

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

Board of Education Meeting Agenda Document Cover Sheet

Meeting Date: November 23, 2015

Agenda Item Title: 2016-17 Budget Q&A Round I

Name of Submitter(s): Dr. William McKersie, Superintendent

BUDGET- GENERAL

1. Given the need to identify efficiencies to continue to provide level services with less than a 2.88% increase to the budget, please provide a top-line explanation and of where the key efficiencies were found in the 2016-17 budget, what \$ amount each efficiency represents and the rationale for absorbing the reduction in that particular area. JD¹

RESPONSE:

The projected 2.88% provided as part of the FY 2016/2017 pro-forma was developed using a conservative approach of 2.5% in expenditure escalation. As we built this year's budget, we first looked at our staffing along with the projected salary growth.

Comparing the pro-forma to the proposed budget, regular salaries came in higher than projected. This was due to regular step progression and settlement of contracts above 2.5% (e.g. Nurses 3.0+%). Teacher salaries came in as projected.

Additionally, we looked at salary savings. This year we assumed a savings of \$1.4M. The projected increase in savings of 3.57% is based on average salary increases and projecting slightly more savings. Other non-salary variances came from a number of areas that varied from the pro forma based upon budgets that were developed to support programs and locations for the upcoming year.

As mentioned, some of the increases in Services can be tied back to contractual and demand increases (e.g., Transportation). The decrease in supplies is related to a reduction in funds requested for HS text book replacement. This reduction can be absorbed next year but we anticipate returning to prior levels moving forward.

Lastly, we have been experiencing some relief with utilities. We will have additional facility management costs related to the new Performing Arts Center, which we project to be able to cover.

2. What are the major priorities of this budget, how do they directly support student achievement in the classroom? BON

RESPONSE:

The CIPL budget is the logical portion of the total Operating Budget to consider for direct impact on student achievement in the classroom.

The CIPL budget annually provides funds to support the priority areas of:

- Tiered Interventions (Rtl);
- Professional Learning, including consultancies;
- Standards Based Curriculum Development and Renewal;

¹ Initials refer to BOE member submitting question. DA: Debbie Appelbaum; JD: Jennifer Dayton; LE: Laura Erickson; BON: Barbara O'Neill.

2016 – 17 BOE Budget Questions Round I
November 23, 2015

- Comprehensive Assessment System; and
- Instructional Supplies.

The Program Budgets annually provides funds to support the priority areas of the district strategic plan/goal and mutually agreed upon program goals. The priorities for program areas include:

- Standards based Curriculum Development and Renewal;
- Equipment (Instruments, PE and Fitness, technical and lab equipment);
- Instructional supplies, including digital resources;
- Supplies for schools with increased enrollments (extra sections);
- Consultancies (Teachers College, CT Science Center)
- Professional learning;
- Assessment Tools/Resources (ELL and World Language specific)

3. What is the goal of including Program Success Measures – Current –Goal
- a. Why do many department state not applicable to Program Success Measures Current and Goal?
- b. How might this part of the budget book be improved? BON

RESPONSE:

The goal in including Program Success Measures is to measure outcomes and the delivery of services. The goal being for decision makers to be able to use those outcomes in the decision making process. The budget process is a good time to assess such outcomes. Program Success Measures are not aligned to our currently evolving metrics for success. For the next budget process, program measures will be aligned with the Strategic Plan and System Operations dashboard metrics.

STRATEGIC PLAN

4. Except for funding to administer a survey to measure Social Emotional/Engagement/parents' satisfaction, what other funding has been provided toward implementation of the strategic plan? DA (full response below)
5. Please provide a top-line of how funding in other areas will be used to address implementation of the strategic plan. DA (full response below)
6. How does this budget support the strategic plan? BON (full response below)

RESPONSE:

The Superintendent's Proposed Operating Budget for 2016-17 is framed by the goals and the action plans of the Strategic Plan. In all but a few cases, which are noted below, the administration will be using existing funding and staffing to support the Strategic Plan. We believe that the overarching aim of personalized learning—guided

2016 – 17 BOE Budget Questions Round I
November 23, 2015

by the academic, personal and interpersonal growth goals—can be addressed through existing resources. Our approach is pragmatic: the overall budget is exceedingly tight, leaving little room for additional funding or new initiatives.

The specific budget implications in each of the four Strategic Action Plans are as follows. (See Addendum for full listing of the Four Strategic Action Plans.)

Strategy 1: Strategic Leadership and Management

There are seven Action Steps for Strategy 1 (See Addendum for full listing). In all but two cases, the work on the Action Steps is covered by core administration expenditures for personnel time and minor meeting expenses.

We have two cases in the budget of targeted funding for Strategy 1. The first case is the \$40,000 recommended as continued funding for Strategic Plan Implementation. This is a roll-over of the amount allocated for 2015-16. The funding is applied to consultant assistance in establishing the most effective leadership, management, monitoring and communications structures and processes for implementation of the Strategic Plan (i.e., Action Steps #1, #2, #3, #5, #6 and #7). During 2015-16, the assistance has entailed a continued contract with Public Consulting Group. We would envision continuing similar support in the 2016-17, either by Public Consulting Group or another entity.

The second case of targeted funding relates to Action Step #4 (*Develop a multi-year Strategic Dashboard to guide and monitor the implementation of the Strategic Plan*). The largest share (\$105,000) covers the annual contract with ECRA, and is a roll-over of the 2015-16 funding level. We also are recommending an additional amount of funding for Action Step #4: the \$44,000 requested for comprehensive survey research to assess progress on the Strategic Plan Outcomes related to the Personal and Interpersonal Goals, and Systems Operations metrics. This is a modest addition, but should get us started with ample survey-based feedback on progress during 2016-17. We base the \$44,000 figure on our biennial expenditure for the Harris Surveys, which were conducted up through the 2011-2012 school year. We envision seeking an independent external vendor to design, conduct and analyze the surveys. One possible vendor would be ECRA, which does substantial survey research.

Strategy 2: Curriculum and Instruction

The CIPL Budget is the primary financial resource to support the implementation of identified Curriculum and Instruction Actions Steps in the Strategic Plan.

Curriculum Development and Renewal - Action Steps 5 - 8:

The CIPL Budget is developed to support the ongoing development, renewal and communication of a standards-based curriculum. This is completed through the provision of growth and development for curriculum cadres to support the renewal of all units on an annual basis.

2016 – 17 BOE Budget Questions Round I
November 23, 2015

The Growth and Development allocations continue to support the identified Action Steps 5 and 6 to continue the development and implementation of the standards-based curriculum. Action Steps 7 and 8 are also supported by these funds as the district continues to document all curricular units of study PreK-12 through the summer.

Learning Opportunities Beyond the School Day - Action Step 4:

The CIPL Budget provides funds to support the implementation of Action Step 4. We plan to continue and expand the partnership with Odysseyware, an online course management system. This resource, already proven successful for summer school credit recovery and as a supplemental resource for the Alternative High School, can potentially be used to support personalized learning experiences for grades 6-12. This resource can provide standards-based course content for students to retrieve credit, access courses not offered in Greenwich, provide alternate learning and individualized learning materials to support students in their access to the curriculum.

Classroom Practices/Personalized Learning - Action Step 9:

The STEM Budget directly supports Action Step 9 in the provision of IXL - a digital resource providing personalized interventions and learning in mathematics. The district completed full implementation of this resource K-5. The STEM budget will maintain the budget for ongoing renewal of the annual licensing.

Educator Evaluation - Action Step 4:

The Deputy Superintendent's Budget will continue to provide annual funding to support the ongoing renewal and alignment of the TEPL Rubrics with Educator Evaluation.

Strategy 3 – Social Emotional Learning & Family and Community Engagement

Action Step 3.1 and 3.2 FaCE Fundamentals Rubric - The primary action step for FaCE is the implementation of a consistent framework for approaching family and community engagement in the form of the FaCE Fundamentals Rubric. In Spring 2016, schools will self-assess the level of engagement according to the rubric and set goals for improvement to be implemented in 2016-2017. The specific activities that schools will focus on for 2016-2017 will be determined by June 2016. It is anticipated that most engagement activities would primarily require time and existing human resources. Any associated resource expenses would be absorbed through existing allocations.

Additionally, the proposed Operating Budget provides for:

- **Action Step 4.1 Cultural Sensitivity Training** (Superintendent's Budget - Program 74 - \$4,400 as part of the Achievement Gap Budget)
- **Action Step 4.3 Customer Service Training** The Human Resources department will provide training for district and school-based administrative staff as the front line ambassadors for the GPS, using existing resources and funding within the HR program allocation.
- **Action Step 6 Web Site Enhancements** (Superintendent's Budget - Program 74 - branding and ENotify ~\$7,000) - The responsive redesigned District and school

2016 – 17 BOE Budget Questions Round I
November 23, 2015

web sites will launch by August 2016. The 2016-2017 budget provides funding for an additional function for facilitating user sign up for notifications of news and information and to apply branding elements that will be determined by the end of the 2015-2016 school year.

- **Action Step 7 Survey** - the FaCE Framework calls for surveying stakeholders to monitor satisfaction with engagement, and a survey mechanism will be the primary evaluation tool for monitoring the success of the FaCE Strategy Action Plan. It is expected that components of the Strategic Plan Survey (Superintendent's Budget - Program 74 - \$44,000) will address engagement with the GPS.

Strategy 4 – Data and Information

Strategy 4, stated as "[p]ersonalized Learning is achieved through systemic data and information systems that gauge progress on student growth," is supported by several areas in the IT Budget (Operating and Capital):

- A lead element is the contract with ECRA to provide a data system and services in the amount of \$105,000 (also noted under Strategy #1). This has been budgeted in Program 82 (IT).
- The Library Media operating and DLE capital budgets generally work to support Strategy 4 by providing funds for many digital instructional resources (LMS), and an instructional management system (Schoology, in DLE capital), that support the flow of information.

The CIPL Budget also provides funds that support Action Steps under Strategy 4, including:

- All district assessments, including STAR and CoGat.
- The administration of state standardized tests through printing costs, district and parent workshops (as outlined in Strategy 2 Action Steps 2 and 3, and Strategy 4 Action Step 7).
- RtI Resources, such as RTI Direct. This ongoing resources supports Strategy 4, Action Step 5 and 6.

100s – PERSONNEL

7. Does the 10% decrease in personnel costs in Program 62 represent any decline in services LE

RESPONSE:

The budget decrease in Social Work is generated from a retirement; the replacement position is now funded through a grant

8. What is the reason Personnel Services - Program 93 is showing an increase of 21% LE

2016 – 17 BOE Budget Questions Round I
November 23, 2015

RESPONSE:

The reason for the large variance is one line item. The Program 93 budget includes a line item for "New Positions". Last year, that budget line had a savings (or negative) assumption of \$365,500 based upon reorganization (see page 74). This year, that same budget line is proposing an increase of \$89,471, or a difference of \$454,971. Removing the "New Position" line, Program 93 has an adjusted increase of 1.98%.

