

**GREENWICH BOARD OF EDUCATION
GREENWICH PUBLIC SCHOOLS
Greenwich, CT**

Board of Education Meeting Agenda Document Cover Sheet

Meeting Date: November 24, 2014

Agenda Item Title: **2015-16 Budget Q&A #1**

Name of Submitter: Dr. William McKersie, Superintendent

**GREENWICH PUBLIC SCHOOLS
Greenwich, CT**

**Questions & Answers I
Superintendent's Proposed 2015-2016 Budget
November 24, 2014**

INTRODUCTION

This document presents the first round of questions raised by the Board of Education regarding the Superintendent's Proposed 2015-16 Budget. The questions are listed exactly as they were submitted. The GPS administration looks forward to fielding additional BOE queries throughout the budget process, culminating with Board action on December 18, 2014.

GENERAL

- 1) Harris survey is not being conducted this year and "is being replaced by the Strategic Planning survey." [p.66] Strategic Planning questions (looking forward) might be very different than the ones included in past Harris surveys. For purposes of teacher and administrator evaluation system, which requires a parent feedback component, how will parent/student feedback component, be addressed and is there any projected cost?**

School Data Teams (SDT) and principals will have multiple options at their disposal when identifying a school Parent Feedback goal and a principal Parent Feedback goal as part of teacher and administrator evaluations. First, the SDT may continue to look at trend data from the past administrations of the Harris Survey, which still has a lot of analytical value. Once SDTs and principals choose a focus, they can mirror the language of the Harris Survey item when sending out their own survey at the end of the year to measure growth. Second, schools and principals may use the results of the GPS Parent Safe School Climate results to inform their parent feedback focus and goals. A third option would be for schools to conduct their own parent survey at the beginning of the year and resend at the end of the year to determine goal progress. None of these options have projected costs associated with them.

STAFFING

- 2) How will late certified staff hires required by increased enrollment be addressed should they be needed again this year? May additions be made if necessary to meet enrollment or student needs?**

We are optimistic that we will be in a strong position in the 2015-2016 school year to meet our staffing needs. Each year we face the possibility of adding a position or two due to increased enrollment and we have been able to meet those demands. If additional staffing becomes necessary, our practice has been to try to manage the salary through the anticipated fund balance.

- 3) The organizational charts provided in the budget book show subject specific coaches for Science, Math and Sped. Will this be changing and how is this noted for the sake of the budget?**

These changes will be noted in the final organizational chart if the Board of Education approves the final budget on December 18, 2014.

GREENWICH PUBLIC SCHOOLS
Greenwich, CT

- 4) FLES adjustments: Which schools are likely to share resources for FLES? What is average billet for travel time? Will magnet schools be affected? Will program success measure (first bullet point on p. 99) still be achievable?**

Schools that will share teachers:

- Glenville
- Ham Ave
- Julian Curtis
- New Leb
- North Street
- Park Way
- Riverside

We will require 0.6 in billets for travel as a FLES program. Magnet Schools will continue to offer K-5 FLES. The program success will continue to be measured with a variety of assessments, including SOPA assessments and DRA in Spanish

- 5) GEA Staffing – p.67: What is Unified Arts Lead Teacher (new)?**

The Unified Arts Lead teachers are two new positions introduced this year that total 0.4 FTEs. There is no additional cost to the district, because an administrative assistant's position that was associated with the former Physical Education Program Coordinator was eliminated. The salary for that position was applied to the 0.4 Unified Arts Lead Teacher position to provide release time for an art teacher (0.2) and a physical education teacher (0.2) to act as Lead Teachers to the Assistant Superintendent of CIPL. These positions represent the interests of the performing and fine arts departments and physical education department. Examples of the work covered by the Unified Arts Lead Teachers include, presentation of program budgets, development of various department contracts, coordinating programs bids and orders, coordinating program meetings, professional learning, integrating district events and, overall, providing support to the Network Liaisons, and program by working with the Principals and Assistant Superintendent for CIPL.

- 6) PPS Summary [p.209] – Please explain why psychologists and school social workers are down 2.5 FTEs vs. budget '14-'15 and staying at that level for proposed '15-'16.**

The question about staffing for psychologists and social workers often arises. There is no change in the number of psychologists and social workers for next year. Our practice has been to adjust the positions that are funded by the grant versus the operating budget for efficiency purposes. The total number of positions in PPS staffing is stable, but the specific positions funded by grants may shift due to personnel changes.

- 7) What is the reason for the 11% decline for Personnel in CIPL-Program 70? [p.150]**

Some of the reduction is attributed to budget reductions in non-salary accounts that were budgeted to "Other100s" and "For Services" category. In addition, staff budget allocations changed from Program 70 to Program 28.

GREENWICH PUBLIC SCHOOLS
Greenwich, CT

- 8) When there is a 1.0 classroom cut at the elementary level what should be the corresponding cut in music, art and PE.**

Generally speaking, a reduction in one elementary section in an elementary school can result in a 0.05 reduction in a special area teacher. It should be remembered, however, that scheduling is not a purely mathematical process and that, on occasion, there may be some flexibility required to accommodate master schedule needs. Additionally, instrumental music is based upon student enrollment in the program and not the number of sections per school.

- 9) How many Special Education evaluation teams are there, what specialists are on each team?**

There are four evaluation teams. The Preschool Team consists of a .6 psychologist, a 0.6 speech therapist, and a 0.6 educational evaluator/special education teacher. There are two teams for grades K-8. Each team consists of a 1.0 psychologist, a 1.0 speech therapist and a 1.0 educational evaluator/special education teacher. There is one team for Greenwich High School that consists of a 1.0 psychologist and a 1.0 educational evaluator/special education teacher. We also have a 1.0 psychologist and a 0.3 speech therapist who are responsible for Spanish bilingual evaluations and the private schools in Greenwich. There is a 1.0 special educator who is responsible for assistive technology support and evaluations and who is on call for any required out of state evaluations.

