratic leadership skills, as well as how to resolve conflicts through democratic and nonviolent means such as restorative justice and peer mediation, the JROTC practices and teaches a top-down command structure in which students are taught to give and obey orders according to rank and without question. In my high school, I observed a JROTC instructor teaching students to close ranks and boldly lie when faced with unwanted questions and critique.

The JROTC leadership model requires students to lead and practice drills. Non JROTC teachers regularly complain about JROTC students out on the field or in the hallways and common areas with no staff supervision.

Guns do not belong in schools.

How can this board justify teaching students to shoot guns on campus? 10 years ago, at Reynolds HS, just seventeen miles away, a JROTC student honed his marksmanship skills in the JROTC classroom and used those skills to mastermind a mass shooting on campus. Due to unforeseen circumstances, he was thwarted, but not before 2 students died and a brave teacher was shot and injured. The rest of us who were there that day were forever traumatized. Guns do not belong in schools.

JROTC teaches dogma.

JROTC curricula, including the textbooks, are created by the Pentagon, which contracts with Pearson Publishers. The local school district has no control over their content. The local school district cannot review materials for content appropriateness, accuracy, and conformity to academic standards. The texts contain numerous inaccuracies and distortions. JROTC teachers rarely have credentials to teach many of the subjects the curriculum covers—e.g., history, civics, literacy skills such as reading and writing and speech, etc. JROTC propagandizes students—A review of JROTC materials reveals that students are being presented with a one-sided, partisan view of political and historical events. For example, the authors of one current textbook claim that nonviolent civil disobedience, an integral strategy in the U.S. Civil Rights Movement, has no place in a democracy. Schools have an educational, moral, and legal responsibility to refrain from giving support to only one side in such controversies.

Michael Sonnleitner

PCC

Please vote a resounding NO on the JROTC agenda item. In statements (together with written Documents citing source) I have made to both the Board Policy Committee "JROTC is Not Compatible with CTE" and twice to the Student Success Committee "JROTC: Budget Bad & Low Demand" my comments should be quite clear. To vote Yes, even as part of a strategy to make JROTC more difficult to adopt in the future, is very problematical. Putting a foot in the door for some future Superintendent to possibly approve JROTC and placing hope in screening committees to recognize as correct the arguments I have documented, only leaves the door ready to be pushed open by political pressure or a patriotic emotional outpouring. Keep the door closed. VOTE NO.

Martin Hart-Landsberg

Ida B Wells

I strongly oppose the introduction of JROTC into the Portland Public School system.

Some claim that the program offers important benefits for some students, including leadership development. But the JROTC program uses teaching material that does not teach critical thinking skills and has not been approved by normal district procedures. And the classes are taught by teachers with no teaching background whose aim is to promote the military, not educate. How can that be beneficial for developing leadership abilities?

Some people claim that the program will help PPS with budgetary problems. But the program is far from free. It will not be long before PPS will have to pay costs that increase over time. And given that minimum student numbers must be maintained to sustain the program, it is likely that before long PPS will be forced to become a recruiter for the program.

More could be said, but this program is not what we need here in Portland. The school board should be working to get our state leaders to increase funding for meaningful educational opportunities for our students and working with teachers to ensure that they are well delivered.

JROTC is run by the military and for one primary reason—to recruit. Our public schools should not be used for recruiting young people into the military. Please do the right thing for the sake of our students.

Public Comment Received via the Draft Policy Survey:
Revision: Junior Reserve Officer Training Corps. and Military
Careers Policy 6.20.043-P (Formerly Military Recruitment)

Received between April 24-26, 2024

--Permission to Post--

Kristin Klotter
PPS, formerly Centennial School District and GBSD

I do not approve of the PPS school district allocating any state, district, or private money to JROTC. If students want to join the military, that is their prerogative, but there are free programs in place as they move toward graduation that offer them the support they need in that goal, without school districts spending precious dollars. Students still in high school are already recruited and mentored by their recruiters in their physical training and their studies without the district spending any money, so JROTC is unnecessary.

I want to emphasize the vulnerability of all children in our schools. As they are graduating, students who join the military make decisions largely based on the resources awarded to them (college scholarships and mentorship) often minimizing the very real fact that this means they could fight in wars overseas, killing people and even dying themselves. We need to protect their vulnerability by not allowing them to make decisions about joining the military even earlier in their childhood.

Not allowing JROTC into the schools will also protect the vulnerability and benefit our students (including those drawn to the military) by making sure the money that could be allocated to JROTC is instead allocated to other programs that will support students in graduating from high school and taking their next steps in life. This includes ensuring that creative students have sufficient access to classes in arts, hands-on students have access to classes in the trades, college bound students have access to class time during the school day to research and apply for colleges, FAFSA/ORSAA and scholarships, teachers have a second adult/EA in each class they teach to support all students but especially the ELL and SpED students, all students with mental health challenges have access to services in their schools — when they need it, Pregnant and Parenting students have access to childcare in the building in which they attend ... and the list of supports for all students, ALL of whom are vulnerable, goes on.

Please understand that students that are interested in the military already have the supports in place that they need in order to get into the military and into college. This is important — the supports for every branch of the military are already in place for high school students who choose that path and the supports are free to them and the district. What they, and every student really needs in this vulnerable time of their lives, is more opportunity to discover and practice their talents and skills while in high school, regardless of what next step they choose. Once you understand this, please turn your attention back toward programs that have been reduced or cut and to expanding programs that are already in place in order to improve on what is already there.

