

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

**Board of Education Meeting Agenda Document Cover Sheet**

Meeting Date: December 10, 2015

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

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

2016-17 Budget Q&A Round II  
December 10, 2015

**100s - PERSONNEL**

1) What is the number of social workers this year compared to last year and next year? (BON)

**RESPONSE:**

Level	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17
District/Elementary	1.0	1.0	1.0
Elementary (HA, NL)/Title 1	0.0	0.8*	1.0
Middle/TO	2.5	1.5	1.5
Middle/IDEA Grant	0.0	1.0	1.0
Middle/KIC**	2.0	3.0	3.0
GHS	5.6	5.6	5.6
GAHS***	1.5	1.0	1.0

\* not hired until November 2015

\*\* funded through the Department of Social Services

\*\*\* the GAHS administrator was .5 social worker/.5 admin but is now a full time administrator position (decreasing social work by .5)

2) What is the number of certified staff who are not full time but qualify for benefits? (BON)

**RESPONSE:**

Staff who work .50 Full Time Equivalent (FTE) or more receive benefits. There are currently 60 certified staff who are assigned .50 to .90 FTE who receive benefits (59 GEA and 1 GOSA):

- .50 FTE (9 staff)
- .60 FTE (15 staff)
- .70 FTE (13 staff)
- .80 FTE (18 staff, to include 1 GOSA)
- .90 FTE (5 staff).

3) There are some positions that are funded by other sources and this seems to vary year to year (e.g. – bilingual social worker this year is funded by Title I funds; this year TOG is funding 3 middle school social workers for Teen Talk program; budget decrease in social work for next year is due to a retirement and will be funded via a grant; .5 school psychologist for next year shifting from TOO to being funded by IDEA) On p. 321 there is a summary of positions funded by some of the other sources for the current year. Is there a “crosswalk” to the proposed budget for these positions plus any others not on the TOO which are important for the BOE to know about should the funding source go away and the TOO would need to absorb? (LE)

**RESPONSE:**

The IDEA is a federal entitlement program (which by all analysis is permanent), although the allocation may change from year to year (only slightly by regulation). The number and certification of staff on the grant may vary from year to year as staff members transfer from the district or go on leave. The number and certification of the

2016-17 Budget Q&A Round II  
December 10, 2015

staff assigned to the non-public grant reflects the requests made by the private schools at our annual consultation meeting.

4) School Libraries (program 40): Is there an increase in personnel, if so, please explain the rationale. (BON)

**RESPONSE:**

The budget increase "For Personnel" shown in Program 40 - School Libraries, is due to a shift of personnel from one program to another. One position, that of a GMEA Electronics Technician previously budgeted in Program 82 - IT/MIS (FY 15/16) was shifted and budgeted in Program 40 -School Libraries (FY 16/17).

5) Nursing (program 49): Is the "School Medical Advisor" the same position as the "School Nurse Supervisor"? If not, please describe the position. (BON)

**RESPONSE:**

No, the two positions are distinct. The "School Medical Advisor" is required by Connecticut statute (Sec. 10-205. Appointment of school medical advisors. Each local or regional board of education of any town having a population of ten thousand or more shall, and each local or regional board of education of any town having a population of fewer than ten thousand may, appoint one or more legally qualified practitioners of medicine as school medical advisors.)

The 'School Nurse Supervisor" is responsible for the clinical supervision of nurses as well as coordination of the department (arranging for substitutes, providing professional learning, ordering materials, keeping current with regulatory changes and best practices in public health/school nursing). By education, certification and experience, the 'School Nurse Supervisor' is a nurse and the "School Medical Advisor" is a physician.

**UNIFIED ARTS PROGRAM COORDINATOR**

6) How many evaluations would the UA coordinator be responsible for? (BON)

**RESPONSE:**

The number of evaluations handled by each coordinator is a decision made in collaboration with the building principal at the start of the school year. As with other program coordinators, the UA Coordinator would provide the following:

- support for new teachers
- complimentary evaluations
- evaluator for teachers on support

Specific to Unified Arts, there would be 140+/- certified staff in the area of unified arts (Physical Education, Health, Family Consumer Science, Art, Music). It is a requirement that the Program Coordinator for each of those areas is required to conduct a formal observation as a contributing evaluator for all first year teachers. This number is hard to

2016-17 Budget Q&A Round II  
December 10, 2015

predict, but would likely range from 10 to 20 teachers. Additionally, they may be asked to do formal observations for teachers on Structured Support Plans in their area of expertise - this could be 1 to 3 a year potentially.

As a benchmark, the evaluations conducted by substitute administrators in 2013 and 2014 respectively were 25 and 17.