- 10) Last year a decision was made to trade a proposed F/T GHS Orchestra position for BANC lease. What is current and projected enrollment for orchestra? See attached email for parent concern. Given the progress of MISA, does the orchestra program warrant a FTE?**

It is too early to have a firm projection of numbers of students enrolled in the high school orchestra. The current enrollment is 102 students with 22 graduating seniors. There are also 23 students in an after-school orchestra group. Currently, we have about 75 8th graders in orchestra across the three middle schools. Therefore, if all 75 8th graders choose to continue with orchestra and can fit it into their schedule, replacing the 22 graduating seniors, there is a potential for 50 more orchestra students over the current year's enrollment. This is highly unlikely, but what is likely is that the orchestra will be larger next year than it is this year. As we developed the budget for 2015-2016, we operated with the guideline to add new staff only in extraordinary circumstances, which means that areas such as the Orchestra did not qualify for added staff time, despite the likely need, which we have been tracking for two years.

- 11) Elementary School GEA Summary [p.208] – Please explain why Reading (specialists?) are down 4.5 actual FTEs vs. budget '14-'15 and increasing just .5 for '15-'16 budget.**

Reading teachers were moved from the GEA summary to the Havemeyer summary because they are no longer school-based, but are shared among the Networks, which makes them "district-based". You will see the corresponding increase in reading listed as "Instructional Coaches" under Havemeyer.

GREENWICH PUBLIC SCHOOLS
Greenwich, CT

12) Physical Education- Adventure Based Programming is this provided by an external partner, if so where in the budget book is the cost broken out?

The Physical Education Teachers provide the adventure-based learning and utilize the elements in each of their gymnasiums. Each year, the fifth graders participate in an orienteering experience at Camp Seton with other fifth grade classes from their Network.

All equipment must be inspected annually, prior to use in the Adventure Based unit of instruction. This is a service that goes out to bid. Currently, Corby Associates has the contract with GPS and BnB Fitness and Flooring holds the contract for inspecting the Fitness Rooms at the Middle Schools and High School.

Costs can be found in the following areas within the Physical Education Budget:

- 149: Orienteering Services provided by Camp Seton
- 213: Transportation to Camp Seton
- 410: Inspections

13) May I have a better understanding of the Nurses staffing? Will the reduction in subs still provide the coverage needed in each building?

There is one full time nurse in every elementary and middle school and three full time nurses at Greenwich High School. The decrease in the funding request is based on actual spending needs in nursing substitutes from prior years.

14) With a change in the magnet theme at Ham Ave to STEM, will class size guidelines remain?

Class size guidelines at Hamilton Avenue will remain the same for 2015-16 and the foreseeable future. We will build into the multi-year comprehensive evaluation of the Hamilton Avenue STEM program a review of the impact of class size on teacher effectiveness and student outcomes.

GRANTS

15) Please show what grant monies come into each school and how many students they reach. Please designate what needs they cover such as ELL, SpEd, RTI, etc. It would also be helpful to have a idea of grant money from any source during the same time periods that were used to offset need to spend town funds.

16) Is there a formula for distributing the Title I,II and III grant money, if so on what is it based?

ANSWER TO QUESTIONS #15 & 16: We would like to provide a through response to these important questions, which will take some time to pull together. The answers to these questions will be provided as part of the responses to Round II Questions, which the Board will receive on December 8th.

GREENWICH PUBLIC SCHOOLS
Greenwich, CT

COACHES

- 17) RE: Two coaches assigned to each of the 3 elementary networks and 2 coaches assigned to Secondary Network. How will caseload and effectiveness of this approach be monitored through this new model? Will all new teachers and teachers identified as needed support services have access to this resource?**

Ellen Flanagan and Irene Parisi are leading the Coaching Workgroup, which will address two priority areas: developing the GPS Instructional Coach Model and establishing the Hiring Process (including Job Description). The Coaching Workgroup will include the Deputy and Assistant Superintendents, lead principal, instructional coach, two teachers and a Network facilitator. The outcomes include hiring the instructional coaches by February to have the cadre participate in the appropriate professional learning to ensure effectiveness across all content areas. A plan for deploying coaches across the Networks will be developed. Coaches will be part of implementing the deployment plan so that they are effectively matched with the particular needs of the Networks.

The GPS Coaching Model is not a deficit model. Coaches provide services to all teachers, not only those on a support plan. Based on current monitoring tools already in use (i.e., coaching logs), we know that coaches are accessed across the District for a variety of purposes, such as planning instruction, data analysis, TEPL, curriculum implementation, and planning the unit of instruction. We will regularly review deployment to ensure proportional caseloads across Networks. We will adjust as needed throughout the year to accommodate the needs of the teachers and will evaluate the model at the end of 2015-2016.

- 18) Last year coaches were considered critical to addressing achievement and improving instruction, please explain how the shift in coaching model and reduction of coaches will continue to offer level services. Roughly how many teachers will be impacted by not being able to access this service? Would this shift in model have been made were it not necessary to achieve efficiencies in the budget?**

Educational researchers have long established teacher quality as the single most powerful determinant of student success that is within a school district's sphere of influence. The District values coaches as an integral component of its overall approach to continually improve and enhance teacher pedagogical skill through high-quality professional learning opportunities. It is difficult to determine at this time what the impact of a reduced coaching cadre will be on the quality of support for teachers. A reduction in the number of coaches will lower the number of teachers that can be served within the school year; however, the quality of support is expected to increase due to more systematic coordination, training and monitoring of the coaches.