Teresa Osborne
Grant/Beaumont/Alameda/Sabin

I am not in favor of PPS adding JROTC. It is not free to a school district, and at a time when budget cuts are coming after existing programs, it seems unwise to add additional expenses. In addition, JROTC instructors are not trained teachers and do not have the same background as we expect all teaching staff to have. Students marching around campus in uniforms presents a different feel and is not appropriate for a school.

Students have all sorts of ways to access information about the military if they wish to join. It is not necessary for PPS to give the military an easy access point to recruit students into the armed forces- and you know that is the purpose of the JROTC program.



Field Trips, Foreign Travel, and Other Off-Campus Activities

The District believes in the value of experiences outside the classroom and endeavors to make these opportunities available to all. As in all other aspects of school life, PPS is committed to both the access to and the inclusivity of off-campus activities. In planning and authorizing off-campus activities, primary consideration shall be given to the educational outcomes derived, the safety and welfare of students involved, District expectations of conduct and behavior on the part of all participants, and the selection of appropriate adult supervision in accordance with Board Policy [5.10.064-P Professional Conduct between Adults and Students](#).

I. District-Sponsored Activities

Special activities outside the classroom are an important part of an educational experience. Students shall be allowed to participate in carefully planned learning experiences or co-curricular activities, which fall outside the normal school program, school day, and/or are off-campus when they serve a legitimate educational purpose. Off-campus activities should promote and not compromise the integrity and purpose of the District's educational programs. Plans for continuity of curriculum must be made for the off-campus activity and likewise for students remaining on campus. This policy applies to all off-campus activities, unless otherwise noted.

- 1) As authorized through this policy and Administrative Directives, the Superintendent's designees may authorize field trips and other extra-curricular activities involving travel off-campus when such activities contribute to educational goals.
- 2) District staff responsible for overseeing extended travel must notify building administrators in advance of the trip so that plans for continuity of curriculum and instruction can be assured for students remaining on campus. Those plans will be communicated to the school community and observed so that no disruption in curriculum or programming will occur for students remaining on campus.



Field Trips, Foreign Travel, and Other Off-Campus Activities

- 3) Schools and staff to submit field trip requests for review, and approval or denial, prior to any planned activities.
 - a. Principals shall have the authority to approve regular off-campus field trips, subject to Risk Management approval, occurring during the course of one school day.
 - b. All off-campus trips comprising more than one school day will be reviewed by Risk Management and approved by the supervising Area Assistant Superintendent.
 - c. Specific timelines, procedures, and requirements of this field trip approval process will be outlined in a related Administrative Directive.
- 4) All out-of-state and foreign travel shall require prior Board approval with the exception of travel up to 150 miles from the PPS headquarters.
- 5) In planning for off-campus activities, staff members must avoid factors that might prohibit student participation, including financial burden, as well as any hazards or barriers for students arising from discriminatory policies or practices in the destination or during transit based on race, religion, culture, gender orientation, sexual identity, or immigration status. Trips should be designed to promote healthy, safe, and inclusive experiences for all students, and consider the identified special needs and required accommodations of students with an Individualized Education Plan (IEP) and/or plans under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973. .
- 7) Both students and adult supervisors should be acquainted with and comply with relevant District policies, administrative directives, and other guidance, including the *PPS Student Responsibilities, Rights, and Discipline Handbook*, while representing the District. These expectations should be reviewed again by all students and staff prior to any extended off-campus activity.



Field Trips, Foreign Travel, and Other Off-Campus Activities

II. Non-School Sponsored Off-Campus Activities Must Clearly Indicate They Are Not Affiliated with the District

The unique professional status of District staff members may at times make it difficult for students and families to distinguish between school-sponsored off-campus activities from non-school privately sponsored off-campus activities. While working as PPS staff and/or representing PPS, District staff may not develop, plan, and/or supervise off-campus activities represented as "school, class, club, etc." other than what has been approved under this policy and the implementing administrative directives. In addition, District staff or other persons may not use District email, social media, hardcopy distribution to students, or other methods of District-controlled distribution that are not open to the general public to communicate to District students or families about private, non-school sponsored off-campus activities, without the pre-approval of the school building administrator and in adherence with PPS Disclaimer Requirement (11.1.a)

1) Travel Study Programs

Travel Study Programs are activities involving student travel that are planned, marketed, and conducted by organizations other than Portland Public Schools. Portland Public Schools does not fund, sponsor, or endorse any such programs.

- a) Disclaimer Requirements: Any information about travel study programs must include the following disclaimer: "Portland Public Schools does not fund, sponsor, or endorse this travel study program. The District is not responsible for conducting or supervising this trip. Portland Public School employees who participate in travel study programs are not acting in their capacity as District employees and do so at their own risk. Students participating in travel study programs do so at their own risk."
- b) Any information distributed about travel study programs cannot contain the name of the District or any Portland Public school.
- c) Distribution of information by travel study organizations must follow distribution guidelines in Board Policy 3.30.035-P Distribution of Materials and Information to Students and Administrative Directive 3.30.038-AD. Information distributed about



Board Policy

6.50.010-P

Field Trips, Foreign Travel, and Other Off-Campus Activities

travel study programs shall not be made through PPS email, without the pre-approval of the school-building administrator and in adherence with PPS Disclaimer Requirement (see 11.1.a).