7) Is the Unified Arts position in other districts covering the same functions? (PB)

**RESPONSE:**

Yes. The table below lists some of the responsibilities shared by surrounding districts (table was shared in Round 1).

<b>District</b>	<b>Position/Role</b>	<b>Responsibilities</b>
<b>Cheshire</b>	Unified Arts Coordinator 6-12	Meetings Budget Evaluations
<b>East Windsor</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Unified Arts PLC Team Leader (MS)</li> <li>● CTE PLC Team Leader</li> <li>● Applied Arts PLC Team Leader</li> </ul>	Meetings Budget Professional Learning Communications
<b>Stamford</b>	Unified Arts Supervisor	
<b>West Hartford</b>	<b>K-12 Department Supervisors:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Library Media</li> <li>● Music</li> <li>● CTE (grades 6-12 only)</li> <li>● Health and PE</li> <li>● 0.8 - Art</li> </ul> G&T Administrator PK Curriculum Lead Teacher	Meetings Budget Communications Evaluations Staffing/Hiring
<b>Meriden</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● K-12 Fine Arts Chairperson</li> <li>● Director of Curriculum and Instructional Technology</li> <li>● Supervisor of Curriculum and Accountability (Literacy/Numeracy K-12)</li> <li>● Supervisor of Curriculum (All other</li> </ul>	Meetings Budget Professional Learning Communications Curriculum Development

2016-17 Budget Q&A Round II  
December 10, 2015

	<p style="text-align: center;">non-tested content areas)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supervisor of Blended Learning</li> </ul>	Leads implementation of 1:1
<b>Region 15</b>	<p>Director of Fine Arts who oversees the music and art departments.</p> <p>Director of Athletics oversees the PE, Health and Athletics program</p>	<p>Meetings</p> <p>Budget</p> <p>Professional Learning</p> <p>Communications</p>
<b>Clinton</b>	Building Administrators provide supervision	
<b>Monroe</b>	Assistant principals at the high school are the Instructional Leaders for Art and CTE.	<p>Budget</p> <p>Meetings</p> <p>Evaluations</p>
<b>Ridgefield</b>	No Curriculum Coordinators	N/A
<b>Southington</b>	<p>K-12 Music Coordinator (Teacher)</p> <p>Same for CTE, and Art</p>	<p>Conduct Meetings,</p> <p>Budget,</p> <p>Complimentary Evaluator</p>
<b>Rocky Hill</b>	Subject Area Supervisors	<p>Manage budget,</p> <p>conduct monthly department meetings</p>

8) What happens to the lead teachers that are currently performing the function of a UA program coordinator (JD)?

**RESPONSE:**

The current lead teachers return to being full time teachers. These positions are currently being filled by long term subs.

If for whatever reason the BOE does not approve the addition of a Unified Arts Coordinator, the district will need to utilize the budgeted funds for the coordinator to provide for the lead teacher positions, as we would not want to leave these program areas without the support they have been provided.

9) The following are clarifying questions to determine how much we could be asking a UA coordinator to do compared to other coordinators: (BON)

i) What would be the job description of the UA Coordinator?

2016-17 Budget Q&A Round II  
December 10, 2015

- ii) What would be the number of people by department that would be under the K-12 UA Coordinator? Would there be teacher leaders or lead teachers for support?
- iii) Please compare the UA proposed position to the amount of administration and number of people by department for K-12 Science and Math aka Stem, and K-12 Humanities and K-12 Media Centers.
- iv) Would there be teacher leaders or lead teachers for support?

**Questions 9 parts i, ii, iii, iv are answered together**

RESPONSE:

All Program Coordinators work under the same job description. The district would utilize the current description for any new Program Coordinator, including the UA Coordinator. The posting would list specifics for certification and preferences for expertise. Standard position duties and expectations include:

- Curriculum and Instruction
- Professional Learning
- Personnel
- Assessment and Progress Monitoring
- Communications and Public Relations
- Finance
- Management
- Scheduling and Placement
- Professional Activities

It is important to note that all certified educators report to and are supervised by their building principal, not their Program Coordinators.