9. Executive Summary – Attachment B – page 66 Can we have a better description for the staffing changes summary as they are not easily correlated to Attachment C (pages 67-70) or Staffing (pages 220-222)? LR

RESPONSE:

Attachment C does not have a direct link to the staffing changes summary on page 66. Attachment C lists the new initiatives or staff that were being considered before the Superintendent's proposed budget was finalized. Only two (2) of those positions are included in the proposed budget – Item 5 Unified Arts Coordinator (1.0 FTE) and Item 21 AVID Teacher (.20 FTE)

The correlation between the staffing changes summary on page 66 and the details on pages 220-222 are in the "Budget to Budget Change" column for each section. For example, looking at page 221 "Greenwich High School Summary" the +1.40 FTE Greenwich High School due to enrollment projections is indicated on the first line "TO FTEs"; the -.50 FTE Media Specialist shows on line 4 "Media"; and the AVID increase for the high school of .20 FTE is reflected in line 7 of that section.

UNIFIED ARTS PROGRAM COORDINATOR

10. Is the term "Unified Arts Coordinator" a known term in education? The title does not give equal weight to PE/Health or FACS. LE (full response below—grouped with Questions #12-13)

11. Note: The exec summary (#1 on p.58-59) refers to "budget to budget cost impact is nominal".... but the offsets refer to actual '15-'16 (1.0 FTE) instead of budgeted figure (.4 FTE). LE

RESPONSE:

During June of 2015 it was determined that the Lead Teacher allocations for Unified Arts needed to be increased from .40 FTE budgeted to 1.00 FTE actual. The reference to the cost impact being nominal is the difference between the salary of a 1.0 FTE Program Coordinator and the .40 FTE teacher salary, plus the evaluation cost for 2015-2016 (which would be \$17,500 across all disciplines and school levels).

2016 – 17 BOE Budget Questions Round I
November 23, 2015

12. I would like a better understanding of the availability of an individual able to perform the coordinator function for these disparate curricular areas, including the teacher evaluations. If such a person doesn't exist, what is the alternative plan? LE (full response below)

13. Please explain how one individual can accommodate the two very different areas of the Arts and PE/Health. Would this need be better served by two individuals given the extensive programming in each area and the upcoming health/PE curriculum review? If two people were needed, what would be the impact to the budget? DA (full response below)

RESPONSE:

The following statement provides answers to questions 10, 12 and 13:

Unified Arts is a term used in education to unify programming that begins in the middle school and extends through the high school. Unified Arts consists of the disciplines of Art, Music, Physical Education, Health, Family and Consumer Science and Technical Education subjects.

Many Connecticut districts have a Unified Arts Supervisor, Facilitator or Coordinator to oversee the same programs. Each role is responsible for supervising the implementation of the programs, monitoring the operations of each program and working with the principals and curriculum specialists. Not all positions require the evaluation of personnel. School districts with the position include:

- Cheshire
- Stamford
- East Windsor (Unified Arts Professional Learning Community (PLC) Team Leader)

Ms. Parisi is currently gathering information/data from surrounding districts from CAPSS regarding this position.

A district coordinator position requires an Intermediate Administrator Certificate (092). The Intermediate Administrator Certification guarantees that an individual has completed practical preparation for administrative positions in schools up to, and including, the assistant superintendent position. GPS Administrators with this certification have responsibilities that cross-cut multiple disciplines. For instance, GPS building administrators provide supervision for multiple programs. As an administrator, the Program Coordinator would provide supervision PK-12 in the identified areas specific to educator evaluation, operations, and program implementation.

The primary job description for a GPS Program Coordinator outlines the following: The Program Coordinator K-12 is responsible for the design, development and evaluation of the academic program, K-12, in his/her subject area(s). The Program Coordinator reports directly to the Assistant Superintendent. Key duties include

2016 – 17 BOE Budget Questions Round I
November 23, 2015

oversight for Curriculum, Personnel/Staffing, Assessments, Communications and Public Relations, Finance, Management, Scheduling, and professional Activities.

The primary and immediate need is to provide district oversight and supervision for the operations of each program area. The liability issues are a major concern if the appropriate steps are not taken to ensure the classrooms and equipment are safe. This is specific to the Physical Education, Fitness, FACS and Technical areas. A secondary concern is the magnitude of the equipment bids required to ensure that all classrooms have the necessary equipment to support the curriculum and program implementation.

If an individual, such as a building principal, has the organizational skills, is proficient in budget development and fiscal management, leadership skills and can work with a team of individuals, they can support each area effectively.

There will be challenges for any individual to oversee all areas; however the programs are in need of a single point of contact in the role of administrator who can provide leadership, day-to-day guidance, and monthly contact at program meetings.

Upon approval, the district would engage in the standard hiring process, which would include an internal and external positing, interview committee and final recommendation to the superintendent.

If there are no qualified applicants, we will review the reasons as to why the district was not able to attract viable candidates. The fallback would be to revisit the solutions that have been in place to support these areas. The district would also revisit the consideration of adding two 1.0 Positions that would oversee Art and Music and then PE, Health/wellness and FACS respectively. The impact to the budget would be approximately \$307,000 with an additional 1.0 increase to GOSA.

14. What would be the per annum cost of required inspections of PE spaces if outsourced? LE

RESPONSE:

There is an annual budget of \$30,000 to conduct all inspections. GPS conducts an annual bid for a contract to complete all inspections of the Physical Education spaces including all equipment, the Fitness centers at the middle schools and high school and the outdoor adventure courses. Corby Associates and Hintzen Fitness holds the current contracts for all inspections. Per the contract, the vendor will only interact with central office personnel. All inspections must be conducted by a licensed vendor per Greenwich Risk Management and Town Legal.

15. What is the current level of administration and teacher release time and administrative assistant support allocated to overseeing the PE, Health, Consumer Science, Music, Art and Theater programs? BON

2016 – 17 BOE Budget Questions Round I
November 23, 2015

RESPONSE:

The Assistant Superintendent for CIPL acts as the primary administrator for Art, Music, PE, Health and Family and Consumer Science (FACS) working in partnership with building principals. We currently budgeted for two .5 positions to provide a lead teacher position. This equates to an hour each day. This was created as a result of combining the part-time Administrative Assistant position for PE and FACS and the elimination of the Network Liaison stipend positions. Currently, the AA support is shared by two part-time AAs that also support other areas in the CIPL Office. The Administrative Assistant to the Assistant Superintendent provides additional support to the programs and teachers when needed, specifically during professional learning, budgeting and ordering seasons.

The Building Administrators have since taken on additional responsibilities for Art, Music, PE, Health, and FACS as a result of the reduction of program coordinators in 2013.

Given the increase of evaluations, retired administrators were hired as a consultant to the district to conduct complimentary evaluations in these areas at annual cost of \$17,500 (referred to earlier in Question #11).

PSYCHOLOGISTS/SOCIAL WORKERS (Programs 60 & 62)

16. This question was asked last year and answered that the positions remain but are funded through grants. Is the .5 School Psychologist a cut in services or a change in funding? LE

RESPONSE:

Change in funding from TO to IDEA.

17. The budget shows a decrease in social workers and an increase in Psychologists. Can you please explain this offset? Can we confirm we are meeting the growing needs to connect with families of students who are at risk with this model? DA

RESPONSE:

The 2014-2015 administrative position at the Alternative High School was allocated .5 to Social Work and .5 Administrator. The increase of .5 to the Administrator's billet made the current person a 1.0 Administrator with a resulting .5 decrease to the Social Work budget. The remaining 1.0 difference is a result of one Social Worker moving from the TO to a grant position.

18. What would be the cost of adding the recommended addition of a Bilingual Social Worker into the budget? Can this cost be offset by a reduction in cost for

2016 – 17 BOE Budget Questions Round I
November 23, 2015

translator/interpreter services? How will this need be addressed without the addition of this individual? DA

RESPONSE:

Please note that the budget does not recommend the Bilingual Social Worker, it had been raised as a consideration. The 'average' cost of a certified position is \$85,451 plus benefits. The focus of a bilingual social worker would be to provide direct service, in Spanish, to families and students, interface with public and private agencies and increase access services for families for whom a home language other than English presents a barrier. While this individual could provide some emergency translations of general district materials it would not fulfill the district's need to document translation services given the time requirements of the primary job responsibilities.

PARAPROFESSIONALS

19. Does the budget accommodate coverage for paraprofessionals attending PPT/IEP meetings? (asked verbally on 11/10) LE

RESPONSE:

Schools are currently using a variety of strategies to include professional assistants in IEP meetings when requested by the parents. Schools have designated IEP team meeting days which supports advanced planning of student and staff schedules to allow for meeting attendance. Schools also consider having the student and professional assistant attend the meeting together (for all or part of the meeting) which means that no additional coverage is required. Having the additional funds would have allowed the schools to schedule regular substitutes on meeting days which would have less impact on instruction.

ELL COORDINATOR

20. Were we to add the recommended ELL coordinator, would this individual be an addition to staffing or increased/shifted responsibilities of someone already on staff? What would be the impact to the budget for including this position? What would be the value added with respect to providing services across all our schools if this recommendation were met? DA

RESPONSE:

Please note that the budget does not recommend the ELL Coordinator, it had been raised as a consideration. This is the third year the request to increase the ELL Coordinator has been made and deferred.

2016 – 17 BOE Budget Questions Round I
November 23, 2015

The current ELL Coordinator is a district position with oversight of the K-12 ELL. The position as proposed in this budget is actually a shift in specific responsibilities that directly relate to aspects of the Strategic Plan. Currently the ELL position is funded .5 GOSA/.5 GEA, with some teaching responsibilities and the oversight of the District's AVID program. If we were able to increase the ELL Coordinator, we would shift in the responsibilities that would provide time to supervise not only AVID at the current three AVID sites, but also coordinate District-wide efforts related to the Strategic Plan's Family and Community Engagement (FaCE) work, allowing for the additional role of "FaCE Coordinator." The request is that the ELL Coordinator position be expanded to include these other areas, and that funding for this position be a full GOSA position, eliminating the teaching responsibilities. The difference in funding is the .5 GOSA vs .5 GEA salary, approximately \$28,000.00.