- d) Travel study organizations must use the Civic Use of Buildings (CUB) procedures for informational/planning meetings after the school day. See Policy 3.30.010-P Community Use of School Buildings and Facilities and 3.30.011-AD Community Use of School Buildings and Facilities: Short-Term Use.

Legal References: ORS 332.107; ORS 336.183; ORS 339.155

Amended 9/2002, Amended 3/2019

Portland Public School District 1st Reading

DATE OF FIRST READING: April 02, 2024

PUBLIC COMMENT FOR Revision of Districtwide Advocacy and Fundraising 7.10.020-P (Formerly: Parent Groups And The Schools)

The Portland Public School District is providing Notice of Proposed Revised Policy and Public Comment to offer interested parties reasonable opportunity to submit data or comments on the proposed policies noted below.

Public comment may be submitted in writing directly to the district or through the district website noted below. Written comments must be submitted by 5:00pm on the Last Date for Comment listed below.

**Open for Comment until at least:
April 23, 2024**

Summary: **Districtwide Advocacy and Fundraising 7.10.020-P
(Formerly: Parent Groups And The Schools)**

1st Reading by: **Director Julia Brim-Edwards**
Portland Public School Board, Policy Committee Chair

Recommended for a 1st Reading by:
Portland Public Schools Board of Education, Policy Committee

Draft Policy Web Site: <http://www.pps.net/draftpolicies>

Contact: **Rosanne Powell, Senior Board Manager**
Address: P.O. Box 3107, Portland, OR 97208-3107
Telephone: 503-916-3741
E-mail: schoolboard@pps.net

Draft Policy Comment Form: <https://forms.gle/VqYbmVA36qqADj6n6>

Included in Packet**Page**

Draft Policy Redline (Amended 4/11/24*)

03

*4/11/24 Amendment to proposed draft policy highlighted in yellow

PROPOSED REVISION March 25, 2024 draft , Option #1

7.10.020-P Districtwide Advocacy and Fundraising ~~Parent Groups And The Schools~~

~~Parent groups functioning in various support and communications capacities have made important contributions to Portland schools. The Board recognizes that the assistance of parent organizations in cooperation with the schools is necessary and desirable to achieve the goals established for the schools. The school principals, supervising administrators and the office of the superintendent shall regard as an important aspect of their work cooperation with parent organizations in order to assure the most effective liaison between such organizations and the schools in behalf of good education for Portland children.~~

Parent and community-based organizations and individuals make important contributions to support PPS school communities and programs, as well as students and staff. Elements of that support include advocacy in support of PPS schools and fundraising to pay for a wide variety of activities and projects. This policy is designed to foster a spirit of community and shared purpose and facilitate collective impact on behalf of PPS students. Given our common mission and vision, the District encourages parents and community groups to advocate, fundraise and support improving the educational experience districtwide in alignment with our racial equity and social justice values.

Local School Foundations and school or program fundraising:

An inclusive districtwide foundation, designated by the Board of Education, shall serve as the districtwide advocacy and fundraising entity and serve as the fiscal agent for the Local School Foundations (LSFs).

Fundraising for Staff and Contracted Staff:

Effective July 1, 2024, donations for staff positions may be collected only by the designated districtwide foundation in a single, combined fund account. Donations shall be accepted from Local School Foundations, Independent School Foundations, nonprofits, corporations/businesses and individuals. A formula for the distribution of any funding to individual schools shall be developed in advance of the school year by a Parent Advisory Committee, shared with school administrators for feedback, and a recommendation made to the Board of Education for its approval.

(Donations for staff positions collected by Local School Foundations between July 1, 2023 and June 30, 2024, plus any carryover balances held in the associated grant accounts S0083, shall be expended in the 2024-2025 school year for staffing positions per donors' intent.¹)*

Registration and Reporting

All groups affiliated with PPS and individual schools or programs that fundraise \$20,000 or more in aggregated funds in a school year for PPS school-related activities are encouraged to register with the District by September 30 in the following school year, sharing their officer names and contact information,

The Board of Education shall receive annually a report at the end of the District's fiscal year sharing the districtwide foundation's donations, expenditures, and major projects.

¹ This language may be moved to the resolution.

Other Requirements

Entities that fundraise to support individual schools shall:

Provide ways for all members from the benefitting school or program who wish to participate in a fundraising event or activity to have an avenue to participate.

Shall not communicate, share, or maintain expected per-family or per-student fundraising targets.

Include and inform the broader school community about fundraising decision-making processes, especially including families for whom the educational equity programs are meant to benefit.

Adhere to District policies, administrative directives, and other requirements.

Other Provisions

For purposes of this policy, District and contracted staff includes all manner of contracted positions if the position compensation exceeds \$15,000 in a school year.

The designated district foundation shall have a Board of Directors of sufficient size given PPS's enrollment, and members should have diverse experience to support the activities of the foundation. ~~The Board members will be approved by the PPS~~

~~Board of Education.~~

Legal Reference: ORS 332 \07

History: Adpt 6/7\; Amd 9/9/02; BA 2422; Amd ____/20____Portland Public Schools

Page 1

Portland Public School District 1st Reading

DATE OF FIRST READING: April 02, 2024

PUBLIC COMMENT FOR Revision of Diploma Requirements Policy 4.20.042-P:

The Portland Public School District is providing Notice of Proposed Revised Policy and Public Comment to offer interested parties reasonable opportunity to submit data or comments on the proposed policies noted below.