The table below lists the number of teachers that serve/teach within each program/department area (to repeat, they report to and are supervised by their building principal, not their particular program coordinator):

<b>Program/Department</b>	<b>Number of Teachers Serving under the Program</b>
ART	Elementary: 12 Middle School: 4 High School: 7 <b>Total: 23</b>
Music	Elementary: 28 Middle School: 11 High School: 5

2016-17 Budget Q&A Round II  
December 10, 2015

	<b>Total: 44</b>
Physical Education/ Health	Elementary: 22 Middle:11 High School: 10 <b>Total: 43</b>
Family Consumer Science	MS: 3 GHS: 2 <b>Total: 5</b>
<b>Unified Arts Total</b>	<b>115</b>
STEM	<p>Elementary</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Grade K: 40</li> <li>• Grade 1: 39</li> <li>• Grade 2: 37</li> <li>• Grade 3: 35</li> <li>• Grade 4: 31</li> <li>• Grade 5: 34</li> </ul> <p>Science 6-12:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Grade 6: 7</li> <li>• Grade 7: 8</li> <li>• Grade 8: 7</li> <li>• GHS: 33</li> </ul> <p>Mathematics 6-12:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Grade 6: 7</li> <li>• Grade 7: 8</li> <li>• Grade 8: 8</li> <li>• Grades 6-8: One Math Intervention Teacher</li> <li>• GHS: 27</li> </ul> <p>Technology Education:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• One teacher at each Middle School (3)</li> <li>• GHS: 3</li> </ul> <p><b>Total: 328</b></p>
Humanities	<p>Elementary:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Grade K: 40</li> <li>• Grade 1: 39</li> <li>• Grade 2: 37</li> <li>• Grade 3: 35</li> <li>• Grade 4: 31</li> <li>• Grade 5: 34</li> </ul> <p>Literacy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• K-12 Literacy Specialists - 29</li> </ul> <p>English 6-12:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 6-8 English Teachers - 36</li> </ul>

2016-17 Budget Q&A Round II  
December 10, 2015

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● 9-12 English Teachers - 33</li> </ul> Social Studies 6-12: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● 6-8 Social Studies Teachers - 21</li> <li>● 9-12 Social Studies Teachers - 29</li> </ul> <b>Total: 364</b>
Pre K	<b>14</b>
World Language	FLES: 13 Middle School: 15 GHS: 26 <b>Total: 54</b>
ELL	<b>21</b>
LMS	Library Media Specialists: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Elementary: 5</li> <li>● Middle School: 6</li> <li>● High School: 5</li> </ul> Media Assistants: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Elementary: 14</li> <li>● Middle School: 3</li> <li>● High School: 2</li> </ul> Media Tech Assistants: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Elementary: 14</li> <li>● Middle School: 3</li> <li>● High School: 3</li> </ul> <b>Total: 55</b>
ALP	Grades 2-8 <b>Total: 41</b>

There would not be teacher leaders or lead teachers for support of the UA Coordinator. As note in response to Question #8, the lead teacher positions would be eliminated to provide the offset to allow for the UA Coordinator.

**ELL COORDINATOR**

10) Does the AViD program have enough coverage across the multiple sites? (JD)

**RESPONSE:**

There is sufficient staffing for '16-17 by providing .2 of each teacher's 1.0 assignment. In 16-17, the following "coverage" will be provided:

- GHS = 1.4 (.2 of 8 teachers)



2016-17 Budget Q&A Round II  
December 10, 2015

- CMS = .6 (.2 of 3 teachers)
- WMS = .4 (.2 of 2 teachers)

**ENROLLMENT/STAFFING**

11) The elementary enrollment projection for '16-'17 is 4159, just 17 students shy of this year's enrollment projection of 4176 which was budgeted at 212 sections and required 216 sections. Using the existing class size formula [p.218, 1(a)] of dividing enrollment by 20 equates to 208 sections. The concern is there does not seem to be adequate "cushion". (previous response to question stated only 205 sections were needed versus a budget of 208, for a 3 section cushion. (PB/LE)

**RESPONSE:**

The response below is a summary of those provided in Round 1.

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, which would have made the budget increase 2.43%. A "cushion" of an additional 4 teachers for a total of 212 elementary sections would be ideal. However, the administration felt this would put us too far beyond the guidance from the BET for a 2.0% increase and no net increases in "head count".

Dividing the projected elementary enrollment of 4,176 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 uniqueness to the allocation of classrooms based on specific enrollment, which changes over the course of the spring and summer up until September 15<sup>th</sup> (the policy-based date when sections are finalized). 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 4 sections.

**PROGRAMS**

**Summer School**

12) Is summer school staffed appropriately at the administrative level given the multiple sites? (DA)

**RESPONSE:**

In responding to this question, we are interpreting "administrative level" as clerical assistance, not certified Administrator support. After the last Board of Education budget meeting, the Deputy Superintendent reviewed how additional clerical support might be able to address concerns regarding the competing needs of summer school preparation

2016-17 Budget Q&A Round II  
December 10, 2015

and building level responsibilities of the Summer School Coordinator.

While a clerical position would not support building evaluation responsibilities, the administration does support the addition of a part time (25 hour), 10 month clerical position for Summer School. This person would be available to respond to parent phone inquiries; student registration and tuition payment; assist in the data collection; communication; ordering; etc. The cost of this position would be approximately \$23,400. There are no health benefits associated with this position.