FLES Staffing

21. Update on FLES staffing: Last year 2.5 FTEs were cut in this area. Looking at location detail for actual current year, just as examples, NMS has a .8 allocation with 24 classrooms, Parkway has a .5 allocation with 12 sections and NSS has a .6 allocation with 19 sections. NMS has double the sections but only a .2 FTE increase and NSS has only a .1 increase in allocation for an additional 7 sections. Is this skewed by travel time? LE

RESPONSE:

The allocation is based on a formula that uses instructional time and sections. FLES offers 90 minutes a week to third and fourth grade and one hundred minutes to fifth grade. If a staff member is shared between two schools, .1 is added for travel time. The teacher at NS currently is a traveler. There are three schools that currently offer FLES K-5 and that would automatically increase the amount of billets and travel time.

- North Mianus 24 sections, 10 in grades 3-5. .80 FTE
- North Street 19 sections, 9 in grades 3-5. .60 FTE
- Parkway 12 sections, 6 in grades 3-5. .50 FTE (Scheduling specials at a small school is very difficult, so an additional .10 FTE was added)

2.50 FTE FLES Teacher positions were eliminated in the 2015-2016 budget. During the course of the summer sections were added that required the reinstatement of .20 FTE originally cut in order to allow appropriate scheduling and preparation time for teachers. FLES instruction is provided to grades K to 5 at four schools – Julian Curtiss; Hamilton Avenue; New Lebanon; and International School at Dundee. For the other schools it is only provided for grades 3 to 5.

ENROLLMENT/STAFFING

Elementary

2016 – 17 BOE Budget Questions Round I
November 23, 2015

22. Explain in detail the reduction in elementary class sections. Total enrollment is not in decline nor is the pipeline from Kindergarten in decline, in fact these are growing, so is the change based on new data or new methodology? JD

RESPONSE:

The elementary class sections are based on enrollment projections, with some minor modification. The actual elementary classrooms for 2015-2016 are 216. Using the existing class size formulas in place applied to the elementary enrollment projections for 2016-2017 only 205 classroom sections are needed. Based on the projections and past experience we added three sections to cover schools/grade levels that are likely to trip the class size guidelines and require another section. Maintaining the current section allocation at 212 would mean an additional 4.0 FTE to the proposed budget without the adequate enrollment projections to justify the additional staff.

23. Is there sufficient capacity in the budget to absorb any additional sections if elementary enrollment differs from expectations at the building level? What would the budget look like if we budgeted for 212 sections? LE

RESPONSE:

Adhering strictly to class guidelines, the number of elementary sections needed is 205. The proposed budget calls for 208 to handle additional classes if needed. If 212 sections were included in the budget we would need to add an additional \$341,804 making the budget increase 2.43%.

24. [note the staffing model of 1 section per 20 students equates to 209 sections for the current year (enrollment projection of $4176/20 = 209$) vs. a budget of 212 sections and an actual of 216 (though actual enrollment is 23 students shy of projection.)] LE

RESPONSE:

Referring back to Q 22, dividing the projected elementary enrollment of 4176 by 20 equates to 209 classrooms. Looking at the specific enrollment projections by school by grade the staffing model indicated a need for only 205 classrooms. It was determined that a more appropriate number of classrooms would be 208. Each year there is a uniqueness to the allocation of classrooms based on specific enrollment, and that changes over the course of the spring and summer up until September 15th. This requires the re-allocation of budgeted positions in some rare occasions each year from one school to another and/or the addition of elementary teachers to open new sections, such as this year when the actual number of classrooms was increased from 212 budgeted to 216 actual based on enrollment changes.

Middle School

2016 – 17 BOE Budget Questions Round I
November 23, 2015

25. What is the enrollment of the MS by class? BON asked previously

RESPONSE:

Please see the attached class size report by school and program. This report is in response to the enrollment questions raised by BOE members subsequent to the Fall 2015 *Enrollment Report* (October 8, 2015 BOE Work Session). Class size by course and the sizes of individual classes are available on request.

26. How has enrollment in each middle school changed from 2014-15, 15 -16 and projected for 16 -17 and how has staffing changed over the same period? BON

RESPONSE:

Please combined answer for Questions #26 and 27 below.

High School

27. How has enrollment changed from 2014-15, 15 -16 and 16-17 projection. BON

RESPONSE (Combined for Questions #26 & 27):

The enrollment numbers for each secondary school over the years requested:

	2014 - 2015	2015 - 2016	2016 – 2017 (proj)
Central	578	567	560
Eastern	812	818	843
Western	533	534	547
High School	2570	2591	2613

Staffing allocations at the Secondary Level (GHS and Middle Schools) are driven by a three part staffing model: 1) staffing for regular course enrollments (see answer to Question 24); 2) staffing for programs that deliver fixed services at each school (i.e., administration, media, guidance, social work, psychologists); and 3) staffing for academic support needs of students (i.e., special education, ESOL, reading).

For this round of budget questions, we have focused on the first part of the staffing model (data provided in the above chart), which is driven by total enrollment (the ratios). If requested, we could disaggregate staffing into the three staffing model categories and generate data on student need for each of the schools over the three years (2014-15, 15 -16 and 16-17).

The problem with comparing the total staff number to total enrollment numbers is that it masks the effects of the second and third parts of the staffing model. The

2016 – 17 BOE Budget Questions Round I
November 23, 2015

second part is essentially fixed so increases and decreases in enrollment will not be reflected. The third part of the model allocates staff based on student need. It is possible for the need at a school to drive an increase in staffing even as the total enrollment declines and vice versa.

28. How has certified staffing changed over that same period? BON

RESPONSE:

	2016-17	2015-16	2015-16	2014-15	2014-5
	Budget	Actual	Budget	Actual	Budget
TO FTEs	171.00	169.60	169.60	169.90	170.30
Enrollment Projection	2,613		2,585		2,576

PROGRAMS

Summer School

29. Having visited the summer program this year, I saw first hand the need for .5FTE year round Asst. Principal. Given the program's continued expansion and the fact that it is tuition based and generates revenue, what would be the impact to the budget to add this position? DA

RESPONSE:

\$66,475 (.5 Assistant Principal Salary)

30. Given that summer school students will be receiving devices beginning in summer 2016 and the importance of devices to personalizing learning for students, what support for the devices will be available at all summer school locations? If needed, what might be the impact to the budget to add an MTA to the summer school staff? DA

RESPONSE:

The Superintendent's proposed budget includes \$6,000 in the summer school budget to provide an MTA (Media Technical Assistant) at both elementary summer school locations for the full six weeks of the program and the two preparation days before summer school starts. (See Summer School report page 22, for additional information.

31. Will the successful summer 2015 field trip/ enrichment programs continue to be provided? Will this occur through grants or be covered by revenue generated by the program? If not, what is the plan to address this need and/or the impact to the budget to add these? DA

RESPONSE:

2016 – 17 BOE Budget Questions Round I
November 23, 2015

The administration will apply for a Greenwich Alliance grant to subsidize the enrichment partnerships for in-school STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering, and Math) experiences. It has been proposed that the field trips for summer school be funded using the 2015 Summer School fund balance. The Board of Education will have an opportunity to approve the use of the funds for the field trips at the November 19 Board of Education meeting as part of the recommendations in the Summer School Report.

32. Please provide an estimated total budget increase, dollars and percent change, if we include a 0.5 summer school administrator and media technology assistant for a six-week assignment. JD

RESPONSE:

The Media Technical Assistant (MTA) is already included in the Superintendent's proposed budget for 2015 at a cost of \$6,000 and thus does not represent an increase. The cost of including a .5 administrator to support the planning and implementation of summer school would be \$66,475. Including this into the 16-17 budget will bring the total proposed budget for 16-17 to \$150,097,469 which would represent a 2.23% increase over the 15-16 budget.

33. How does the BOE take action on the recommendation that a portion of the summer school fund balance (\$30,000) be allocated for field trips? LE

RESPONSE:

The Board of Education will have an opportunity to approve the use of the funds for the field trips at the November 19 Board of Education meeting as part of the recommendations in the Summer School Report.

34. How many students who fall in one of the at-risk categories but who are performing on grade level are not invited to summer school? What would it cost to include them? GF

RESPONSE:

The administration used the following method in developing a response to this question. At risk categories were defined as students receiving Special Education or English Language Learner services or those students who qualified for Free/Reduced Lunch. We identified these students using Aspen data and then removed any student who was invited to summer school in 2015. We also removed any student who attended summer school as an ESY student. There were 569 students who were on grade level (not invited to summer school) who fell into at least one at risk category. In calculating the cost of offering summer school tuition to these students, we applied the same "acceptance rate" of 48% that was realized for the 2015 summer school. In other words, of the total number of students invited to attend summer school in 2015, 48% accepted and attended. Based on these assumptions, our working number of students

2016 – 17 BOE Budget Questions Round I
November 23, 2015

who are on grade level and fall into one or more at risk categories who might accept our offer to attend summer school at reduced tuition would be 273.

The cost to accommodate 273 additional students would be approximately \$655,133. This figure includes:

- Site Supervisor: \$ 19,658
- Nurse: \$9,119
- Clerical: \$8,755
- Classroom Teachers and Specialists: \$336,738
- Professional Assistants: \$159,992
- Crossing Guard: \$1,218
- Materials: \$3,000
- Transportation: \$84,153
- Food Services: \$17,500
- Field Trips: \$15,000

It is difficult to calculate what the cost of lost revenue would be since the number of students who would have attended summer school as full tuition students is unknown.

In addition, the administration would strongly recommend that a .050 Summer School Administrator (\$66,475) be added should enrollment be broadened as this question suggests. We would not be able to manage a program with an additional 273 students without increased administration. The total estimated cost for the idea suggested by this question would be \$721,608.

PRE K

35. The recommendation inferred it might be necessary to add a section of Pre K to accommodate an increase in SPED PK students. An additional Section was not added to the budget. Will you please explain the reasoning behind this decision and when it will be clear the section is or is not officially needed? Will it be possible to accommodate the students who require PK within our current model? JD

RESPONSE:

For the first time since 1997, the preschool program was required to open a section during the winter (mid year) to accommodate the number of incoming three year old children. Since September 2014, the preschool director had been concerned about the number of potential new students based on known and projected students. During the summer of 2015, there was concern raised again about the number of returning students and incoming three year olds. At this time last school year there were only 5 open seats and 11 students anticipated to require a classroom seat. At the present time the preschool has 3 vacancies for children with disabilities and 10 students known or projected to be transitioning

2016 – 17 BOE Budget Questions Round I
November 23, 2015

into the program. The preschool staff plans to increase the number of children with disabilities in classes by one to accommodate any additional students this year. Considering the large group of 4 year of students who will be moving to kindergarten (29), it is our expectation that 12 classes will be sufficient to serve all of the young children with disabilities for the 2016-2017 school year.