Public comment may be submitted in writing directly to the district or through the district website noted below. Written comments must be submitted by 5:00pm on the Last Date for Comment listed below.

**Open for Comment until at least:
April 23, 2024**

Summary: **Revision of Diploma Requirements Policy 4.20.042-P**

1st Reading by: **Director Julia Brim-Edwards**
Portland Public School Board, Policy Committee Chair

Recommended for a 1st Reading by:
Portland Public Schools Board of Education, Policy Committee

Draft Policy Web Site: <http://www.pps.net/draftpolicies>

Contact: **Rosanne Powell**, Senior Board Manager
Address: P.O. Box 3107, Portland, OR 97208-3107
Telephone: 503-916-3741
E-mail: schoolboard@pps.net

Draft Policy Comment Form: <https://forms.gle/VqYbmVA36qqADj6n6>

Included in Packet	Page
Staff Report	03
Redlined Policy with Proposed Changes	05



PORTLAND PUBLIC SCHOOLS

OFFICE OF General Counsel

501 North Dixon Street / Portland, OR 97227

Telephone: (503) 916-3274

STAFF REPORT

Date: March 20, 2024

To: School Board

From: Mary Kane, Senior Legal Counsel

cc: Dr. Sandy Husk, Interim Superintendent
Liz Large, Contracted General Counsel

Subject: 4.20.042-P Diploma Requirements

BACKGROUND

The 2023 Oregon legislature enacted a number of changes to graduation requirements, including extending the pause on the essential skills requirement until 2027. Additionally, it now requires students, beginning with the class of 2027, complete .5 credits in Personal Financial Education and Higher Education and Career Path Skills to satisfy diploma requirements. Staff brought forward a proposed amended Diploma policy to the Policy Committee and then to the Student Success Committee with information on implementation plans. Upon its return to the Policy Committee on March 18, it was recommended that it go out to the full Board.

RELATED POLICIES/BEST PRACTICES

It is best practice to review policies regularly to determine whether they reflect current laws and practices. It is also a best practice to write policies that are readily understandable.

ANALYSIS OF SITUATION

The amendments to the policy should be adopted in order to align with state law and to be more accurate and comprehensible for our community. PPS staff consulted with ODE on certain changes, as well.

FISCAL IMPACT

These changes are not expected to have a material financial impact.

COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

Because these changes were driven by legislative directives, there was no stakeholder engagement.

TIMELINE FOR IMPLEMENTATION/EVALUATION and COMMUNICATION PLAN

Staff has already communicated to school administrators of the changes to diploma requirements. They are also developing guidance to be shared with staff and students.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the Board accept the respective revisions as recommended by the Policy Committee.

ATTACHMENTS

- A. Redline draft of Policy 4.20.042-P Diploma Requirements



BOARD POLICY

Diploma Requirements

4.20.042-P

k

Diploma requirements ~~are a significant indicator of~~ **reflect** the high expectations Portland Public Schools holds for every student. A student graduating from a Portland Public School District high school shall have completed all state requirements, as well as all **D**-district requirements specified here. The Board will establish graduation requirements for the awarding of a high school diploma, modified diploma, extended diploma, and alternative certificate ~~which~~ **that** meet or exceed state requirements.

I. High School Diploma Requirements

- A.** To earn a high school diploma from Portland Public Schools, the following credits and proficiencies are required.

Subject	Credits
Language Arts	4
Math (Algebra 1 and Above)	3
Science (Must include Scientific Inquiry and Lab Experiences as outlined in the standards)	3
Social Studies (including ½ credit of Civics beginning with the class graduating in 2026 and inclusive instruction in Tribal History/Shared History, Holocaust/Genocide, and Ethnic Studies)	3
Physical Education	1
Health Education	1
World Language (2 credits in same language)	2



BOARD POLICY

4.20.042-P

Diploma Requirements

Career and Technical Education, the Arts, or a third credit of World Language	3
Personal Financial Education (beginning with the class of 2027)	0.5
Higher Education and Career Path Skills (beginning with the class of 2027)	0.5
Electives	4
Total Credits	24



BOARD POLICY

Diploma Requirements

4.20.042-P

1. In addition to the above credit requirements, students must:
 - a. Develop a Personal Education Plan and build an education profile,
 - b. ~~Demonstrate Career Related Learning Standards,~~
 - c. ~~Complete~~ Participate in ~~two~~ Career Related Learning Experiences,
 - d. ~~Complete a Resume, and~~
 - e. Complete an Extended Application/~~My Plan Project~~.
2. World language credit may be awarded for a language course that teaches a language other than the student's primary language. The World Language definition is based both on the individual student's linguistic background and the standards/content coverage of the course.

B. ~~Credit Requirements:~~ ~~Requirements and procedures for awarding credit will be specified in an accompanying Administrative Directive approved by the Superintendent.~~

C. Proficiency credit: Proficiency credit will be awarded in accordance with State law and ~~d~~District guidelines.

D. If the District requires diploma requirements beyond the state requirements, the District shall grant a waiver for those requirements to any student who, at any time from grade 9 to 12, was:

1. A foster child;
2. Homeless;
3. A runaway;
4. A child in a military family covered by the Interstate Compact on Educational Opportunity for Military Children;
5. A child of a migrant worker; or
6. Enrolled in the Youth Corrections Education Program or the Juvenile Detention Education Program.