It would be important to consider this addition to the 16-17 budget within the context of all of the other competing needs. Including this into the 16-17 budget will bring the total proposed budget for 16-17 to \$150,054,344 which would represent a 2.21% increase over the 15-16 budget.

13) What is the impact on the summer school food program of changing the location of summer school from Hamilton Ave. to another location?

RESPONSE:

The administration is still working with the state to get a definitive answer regarding the impact of changing the 2016 summer school location from Hamilton Avenue School to Glenville School. However, we have learned the following.

The District may be able to open a "Closed Enrolled Site" (CES) at Glenville School. A CES would only provide meals to students registered in the GPS summer school at the Glenville School location. There would be no meal service at Glenville for persons 18 years or younger from the Greenwich community which was a part of the Seamless Summer Meal Option at HAS in 2014 and 2015. The CES option is only applicable if the District can ensure that 50% or more of the children who participate in the summer school program at the Glenville location are free or reduced-price lunch eligible. The state would also require a letter from the District that there is no mandatory academic summer school programming being conducted at that location. The administration reviewed the free or reduced lunch status of the students who attended summer school at HAS in 2015 and found that we surpass the 50% criteria, with 56% of students eligible. GPS does not mandate any students attend summer school. In light of this information, the District is cautiously optimistic that we will qualify for a Closed Enrollment Site (CES) at Glenville School and be able to offer breakfast and lunch to all students enrolled at that location. We will continue to work with the state to obtain CES status.

14) The BOE took action at the 11/19 regular meeting to fund field trips from the summer school fund balance. How is the summer school fund balance generally reported? (LE)

RESPONSE:

2016-17 Budget Q&A Round II  
December 10, 2015

The summer school fund balance is reported as part of the monitoring reports. The change in all RRR accounts increases or decreases the GAAP fund balance.

15) I am trying to understand the basic outline of tuition, summer school, budget. GF)

RESPONSE:

In our budget we are now reviewing, it says there will be about \$1.3M for ESY and \$360K for summer school. In the summer school report, expenses were ~\$1.2M for ESY and \$624K for summer school. Tuition collected was about \$139K.

The Summer School financial statements were reported as of 9/2015. Attached is an updated financial report (12/2015) with revised information illustrating projected budget adjustments using RRR and achievement gap funds.

a) Does the tuition collected offset the expenses?

RESPONSE:

Summer School tuition goes to the Summer School "RRR" and can be drawn down upon for program expenses.

b) As the expenses are higher than the tuition collected and budget added in, where does the rest of the money come from?

RESPONSE:

The general fund budget.

c) Where is the "extra" 30K that is going to be spent on field trips (fund balance)?

RESPONSE:

The field trips will be funded from the Summer School RRR account which has sufficient fund balance.

d) As for general tuition, where does ~300K collected go? Back into the budget? The town?

RESPONSE:

K-12 tuition and Pre-K tuition go to the Towns General Fund.

16) I would like to understand the impact of providing administrative support for summer school. Both related to staffing numbers and cost. What is the adjusted budget if we add the suggested position? (DA)

RESPONSE:

2016-17 Budget Q&A Round II  
December 10, 2015

To be clear, the administration did not recommend the 0.5 Summer School Administrator. It was considered in the Program Service analysis, but not recommended due to budget constraints. 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.

**Continuing Education**

17) What percent of the expenses are offset by tuition? (BON)

**RESPONSE:**

The enrichment program charges a fee, and is self-supporting.

18) What percent reimbursement from the State offsets the cost of Programs for citizenship and English Language Learner programs? (BON)

**RESPONSE:**

The Mandated Program receives no money from the State.

**PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT**

19) There is a small amount of money budgeted next year for cultural sensitivity training which is now required by the State. Is the budgeted funds enough to fulfill the mandate? Is the mandate being phased in? (BON)

**RESPONSE:**

Based on extensive research including conferring with the CSDE, the expectation for Cultural Competencies training is required in Teacher Prep Programs. We are not aware of a current state mandate for districts to provide certified staff cultural sensitivity training. All districts must ensure that their curriculum is culturally responsive, which is embedded in our curriculum development process.

Nevertheless, we do know that the current proposed funding would not be sufficient to ensure that all the teachers in the district are trained by the end of the school year. However, through the Strategic Plan, Strategy 3, the district would expect to complete training of Title I schools by the end of 2017 followed by a phase in approach for the remaining schools by 2020.

**CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT**

20) Are we writing the STEM curriculum or are we looking for a program we can adapt? (BON)

**RESPONSE:**

2016-17 Budget Q&A Round II  
December 10, 2015

No, we are not writing a “STEM” Curriculum. STEM by definition is an interdisciplinary approach grounded in inquiry, discovery and experiential learning in core Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics. There is no singular curriculum for STEM available for purchase. THE CSDE is advising districts to not purchase Science or STEM materials at this time as they do not meet the state publishing criteria outlined in the Next Generation Science Standards.

The district is using this research-based framework (Interdisciplinary) to renew existing units of study as transdisciplinary units with the expectations of inquiry, higher order thinking, student discourse

The STEM Committee led by Cindy Ringling, Principal of Hamilton Avenue, and Sheila Civale, STEM Coordinator, are reviewing the available instructional resources and practices and possible acquisition of additional instructional resources.

21) Do we know of any pilots that will need to be funded from next year’s budget? BON

**RESPONSE:**

No. If there were any pilots, they would have been presented in the New Courses and Pilot board report of October 8, 2015.

**OPERATIONS SERVICES**

**Transportation**

22) Is the increase in SPED transportation a result of more SPED students requiring transportation or more SPED students requiring transportation out of district? (JD)

**RESPONSE:**

The number of students being transported outside the school district year to year is about the same. However, the specific schools and needs of the students change annually as part of the IEP process. The transportation office works to minimize costs by coordinating student trips as well as using existing capacity. Recent placements servicing the unique needs of students and school locations lead us to believe an additional bus will necessary next fiscal year.

**WIFI**

23) How are students who need wifi being defined and identified/found? (GF)

24) How much is it expected to cost per student to get wifi? How is this being addressed 15-16? (Cost and timing) GF

25) How is this being addressed 16-17 (is it in the budget and when will new round of identification take place)? GF

2016-17 Budget Q&A Round II  
December 10, 2015

26) What additional information is the administration able to provide on the number of current students who are without home Internet access and when would this information be made available? (LE)

27) Evidence from DLE Technology Readiness Survey that will be distributed beginning this week: how many students self-identify as having no home wifi access? (JD)

28) With all the publicity regarding home internet access - has the the district considered a dialog with Social Services to help determine how to best identify need? Social Services has experience with assisting clients with aid for other utilities. (LR)

29) Specifically, how were the 25 students for this year identified? What provisions exist to add students as they might be identified? What plan do they have to identify if there are other students with a similar need and how will they determine if students have Internet in the house but not access to it or that it might be too slow? What are the goals of the planned pilot scheduled to begin on 12/1? What do they hope to learn and what might change practice during the year or perhaps impact funding needs for 16-17? (DA)

## RESPONSES

**All WIFI questions (#23-29) are answered together in the following statement.**

### **HOME WIFI ACCESS OVERVIEW**

We fully intend to ensure that all students have access to the appropriate resources that support the GPS curriculum, including home internet access. The District is committed to providing all students with the resources that they need to support their learning. Although the administration presented a maximum estimate of 120 students without home internet access Districtwide in April 2015, the actual number is likely far lower. Based on past and pending surveys, and present inquiries, the actual number will likely be less than half of the 120 estimate, and most, if not all students without home internet access will be provided with access this year. To accomplish this in the 2015-16 school year, the District is:

- 1 – Piloting a home wifi access program by loaning Verizon mobile hotpots to up to 25 students in grades 6-12;
- 2 – Contingently making Optimum wifi public hotspot accounts available, as needed, focusing on ameliorating any coverage needs for students in the local housing projects where signal density is higher and reception is stronger for Optimum;
- 3 – Making a small modicum of mobile hotspots available as long-term circulating resources in school media centers (1-2) devices.

### **TOPIC: Goals of the FY15 Pilot (Q29)**

The goals of the FY15 Pilot involve the study of the risks in this industry-leading model, as follows:

- 1 – To learn the quantity and quality of data access that is necessary to support the GPS curriculum, particularly at the secondary level given that present administrative guidance has been for the elementary schools to not assume access to the internet at home when assigning homework, and to always provide a paper alternative;

2016-17 Budget Q&A Round II  
December 10, 2015

2 – To better learn how to keep students safe at home during hours when the District offices are not in operation; and

3 – To learn about other factors causing a family to “need” internet access, whereby such factors can be used to better screen families for future internet service offerings without creating the moral hazard of families who factually have self-provided access, passing the costs onto the District simply because they meet narrow “means-tested” criteria.

The confluence of these items learned during the pilot will affect both the service model and cost for a Districtwide, grades 3-12 program in FY17.