36. How will deferring an additional preschool class change the ratios of SPED to typical students and in what locations? JD

RESPONSE:

It is our current projection that given the number of 3 turning 4 year olds and the projection of known and unconfirmed (currently eight children) incoming 3 year olds, that the classes will be able to run within the guidelines for the 2016-2017 school year (5 children with disabilities per class at OG, NS and PK, and 4 children with disabilities per class at Ham Ave). Depending on the entry date of the 3 year olds, we have added one child with an IEP to classes toward the end of the year with little negative impact.

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

37. By program what is the cost of training teachers- direct training of teachers. BON (full response below)

- a. Substitute days
- b. Consultants
- c. Summer pay
- d. Other

CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT

38. By Program what is the cost of writing, and or aligning the curriculum. BON (full response below)

- a. Substitute days
- b. Consultants
- c. Summer pay
- d. other

RESPONSE:

The following statement provides an answer to questions 37 and 38:

The separate spreadsheet provides the requested information by object code. Specifically, the pivot table tab provides the overview of each program area and the expenditures for professional learning, including substitutes, consultants, and growth and development (summer). In addition to this spreadsheet, program tables with

2016 – 17 BOE Budget Questions Round I
November 23, 2015

explanations are provided for Science, Mathematics and ESL/ELL. If requested, we can provide the program narrative in round II of budget questions.

To further clarify, developing, writing and renewing the curriculum is conducted during the last days of the school year when students and teachers are no longer in session. Therefore, we no longer fund for substitutes to cover teachers for curriculum “writing”.

Any GEA educator participating in the summer curriculum institute or additional curriculum writing receives the contracted rate of \$240.00 per day (for a six hour day). The number of days worked will determine the total cost per teacher.

We currently do not contract with consultants for the summer curriculum institute.

All costs associated with curriculum development can be found on the attached Spreadsheet.

OPERATIONS SERVICES

Food Service

39. How much of the \$98K increase in cafeteria receipts in the food service budget is accounted for by the proposed 2.5% price increase? Is there a table with proposed pricing for '16-'17 (not sure if cost of meals with price increase in food service program, like tuition increases, is voted on by BOE?) LE

RESPONSE:

\$22,500 of the \$98,000 of the projected revenue increase is assumed to come from the proposed price increase.

	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17
ES	\$2.10	\$2.35	\$2.60	\$2.60	\$2.75	\$2.75	\$2.90	\$2.90	\$3.00	\$3.00	\$3.15	\$3.25	\$3.35
MS	\$2.25	\$2.50	\$2.75	\$2.75	\$2.90	\$2.90	\$3.05	\$3.05	\$3.15	\$3.15	\$3.30	\$3.40	\$3.50
HS	\$2.35	\$2.60	\$2.85	\$2.85	\$3.00	\$3.00	\$3.15	\$3.15	\$3.25	\$3.25	\$3.40	\$3.50	\$3.60
Proposed Increase	\$0.10	\$0.25	\$0.25	--	\$0.15	--	\$0.15	--	\$0.10	--	\$0.15	+2.5% Rounded	+2.5% Rounded
	First increase in 10 years	First year to capture 1/3 Benefit Cost	Capture 2/3 Benefit Cost	Capture Full Benefit Cost									

Transportation

2016 – 17 BOE Budget Questions Round I
November 23, 2015

40. During Bill's Budget presentation on 11/10 – the PowerPoint Presentation indicated a \$130K increase in transportation, but page 164 only lists \$70K? LR (full response below)

41. The rate of increase for SPED transportation services (52140) is significantly higher than contractual increase of 2.5% (line 52120). What's the reason for that? LE (full response below)

RESPONSE (Q40 and Q41):

The total increases in transportation are generated from three categories. Regular, Special and Summer. The \$130,000 increase was for Special Education transportation only. The 2.5% contractual increase makes up \$118,735 of the total transportation increase. An additional \$106,766 was added for Special Education and Summer School. This is due to increased special education demand as well as the anticipation of Hamilton Avenue School not being available for this summer and the need for additional transportation.

	FY 15-16	Proposed 16-17	2.5% Dollar impact	Additional Svs. Dollar Impact	Total
Transportation	\$4,749,369	\$4,974,870	\$118,735	\$106,766	\$225,501

WIFI

42. pg. 69 How is home Wi-Fi access for all students who do not have it being addressed? Are we certain that all students will have access to Wi-Fi in their homes? What options are there for additional funds if required to meet this need? LE

RESPONSE:

There will be a pilot, beginning December 1, to provide home internet access, for GPS DLE-issued devices only, to a group of 25 students who are thought to "need" internet access. The provisioning of home internet services for students by school districts is a relatively new endeavor, and is without precedent nor analogue in other areas of educational services (e.g., K-12 districts provide nutritional assistance for students on school grounds, not in their homes) and hence, must be carefully studied. Because many families voluntarily choose to not have internet access at home, the question presently being studied is how the district can systematically identify "need." "Need" is expected to be defined as those students whose families i) desire internet access, but ii) lack the means to afford it iii) given other reasonable priorities. If there are needs that exceed the pilot this year, those additional students will be referred to existing subsidy programs such as the federal FCC Lifeline and Connecthome Programs, in addition to telecommunications carriers' discounted-access programs.

2016 – 17 BOE Budget Questions Round I
November 23, 2015

43. How many households are expected to need Wi-Fi and could we look at doing 12 months instead of just 10 to combat summer slide? GF

RESPONSE:

Initial estimates put the number of families who need internet access at approximately 120, but the actual number identified through guidance counselors has historically been south of that. However, if "need" is solely measured through means testing, using the lone criterion of free and reduced lunch would put the number at approximately 1,100.

There are no plans to extend the internet access pilot described above to the summer months. Regarding the "summer slide," a defined summer curriculum would be required for an educational tool and accompanying internet connection to be educationally impactful. A device and internet connection without defined student outcomes and educational plans would place the burden of learning entirely upon the students and families who are already most in need of educational support.

44. Are we the District doing anything this year to address the need to provide Wi-Fi to students who need it? BON

RESPONSE:

Although funds had not been budgeted this year to provide home wireless internet access (the BOE approved such measure in April 2015), the District will provide unlimited home access for DLE devices to a total of 20-25 households beginning in December 2015. Please see the answer to question 43 for additional information.

45. Does this budget provide for Wi-Fi access at home for students with identified need? (asked verbally on 11/10) LE

RESPONSE:

No; the request that appeared in the Program Services document as a line item was not built into the operating budget. In the event that this item is not approved, there will be an extension and modest expansion to the FY16 pilot by leveraging any remaining DLE capital funds from FY16.

MINORITY STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT NETWORK

46. What is the cost?

RESPONSE:

The proposed budget includes \$35,450 for MSAN expenses. They are broken out in the following table, showing the budgeted amount and the actual expenditures for each of the past two years. The table indicates that in 2014-15 we expended far less

2016 – 17 BOE Budget Questions Round I
November 23, 2015

(proportionally) than budgeted, so we reduced the annual budget amount last year to the current recommended level of \$35,450. For 2015-16, we anticipate using nearly all of the allocated funds (indeed, we already have used two-thirds of the available funding). The primary difference in fund usage is that we now have a GHS MSAN Student Leadership Group, which participated in Fall 2015 in MSAN Student Leadership Conferences and will continue its work, including outreach to regional schools and districts, through this full school year.

MSAN Budget Allocation and Expenditures 2014-15 – 2016-17

MSAN Items	2014-15 Budget	2014-15 Actual	2015-16 Budget	2015-16 Actual	2016-17 Budget
Membership	\$13,500	\$13,500	\$13,500	\$13,500	\$13,500
Conferences & Meetings	\$17,500	\$2,767	\$6,850	\$0.00*	\$6,850
Travel & Lodging	\$4,000	\$0.00	\$10,100	\$8,428	\$10,100
Outreach to Other Districts	\$5,000	\$0.00	\$5,000	\$0.00	\$5,000
TOTAL	\$40,000	\$16,267	\$35,450	\$21,928	\$35,450

*Conference Costs for Student Leadership are covered in Membership Fee, as are registration fees each year for several staff and administrators.

47. What was the goal when joining?

RESPONSE:

The GPS applied to MSAN in February 2014 and was accepted by the organization's Governing Board (consisting of member school districts) in April 2014. Our application listed a goal statement (excerpted below in *italics*) that still stands as an apt statement on our purposes in being a member of MSAN.

It is our hope that membership in MSAN will expand our repertoire of strategies for raising achievement for all students and closing gaps in achievement among student subgroups. The growing diversity of our community, the uneven distribution of diversity with the community and the differing performance levels of the community's elementary and middle schools, combine to make Greenwich somewhat unique within CT...The problems we face as a district in closing gaps in achievement are substantially different from neighboring districts. Membership in MSAN will provide us an opportunity to share issues, concerns and approaches with districts more similar to Greenwich and benefit from their experience. Specifically, it is our hope that membership in MSAN will:

1. Provide GPS with a network of similarly high performing districts, nationally and regionally, to learn from and share with regarding minority student achievement and achievement gap work;
2. Provide the superintendent and job and content specific positions a set of colleagues, national and regionally, who are grappling with similar opportunities and challenges;

2016 – 17 BOE Budget Questions Round I
November 23, 2015

3. Provide our students who already are oriented to leadership and problem solving with an essential leadership experience on a core academic and social issue for the GPS;
4. Provide GPS entrée into research and researchers working on minority achievement issues in high performing schools districts and schools;
5. Provide the GPS BOE, parents and community with comparison and reference points (i.e., other MSAN member districts) for the opportunities and challenges our district and schools are facing. That is, provide assurance that Greenwich is not alone in this important work and help our entire community learn from other MSAN communities;
6. Emphasize the priority of the minority achievement opportunity and challenge for the superintendent and district professionals;
7. Connect with a group of districts and schools increasingly concerned with the performance of low income Latino students.

48. Have we used it in such a way as to reach that goal?

RESPONSE:

We have partially met the hopes for MSAN membership. It has been a good resource as a network of like districts (Point #1 above), who are connected virtually and in-person via phone and meetings. MSAN also has been an occasional resource for the Superintendent and other administrators examining particular issues (Point #2 above). For instance, the FaCE research was informed by consultation with MSAN members. As of this year, it has become a leadership opportunity for students, with a multi-grade team of GHS students having attended the Fall 2015 MSAN Student Meetings and now working on action plans at GHS with two faculty advisors and monthly meetings (just beginning) with the Headmaster and Superintendent (Point #3 above). The MSAN Student Group currently includes seven students (four seniors and three juniors), with recruitment underway for 9th-11th graders. It also has been a good resource for research and knowledge sources on achievement gap issues (Point #4 above).

We have not been as active with MSAN as originally envisioned. It has not been possible for the Superintendent or another Cabinet member to attend any of the trimester leadership meetings hosted by MSAN. Similarly, we have only occasionally linked “job and content specific positions” (Point #2 above) with MSAN. The MSAN meetings and sessions—for administrators and other staff--prove critical to MSAN districts in terms of adding real value to the membership.