The transition to a District Instructional Coaching model provides many benefits:

Benefits:

- Reducing the barriers that define the support by content only;
- Middle School increase in support from one to two coaches;

GREENWICH PUBLIC SCHOOLS
Greenwich, CT

- Western and Central Elementary Networks currently have 1.5 Literacy Coaches and this will mean an “increase” in support there, as they will now have two coaches that could provide literacy or other content support
- Increased alignment and collaboration between two network coaches;
- Increased alignment with Humanities and STEM philosophy by having coaches who are dedicated to multiple content areas;
- Increased support in the transition to new standards (CT Core, Social Studies--C3 Framework, NGSS) as instructional coaches are not defined by the content
- Increased facilitation of communication within the network model

19) It appears we have a problem with remedial STEM instruction at the secondary level based on assessment data in the Supplemental Funds report and the Summer School Report. In the proposed reduction of coaches, how many remaining individual coaches will have science expertise? If not yet determined, how many current coaches have Science expertise?

For the purposes of answering this question, we will assume the inquirer is most interested in science instruction overall, as we do not yet provide STEM instruction, with the exception of one summer school class.

We currently have one dedicated elementary science coach. One of the two current instructional coaches has a science background. We do not yet know what the background will be of the new instructional coaches. Pending Board action, we do plan to have a STEM Coach at Hamilton Avenue School in 2015-2016, and will be able to take advantage of his or her expertise in an advisory capacity for district-wide concerns.

MIDDLE SCHOOL STUDY

20) Is there money in the budget for a review of the Middle Schools, this was mentioned as so something the Board was interested in?

21) Last year the Board requested funding for a MS study. Based on District workload, the project was to be postponed to the 2015-16 school year. I do not see any funds for a MS study in the 2015-16 budget. If it is not in the budget, will you please provide the rationale for it not being included again? When and how will this need be addressed?

ANSWER TO QUESTIONS #19 & 20: A major consideration before undertaking a complete “action study” regarding our Middle Schools is to see what emerges from the strategic planning process now underway. The strategic planning process will flag a series of high priority issues requiring careful analysis and action planning. Middle schools may be one of those priority areas, but we need to let the strategic planning process identify those priorities before starting on what could be far-reaching district-wide research and action on a large segment of our schools. Funding for a Middle Schools “action study,” if it emerges as a priority from the strategic planning process, would have to be drawn from two sources: first, a portion of the Strategic Planning implementation funds proposed in the budget; and, second, a portion of the Data External Partner funds, who by design will assist with a selected set of program evaluations each year.

Nevertheless, while the strategic planning process is underway, we want to develop a baseline for the BOE and Administration on our Middle Schools. We need a shared understanding of the

GREENWICH PUBLIC SCHOOLS
Greenwich, CT

Middle Schools current philosophy, structure, academic and extracurricular programming, enrollment patterns, and special issues. We will present a baseline report on our Middle Schools in March 2015. We are working with the Policy Governance Committee to outline the parameters of the report. This report will help guide future research on our Middle Schools, either as a priority action area from the strategic planning process or a topic deemed to still require BOE and Administration attention.

MAGNET TRANSPORTATION

22) What happens to the funding designated for magnet transportation if the service is not used?

If additional buses are not needed, there would be budget savings in the transportation department's operating budget. The budget savings would either be used to offset budget overages in other areas and/or contribute to the fund balance at the end of the fiscal year.

23) Transportation estimate for Racial Balance Plan – I understood the cost of one bus to be approximately \$70K. What are the assumptions for the \$119,356 figure?

For 2015-16, the cost for one bus for 180 days of services is \$76,315 annually. It is estimated that three additional busses are needed to provide transportation to magnet students attending HA, NL, and WMS not currently eligible for transportation services. Three buses will cost \$228,943. Transportation expenses are budgeted 51% BOE and 49% private schools (budgeted on Town side). With the increase from 64 to 67 Type I buses the budget on the BOE side is \$119,356.

SUCCESS MEASUREMENT

24) Throughout the budget book, success is measured based on students achieving goal on state standardized tests. These goals were developed while the CMT was the state test. Given there is no CMT data to use and that a correlation does not exist between CMT and SBA results, how are we measuring success for the 2015-16 budget?

As the District transitions from the Connecticut Mastery Test to the Smarter Balanced Assessment, we have been using the Fountas and Pinnell Benchmark Assessment for the third grade reading goal, a locally administered and scored prompt for the eighth grade writing goal, and successful completion of Algebra I by the end of eighth grade for the mathematics goal. Evaluation of the Board Goals for 2014-2015 will be based on this data.

One of the objectives of the strategic planning process is to determine how we will measure success, set new goals for the District and identify the means to measure progress towards these goals. The results of the SBA pilot will be available over the winter so we will have some time to familiarize ourselves with the reporting format and explore how to use the test data for overall accountability, program evaluation and student progress monitoring. Results from the Spring 2015 administration of the SBA are scheduled to be available by the end of the 2014-

GREENWICH PUBLIC SCHOOLS
Greenwich, CT

2015 school year so the September assessment report should include a full set of standardized data for English Language Arts and Mathematics from the SBA in addition to other data sources (Science CMT, AP, SAT and ACT). This data will serve as the new baseline for future improvement goals and allow us to quantify and measure the goals set by the new strategic plan.

Fundamental to our success measures will be the work of an external partner, selected through a competitive RFP process, to develop a data warehouse, benchmarks, and student growth model. The District will have a robust data management system for monitoring and measuring student progress.

FINANCIAL QUESTIONS

25) In the August financial report [p.17], a detailed listing of possible actions to the '15-'16 budget were under consideration given the budget variances in '13-'14. These variances totaled over \$2 million. Please provide rationale for the proposed '15-'16 budget line item vis a vis last year's variance.

Rank	OBJ	DESC	Variance	'15-'16 Budget	Reason?
1	51050/51310	LT Sub & Temp Teachers	\$607,960	Net zero	
3	51490	Prof & Other – NOC	\$292,715	\$(424,115)	
7	52360	Rental – Software	\$89,241	\$248,945	CAS & Ext. Partner?
10	51497	Prof & Other – NOC	\$49,161	\$295,306	

The budget variances mentioned in the August 28, 2014 Financial Report for Fiscal Year End 13-14 was comparing FY14 budget to FY14 actual expenses. The '15-'16 variance referenced in the above table compares FY15 budget to FY16 Budget.