**TOPIC: Identification of Students (Q23 & Q29)**

Students will be identified through 2 criteria for the FY15-16 home wifi access pilot: 1) any student who was participating in the services offered by the Digital Divide grant will automatically be enrolled in the pilot; or 2) any secondary student who is referred by a guidance counselor or principal will be enrolled in the pilot up to the first 25 available slots. One of the purposes of the pilot is to help identify what the appropriate criteria should be to scale the program to support all needs in grades 3-12 in FY17. This year, students who are identified in excess of that need (either because they lack internet access or because they indicate that the internet access in their home is unacceptably slow) will either be serviced by Optimum access (see item 2 above), or be directed to the FCC Lifeline Program and their families will be supported in completing an application for services once the FCC publishes the new application.

**TOPIC: Cost of Pilot (Q24 & Q25)**

Home wifi access in the present model costs \$400/year/student for the mobile hotspots, and \$200/year/student for public Optimum hotspot access over the course of the 10-month academic year. The pilot is expected to be paid for by re-prioritizing Digital Learning Environment (DLE) capital monies to support the purchase of the equipment. However, this cost will have to be built into the operating budget for FY17 and beyond (please see the \$50k wifi request in the Program Services document that will be required to support as many as 120 students) if the present model of directly providing home internet access continues.

**TOPIC: The Current Need for Home Wifi Access (Q26 & Q27)**

Although the administration presented a maximum estimate of 120 students Districtwide without home internet access in April 2015, the actual number is likely far lower. A January 2015 survey to grades 3-6 with an approximate response rate of 80% identified 19 students without internet access at home. The number in grades 7-12 is expected to be far lower than the number in grades 3-6. A new DLE Student Technology Readiness Survey is being administered to students in grades 7-12 and will close on December 11, 2015. Results will be ready within 2 business days thereafter.

2016-17 Budget Q&A Round II  
December 10, 2015

Student Technology Readiness Survey - Grades 3 - 6 - Administered as of Jan 2015										
Q3. Do you have permission to use the Internet at home?										
GRADE	No		We do not have the Internet at home		Yes		Grand Total	FY15 Enrollment	Response Rate (as % of Budget Book Enrollment)	%age Variance of Estimate
	#	%	#	%	#	%				
Grade 3	33	6.7%	7	1.4%	452	91.9%	492	664	74.1%	0.5%
Grade 4	13	2.3%	2	0.4%	543	97.3%	558	731	76.3%	0.3%
Grade 5	5	0.9%	6	1.0%	568	98.1%	579	680	85.1%	0.4%
Grade 6	3	0.6%	4	0.9%	461	98.5%	468	643	72.8%	0.4%
<b>Total Count (Avg. %)</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>2.6%</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>0.9%</b>	<b>2024</b>	<b>96.5%</b>	<b>2097</b>	<b>2718</b>	<b>77.2%</b>	<b>0.2%</b>

**TOPIC: Social Services and Other Community Partners (Q28)**

While the District has not yet spoken with any other social services agencies, it is actively communicating the availability of the FCC Lifeline program, and will be engaging the Greenwich Town, Social Services, and Library to foster community-wide solutions by January 2016.

**RENTAL COSTS**

30) What long term rentals does this include? What does it cost for the daily maintenance and painting at the alternative high school at St. Catherine's? Has the security there been upgraded to meet GPS and State Standards? (BON)

**RESPONSE:**

Long term rentals include the costs of leases for St. Catherine's, which houses the Alternative High School, and BANC for New Lebanon Kindergarten. The St. Catherine's facility meets the safety/security standards established by the district and state (CCTV, access controls, Alertus, district locking system, keypad door locks and intercom). Additional security upgrades are planned as a result of recent office moves. This year we spent approximately \$7,000 on painting at St. Catherine's. A custodian is assigned to the site every day for a half day of cleaning.

**MOC 200s – OTHER SERVICES**

31) Rental/Maintenance Software (line 52360) - is this increase due to ECRA contract? (LE- asked in round 1 but did not make it in Q&A)

**RESPONSE:**

The increase in this line is due to the ECRA contract.

**MOC 300s - SUPPLIES**

32) Textbooks (53110) is showing a significant reduction. Even with digital resources, is this excessive at (\$214,250) or -41.5%? (LE- asked in round 1 but did not make it in Q&A)

**RESPONSE:**



2016-17 Budget Q&A Round II  
December 10, 2015

The budget request for textbooks is broken down in two categories, new editions and replacements. The requests for new editions for programs came in lower than the current budget. We have already been informed to expect an increase in the 17-18 budget to return to prior year levels. The second category "replacements" was reduced based on past spending patterns and coordination of textbook purchases this fiscal year.