For any student identified above, the District shall accept any credits earned by the student in another district or public charter school, applying those credits toward the state requirements for a diploma if the credits satisfied those requirements in that district or public charter school.



BOARD POLICY

4.20.042-P

Diploma Requirements

E. Essential Skills:

Essential skills credit will be awarded in accordance with State law¹ and District guidelines.

1. The District allows English Language Learner (ELL) students to demonstrate proficiency in all required Essential Skills in the student's primary language.
2. The District will provide and administer Essential Skills assessments in the ELL student's primary language, and they will be scored by a qualified rater.
3. Students may appeal the denial of a diploma based on the Essential Skills graduation requirement through the Formal Public Complaint process found in 4.50.032-P. The District will retain student work samples and student performance data to ensure that sufficient evidence is available in the event of an appeal.

II. Modified Diploma Requirements

- A. A modified diploma will be awarded to students who have demonstrated the inability to meet the full set of academic standards established by the State Board of Education and the ~~Portland Public Schools~~ District's Board of Education for a diploma while receiving reasonable modifications and accommodations.
- B. To be eligible for a modified diploma a student must:
 1. Have a documented history of an inability to maintain grade--level achievements due to significant learning and instruction barriers; or
 2. Have a documented history of a medical condition that creates a barrier to achievement.
 3. Earn 24 credits between grade nine through the completion of high school, which shall include the following credits:

¹ The State of Oregon has suspended the Essential Skills requirement through the 2027-2028 school year.



BOARD POLICY

Diploma Requirements

4.20.042-P

Subject	Credits
Language Arts	3
Mathematics	2
Science (Must include Scientific Inquiry and Lab Experiences as outlined in the standards)	2
Social Studies (including ½ credit of Civics beginning with the class graduating in 2026)	2
Physical Education	1
Health Education	1
Career and Technical Education, the Arts, or World Language	1
Electives	12
Credits	24

4. In addition to the above credit requirements, students must:
- Develop a Personal Education Plan and build an education profile,
 - ~~Demonstrate Career Related Learning Standards,~~
 - ~~Complete~~ Participate in ~~two~~ Career Related Learning Experiences,
 - Complete a ~~resume and an~~ Extended Application,
 - ~~Complete an Extended Application/My Plan Project. Demonstrate proficiency in the Essential Skills with reasonable modifications and accommodations.~~

~~Requirements and procedures for awarding credit will be specified in an accompanying Administrative Directive approved by the Superintendent.~~



BOARD POLICY

4.20.042-P

Diploma Requirements

- C.** Proficiency credit may be awarded in accordance with State law and ~~D-~~district guidelines.
- D.** Students may earn units of credit through regular education with or without accommodations or modifications and through modified courses.

III. Extended Diploma Requirements

- A.** An extended diploma will be awarded to students who have met specific requirements established by the State Board of Education and have demonstrated the inability to meet the full set of academic standards even with reasonable accommodations and modifications.
- B.** To be eligible for an extended diploma a student must:
 - 1. Have participated in an alternate assessment beginning no later than grade six and lasting for two or more assessment cycles; or
 - 2. Have a serious illness or injury that occurs after grade eight, that changes the student's ability to participate in grade-~~le~~ level activities and that results in the student participating in alternate assessments; ~~or~~
 - 3. Have a documented history of an inability to maintain grade level achievement due to significant learning and instructional barriers; or
 - 4. Have a documented medical condition that creates a barrier to achievement.



BOARD POLICY

Diploma Requirements

4.20.042-P

5. Earn the following 12 credits between grade nine through the completion of high school:

Subject	Credits
Language Arts	2
Mathematics	2
Science	2
Social Studies	3
Physical Education	1
Health Education	1
Career and Technical Education, the Arts, or World Language	1
Credits	12

- ~~C. Requirements and procedures for awarding credit will be specified in an accompanying Administrative Directive approved by the Superintendent.~~

IV. Alternative Certificate Requirements

- A. Alternative certificates shall be awarded to students who meet the minimum requirements established by the ~~d~~District, but do not satisfy the requirements for a high school diploma, modified diploma, or extended diploma.
- B. An alternative certificate will be awarded based on a student's needs and achievement.



BOARD POLICY

4.20.042-P

Diploma Requirements

- C.** Requirements and procedures for awarding the certificate will be specified in an accompanying Administrative Directive approved by the Superintendent.
- D.** Beginning in grade five or beginning after a documented history to qualify for an alternative certificate, the District shall annually provide to the parents or guardians of the student, information about the availability and requirements of an alternative certificate.

V. Additional Information

A. Exceptions to PPS-specific Graduation Requirements

The Superintendent ~~shall~~ may grant exceptions to PPS diploma requirements in excess of State diploma requirements. The Superintendent will establish a Diploma Exceptions Committee to meet quarterly to consider these requests. The Superintendent will report annually to the Board on the number and nature of waivers granted for the school year.

B. Graduating in Less Than Four Years:

1. The ~~d~~District will award a diploma to a student fulfilling graduation requirements in less than four years upon the request of the student and, if required, the consent of the student's parent or guardian.