The budget variances for FY 15-16 regarding the object codes are addressed under question #32.

GREENWICH PUBLIC SCHOOLS
Greenwich, CT

26) I would also like details on the specifics of funds that were returned to town in 2013-14, 2014-15 (to date and projected) and projected for 2015-16. This should include unspent funds, revenues collected from various programs (pre-K, tuition students, etc) and any other funds provided to town (e.g., offsets, etc.).

The fund balance or “funds returned to Town” was discussed in the August 28, 2014 Financial Report for Fiscal Year End 13-14. The amount returned to the Town, as a percentage of operating budget, has decreased over the years. Please see the following table:

	Variance	ARRA Offset	Revised Variance	% of Budget	
FYE 2014 *	\$ 2,458,520		\$ 2,458,520	1.74%	
FYE 2013	\$ 2,913,930		\$ 2,913,930	2.08%	
FYE 2012	\$ 1,197,583		\$ 1,197,583	0.87%	
FYE 2011	\$ 4,047,802	\$ -	\$ 4,047,802	3.03%	
FYE 2010	\$ 3,761,381	\$ 487,721	\$ 3,273,660	2.56%	
FYE 2009	\$ 3,488,479	\$ -	\$ 3,488,479	2.74%	
FYE 2008	\$ 2,668,906	\$ -	\$ 2,668,906	2.19%	
FYE 2007	\$ 3,115,821	\$ -	\$ 3,115,821	2.67%	
			8-Year Mean	\$ 2,895,588	2.24%
			3-Year Mean	\$ 2,190,011	1.57%
			8-Year Median	\$ 3,014,876	2.37%
			3-Year Median	\$ 2,458,520	1.74%

* Unaudited

Projections for the current fiscal year (2014-15) are calculated in January 2015 and refreshed in April 2015. The same schedule would be applied to next fiscal year (2015-16); calculated in January 2016, and refreshed in April 2016. This projection schedule provides the administration with six months of actual data that can be extrapolated for future months.

The revenue information is included on page 312 of the budget book.

27) Please show supplemental income based on student performance needs and for how many students that comes into each school.

As stated in the Supplemental Funding Report presented to the Board on November 13, 2014, the District is recommending that the total allocation for Supplemental Funding in 2015-16 remain \$150,125 (unchanged from 14-15). In the past the District used CMT (CT Mastery Test) scores to calculate a per school allocation based on the number of students in the three performance categories below goal. The following chart shows the performance category and the allocation per student.

GREENWICH PUBLIC SCHOOLS
Greenwich, CT

Standardized Testing Category	Allocation
Proficient	\$100
Basic	\$175
Below Basic	\$250

However, since there were no CMT or SBA (Smarter Balanced Assessment) results generated for the 2013-14 school year, the District will not be able to calculate the per school allocation until the spring 2015 SBA results are received. During the summer of 2015, the District will allocate the individual school funding amounts using the SBA results, not to exceed \$150,125. For an example of how the District allocates these funds please refer to the 13-14 *Supplemental Funds for Students Performing Below Standard* chart on page 5 of the November 13, 2014 Supplemental Report.

28) Please show where possible AG money against need as well.

The Achievement Gap Funds proposed for continuation in 2015-16 were highlighted in the October 23, 2014 Memorandum to the BOE, "Updated Achievement Gap Funding Allocation Recommendations." On pages 16-17 of the Memorandum, the following programs were listed as continuing in 2015-16:

- Family Curriculum Nights (Four Title 1 Schools) -- \$39,560
- School Program Facilitators (Four Title 1 Schools) -- \$25,000
- Cultural Competency Training (Four Title 1 Schools) -- \$8,800
- Minority Student Achievement Network (All Schools in GPS) -- \$40,000

Two additional programs were listed as continuing in 2015-16, but are on hold until a new proposal is submitted to the BOE:

- Experiential Saturdays (Middle School) -- \$56,000
- Elementary School Extended Day (Julian Curtiss and New Lebanon) -- \$66,850

The proposal for both of these programs is being revised based on BOE comments at the October 9 Work Session and October 23 Business Meeting. The proposal is due to the BOE in December 2014. It will address the use of the 2014-15 Achievement Gap Allocation and the use of the continuation funding for 2015-16. The administration intends to have the proposed use of the Achievement Gap Funds for the rest of 2014-15 and all of 2015-16 clearly delineated and not left as lump-sum recommendations.

The Achievement Gap Funding is focused on the four Title 1 Schools, with the exception of the support for the MSAN partnership, which benefits all schools in the GPS. The programs supported are school-wide in nature. The programs are designed and funded so as to complement other work and funding underway in each school through resources from the Operating Budget, Supplemental Funds, and Title 1.

GREENWICH PUBLIC SCHOOLS
Greenwich, CT

29) Do I read correctly that the fund is expected to break even for 2015-16? What changes are being made to insure this is the case? Does it presume we will participate in the Nat'l school lunch program at the HS in 2015-16?

The FY2015-16 Food Service budget is projected to break even. After several years of minor patching to reduce the fund balance, we have developed a more realistic budget with reference to expected revenue. The short term objective is to stabilize the yearly operating budget. The longer term objective is to reduce the negative fund balance.

The Food Service Department understands that revenue generation must align with revenue projections. At the same time, a combination of declining enrollment, impact of Free & Reduced Price students and the challenge of HHFKA regulations has hampered revenue alignment over the last several years. With reference to ordinary expenses, the department has maintained strong managerial practices to limit the increases in cost where it has direct control. The 2.4% budget increase is primarily reflected in non-controllable line items: collective bargaining wage and fringe benefit increases. The department is focusing on the following areas:

- Increasing average daily participation (ADP) and sales in schools that have been under performing.
- Working closely with PTAC Wellness to support and communicate positive changes that have been occurring in the program.
- Continued menu development to introduce more items that meet the community's expectation of high quality foods.
- Increased marketing. Through, menu design, signage, wellness initiatives, parent link, newsletters, social media and the district's website, marketing will highlight: healthy changes, new products and improvements in the food service program.