**CAPITAL BUDGET**

33) Do the funds for the repairs for the Hamilton Ave. garage need to be appropriated from the BOE budget? Understand that the Hamilton Ave. building committee needs to authorize the funds from that capital account but don't we also need an appropriation? (LE)

**RESPONSE:**

The funds identified for the corrective action on the Hamilton Avenue Garage are coming from the Hamilton Avenue School project, a previously authorized capital project.

34) Will the administration be making an adjustment to remove the Williams St. remediation and restoration (\$135K)? LE

**RESPONSE:**

Our recommendation will be to remove this project as the Town has taken on the remediation project.

35) Science Lab renovation (BON)

i) Are they being renovated with a particular program or change in program in mind or is this just a general updating? Is this update part of a multiyear plan to update all the science labs across the middle schools and high school?

**RESPONSE:**

Renovations are being planned with the goal of ensuring continued compliance with recommended safety standards. This is a continuous process as we review labs throughout the school district.

ii) Have we done an inventory of all the science labs and their adequacy in light of the change to programs that include more STEM activities?

**RESPONSE:**

We have engaged the services of a professional and conducted a walk through last spring to assess the labs. Work is scheduled to continue on recommended safety standards. The existing labs are adequate to support current STEM activities. In

2016-17 Budget Q&A Round II  
December 10, 2015

support of STEM we also leverage the use of other non-lab resources (robotics, 3D printer, etc)



# GREENWICH PUBLIC SCHOOLS

*“Setting the Standard for Excellence in Public Education”*

**Havemeyer Building  
290 Greenwich Avenue  
Greenwich, Connecticut 06830 – 6521  
Tel: (203) 625-7446**

**Dr. Robert Lichtenfeld  
Director of Human Resources**

## Job Description: Program Coordinator, K-12

### PRIMARY FUNCTION

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 of Curriculum, Instruction, and Professional Learning.

### ILLUSTRATION OF KEY DUTIES

1. **CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION**– Plans, develops, coordinates, evaluates, revises, and provides access to the academic curriculum K-12 in conjunction with the Curriculum Council and the 9-12 Program Administrator. Studies and reviews new developments in curriculum and digital learning. Provides organization and leadership in the adoption and use of instructional materials.
2. **PROFESSIONAL LEARNING** - Develops plans, schedules, curricula, instruction, professional learning, locates resources, materials aligned with District goals. All responsibilities are aligned with the Teacher Evaluation Professional Learning Plan (TEPL). Consults with principals on school-based needs.
3. **PERSONNEL** – Recommends program staff assignments and transfers in consultation with principals. Evaluates program staff in consultation with the Principal. Participates in the goal setting component of the appraisal process when appropriate and in informal and formal observation, individual conferences, and periodic evaluation of performance of staff members. Assists in recruiting and interviewing prospective teachers. Guides and encourages professional personnel through the planning of effective professional learning programs, and faculty meetings focused on curriculum and instruction.
4. **ASSESSMENT AND PROGRESS MONITORING** – Establishes program goals and a holistic accountability structure to ensure accountability through the design, implementation and analysis of multiple measures. These goals should connect and align to district and school-based strategic goals.

5. **COMMUNICATIONS AND PUBLIC RELATIONS** – Maintains multiple effective lines of communication with all stakeholders. Interprets the academic curriculum design to the various constituencies. Reports to the Superintendent on developments in his/her subject field and prepares reports for the Board of Education as requested by the Superintendent of Schools.
6. **FINANCE** – In concert with Principals, 9-12 Program Administrators and Learning Facilitators, develops, recommends and assists in the implementation of the budget for his/her program.
7. **MANAGEMENT** – Maintains an office when appropriate, conducts correspondence to include letters of recommendation, meets with representatives of sales companies, and evaluates classified staff assigned to that office. Coordinates supply and equipment orders.
8. **SCHEDULING AND PLACEMENT** – In consultation with the Principal, assists in the process of staff assignment to use staff and implement the learning program(s) most effectively. Recommends transfers when appropriate.
9. **PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES** – Serves on standing and special committees in the schools and community when assigned, participates in workshops, conferences, professional learning, parent-teacher meetings in consultation with the Principal, and other activities of a professional nature.

## WORK YEAR AND COMPENSATION

The work year and compensation is according to the agreement between the Board of Education and the Greenwich Organization of School Administrators (GOSA).

## DESIRABLE QUALIFICATIONS

1. The candidate shall have demonstrated the ability to work well with supervisors, faculty, students and the community, and shall show evidence of good mental and physical health.
2. The candidate shall have demonstrated 3-5 years of outstanding classroom performance.
3. The candidate shall have had successful previous experience in administrative or curriculum leadership.
4. The candidate shall demonstrate the level of professional competence and creative leadership necessary to execute effectively the duties and responsibilities indicated in the position description.