2. A student may satisfy the requirements for a modified diploma, an extended diploma or an alternative certificate in less than four years but not less than three years. To satisfy the requirements for a modified diploma, an extended diploma or an alternative certificate in less than four years, the student's parent or guardian or a student who is emancipated or has reached the age of 18 must provide written consent which clearly states the parent, guardian or student is waiving the fourth year and/or years until the student reaches the age of 21. A copy of the consent will be forwarded to the Superintendent who will annually report to the Superintendent of Public Instruction the number of such consents.

- C. Participation in Graduation:** All students who receive a high school diploma, modified diploma, extended diploma, or alternative certificate have the option of participating in a high



BOARD POLICY

4.20.042-P

Diploma Requirements

school graduation ceremony with the student's class unless the student is deemed ineligible due to discipline violations.

D. Issuance of Diplomas to Veterans: As specified in Oregon statute, the ~~ed~~District will issue a high school diploma, upon request, to a person who served in the Armed Forces if:

1. The person was discharged or released under honorable conditions, and
2. Has received either a General Education Development, a post-secondary degree, or has received a minimum score on the Armed Services Vocational Aptitude Battery, ~~and~~.
3. Resides within the boundaries of the ~~school ed~~District or is a resident of this state and attended a ~~District~~ high school ~~of the school district~~, and

4. Served in the Armed Forces during wartime or was physically present in areas designated as combat zones by the President of the United States, and
5. Did not graduate from a high school because the person was serving in the Armed Forces of the United States.

Legal Reference(s): ORS 329.095, ORS 329.451, ORS 332.107, ORS 332.114, ORS 339.115, ORS 343.295, OAR 581-021-0071, OAR 581-022-0615, OAR 581-022-1130, OAR 581-022-1210, OAR 581-022-1350,, HB 2061 (2009), HB 2507 (2009)

History; Adpt. 6/71; Amd. 10/72; Amd. 6/72; Amd. 5/76; Amd. 10/76; Amd. 2/84; Amd. 9/9/02, BA 2420; Amd and combined with 4.20.040-P Graduation 5-23-2005 (BA3313); Amd. 2/10; Amd 1/18; Amd 1/20; Amd __/22; Amd __/24



BOARD POLICY

Diploma Requirements

4.20.042-P

Diploma requirements are a significant indicator of the high expectations Portland Public Schools holds for every student. A student graduating from a Portland Public School District high school shall have completed all state requirements as well as all district requirements specified here. The Board will establish graduation requirements for the awarding of a high school diploma, modified diploma, extended diploma, and alternative certificate which meet or exceed state requirements.

I. High School Diploma Requirements

- A.** To earn a high school diploma from Portland Public Schools, the following credits and proficiencies are required.

Subject	Credits
Language Arts	4
Math (Algebra 1 and Above)	3
Science	3
Social Studies (including ½ credit of Civics beginning with the class graduating in 2026)	3
Physical Education	1
Health Education	1
World Language (2 credits in same language)	2
Career and Technical Education, the Arts, or a third credit of World Language	3
Electives	4
Total Credits	24



BOARD POLICY

4.20.042-P

Diploma Requirements

1. In addition to the above credit requirements, students must:
 - a. Develop a Personal Education Plan and build an education profile,
 - b. Demonstrate Career Related Learning Standards,
 - c. Participate in Career Related Learning Experiences,
 - d. Complete an Extended Application.

2. World language credit may be awarded for a language course that teaches a language other than the student's primary language. The World Language definition is based both on the individual student's linguistic background and the standards/content coverage of the course.

B. Credit Requirements: Requirements and procedures for awarding credit will be specified in an accompanying Administrative Directive approved by the Superintendent.

C. Proficiency credit: Proficiency credit will be awarded in accordance with State law and district guidelines.

D. If the District requires diploma requirements beyond the state requirements, the District shall grant a waiver for those requirements to any student who, at any time from grade 9 to 12, was:

1. A foster child;
2. Homeless;
3. A runaway;
4. A child in a military family covered by the Interstate Compact on Educational Opportunity for Military Children;
5. A child of a migrant worker; or
6. Enrolled in the Youth Corrections Education Program or the Juvenile Detention Education Program.

For any student identified above, the District shall accept any credits earned by the student in another district or public charter school, applying those credits toward the state requirements for a diploma if the credits satisfied those requirements in that district or public charter school.



BOARD POLICY

Diploma Requirements

4.20.042-P

E. Essential Skills:

Essential skills credit will be awarded in accordance with State law¹ and District guidelines.

- 1.** The District allows English Language Learner (ELL) students to demonstrate proficiency in all required Essential Skills in the student's primary language.
- 2.** The District will provide and administer Essential Skills assessments in the ELL student's primary language, and they will be scored by a qualified rater.
- 3.** Students may appeal the denial of a diploma based on the Essential Skills graduation requirement through the Formal Public Complaint process found in 4.50.032-P. The District will retain student work samples and student performance data to ensure that sufficient evidence is available in the event of an appeal.

II. Modified Diploma Requirements

- A.** A modified diploma will be awarded to students who have demonstrated the inability to meet the full set of academic standards established by the State Board of Education and the Portland Public Schools' Board of Education for a diploma while receiving reasonable modifications and accommodations.
- B.** To be eligible for a modified diploma a student must:
 - 1.** Have a documented history of an inability to maintain grade level achievements due to significant learning and instruction barriers; or
 - 2.** Have a documented history of a medical condition that creates a barrier to achievement.
 - 3.** Earn 24 credits between grade nine through the completion of high school, which shall include the following credits:

¹ The State of Oregon has suspended the Essential Skills requirement for the classes graduating in 2022, 2023, and 2024.