49. Why do you think it is worth signing up for it for another year?

RESPONSE:

Despite only partially meeting our original hopes for MSAN membership, it is a good idea to continue MSAN participation for at least one more year. MSAN remains the only

2016 – 17 BOE Budget Questions Round I
November 23, 2015

network of its type nationally or regionally—that is, a network of typically high performing school districts with significant achievement gaps. (For reference, the following link lists the MSAN member districts:

<http://msan.wceruw.org/members/districts.html>.) This is too rare and too relevant a network of districts for us to step away from, without attempting to increase our efforts to maximize the benefits. Consider how often we ask, “what districts are doing what we are doing or facing what we are facing?” And, consider how often we answer that question with, “not many.” MSAN provides us a group of districts that are remarkably similar. We need to do more to connect with and learn from them. The key step will be to have the Superintendent and other top administrators, and one or more “job or content specific staff,” commit to participating in MSAN’s programs and meetings, and following through with work plans to bring the knowledge and information back into Greenwich.

It also is important to give MSAN one more year because, as noted above, we now have a MSAN student group at GHS, which attended the Fall 2015 MSAN Student Leadership Conference and came back inspired to pursue action plans on minority achievement issues. The group has good faculty leadership from Gary Charles and Valerie Bolling. The group has begun to reach out to MSAN members in this region, to help make the work more viable by connecting with districts easily accessed. The student leadership component of MSAN always has been highly rated by member districts. We finally are seeing the potential for drawing on that resource. It would be a mistake to withdraw from MSAN right after we get the student leadership element started.

We have been an MSAN member for just 18 months. We need to give it a third year to see if we can maximize the resources the MSAN network can provide our senior administrators, staff and students as we seek to improve minority student performance.

Submission For Strategic Plan Action Plan
Strategy 1: Personalized Learning - Strategic Leadership and Management
Submitted by William S. McKersie, Ph.D., Superintendent

Strategy 1: Personalized Learning is achieved through strategic leadership and management.	
Action Steps – Personalized Learning - Strategic Leadership and Management	Progress
<p>1. <i>Establish the management body for implementation of the Strategic Plan – Process Action Step</i></p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">a) Designated the Cabinet as the lead management body for overseeing implementation of the Strategic Plan</p> <p>Timeline: by September 2015 Lead: Superintendent</p>	Completed
<p>2. <i>Establish Board and Administration Joint Committee to monitor implementation of the Strategic Plan – Process Action Step</i></p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">a) Designate committee chairperson b) Build a charter in which the purpose of this committee is to support implementation of the strategic plan and monitor progress</p> <p>Timeline: by October 2015 Lead: Board and Superintendent</p>	In Process
<p>3. <i>Review current leadership structures and processes, including committees, to determine optimal oversight, coordination and alignment toward creating personalized learning experiences for students – Process Action Step</i></p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">a) Redirect committees to focus on personalized learning</p> <p>Timeline: by February 2016 Lead: Superintendent</p>	In Process
<p>4. <i>Develop a multi-year Strategic Dashboard to guide and monitor the implementation of the Strategic Plan – Process Action Step</i></p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">a) Strategic Dashboard will establish Outcomes, Targets and Timelines for the Academic, Personal and Interpersonal Goals and Systems Operations b) Strategic Dashboard will list Strategy Action Steps, with differentiation between Process Action Steps and Improvement Action Steps, and monitor progress</p>	In Process

<p>Timeline:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • First Iteration for 2015-16 – October 8, 2015 and October 22, 2015 • Final Iteration for 2015-16 – by November 17, 2015 • Multi-Year Plan – by July 2016 <p>Lead: Superintendent</p>	
<p>5. <i>Define “Personalized Learning” in GPS and the steps necessary for district wide understanding and effective implementation – Process Action Step</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Establish definition in coordination with Strategies #2-4. b) Implement DLE Phase III as lead approach in delivering personalized learning. c) Complete a review of the efficacy of current GPS practices vis-a-vis personalized learning d) Develop a filtering mechanism for removing or adding practices, procedures, and initiatives that are inconsistent with the personalization of learning <p>Timeline: by February 2016 Lead: Superintendent with Cabinet</p>	In Process
<p>6. <i>Enhance communications by creating a messaging campaign around the new strategic plan – Process Action Step</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Differentiate the campaign for internal and external stakeholders b) Identify a slogan/approach that demonstrates the emphasis on Personalized Learning and the Academic, Personal and Interpersonal Goals <p>Timeline: by February 2016 Lead: Superintendent, Director of Communications, Board of Education Liaison</p>	In Process
<p>7. <i>Evaluate progress and refine plan – Process Action Step</i></p> <p>Timeline: by July 2016 Lead: Superintendent, Cabinet and Joint Board-Administration Committee</p>	In Process

Submission For Strategic Plan Action Plan

Strategy 2: Personalized Learning – Curriculum and Instruction

Submitted by Ellen Flanagan, Deputy Superintendent and Irene Parisi, Assistant Superintendent

Strategy 2: Personalized Learning is achieved through standards-based, rigorous and relevant Curriculum and Instruction	
Action Steps	Progress
Curriculum	
1. Establish Strategy #2 sub-committee – Process Action Step	Complete
2. Develop standard expectation for review of district assessment data by leadership – Process Action Step Timeline: August 2015 – October 30, 2015 Lead: Assistant Superintendent with Deputy Superintendent	In Process
3. Develop Assessment Literacy skill in teachers and administrators - Improvement Action Step Timeline: August 2015 – November 2015 Lead: Assistant Superintendent with Deputy Superintendent Improvement Action Step: By January 2016, 90% of the GPS Building Administrators will have participated in an assessment literacy workshop.	In Process
4. Identify and plan for student learning opportunities beyond the classroom – Process Action Step Timeline: June 2015 – February 2016 Lead: Assistant Superintendent with Program Coordinators	In Process
5. Distribute and communicate GPS Curriculum Management Plan to support implementation and annual renewal of the written curriculum – Process Action Step Timeline: June 2015 – August 2016 Lead: Assistant Superintendent with Program Coordinators	Complete
6. Continue the development and implementation of a standards-based, rigorous, transdisciplinary curriculum to ensure alignment to personalized learning – Process Action Step Timeline: August 2015 – March 2016 Lead: Assistant Superintendent with Program Coordinators	In Process
7. Complete documentation of all curricular units of study PreK – 12 - Improvement Action Step Timeline: Jul 2015 – June 2016 Lead: Assistant Superintendent with Program Coordinators Improvement Action Step: By August 2016, 100% of the PreK-12 Curricular Units of Study will be documented in the district curriculum mapper.	In Process

<p>8. Develop a plan for summer curriculum Institute 2016 to focus on documentation of secondary elective courses – Improvement Action Step</p> <p>Timeline: August 2015 – March 2016 Lead: Assistant Superintendent with Program Coordinators</p> <p>Improvement Action Step: By August 2016, 100% of secondary electives will be documented in the district curriculum mapper</p>	In Process
<p>9. Align classroom practices with the definition of personalized learning - Improvement Action Step</p> <p>Timeline: August 2015 – March 2016 Lead: Assistant Superintendent with Program Coordinators</p> <p>Improvement Action Step: By the spring of 2016, 80% of GPS students grades K-8 will have an individualized learning plan in IXL digital resource for ELA and or Math</p>	In Process
<p>10. DLE Professional Learning opportunity for teachers to understand district expectations for accessing the curriculum through Schoology and populating a course to support instruction - Improvement Action Step</p> <p>Timeline: August 2015 – August 2015 Lead: Assistant Superintendent with Program Coordinators and CIO</p> <p>Improvement Action Step: By August 2015, 100% of the GPS Educators will have received 6 hours of Schoology Training in accessing the district curriculum through Schoology</p>	Complete
Instruction	
<p>1. Plan and implement professional learning in support of DLE Goals - Improvement Action Step</p> <p>Timeline: April 2015 – June 2016 Lead: Assistant Superintendent with Program Coordinators and CIO</p> <p>Improvement Action Step: By the spring of 2016, 95%GPS educators will have received 37 hours of professional learning on the DLE goals.</p>	In Process
<p>3. Revise TEPL Rubric to reflect DLE goals – Process Action Steps</p> <p>Timeline: January 2015 – September 2015 Lead: Dep. Supt. with TEPL Committee</p>	Complete
<p>4. Conduct a field test of revised TEPL Rubric indicators in order to revise rubric based on feedback – Process Action Step</p> <p>Timeline: August 2015 – May 2016 Lead: Dep. Supt. with TEPL Committee</p>	In Process

Submission For Strategic Plan Action Plan Strategy 3 Social Emotional Learning

Submitted by Mary P. Forde

Strategy 3: Personalized Learning is achieved through the implementation of a comprehensive Social Emotional Learning (SEL) Framework and enhanced Family/Community Engagement (FaCE).	
Action Steps (SEL) 2015-2016/17	Progress
1. District Norm Activities – Improvement Action Step Finalize the Norm Activities for the 2015-2016 school year: Sept. 30 Be Here – Log Off and Listen In (Yellow) Nov. 12 Care for Self and Others – You’ve Got a Friend in Me (Red) Jan. 28 Be Safe – Stop, Think, Act (Green) Mar. 24 Let Go and Move On – Keep Calm – Let Go and Move On (Blue) May 19 Be Honest – Keep It Real (Orange) Timeline: 2015-16 School Year Lead: Alina Agiurgioaei Boie	Planning Completed Implementation throughout the school year
2. District Safe School Climate Committee – Process Action Step Committee meets three times during the school year. Committee members include representatives from each school, GAHS and Preschool and Special Education Coaches. The committee will identify and coordinate subcommittees to complete the following activities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review and revise the SEL Student Rubrics to reflect the district norms • Review and revise the SEL Implementation Expectations for Schools to include the norms and revised SSC legislation • Develop a rubric that will be used to evaluate the pilot implementation of school-wide SEL/PBIS (Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports) programs • Identify SEL programs that schools can select for pilot implementation in 2016-2017 Timeline: by June 30, 2016 Lead: Subcommittee chairs from the District SSC Committee	First meeting – Oct. 20, 2015
3. Expansion of PBIS to Additional Schools - Process Action Step Identify 2-3 schools to begin the three year implementation process of PBIS with professional development provided through SERC. Timeline: Expansion Cohort 1 - First Year completed by June 30, 2016 Lead: District Behavior Coaches	Pending
4. District Norm Activities 2016-2017 - Process Action Step Plan Norm Activities for the 2016-2017 School year and update the training materials (implementation of the norms in schools) for the activities offered to SSC school-based committee members each year. Timeline: By June 2016 Lead: Alina Agiurgioaei Boie	Pending