5. The candidate shall have a Master's Degree and shall have Connecticut certification appropriate to the position. (An 092 certificate and subject-matter certification appropriate to the position – see below)

- For STEM Coordinator, certification in any of the following: mathematics, technology education, science, or engineering.
- For Humanities Coordinator, certification in either Language Arts or social studies/history

# SUMMER SCHOOL FINANCIAL DETAIL FOR ROUND II BUDGET QUESTION #15

## 12.3.15

	ORG	DESC	OBJECT	2015-2016 ORIGINAL BUDGET	2015-2016 REVISED BUDGET	2015-2016 EXPENDITURES AS OF 12.2.15	FUND BALANCE AS OF 12.2.15	2016-2017 REQUEST					
PROGRAM 55 ESY	A6201755	TEMPORARY SALARIES	51300	-	-	170,573.84	(170,573.84)	-					
	A6201755	PAYMENTS FOR TEMP SVC-SPEC PRJ	51390	992,796.00	992,796.00	726,314.02	266,481.98	1,092,509.00					
	A6201755	PROF& OTHER SPEC SERV- NOC	51490	400.00	400.00	-	400.00	400.00					
	A6201755	POSTAGE	52050	-	-	-	-	45.00					
	A6201755	TRANSPORTATION OF OTHER NON-EM	52130	3,600.00	4,017.32	4,285.28	(267.96)	4,000.00					
	A6201755	OFFICE SERVICES	52150	-	-	582.75	(582.75)	-					
	A6201755	RENTAL OF BUILDINGS AND OTHER	52340	1,800.00	1,800.00	1,800.00	-	4,000.00					
	A6201755	MISC SVCS- NOT OTHERWISE CLASS	52950	450.00	63.68	63.68	-	45.00					
	A6201755	OFFICE SUPPLIES	53010	300.00	300.00	-	300.00	-					
	A6201755	DATA/WORD PROCESSING SUPPLIES	53070	200.00	200.00	-	200.00	600.00					
	A6201755	TEACHING SUPPLIES	53100	4,600.00	4,600.00	7,020.80	(2,420.80)	3,600.00					
	A6601755	TRANSPORTATION OF PUPILS - EMO	52140	252,461.00	252,430.00	251,078.96	1,351.04	280,089.00					
			<b>\$</b>	<b>1,256,607.00</b>	<b>\$</b>	<b>1,161,719.33</b>	<b>\$</b>	<b>94,887.67</b>	<b>\$</b>	<b>1,385,288.00</b>			
PROGRAM 94 SUMMER SCHOOL	A6201794	OVERTIME SERVICES	51100	-	-	356.65	(356.65)	-					
	A6201794	TEMPORARY SALARIES	51300	-	-	183,328.52	(183,328.52)	-					
	A6201794	PAYMENTS FOR TEMP SVC-SPEC PRJ	51390	346,315.00	470,315.00	396,208.55	74,106.45	352,409.00					
	A6201794	POSTAGE	52050	500.00	500.00	80.01	419.99	55.00					
	A6201794	OFFICE SERVICES	52150	-	-	13,385.75	(13,385.75)	-					
	A6201794	RENTAL OF BUILDINGS AND OTHER	52340	-	-	1,800.00	(1,800.00)	55.00					
	A6201794	MISC SVCS- NOT OTHERWISE CLASS	52950	300.00	300.00	-	300.00	-					
	A6201794	OFFICE SUPPLIES	53010	500.00	500.00	-	500.00	-					
	A6201794	DATA/WORD PROCESSING SUPPLIES	53070	200.00	200.00	389.04	(189.04)	200.00					
	A6201794	TEACHING SUPPLIES	53100	5,400.00	5,400.00	17,209.38	(11,809.38)	5,500.00					
			<b>\$</b>	<b>353,215.00</b>	<b>\$</b>	<b>612,757.90</b>	<b>\$</b>	<b>(135,542.90)</b>	<b>\$</b>	<b>358,219.00</b>			
RRR FUND BALANCE AS OF 12.2.15 (A620-35016)							\$	144,231.00					
A-GAP SUMMER SCHOOL AS OF 12.2.15 (A6001774)							\$	91,790.00					
<b>TOTALS</b>				<b>2015-2016 ORIGINAL BUDGET</b>	<b>2015-2016 REVISED BUDGET</b>	<b>2015-2016 EXPENDITURES AS OF 12.2.15</b>	<b>FUND BALANCE AS OF 12.2.15</b>	<b>2016-2017 REQUEST</b>					
				\$	1,609,822.00	\$	1,733,822.00	\$	1,774,477.23	\$	195,365.77	\$	1,743,507.00