Concentration at Greenwich High will be focused on:

- Working with student government survey results to incorporate suggestions and areas of improvement.
- Introducing new menu items and themes that emulate community favorites.
- Marketing and promoting through social media, signage and video display.
- Partnering with FCS department to promote student cooking and peer level interest.

The 2015-16 food service budget is written presuming the High School will not be participating in the National School Lunch Program (NSLP). This was done to continue the preservation of the success of the program that would now be adversely affected by the Smart Snack section of HHFKA. The impact of keeping the High School off the NSLP is reflected in the reduction of Lunch Program Reimbursements under Revenues. The reduction, \$154,103, is a combination of both State and Federal reimbursements tied to Greenwich High School.

30) In terms of funds returned to town, I would also like to know what happens with facilities rentals and janitorial fees we collect.

Facility rental expenses are charged to program 98 (Facilities/Rental). See pages 69 and 154 of the Budget book. There is no budget for program 98. The expenses incurred for the rental are offset by drawdowns of revenue collected.

GREENWICH PUBLIC SCHOOLS
Greenwich, CT

The revenue collected for facilities rentals are deposited in account # 46202. See page 312 of the Budget book.

31) Also, I know we've been requested to help find the DC trip for middle school. It appears that was left out of the budget. I would like an explanation of why.

We have not included the Washinton DC trip in the budget for 2015-16 due to program efficiency priorities (had to make cuts and only add selectively). We are not yet prepared to recommend the Washington DC trip as an assured experience, which thereby requires district funding.

However, an analysis is underway to review the benefits, costs, and value-add of the annual Washington DC Trip. Surveys were conducted of lower to mid-upper state districts to collect data on what other districts provide for graduating 8th graders. We continue to explore options for providing an end of year experience for eighth grade students. We will complete the inquiry process and have a recommendation for the BOE later this year about the merits of the program as a possible assured experience, and thus an item to include in the 2016-17 Budget.

32) I would like a bullet point list with a sentence or two describing the change for each line item on pages 68 to 76 where the % change is in double digits (up and down). This includes specific information regarding changes in staffing. This information will be useful in both our review and with explaining the budget to the other stakeholders in town. We will need to explain additions and reductions in staffing and defend why changes weren't previously made.

Please see Attachment in the Budget Q/A packet.

33) I do not want a repeat of the achievement gap fund where money is not earmarked to specific activities. So, I want them to identify any areas where funds are not specifically earmarked or are able to be spent without additional input and approval from Board.

All funding in the Superintendent's Proposed 2015-16 Budget is directed to specific areas and activities. There is no funding generally earmarked, as occurred with the lump sum Achievement Gap proposal in the 2014-15 Budget.

34) I am still interested in having the administration conduct research into outsourcing food services, but can reserve that for a work session/meeting. However, I think it is appropriate to ask them to benchmark our budget figures at this time (which Ben has likely already done). I know Laura asked some questions and will likely submit them.

When benchmarking our budget, it is difficult to draw comparisons to like school districts. Our preliminary findings show that many school districts treat or classify their food service financial information differently. From pricing policies to expensing program cost, local BOE's and Town governments differ greatly. For example:

- Some districts charge for custodial service while others don't.
- Some districts charge for a % of utilities while others don't.

GREENWICH PUBLIC SCHOOLS
Greenwich, CT

- Some town's cover the cost of benefits or a portion there of.

Other factors that differ widely are employee hourly wages. A quick comparison of Greenwich, Westport and Fairfield finds:

Classification	Fairfield	Westport	Greenwich
General Worker	\$12.98 - \$14.24	\$10.00 - \$16.00	\$16.94 - \$18.97
Cafeteria Lead	\$19.66 - \$23.99	\$14.00 - \$24.00	\$21.45 - \$28.46

A quick look a 2012-13 data for Fairfield vs. Greenwich shows another comparison on how two like school districts greatly differ:

Category	Fairfield	Greenwich
Schools	11 E, 3MS, 2HS	11E, 3MS, 1HS
Enrollment	10256	8838
F & R Data (Number / %)	889 / 8.7%	1281 / 14.5%
Total Revenue	\$2,775,188	\$3,559,048
High School Enrollment	3074 (2 HS)	2631
High School Sales	\$574,180	\$1,280,769

We will continue to research and disseminate information during the year.

Greenwich Public Schools 2015-2016 Budget

Summary by Program

<i>Program</i>		<i>2013-2014 Actual</i>	<i>2014-2015 Budget</i>	<i>2015-2016 Budget</i>	<i>Dollar Change</i>	<i>% Change</i>	<i>Note</i>
10	Art	2,224,644	2,268,953	2,228,435	-40,518	-1.8%	Program efficiencies
12	Business Education	255,118	267,436	273,196	5,760	2.2%	
14	ESL	2,111,400	2,135,796	2,435,356	299,560	14.0%	Staffing variances, translation (\$35K)
16	World Language	5,024,181	5,092,280	5,273,663	181,383	3.6%	Staffing variances
18	Health	510,739	546,740	554,581	7,841	1.4%	Program efficiencies
20	Family And Consumer Science	617,306	656,361	696,892	40,531	6.2%	Staffing variances
22	Technology Education	682,362	723,225	721,430	-1,795	-0.2%	
24	Language Arts	5,673,588	5,893,846	6,301,113	407,267	6.9%	Curricular improvements, staffing variances
26	Reading	2,847,828	2,979,915	3,079,712	99,797	3.3%	
28	Mathematics	4,474,265	4,742,001	4,557,549	-184,452	-3.9%	Math curriculum implemented (-\$304K)
30	Music	3,716,407	3,739,504	3,859,964	120,460	3.2%	
32	Physical Education	3,500,209	3,651,586	3,788,971	137,385	3.8%	Program efficiencies
34	Science	4,879,343	5,015,817	5,179,343	163,526	3.3%	Advanced Science
36	Social Studies	4,552,465	4,660,225	4,887,155	226,930	4.9%	Curricular improvements, staffing variances
38	Advanced Learning Program	2,103,410	2,150,103	2,171,085	20,982	1.0%	
40	School Libraries	4,860,316	4,992,094	5,116,921	124,827	2.5%	
45	Theatre Arts	257,218	268,358	272,076	3,718	1.4%	
46	Student Activities	486,402	514,678	524,162	9,484	1.8%	
47	Intramural Sports	140,364	156,463	154,548	-1,915	-1.2%	
48	Athletics	1,857,885	2,013,993	1,981,491	-32,502	-1.6%	Program efficiencies
49	Nursing	1,570,977	1,618,153	1,622,869	4,716	0.3%	Program efficiencies
50	Guidance	3,014,866	3,166,263	3,193,871	27,608	0.9%	
53	Special Ed	19,372,277	19,727,595	20,073,460	345,865	1.8%	Staffing variances, Out of Dist Tuition, Transp.
55	Extended School Year	1,053,270	1,116,042	1,256,607	140,565	12.6%	GEA Contract, Staffing Changes, AG money
56	Alternative High School	1,526,241	1,590,599	1,590,320	-279	0.0%	