BOARD POLICY

Diploma Requirements

4.20.042-P

Subject	Credits
Language Arts	3
Mathematics	2
Science	2
Social Studies (including ½ credit of Civics beginning with the class graduating in 2026)	2
Physical Education	1
Health Education	1
Career and Technical Education, the Arts, or World Language	1
Electives	12
Credits	24

4. In addition to the above credit requirements, students must:
 - a. Develop a Personal Education Plan and build an education profile,
 - b. Demonstrate Career Related Learning Standards,
 - c. Participate in Career Related Learning Experiences,
 - d. Complete an Extended Application,
 - e. Demonstrate proficiency in the Essential Skills with reasonable modifications and accommodations.
- C. Requirements and procedures for awarding credit will be specified in an accompanying Administrative Directive approved by the Superintendent.



BOARD POLICY

Diploma Requirements

4.20.042-P

- D.** Proficiency credit may be awarded in accordance with State law and district guidelines.
- E.** Students may earn units of credit through regular education with or without accommodations or modifications and through modified courses.

III. Extended Diploma Requirements

- A.** An extended diploma will be awarded to students who have met specific requirements established by the State Board of Education and have demonstrated the inability to meet the full set of academic standards even with reasonable accommodations and modifications.
- B.** To be eligible for an extended diploma a student must:
 - 1. Have participated in an alternate assessment beginning no later than grade six and lasting for two or more assessment cycles; or
 - 2. Have a serious illness or injury that occurs after grade eight, that changes the student's ability to participate in grade level activities and that results in the student participating in alternate assessments.
 - 3. Have a documented history of an inability to maintain grade level achievement due to significant learning and instructional barriers; or
 - 4. Have a documented medical condition that creates a barrier to achievement.



BOARD POLICY

Diploma Requirements

4.20.042-P

5. Earn the following 12 credits between grade nine through the completion of high school:

Subject	Credits
Language Arts	2
Mathematics	2
Science	2
Social Studies	3
Physical Education	1
Health Education	1
Career and Technical Education, the Arts, or World Language	1
Credits	12

- C. Requirements and procedures for awarding credit will be specified in an accompanying Administrative Directive approved by the Superintendent.

IV. Alternative Certificate Requirements

- A. Alternative certificates shall be awarded to students who meet the minimum requirements established by the district, but do not satisfy the requirements for a high school diploma, modified diploma, or extended diploma.
- B. An alternative certificate will be awarded based on a student's needs and achievement.



BOARD POLICY

4.20.042-P

Diploma Requirements

- C.** Requirements and procedures for awarding the certificate will be specified in an accompanying Administrative Directive approved by the Superintendent.
- D.** Beginning in grade five or beginning after a documented history to qualify for an alternative certificate, the District shall annually provide to the parents or guardians of the student, information about the availability and requirements of an alternative certificate.

V. Additional Information

A. Exceptions to PPS-specific Graduation Requirements

- 1. The Superintendent shall grant exceptions to PPS diploma requirements in excess of State diploma requirements. The Superintendent will establish a Diploma Exceptions Committee to meet quarterly to consider these requests. The Superintendent will report annually to the Board on the number and nature of waivers granted for the school year.

- B. Graduating in Less Than Four Years:** The district will award a diploma to a student fulfilling graduation requirements in less than four years upon the request of the student and, if required, the consent of the student's parent or guardian.

- C.** A student may satisfy the requirements for a modified diploma, an extended diploma or an alternative certificate in less than four years but not less than three years. To satisfy the requirements for a modified diploma, an extended diploma or an alternative certificate in less than four years, the student's parent or guardian or a student who is emancipated or has reached the age of 18 must provide written consent which clearly states the parent, guardian or student is waiving the fourth year and/or years until the student reaches the age of 21. A copy of the consent will be forwarded to the Superintendent who will annually report to the Superintendent of Public Instruction the number of such consents.

- D. Participation in Graduation:** All students who receive a high school diploma, modified diploma, extended diploma, or alternative certificate have the option of participating in a high school graduation ceremony with the student's class unless the



BOARD POLICY

4.20.042-P

Diploma Requirements

student is deemed ineligible due to discipline violations.

E. Issuance of Diplomas to Veterans: As specified in Oregon statute, the district will issue a high school diploma, upon request, to a person who served in the Armed Forces if:

1. The person was discharged or released under honorable conditions, and
2. Has received either a General Education Development, a post-secondary degree, or has received a minimum score on the Armed Services Vocational Aptitude Battery.
3. Resides within the boundaries of the school district or is a resident of this state and attended a high school of the school district, and
4. Served in the Armed Forces during wartime or was physically present in areas designated as combat zones by the President of the United States and
5. Did not graduate from a high school because the person was serving in the Armed Forces of the United States.