<p>5. <i>Develop Professional Learning Materials (presentation Power Point and Video) introducing PBIS to all staff members - Process Action Step</i> In preparation for the training in Seclusion and Restraint that will be required for all staff in 2019, provide an introduction to the principles of PBIS to all staff to be made available to schools beginning in August 2016. Training materials will include the required components of the Safe School Climate professional learning activities required for all staff members at the beginning of the school year.</p> <p>Timeline: By August 2016 Lead: District Behavior Coaches</p>	<p>Pending</p>
<p>6. <i>District Safe School Climate Committee Improvement Action Step</i> Committee meets three times during the school year. Committee members include representatives from each school, GAHS and Preschool and Special Education Coaches. The committee will identify and coordinate subcommittees to complete the following activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop timeline and implementation plan to introduce the revised SEL Student Rubrics to school SSC committees and staff • Develop timeline and implementation plan to introduce the revised SEL Implementation Expectations for • Provide schools with SEL program options that will be piloted during the 2016-2017 school year and evaluated using the rubric • Prepare a summary report of the pilot implementation of SEL programs and make recommendations for district implementation <p>Timeline: by June 30, 2017 Lead: Subcommittee chairs from the District SSC Committee</p>	<p>Pending</p>
<p>7. <i>Expansion of PBIS to Additional Schools- Improvement Action Step</i> Identify 2-3 additional schools to begin the three year implementation process of PBIS with professional development provided through SERC.</p> <p>Timeline: Expansion Cohort 1 - Second Year completed by June 30, 2017 Expansion Cohort 2 – First Year completed by June 30, 2017 Lead: District Behavior Coaches</p>	

Submission For Strategic Plan Action Plan Strategy 3 Family and Community Engagement

Submitted by FaCE Committee Chairs: Kim Eves, Director of Communications w/Trudi Durrell, ESOL Program Coordinator and Eugene Matejek, ISD Assistant Principal

Strategy 3: Personalized Learning is achieved through the implementation of a comprehensive Social Emotional Learning (SEL) Framework and enhanced Family/Community Engagement (FaCE).	
Action Steps (FaCE) 2015-2016/17	Progress
<p>1. FaCE Enhancement Recommendations – Process Action Step Finalize and Submit FaCE Recommendations (as per Achievement Gap subcommittee for FaCE) to Superintendent; incorporate as directed into Strategic Plan Action Steps.</p> <p>Timeline: by August 2015 Lead: Director of Communications w/FaCE Committee Chairs</p>	Completed
<p>2. FaCE Committee - Process Action Step Re-establish FaCE Committee for oversight of the successful implementation of Strategy 3 FaCE Action Plan, as measured by completion of process action steps and improvement in satisfaction of stakeholders as it pertains to the engagement with the schools via survey metrics.</p> <p>Timeline: by October 2015 Lead: Director of Communications w/FaCE Committee Chairs</p>	Completed
<p>3.1 Fundamentals Rubric – Process Action Step Working with FaCE Committee and GPS Leadership, adapt Cambridge, MA Public Schools' FaCE Fundamentals Rubric for GPS, designed to guide schools in the implementation of effective engagement practices and provide a self-assessment tool to measure level of implementation.</p> <p>Timeline: May 2015 – January 2015 Lead: Director of Communications w/FaCE Committee Chairs</p>	In Progress
<p>3.2 School-based Self-assessment – Improvement Action Step Schools to self-assess level of engagement strategies in use based on GPS FaCE Rubric; establish 2016-2017 objectives and action steps to achieve, at a minimum, Rubric Indicator Level I by June 2017, as measured by Spring 2017 self-assessment and satisfaction survey metrics. (Note: Action Step to repeat annually with intent to achieve Indicator Levels II/III by 2020)</p> <p>Timeline: March 2016 - June 2016 (Self-Assessment and Action Steps); by June 2017 (Achieve Indicator Level I Goal) Lead: Principals w/ FaCE Committee Chairs</p>	Pending
<p>4.1. Professional Learning – Culturally Relevant Training – Improvement Action Step Plan and provide large group and job-embedded professional learning (PL) in Culturally Relevant Training strategies for instructional staff, as measured by completion of action step for all instructional staff; evaluation feedback on PL; and stakeholder satisfaction survey metric.</p>	In Progress

<p>Timeline: by June 2016 (for HAS, JCS, NLS & WMS); by June 2017 (for CCS, GLV, ISD, NMS, NSS, OGS, PKW, RIV, CMS, EMS & GHS/GAHS)</p> <p>Lead: ESOL Program Coordinator</p>	
<p>4.2. Professional Learning – Customer Service – Improvement Action Step</p> <p>Plan and provide large group professional learning (PL) in Customer Service training, to include cultural and linguistic sensitivity for District and school-based administrative staff, as measured by completion of action step for all administrative staff; evaluation feedback on PL; and stakeholder satisfaction survey metric.</p> <p>Timeline: by June 2017</p> <p>Lead: Director of Human Resources w/FaCE Committee Leadership</p>	Pending
<p>4.3 Professional Learning – FaCE Strategies – Improvement Action Step</p> <p>Plan optional and ongoing blended professional learning workshops on FaCE strategies for all staff for 2016-2017.</p> <p>Timeline: by June 2016</p> <p>Lead: FaCE Committee Leadership</p>	In Progress
<p>5.1 Staffing - Administrator</p> <p>Develop role and responsibilities, and propose central administrator oversight for FaCE to monitor and guide District and school-based activities, initiatives and expectations.</p> <p>Timeline: by October 2015 (for proposal) by July 2016 (for implementation)</p> <p>Lead: FaCE Committee Leadership w/CIPL Assistant Superintendent and Director of Human Resources</p>	In Progress
<p>5.2 Staffing – Bilingual Social Worker</p> <p>Propose hiring a bilingual social worker for, at a minimum, the Translation Required Schools (HAS, JCS, NLS & WMS)</p> <p>Timeline: by October 2015 (for proposal) by June 2016 (for implementation)</p> <p>Lead: Director of Pupil Personnel Services w/Director Human Resources</p>	In Progress
<p>5.3 Staffing – Bilingual Staff</p> <p>Through attrition, prioritize hiring at least one bilingual Guidance Counselor for secondary schools, and bilingual office staff for Translation Required Schools and GHS.</p> <p>Timeline: Staff turnover dependent</p> <p>Lead: Director Human Resources w/ESOL Program Coordinator</p>	Pending
<p>5.4 Staffing – Parent Liaisons (grant-funded positions; expected for Translation Required Schools (TRS) as of 2015-2016; optional for others)</p> <p>Clarify role and responsibilities; establish consistent minimum expectations for all schools with liaison positions, communicate expectations to Principals for implementation, and communicate services to parents</p> <p>Timeline: by October 2015 (for Expectations) by December 2015 (for implementation and communication to families and staff)</p> <p>Lead: ESOL Program Coordinator w/TRS Principals</p>	In Progress
<p>6. Web Site Redesign – Improvement Action Step</p> <p>Redesign and implement new District and School web sites to include responsive design format, content streamlining, increased use of visuals, and improved navigation and search capabilities, as measured by web use analytics and</p>	In Progress

<p>stakeholder satisfaction survey metrics.</p> <p>Timeline: by Winter 2016 (for District Web Site Launch); by August 2016 (for School Web Sites launch)</p> <p>Lead: Director of Communications w/Web Redesign Project Team and Principals</p>	
<p>7. Bilingual Needs Assessment – Process Action Step</p> <p>Identify families requiring translation services for scope and communication purposes, establish process for ongoing data collection</p> <p>Timeline: by March 2016</p> <p>Lead: ESOL Program Coordinator</p>	In Progress
<p>8. Evaluation Metric – Process Action Step</p> <p>Identify primary FaCE evaluation tool, an engagement satisfaction survey instrument as part of Strategic Plan Strategy 4 Data Dashboard Metrics.</p> <p>Timeline: by June 2016</p> <p>Lead: FaCE Committee Leadership w/Cabinet and Chief Information Officer</p>	Pending

Submission For Strategic Plan Action Plan Strategy 4: Data and Information Systems

Submitted by Phil Dunn, Chief Information Officer (CIO), October 8, 2015

Strategy 4: Personalized Learning is achieved through systemic data and information systems that gauge progress on student growth for academic, personal and interpersonal success.	
Action Steps 2015-2016/17	Progress
1. Planning – Process Action Step Develop and finalize two year work plan. Timeline: by August 2015 Lead: Chief Information Officer (CIO)	Completed
2. Assessment Review – Process Action Step Review current assessment practices; review existing data systems; and provide recommendations for improving data systems, assessments and practices. Timeline: by June 2015 Lead: Asst. Supt. Of CIPL	Completed
3. Data Warehouse & Local Growth Model – Process Action Step Complete transfer and warehousing of student data. Timeline: by August 2015 Lead: CIO with ECRA support	Completed
4. Provide Strategic Dashboard Access (Administrators) – Improvement Action Step Approve District-wide key performance indicators (KPIs) for each of the goals; and train 100% of administrators and coaches on the strategic use of the data system. Timeline: September 2015 – December 2015 Lead: CIO with support from ECRA	In Progress
5. District and School Improvement – Improvement Action Step Build administration's and instructional coach's capacity to support the deployment of the data system to all relevant stakeholders; disseminate student growth and status reports to support school improvement and Response to Intervention (Rtl); and make data available to teachers after the winter 2015/2016 administration of STAR. Timeline: by June 2016 Lead: Asst. Supt. Of CIPL	In Progress
6. Classroom Instruction – Process Action Step Develop plan to incorporate other data to distribute to teachers; and disseminate information to support teachers and classroom instruction. Timeline: by June 2017 Lead: Asst. Supt. Of CIPL w/ CIO	Beginning in July 2016

7. Parent and Student Engagement – Improvement Action Step Extend data and information access to parents and students to support individualized learning. Timeline: by June 2017 Lead: Asst. Supt. Of CIPL w/ CIO	Beginning in March 2017
8. Ongoing – Process Action Step Continue to collect feedback to support continuous quality improvement of the performance management system. Timeline: Ongoing Lead: CIO w/ ECRA	In Progress

**Unified Arts Personnel
District Research 2015**

District	Position/Role
Cheshire	Unified Arts Coordinator 6-12
East Windsor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unified Arts PLC Team Leader (MS) • CTE PLC Team Leader • Applied Arts PLC Team Leader
Stamford	Unified Arts Supervisor
West Hartford	K-12 Department Supervisors: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Library Media • Music • CTE (grades 6-12 only) • Health and PE • 0.8 - Art
Meriden	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • K-12 Fine Arts Chairperson • Director of Curriculum and Instructional Technology • Supervisor of Curriculum and Accountability (Literacy/Numeracy K-12) • Supervisor of Curriculum (All other non-tested content areas) • Supervisor of Blended Learning
Region 15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Director of Fine Arts who oversees the music and art departments. • Director of Athletics oversees the PE, Health and Athletics program
Clinton	Building Administrators provide supervision
Monroe	Assistant principals at the high school are the Instructional Leaders for Art and CTE.
Ridgefield	No Curriculum Coordinators

Secondary Level Staffing and Enrollment
(Follow-up Analysis Subsequent to the 2015 Enrollment Report)
November 20, 2015

Introduction

The Board of Education requested information regarding the secondary staffing model and the distribution of class sizes by school by learning program. The following analysis focuses on the enrollment based staffing model currently employed in the four secondary schools and uses data drawn from class sizes on November 9, 2015. It is important to note that this analysis does not include class sizes for programs designed to provide support or remediation for students with academic challenges (remedial reading, English Language Learners or Special Education) nor does it include performing music groups which range in size from 5 to over 100 students.