Greenwich Public Schools 2015-2016 Budget

Summary by Program

<i>Program</i>		<i>2013-2014 Actual</i>	<i>2014-2015 Budget</i>	<i>2015-2016 Budget</i>	<i>Dollar Change</i>	<i>% Change</i>	<i>Note</i>
60	Psychological	2,086,522	2,072,180	2,051,441	-20,739	-1.0%	Staffing variances
62	School Social Work	834,663	929,237	920,468	-8,769	-0.9%	Staffing variances
64	Speech & Hearing	1,947,297	2,000,575	2,207,845	207,270	10.4%	Staffing variances
66	Pre Schools	2,288,358	2,342,016	2,484,678	142,662	6.1%	Staffing variances
67	K-5 Classroom Teachers	18,634,913	19,318,061	19,969,445	651,384	3.4%	Staffing variances
68	Teaching & Learning	10,546,823	10,675,418	10,971,446	296,028	2.8%	Program Efficiencies
70	Curric. Instr. Prof Learning	1,472,170	1,988,647	2,141,218	152,571	7.7%	STEM @ HA, Comp. Assessment (\$120K)
72	Board	95,177	105,776	144,810	39,034	36.9%	Strategic Plan (\$38K)
74	Central Office	565,901	1,050,483	754,006	-296,477	-28.2%	Achievement Gap reoccurring reduced
76	Communications	119,601	180,448	132,174	-48,274	-26.8%	Program efficiencies, Harris Survey
80	Safety & Security	534,669	562,793	546,503	-16,290	-2.9%	Staffing variances
82	IT/MIS	2,015,906	2,024,538	2,039,083	14,545	0.7%	
84	Research & Evaluation	2,279	0	0	0	-	
86	Accounting & Budgeting	676,231	735,055	768,630	33,575	4.6%	
88	Supply Acq & Managemnt	337,228	437,432	447,996	10,564	2.4%	
89	Maintenance Of Plants	5,742,557	6,006,018	5,888,060	-117,958	-2.0%	Utilities savings (natural gas)
90	Transportation	2,597,686	2,632,718	2,815,958	183,240	7.0%	Contract, Magnet services (\$119.4K)
91	Printing & Graphic Art	129,969	139,815	142,233	2,418	1.7%	
92	Facilities	6,033,180	6,506,874	6,435,451	-71,423	-1.1%	Staffing variances
93	Personnel Services	4,014,956	4,131,452	3,609,316	-522,136	-12.6%	New Positions (51980)
94	Summer School	357,053	223,543	353,215	129,672	58.0%	GEA Contract, Staffing Changes, AG money
95	Continuing Education	164,920	188,548	198,522	9,974	5.3%	
96	Continuing Ed-general	208,527	0	0	0	-	
98	Facilities/Rentals	210,297	0	0	0	-	
Grand Total		138,929,964	143,939,653	146,817,268	2,877,615	2.0%	

Greenwich Public Schools 2015-2016 Budget

Major Object Summary

<i>Object Description</i>		<i>2013-2014 Actual</i>	<i>2014-2015 Budget</i>	<i>2015-2016 Budget</i>	<i>Dollar Change</i>	<i>% Change</i>	<i>Note</i>
100 Personnel Services							
51010	Regular Salaries	19,574,908	20,976,498	21,467,418	490,920	2.3%	
51020	Regular Salaries-teachers/Cert	86,238,677	87,893,240	90,597,604	2,704,364	3.1%	
51050	Long Term Sub Leave Of Absence	1,260,040	2,000,000	1,865,000	-135,000	-6.8%	Prog 93, shift to 51310 (\$135K)
51060	Regular Wages - Teachers, Etc.	1,087,386	1,085,672	1,071,026	-14,646	-1.3%	
51067	Regular Salaries-teachers-pd	51,773	140,425	30,480	-109,945	-78.3%	Shift to 51497, Network PL (\$87K)
51070	Other Salary Expense	138,732	291,950	344,040	52,090	17.8%	Contractual longevity payments
51090	Standby Time	13,125	10,000	13,000	3,000	30.0%	
51100	Overtime Services	551,476	475,750	455,900	-19,850	-4.2%	
51170	Pay For Accum Vacation Leave	73,651	25,000	25,000	0	0.0%	
51230	Pay For Accum Sick Leave	345,908	85,000	85,000	0	0.0%	
51240	Pay Accum Sick Leave Teach/Cer	0	200,000	200,000	0	0.0%	
51250	Injury Leave Gpp	83,115	45,000	45,000	0	0.0%	
51270	Sabbatical Leave - Teachers, E	48,000	50,000	50,000	0	0.0%	
51300	Temporary Salaries	1,123,048	1,148,614	1,103,436	-45,178	-3.9%	
51310	Payments For Temp Svc Teachers	1,219,399	1,084,500	1,222,135	137,635	12.7%	Prog 93, shift from 51050 (\$135K)
51317	Payments For Temp Svc Teach-pd	37,550	120,600	75,850	-44,750	-37.1%	Shift to 51497, Network PL (\$38K)
51360	Housing And Vehicle Allowances	9	33,000	33,300	300	0.9%	
51390	Payments For Temp Svc-spec Prj	2,313,081	2,396,356	2,603,819	207,463	8.7%	Prog 55/94, GEA contract, staffing, AG money
51397	Payment Temp Svc Spec Proj-pd	142,691	124,190	287,320	163,130	131.4%	Prog 70, STEM (\$48K); Prog 24, curr (\$30K)
51400	Prof & Other Spec Serv- Attrne	120,480	221,100	156,000	-65,100	-29.4%	Prog 53, budget savings (\$40K)
51410	Prof & Other Svc- Audit/Acctng	60,250	47,900	47,900	0	0.0%	Note: for 514XX object codes see pages 313-315
51420	Prof Medical & Dental	1,320,988	1,417,680	1,410,680	-7,000	-0.5%	
51440	Prof Sv- Consult/Resrch/ Srvey	0	40,300	1,000	-39,300	-97.5%	Prog 53, FY15 one time audit (\$30K)
51450	Prof And Other Spec Srvs-fees	875	15,500	6,500	-9,000	-58.1%	Prog 93, budget savings (\$7K)

