

Q: What are your thoughts on redistricting and do you support neighborhood schools? Are you against splitting neighborhoods and busing kids to schools in different towns, or not?

I support neighborhood schools and would prefer to keep neighborhoods together. Neighborhood schools are the preferred model – and our re-districting policy should weight that appropriately.

I and the other 10 active candidates have publicly stated that there is a need for redistricting and I will state it again here. I personally support redistricting to alleviate our unsafe, overcrowded schools in the east and to fully utilize our under-capacity schools in the west. As stewards of taxpayer money, we would be remiss if we did not fully use the facilities we already have as we request public funding for new capital construction. I will support an open, transparent redistricting process that optimizes the facilities available and prioritizes the well being of our students.

Q: What are your thoughts on APFO?

I support the Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance as recently amended – but I think we will need to evaluate the outcomes after it has been in place a year or two in order to determine if it is achieving its goals and is effectively providing for necessary public services. The bottom line is that new development should be accompanied by funds sufficient to address over-crowding.

Q: Are you in favor of raising developer impact facts?

I am in favor of raising developer impact fees, perhaps on a sliding scale. We know that in general, developers pass impact fees directly on to the consumer. As such, it is incumbent upon county leaders to not remove all affordable housing out of the marketplace. If impact fees were proportional to the type of development and its eventual cost-range, then we might be able to both raise additional funds, slow unrestrained growth, and allow for continued segments of affordable lower-cost housing.

Q: Our budget is on a never ending expansion. How do you plan to keep within the budget, without raising taxes?

First, we need to recognize one of the key reasons our budget is increasing – we are significantly adding to the number of students attending our schools. Even if we were to pass ‘maintenance of effort’ budgets, we would see continued budget growth.

At the same time, Board members need to be effective stewards of public money. We have numerous aspirations for our system – many of which would represent real improvements to the educational experience. Simply put, we don’t have the money to fund them all – we need to prioritize.

Additionally, we need to ensure that we provide due diligence on the funds we do have. At the May 3<sup>rd</sup> Board of Education meeting, I gave testimony to the Board of Education regarding issues and discrepancies in the monthly operating budget report for spending year to date. As a Board of Education Member, I will continue to do this type of research, advocate for multi-year strategic fiscal planning, and advocate for quantifiable metrics for both accountability and efficiency. By doing this we should be able to leverage our existing capabilities and align it with our priorities.

The Board of Education does not have the ability to levy taxes and any decision to do so will fall to the County Executive and County Council.

I hear a tremendous amount about "equity", which is a hollow word. Every school, every student, every district is different (which frankly is a good thing). What are your thoughts on having different programs (IE: magnets for tech, gifted, vocational, language, etc.) at different schools, to better use our resources?

I believe the size of our system cannot support magnet schools and attempts to do so in the past were met with poor results and were curtailed quickly. With only approximately 4,000 students per grade across the county, if we were to remove the top 10% of gifted or technical students to fill a magnet school, we would likely remove critical mass of those students to have the robust offerings of academically accelerated offering currently available in each of the schools. We would likely have the unintended consequence of becoming more inequitable because there would be reduced levels of offerings at every school. At the same time, while we do have a quasi-regional/magnet program at the Applied Research Laboratory for Career and Technical Education (CTE, the current category for all vocational programs), students consistently prefer to take those courses offered at their home school rather than those programs exclusively offered at ARL. The JumpStart program (dual-enrollment for college courses) attempted to circumvent the need for redistricting, but insufficient students were willing to move schools in order to fully utilize our existing capacity. We should be cognizant of the strong desire of most students to remain in their neighborhood school.