Legal Reference(s): ORS 329.095, ORS 329.451, ORS 332.107, ORS 332.114, ORS 339.115, ORS 343.295, OAR 581-021-0071, OAR 581-022-0615, OAR 581-022-1130, OAR 581-022-1210, OAR 581-022-1350, HB 2061 (2009), HB 2507 (2009)

History; Adpt. 6/71; Amd. 10/72; Amd. 6/72; Amd. 5/76; Amd. 10/76; Amd. 2/84; Amd. 9/9/02, BA 2420; Amd and combined with 4.20.040-P Graduation 5-23-2005 (BA3313); Amd. 2/10; Amd 1/18; Amd 1/20; Amd 6/22

Portland Public School District 1st Reading

DATE OF FIRST READING: April 02, 2024

PUBLIC COMMENT FOR
Revision of
Junior Reserve Officer Training Corps and
Military Careers 6.20.043-P
(Proposed New Title. Formerly Military Recruitment)

The Portland Public School District is providing Notice of Proposed Revised Policy and Public Comment to offer interested parties reasonable opportunity to submit data or comments on the proposed policies noted below.

Public comment may be submitted in writing directly to the district or through the district website noted below. Written comments must be submitted by 5:00pm on the Last Date for Comment listed below.

Open for Comment until at least:
April 23, 2024

Summary: **Revision of the Junior Reserve Officer Training Corps and Military Careers Policy 6.20.043-P**
(Proposed New Title. Formerly Military Recruitment)

1st Reading by: **Director Julia Brim-Edwards**
Portland Public School Board, Policy Committee Chair

Recommended for a 1st Reading by:
Portland Public Schools Board of Education, Policy Committee

Draft Policy Web Site: <http://www.pps.net/draftpolicies>

Contact: **Rosanne Powell**, Senior Board Manager
Address: P.O. Box 3107, Portland, OR 97208-3107
Telephone: 503-916-3741
E-mail: schoolboard@pps.net

Draft Policy Comment Form: <https://forms.gle/VqYbmVA36qqADj6n6>

Included in Packet	Page
Staff Report	03
Redlined Policy with Proposed Changes	05



PORTLAND PUBLIC SCHOOLS

OFFICE OF General Counsel

501 North Dixon Street / Portland, OR 97227

Telephone: (503) 916-3274

Date: March 20, 2024

To: School Board

From: Mary Kane, Senior Legal Counsel
Christopher Brida, Director of Academic Programs CTE & AP/IB •
College and Career Readiness

cc: Dr. Sandy Husk, Interim
Superintendent Liz Large, Contracted
General Counsel

Subject: Staff Analysis Report to the Board

Policy # and Title: 6.20.043-P-P Military Recruitment (proposed new title Junior Reserve Officers Training Corps (JROTC) and Military Careers)

BACKGROUND

The Policy Committee introduced an amendment to the Military Recruitment Policy on February 12, 2024. The proposed language was again discussed at the committee's March 4 meeting and then approved on March 18 to go to the full Board for a First Reading.

RELATED POLICIES/BEST PRACTICES

The District has been focused on building a more robust CTE program for students and will include JROTC programming in its review of whether its inclusion in CTE curriculum is appropriate. CTE aims to provide access to career pathways that are conducive to student success. In creating the environment and conditions to do so, it is critical to consider the partners we engage with in this endeavor, recognizing that specific initiatives may require collaboration beyond the confines of traditional school structures.

ANALYSIS OF THE SITUATION

Any JROTC program must align seamlessly with established CTE standards and curriculum guidelines. This alignment encompasses integrating pertinent career pathways, fostering skills development, and adhering to industry standards within the JROTC curriculum. The JROTC program should be evaluated to determine the career avenues that are created for students and understand how the skills taught as part of

the JROTC program change student career trajectories across a diverse range of fields. Central to this analysis is the role of JROTC to complement academic learning and enrich students' overall educational experiences. This entails identifying opportunities for interdisciplinary integration and bridging JROTC activities with subjects like history, leadership, physical education, and technology. Further, ensuring accessibility and inclusivity of the JROTC program to all students, irrespective of background or career aspirations, is paramount. Strategies for recruiting and supporting diverse student populations, including historically underserved students and those with disabilities, must be a focal point of this work. Finally, establishing mechanisms for ongoing monitoring and evaluation of the JROTC program's effectiveness is indispensable. Data on student participation, academic performance, career outcomes, and engagement should inform continuous program enhancement and decision-making processes.

FISCAL IMPACT

The Fiscal impact of this proposed change is unknown at this time. The Career and Technical Education (CTE) Department is at the beginning of its exploration as to how a JROTC program could be realized in the District.

COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

There was no community engagement although some members of the community provided public comment at the Policy and Student Success Committees.

TIMELINE FOR IMPLEMENTATION/EVALUATION and COMMUNICATION PLAN

Staff is at the preliminary stages of looking at whether and how the District would support a JROTC program.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the Board accept the respective revisions as recommended by the Policy Committee.

ATTACHMENTS

- A. Redline version 6.20.043-P-P Military Recruitment Workplace Harassment Policy
- B. Clean version 6.20.043-P Junior Reserve Officers Training Corps (JROTC) and Military Careers

Board Policy

Junior Reserve Officer Training Corps and Military Careers Recruitment

6.20.043-P

The District does not prohibit a teacher, counselor or administrator in the district, at his or her professional discretion, from providing information to a student about career and educational opportunities in the military, or from referring a student to a recruitment office.

Schools will provide, at students' requests, transcripts, records and references to military offices and institutions to facilitate military scholarships and appointments or enlistment for military service.

In consultation with and approval of the Superintendent, ~~a~~ high school principal may establish a Junior Reserve Officer Training Corps program that aligns with PPS academic standards, policies and administrative directives,

History: Adopted 5/21/01, BA 1877, Amended 4/2023