Secondary Staffing Model

There are currently three basic models used to allocate certified staff Grades 6 - 12. All three are used concurrently:

1. The grade-level enrollment-based model allocates staff according to the number of students enrolled in a school toward the end of achieving desired class sizes within the policy guidelines for regular classes including Advanced Learning Program, Art, Business, English, Family and Consumer Science, Mathematics, Music, Physical Education, Science, Social Studies, Technology, Theater Arts, and World Language.
 - Beginning with the 1999-2000 school year, secondary staffing ratios for regular classroom teachers were standardized middle schools and high school. These staffing ratios were designed to maintain an average class size of 20.0 students while ensuring that class size range is within the policy guidelines set by E-040 Effective Learning Environments (12 to 30 students per class).
 - The middle school model is based on deploying one certified staff member for every 14.8 students at Central and Eastern, and 14.6 students at Western. Based on the expectation that instructional programs are comparable, any variances in class size are the result of scheduling. Scheduling difficulties can also result in small staffing adjustments.
 - The high school model is based on deploying one certified staff member for every 15.6 students. Variances in class size are the result of course selection.
 - The lower ratio at the middle schools is due to the fact that students have no “opens” and are scheduled into a classroom with a teacher 100% of the day.

2. The grade-level standards for program needs allocates staff based on the requirements of running building based programs and services for students: psychologist, guidance counselor, social worker, nurse, library media specialist, instructional coaches, and learning facilitators.
3. The grade level standards for student needs allocates staff according to the number of students requiring academic support and remediation: English as a Second Language, Title I, reading specialists, special education teachers and instructional support staff (speech and language, etc.). Staff may be funded through the local appropriation and from federal IDEA and other grants.

Analysis

This analysis focuses on the first secondary staffing model, enrollment based staffing in regular classes. Tables listing the number of sections by program by class size by school are attached to this report.

Board of Education Policy E-040 stipulates that secondary class sizes be between 12 to 30 students excluding certain subjects such as physical education and certain music classes. The table below summarizes the number of regular classes at each secondary school by class size range:

		Class Size					
		Cls<12	12 - 15	16 - 19	20 - 23	24 - 27	Cls>27
CMS	Sections	17	43	80	79	31	1
	%	6.8%	17.1%	31.9%	31.5%	12.4%	0.4%
EMS	Sections	21	43	47	92	83	11
	%	7.1%	14.5%	15.8%	31.0%	27.9%	3.7%
WMS	Sections	14	26	63	67	26	0
	%	7.1%	13.3%	32.1%	34.2%	13.3%	0.0%
GHS	Sections	57	97	155	208	242	30
	%	7.2%	12.3%	19.6%	26.4%	30.7%	3.8%
Gr 6 - 12	Sections	109	209	345	446	382	42
	%	7.1%	13.6%	22.5%	29.1%	24.9%	2.7%

As of November 9, 2015, there are 109 sections with less than 12 students (7.1% of the total number of sections) and 42 sections with more than 27 students (2.7% of the total number of sections). Average class size ranges from 18.5 students per class at Central Middle School to 18.8 students per class at Western Middle School to 20.2 students per

class at Eastern Middle School to 20.3 students per class at Greenwich High School. District-wide the average class size is 19.8 students per class, slightly below the target established by the enrollment based staffing model.

While the class size average has remained relatively constant over time as compared to the baseline from the 2000-2001 school year, the variance in class size has increased. In November 2000, 2.7% of sections were below 12 students as compared to 7.1% today and 19.2% of sections were over 23 students as compared to 27.3% today.

What accounts for this increase in variance? As noted in the Middle School Study presented to the Board of Education last spring, the complexity of the schedule has increased dramatically over the last fifteen years, particularly at the middle schools. The middle schools now offer three levels of mathematics at each grade as well as two levels of English, Science and Spanish. All three schools offer classes for native Spanish speakers and Central offers an advanced French course. The complexity of the schedule at the high school has also increased as courses have been added to meet the specific learning needs of students.

When the schedule is built in each school, decisions are made as to how to allocate the staffing resource determined by the enrollment based model. The objective is to provide each student with all required courses and, to the extent possible, the electives they request. The scheduler examines course requests prior to constructing the schedule and, if possible, collapses courses where the number of requests is below 15 students given that it is unlikely that a course with low requests will yield a class size within the guidelines. Some courses with low request numbers are run anyway because they represent the final course in a sequence of courses or are necessary for students to meet graduation requirements. When the schedule is run, class sizes may not distribute evenly across the sections of the same course. Even though the average class size for the course is well within the guidelines, some sections may have high class sizes while others have class sizes below 12 students. This distribution variance is more likely as the schedule increases in complexity.

The increase in the number of sections below 12 students drives the increase in the number of sections with over 23 students. Given the fixed ratio of staff to students in the enrollment based allocation model, the scheduler must run sections of courses with large enrollments at a higher class size to generate staff for classes run at a lower class size. This further increases the variance of sections from the average class size within each school.

Conclusion

Given the complexity of the program offered at the secondary schools, however, it has become increasingly difficult to avoid smaller than 12 student classes (the class size minimum) at GHS. We have a specific set of decision-rules for collapsing sections when demand is low and/or keeping a class below 12 when it is necessary. The risk is that the current class size policy could unintentionally compromise the comprehensive academic program that is the hallmark of the Greenwich Public Schools. Of the 109

sections currently operating below class size guidelines, roughly two-thirds result from scheduling distribution issues where the average class size for the course is well above 12 students, while the other one-third result from singleton or doubleton courses that are part of a required sequence of courses for a student. We will review this situation more closely over this school year and provide recommendations to the BOE on any changes as necessary.

School	CMS																																		
	Class Size																																		
Program	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	35	TOT	Enroll	Avg Class		
ALP					2				1		1						1													5	62	12.4			
ART		1									1			1	2	1		1				1	2							10	181	18.1			
ENG								1		1	2	2	4	8	5	5	14	4	3	6	3									58	1107	19.1			
FCS							1				2				2	1	1												7	113	16.1				
MATH									3		2	2	3	1	4	2	3	4	1	2	1		2						30	557	18.6				
MUSIC								1			1	1		1		1	1				1							7	120	17.1					
PE												1	6	3		2	2	1	2	1	2	7	3		1			31	657	21.2					
SCI									1		3	1	1	2	5	3	2	2		4	1	4						29	564	19.4					
SS							1	1		1		2	2			3	2		6	6	3	1						28	560	20.0					
TECH				1			3			1	2	3		2	2	1												15	212	14.1					
WL							1	4	2	2	4	1	1	4	2		3	3	2	2								31	508	16.4					
TOT		1		1	2		6	7	7	6	17	13	18	23	21	18	29	15	14	21	12	14	5		1				251	4641	18.5				

School	EMS																																		
	Class Size																																		
Program	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	35	TOT	Enroll	Avg Class		
ALP					2	1			1		1		1				1	2	2	1	3	1								6	67	11.2			
ART		1					2			1			1	1			1	2	2	1	3	1								16	297	18.6			
ENG						2		2	2	3	1	3	4	1	3	3	1	5	3	2	2	2		1		1				43	806	18.7			
FCS						1				1		1					1	3	1	2									10	195	19.5				
MATH									1					2	4	1	6	3	2	7	6	2	3	1					38	824	21.7				
MUSIC						1								2		1	1	1	2		1								9	171	19.0				
PE								1	2	7	1	1	2	1	2		1	3	2	2	1	3	3	6	2	2		3	45	959	21.3				
SCI							3						2	2		1	1	4	1	2	5	6	6	3	1				37	822	22.2				
SS						1		1	1	1		1	1	3	1		3	1	1	7	6	5	5						38	808	21.3				
TECH									2	4	1	3	1	1					1	4	2	1							20	355	17.8				
WL					1			2		3	2		2		2	2	5	2	1	6		4	1	1	1				35	686	19.6				
TOT		1			3	6	5	6	9	19	8	7	13	16	10	8	21	18	20	33	28	24	20	11	5	2	1	3		297	5990	20.2			

School	WMS																																		
	Class Size																																		
Program	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	35	TOT	Enroll	Avg Class		
ALP									1				2																	3	44	14.7			
ART							3	1			1		1	2			1				1									10	148	14.8			
ENG										2	1		1	4	2		2	3	3	2	4	1								25	496	19.8			
FCS						1	2	1				1	1		2															8	107	13.4			
MATH					1	1			2	2	1		3	1	2	2	3	4	4	3										29	521	18.0			
MUSIC				1		1				1		1			1							1								6	87	14.5			
PE											1	1	2	1	4	4		3	2	5	5	2								30	618	20.6			
SCI										1			1	1	2	1	3	4	1	6	1	2	2							25	531	21.2			
SS									1			2	2	1	1	5	2		1	3	2	4	1							25	509	20.4			
TECH											2		1		1	2	3		1	1										11	205	18.6			
WL			1				1		1	1	1	2	4		4	2	1	1	4				1							24	414	17.3			
TOT			1	1	1	3	6	2	5	7	7	7	18	10	19	16	15	15	16	21	12	10	4							196	3680	18.8			