Greenwich Public Schools 2015-2016 Budget

Major Object Summary

<i>Object Description</i>		<i>2013-2014 Actual</i>	<i>2014-2015 Budget</i>	<i>2015-2016 Budget</i>	<i>Dollar Change</i>	<i>% Change</i>	<i>Note</i>
51460	Professional Svcs - Data/Word	111,070	108,600	112,600	4,000	3.7%	
51490	Prof& Other Spec Serv- Noc	936,221	1,570,100	1,145,985	-424,115	-27.0%	Recurring AG money and shift to 51497
51497	Prof & Other Spec Svc-pd	117,915	144,300	439,606	295,306	204.6%	Shift from 51490, Network PL (\$220K)
51600	Matching Funds - 401 (k) Plan	67,154	274,922	268,412	-6,510	-2.4%	
51920	Work Trnsfr To/From Other Dept	-55,238	-57,381	-57,933	-552	1.0%	
51970	Prior Year Expenditures	7,984	0	0	0	-	
51980	New Positions	0	324,173	-365,500	-689,673	-212.7%	Staffing adjustments
51990	Salary Adjustment Account	32,593	-1,500,000	-1,400,000	100,000	-6.7%	True up to FY15 YTD
Major Object Total		117,022,861	120,792,989	123,340,578	2,547,589	2.1%	

200 Services Other Than Personnel

52010	Legal Advertising & Public Not	20,879	58,000	58,200	200	0.3%	
52020	Printing And Binding Reports	-3,721	27,597	10,531	-17,066	-61.8%	Various program adjustments
52050	Postage	81,804	119,660	106,310	-13,350	-11.2%	Prog 76, Harris Survey (\$4K)
52070	Tuition-non Sped Out Of Dist	80,357	60,000	75,000	15,000	25.0%	True up to historical expense
52080	Tuition - Out Of Dist Sped	4,651,867	4,300,000	4,500,000	200,000	4.7%	True up to historical expense
52090	Tuition Payments For Town Empl	212,597	291,185	275,437	-15,748	-5.4%	
52097	Tuition Town Empl-pd	66,247	119,117	97,800	-21,317	-17.9%	Network PL shift to 51497 (\$15K)
52100	Travel Expense - Employees	31,722	80,843	67,708	-13,135	-16.2%	School based per pupil allocation (\$9K)
52107	Travel Exp Empl-pd	29,310	71,625	44,400	-27,225	-38.0%	Network PL shift to 51497 (\$25K)
52110	Mileage Allowance - Employees	45,133	63,494	55,514	-7,980	-12.6%	Prog 53, budget savings (\$8K)
52117	Mileage Town Empl-pd	9,062	24,550	15,600	-8,950	-36.5%	School based per pupil allocation (\$7K)
52120	Transportation Of Pupils - Pub	2,550,704	2,570,556	2,751,397	180,841	7.0%	Prog 90, Magnet transportation (\$119K)
52130	Transportation Of Other Non-em	423,780	458,532	469,452	10,920	2.4%	

Greenwich Public Schools 2015-2016 Budget

Major Object Summary

<i>Object Description</i>		<i>2013-2014 Actual</i>	<i>2014-2015 Budget</i>	<i>2015-2016 Budget</i>	<i>Dollar Change</i>	<i>% Change</i>	<i>Note</i>
52140	Transportation Of Pupils - Emo	2,021,472	2,100,512	2,209,396	108,884	5.2%	Prog 53, additional SPED services
52150	Office Services	470,330	527,302	596,610	69,308	13.1%	Prog 53,70, and 82, various program adjustments
52157	Office Services-pd	1,124	1,815	2,150	335	18.5%	
52200	Sewage Service - Town Owned Pr	2,700	3,000	3,000	0	0.0%	
52210	Water Service	139,535	135,000	136,500	1,500	1.1%	
52220	Electric Service	2,222,465	2,300,000	2,361,486	61,486	2.7%	
52240	Telephone, Telegraph And Radio	261,105	281,850	275,850	-6,000	-2.1%	
52261	Gas For Heating	1,139,700	1,300,000	1,050,000	-250,000	-19.2%	Utility rate savings
52262	Oil For Heating	60,742	68,500	60,000	-8,500	-12.4%	True up to historical expense
52310	Rental Of Office Equipment	85,280	177,229	170,551	-6,678	-3.8%	
52320	Rental Of Other Equipment	23,336	28,762	26,151	-2,611	-9.1%	
52340	Rental Of Buildings And Other	353,341	412,006	519,360	107,354	26.1%	BANC (\$73K), Alternative HS (\$17K)
52350	Rental - Data/Word Processing	452,772	474,894	408,305	-66,589	-14.0%	Prog 82, adjustment to computer leases (\$43K)
52360	Rental/Maintenance Software	633,613	575,218	824,163	248,945	43.3%	Prog 40, shift from 53070 (\$58K)
52500	Cleaning Services	154,618	191,625	186,057	-5,568	-2.9%	
52520	Collection And Removal Of Recy	24,993	32,000	40,000	8,000	25.0%	Prog 89/92, MOC 200 & 300
52950	Misc Svcs- Not Otherwise Class	53,569	59,665	72,930	13,265	22.2%	School based per pupil allocation (\$10K)
52970	Prior Year Expenditure	12,308	0	0	0	-	
Major Object Total		16,312,744	16,914,537	17,469,858	555,321	3.3%	