School	GHS																																		
	Class Size																																		
Program	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	35	TOT	Enroll	Avg Class		
ART				1	1	1	1	1	1		2	1	2	3	1	3	2	4	1	6	5	2	2								40	764	19.1		
BUS								1	1		1			2	3	4		3	2		3	1									21	405	19.3		
ENG	1			1	1	2	2	2	2	2	6	8	7	5	6	7	6	10	10	8	16	12	5	2	1	1					123	2430	19.8		
FCS							1		1	1		1					2	1	2	2	3										14	273	19.5		
MATH				1		1	2			1	4	2	4	8	5	6	5	3	6	8	18	19	10	6	8						117	2571	22.0		
MUSIC				2	1			1	1		2	2	2	1			1														13	172	13.2		
PE					1		1			3	2	2		2	4	2	1	2	4	12	9	9	8	5	4	7	1		1	1	81	1881	23.2		
SCI					1		1	2	2	2	3	7	3	4	4	6	11	7	9	12	10	12	16	4	1						117	2472	21.1		
SS				2	1	2	2	2	1	1	5	8	5	1	4	8	2	7	9	7	12	19	9	5	2	1	1				116	2411	20.8		
TECH		1	1	2	1				1	2	1			1	2	2				1											18	250	13.9		
THTR					1		1	1	1	1	1	2	1	1				1		1											1	13	207	15.9	
WL				2			4	3	1	4	5	4	12	6	5	13	10	6	9	12	10	6	4								116	2206	19.0		
TOT	1	1	1	11	8	6	15	14	13	16	31	37	37	35	34	49	43	44	52	69	86	80	54	22	16	9	2		2	1	789	16042	20.3		

ELA Program 24

Professional Learning for Teachers

Budget Line/Item	Activity Description	Cost
1067: Wages-Teachers-PD Academic Year	Provides funds to compensate teachers for attendance at workshops, conferences and related Professional Learning Activities outside of the regular school day (\$230 per diem). ELA teachers prep for PD sessions they will be running throughout the year (6 teachers/1 day).	\$1,380.
1317: Temporary Teachers-PD Academic Year	Provides for substitute teachers so that staff can be released from teaching responsibilities to attend workshops and conferences (50 teachers @\$100 per diem). TCRWP conference days for schools not part of AG funding for TC workshops	\$10,000.
1497: Consultants Academic Year	Provides funding for Consultants for Professional Learning for RDG/LA department. TCRWP staff developers and consultant days for 3 schools (CC, WMS, HA). \$25,000/school	\$75,000.
2097: Tuition	Provides funds to allow teachers to attend out of district workshops and conferences in support of Humanities Department included tickets to conference days at TCRWP for teachers at schools without	\$19,600.

	TC staff developers	
2107: Travel	Provides for travel expenses for Humanities Department to attend workshops and conferences for professional learning.	\$2,500.
TOTAL Professional Learning		\$108,480.

Curriculum Development

Budget Line/Item	Activity Description	Cost
139: Special Projects Summer	Provides funding to compensate teachers for developing and revising curriculum and units of study for Language Arts.(\$230.00 per day) 200 days for K-12 curriculum development teams. Scope of work will be finalized prior to summer curriculum institute-number of teachers per grade level TBD	\$46,000.
TOTAL Special Projects-Curriculum Development		\$46,000.

Mathematics Program 28

Professional Learning for Teachers

Budget Line/Item	Activity Description	Cost
1067: Wages-Teachers-PD Academic Year	Provides funding to facilitate content area workshops to support the implementation of the Math In Focus Program @\$230 per diem (9 days).	\$2,070.
1317: Temporary Teachers-PD Academic Year	Provides funding of substitute coverage for teachers to attend professional development workshops @ \$100. per diem (50 days).	\$5,000.
1397: Special Projects-PD Academic Year	Provides compensation for Middle School Learning Facilitators to prepare resources for program implementation @ \$230. per diem (8.5 days).	\$1,980
TOTAL for Special Projects-PD		\$16,100.
1497: Consultants Academic Year	Provides funding for certified specialists to provide professional learning to Math teachers in inquiry Math instruction, performance based assessment and new Math curriculum (5 resources aligned to CCSS: 3 days for each of the 3 networks @ \$3,000 per day).	\$27,000.
TOTAL for Consultants		\$27,000.

Curriculum Development

Budget Line/Item	Activity Description	Cost
1397: Special Projects-PD: Summer	Provides funding to compensate teachers for developing and revising new Math units at professional development sessions (15 teachers for 5 days at \$230 per diem).	\$17,250.
1397: Special Projects-PD Summer	Provides funding for teachers to revise curriculum during the CIPL Curriculum Development Summer Institute (15 teachers at \$230 per diem).	\$17,250.
1397: Special Projects-PD Summer	Provides funding for teachers to upload curriculum changes to the mapper (5 teachers for 5 days @ \$230 per diem).	\$5,750.
Total for Special Projects-PD		\$40,250.

Science Program 34

Professional Learning for Teachers

Budget Line/Item	Activity Description	Cost
1067: Wages-Teachers-PD Academic Year	Grade 6 Advanced Science: Provides funding to facilitate workshops to support Advanced Science Implementation (in-district) (2.5 days).	\$575.
1067: Wages-Teachers-PD Academic Year	Grade 7 Advanced Science: Provides funding to facilitate workshops to support the implementation of Grade 7 Advanced Science (2.5 days)	\$575.
TOTAL Wages-Teachers PD		\$1,150.
1317: Temporary Teachers-PD Academic Year	Provides for substitute teachers so that staff can be released from teaching responsibilities to attend workshops and conferences (50 teachers @\$100 per diem).	\$5,000.
1317: Temporary Teachers-PD: Academic Year	Grade 6 Advanced Science: Provides for substitute teachers so that staff can be released from teaching responsibilities for one release day per school (10 teachers @ \$100. per diem).	\$1,000.
1317: Temporary Teachers-PD: Academic Year	Grade 7 Advanced Science: Provides for substitute teachers so that staff can be	\$2,000.

	released from teaching responsibilities for two release days per school (10 teachers @ \$100 per diem).	
1317: Temporary Teachers-PD: Academic Year	Hamilton Avenue School STEM: Provides substitutes for 20 Teachers at \$100 per diem x 2 days.	\$4,000
TOTAL Temporary Teachers-PD		\$12,000.
1397: Special Projects-PD: Summer	Hamilton Avenue School STEM: Provides funding to compensate teachers for attending professional development sessions provided by CT Science Center (5 days for 20 teachers at \$230 per diem)	\$23,000
1397: Special Projects-PD Summer	Hamilton Avenue School STEM: 6/17 follow-up: CT Science Center (2 days for 20 teachers at \$230 per diem)	\$9,200.
TOTAL Special Projects-PD		\$32,200.
1497: Consultants Academic Year	Provides funding for Professional Learning for the elementary network, middle school and high school networks, 4 days per network (\$1,400. per diem).	\$12,000.
1497: Consultants Academic Year	Certified specialists to provide professional learning in NGSX modules (Next Generation Science Standards Professional Learning Modules) to building administrators and Learning Facilitators (5 days @ \$1,400 per diem).	\$7,000.
1497: Consultants	Hamilton Avenue STEM: CT Science	\$26,000.

Summer	Center: Consultant @ \$1,300. per teacher (20 teachers for 5 days).	
1497: Consultants Summer	Hamilton Avenue STEM: CT Science Center: Consultant @ 1,300.per Administrator (3 Administrators for 5 days).	\$3,900.
1497: Consultants Summer	Hamilton Avenue STEM: CT Science Center: Lodging, travel, materials	\$3,100.
1497: Consultant Summer	Hamilton Avenue STEM: Consultant @ \$2,000. per diem for 5 days.	\$10,000.
TOTAL Consultants		\$62,000.

Curriculum Development

Budget Line/Item	Activity Description	Cost
1397: Special Projects-PD Summer	Provides funding to compensate teachers for developing and revising new science unit curriculum aligned to The Next Generation Science Standards (NGSS) at professional development sessions (15 teachers for 15 days at \$230 per diem).	\$51,750.
1397: Special Projects-PD: Summer	Grade 6 Advanced Science: 6 teachers/3 days @ \$230 per diem. Provides funding to compensate teachers for developing and revising new science curriculum at professional development sessions.	\$4,140.

1397: Special Projects-PD: Summer	Grade 7 Advanced Science: 6 teachers/5 days @ \$230 per diem. Provides funding to compensate teachers for developing and revising new science curriculum at professional development sessions.	\$6,900.
1397: Special Projects-PD: Summer	5 teachers/5 days to upload NGSS aligned science curriculum to the mapper.	\$5,750.
1397: Special Projects-PD: Summer	Grade 7 Advanced Science: 5 teachers/5 days @ \$230. per diem to upload curriculum to the mapper.	\$5,750.
1397: Special Projects-PD: Summer	Hamilton Avenue School STEM: Mapping by STEM Coach at 3 days at \$230. per diem.	\$690.
1397: Special Projects-PD: Summer	Hamilton Avenue School STEM: Summer Curriculum Renewal for 5 days for 20 teachers at \$230 per diem.	\$23,000.
TOTAL Special Projects-PD		\$97,980.
1497: Consultants Summer	Grade 6 Advanced Science: 6 teachers/5 days to renew curriculum. Decrease of 3 days during the academic year to provide professional learning. Certified specialists to provide Professional Learning to Advanced Science teachers in inquiry science instruction, research protocol, performance-based assessment, and new	\$7,000.

	science curriculum units supporting the curriculum implementation (\$1,400. per diem).	
1497: Consultants Summer	Grade 7 Advanced Science: 6 teachers/5 days to develop curriculum (\$1,400 per diem). Certified specialists to provide Professional Learning to Advanced Science teachers in inquiry science instruction, research protocol, performance-based assessment, and new science curriculum units supporting the curriculum implementation.	\$7,000.
TOTAL Consultant		\$14,000.

Social Studies Program 36

Professional Learning for Teachers

Budget Line/Item	Activity Description	Cost
1497: Consultants Academic Year	Provides funding for Consultants for Professional Learning for SS department	\$8,000.
2097: Tuition	Provides funds to allow teachers to attend out of district workshops and conferences in support of the SS department	\$5,000.
2107: Travel	Provides for travel expenses for SS Department to attend workshops and conferences for professional learning (TCRWP, NCSS, etc)	\$1,000.
310: Teaching Supplies	Provides for professional books	\$1,000.
TOTAL Professional Learning		\$15,000.

Curriculum Development

Budget Line/Item	Activity Description	Cost
139: Special Projects, Summer	Provides funding to compensate teachers for developing and revising curriculum and units of study for Social Studies during Curriculum Institute	\$23,000.
131: Regular Wages	Provides substitute teachers so staff can attend workshops, conferences and related PLAs.	\$5,000.
TOTAL		\$28,000.

ELL/ESOL and AVID Program

Professional Learning for Teachers

Budget Line/Item	Activity Description	Cost
1317: Temporary Teachers-PD Academic Year	Provides for substitute teachers so that staff can be released from teaching responsibilities to attend workshops and conferences	\$4,500
TOTAL Temporary Teachers-PD		4,500
1497: Consultants Academic Year	Provides funding for Professional Learning for the elementary network, middle school and high school networks	\$10,000.
TOTAL Consultants		\$10,000.