Greenwich Public Schools 2015-2016 Budget

Major Object Summary

<i>Object Description</i>		<i>2013-2014 Actual</i>	<i>2014-2015 Budget</i>	<i>2015-2016 Budget</i>	<i>Dollar Change</i>	<i>% Change</i>	<i>Note</i>
300 Supplies							
53010	Office Supplies	111,934	133,345	127,037	-6,308	-4.7%	
53011	Non-capital Office Equip	75,374	41,400	38,460	-2,940	-7.1%	
53070	Data/Word Processing Supplies	224,390	300,833	230,533	-70,300	-23.4%	Prog 40, shift to 52360 (\$58K)
53071	Non-capital Data/Wp Hardware	280,757	294,762	269,607	-25,155	-8.5%	Various program adjustments
53100	Teaching Supplies	1,365,206	1,453,482	1,628,617	175,135	12.0%	Prog 70, STEM (\$134K) & Prog 34 Avd Sci (\$45K)
53101	Classroom/Teaching Equipment	226,219	229,409	207,500	-21,909	-9.6%	Prog 32, budget savings (\$26K)
53110	Textbooks	547,362	769,193	516,684	-252,509	-32.8%	Prog 28, MIF (\$304K), Prog 34 Avd Sci (\$23K)
53120	Library Books	152,929	160,340	167,375	7,035	4.4%	
53140	Audio Visual Materials	51,410	86,745	80,771	-5,974	-6.9%	
53141	Audio Visual Equipment	171,065	164,914	189,924	25,010	15.2%	Prog 82, shift from 51490 (\$35K)
53200	Recreation,athletic&playground	163,628	172,217	172,200	-17	0.0%	
53201	Recreation,athletic&playground	3,921	0	0	0	-	
53250	Medical,surgical & Laboratory	19,264	22,061	24,342	2,281	10.3%	
53300	Wearing Apparel (incl Material	20,330	27,400	26,200	-1,200	-4.4%	
53310	Personal Protective Equipment	10,907	20,000	20,000	0	0.0%	
53350	Custodial & Household Supplies	318,926	350,000	360,000	10,000	2.9%	Prog 89/92, MOC 300 & 400
53500	Motor Fuel And Lubricants	18,262	24,250	24,750	500	2.1%	
53510	Parts For Automotive Equipment	10,372	13,300	13,300	0	0.0%	
53350	Mechanical Supplies And Small	15,031	36,200	34,893	-1,307	-3.6%	
53640	Ordnance And Chemical Supplies	18,031	16,893	17,500	607	3.6%	
53700	Building & Construct Material	224,549	246,500	241,500	-5,000	-2.0%	Prog 89, MOC 300 & 400
53970	Prior Year Expenditure	23,839	0	0	0	-	
Major Object Total		4,053,706	4,563,244	4,391,193	-172,051	-3.8%	

Greenwich Public Schools 2015-2016 Budget

Major Object Summary

<i>Object Description</i>		<i>2013-2014 Actual</i>	<i>2014-2015 Budget</i>	<i>2015-2016 Budget</i>	<i>Dollar Change</i>	<i>% Change</i>	<i>Note</i>
400 Maintenance							
54050	Maintenance Of Build/Supplies	630,849	642,800	606,550	-36,250	-5.6%	Prog 82, budget adjustment to 54100 (\$25K)
54070	Maintenance Of Air Conditionin	301,730	316,500	316,500	0	0.0%	
54090	Maintenance - Requiring Painti	8,912	6,000	5,000	-1,000	-16.7%	
54100	Maintenance Of Instructional E	263,073	326,788	316,188	-10,600	-3.2%	Prog 32, budget savings (\$22K)
54150	Maintenance Of Furniture, Fixt	21,046	32,775	32,275	-500	-1.5%	
54200	Maintenance Of Machinery, Tool	48,187	52,170	56,170	4,000	7.7%	
54210	Maintenance - Data/Word Proces	22,226	24,650	32,856	8,206	33.3%	School based per pupil allocation
54250	Maintenance Of Automotive Equi	8,632	11,200	10,100	-1,100	-9.8%	
54350	Maintenance Of Roads, Bridges	36,990	9,000	15,000	6,000	66.7%	Prog 89, MOC 300 & 400
54970	Prior Year Expenditure	27,703	0	0	0	-	
Major Object Total		1,369,348	1,421,883	1,390,639	-31,244	-2.2%	
600 Insurance							
56310	Boe School Sports Accident	0	2,000	0	-2,000	-100.0%	Included in Town's fixed charges budget
Major Object Total		0	2,000	0	-2,000	-100.0%	
700 Fixed Charges							
57350	Settlement Of Claims And Judge	171,308	245,000	225,000	-20,000	-8.2%	HR Savings
Major Object Total		171,308	245,000	225,000	-20,000	-8.2%	
Grand Total		138,929,967	143,939,653	146,817,268	2,877,615	2.0%	