

2007-08 PROPOSED BUDGET

Q & A
12/7/06

SALARIES

1. Salaries - a. *Line 139 / line 106 relationship: It is explained in the budget book that our new line 139 will pick up a substantial amount of the "old" line 106. Line 139 goes from \$48k to \$761k YOY but 106 actually goes up from \$1.525mm to \$1.550mm. Why is 106 not going down roughly \$700k?*
- b. *Resetting guidelines: Have there been preliminary discussions with the BET about what we view as the correct amount of dollars to use for salary increases and salary savings?*
- c. *In reviewing the 100's summary I note that the salary lines increase only 3.2% and even when you include 5130,5131 and 5139 the increase is only 3.63%. The total of these lines is 97,443,656 which is the bulk of the budget proposed. It appears that without lines 51980 and 51990 the increase in the 100's would be about 3.9%. Line 51980 is the increase in staff for Hamilton Avenue which I understand and pushes the increase to 4.4%. Line 51990 is the salary adjustment account. My understanding is that this is an estimate based on anticipated retirements and departures. I don't see how this estimate should have budget implications. Lastly I believe someone needs to carefully review the schools request for additional funds. Not including Hamilton Avenue these requests range from 10k to 82k with some providing excellent descriptions and explanations and others simply appearing to be a request for funds. I'd like to know what is clearly necessary from the administration point of view.*
- d. *I understand there are many moving parts and, apologies to Sue, but I am still not completely clear how we end up with a 4.8% cost increase. From what I can decipher, the key components are as follows (and I agree this is getting into management on a micro basis but size of the overall cost is part of governance): Salary adjustments: 2930 (101, 102, 107), Pay for accum leave: 150, Temp staff: 464 (am I right this is up 16% across the various categories?), New positions: 522, Salary adj : 382 (diff between 1982 and 1600 savings) Total 4448 (or the bulk of the increase). The salary adjustments appear to be around 3.2% and the accum leave is an accounting change. This leaves temp staff increase and the new positions/salary savings as the drivers of overall increase. See temp staff question above (and as I believe Steve asks, is this consistent with what was explained in changes section of introduction). Your presentation on Thursday explained the new positions (Setting Priorities slide and New Positions slide). It would appear that there was no comparable expense last year; is this correct? On Staff Savings, the savings decreased by a net of \$382; is there a driver on this?*
- e. *Salary Account: This may be addressed by the analysis that Susan is working on with the Town. I'm still unclear as to why if 139 is now increasing to reflect \$462 K for ESY teacher comp previously in 130 and 131, then why are accounts 130 and 132 going down by only \$250K?*

GREENWICH PUBLIC SCHOOLS
'Setting the Standard for Excellence in Public Education'

106, 131, 139 Lines

The relationships between and among personnel/salary lines 106, 131, and 139 are complex. Given some ongoing confusion about the operating definitions of these codes during the budget development process, it will undoubtedly be necessary to make adjustments between and among these lines once the budget is approved.

106	Professional learning (curriculum & staff dev't.) per diem payments to certified staff for activities outside the work year; rates increase each year per GEA contract; number/type of activities vary from year to year. Compensation for interscholastic/intramural contract subject to GEA contract increases including GWI, longevity, steps. Compensation for Schedule C extra curricular assignments subject to GEA contract increases including GWI.
131	Per diem payments to substitutes for covering certified staff assignments due to sick, vacation, leave, professional learning.
139	Supplemental program staff (summer school, District sponsored after school programs, extended school year) Police overtime for school activities Town employees for approved 2 nd job assignment (e.g., athletic event staff) d) home bound instruction

The shift of some expenses previously budgeted in 106 to 139 was also offset by an increase in line 106 for Schedule C (stipends for teachers providing extracurricular activities) and Appendix B (stipends for athletic coaches). Additional increases to the 139 line, above and beyond those simply reallocated from 106, include a) payments to teachers for supplemental after school programs at targeted schools, and b) payments to teachers for the extended school year summer program (previously budgeted in 130 and 131, representing \$462,000 of the total increase in line 139. Funds allocated to supplemental programs was previously budgeted in non-personnel lines in the District (Havemeyer) "Schools" budget administered by the Deputy and Assistant Superintendents. Funds allocated to the new Extended School Year (ESY) program (55) were reallocated from the Special Education program budget (53). The amount budgeted represents a 2.52% increase over 2006-07 actual.

Reconciling the District budget with the BET Guideline

School system administrators, Town Finance staff, and policymakers (BET, BOE) have continued their efforts to reconcile the Superintendent's proposed budget with the BET guideline. This has resulted in greater shared understandings which will greatly inform discussions and decision making when the Board of Education submits its budget request to the BET. There was agreement that the BET calculation of the expected 2007-07 BOE salary level was inaccurate by about \$725,000. This was primarily due to inclusion of some salary savings estimated for 2006-07 that are not permanent changes in the staffing model (\$382,925) and using an escalation percentage that was too low. There was also agreement that the line items relating to utilities and transportation will exceed the 3% annual increase and will result in higher budget request than the guideline (\$1,111,892). This resulted in general agreement around the

GREENWICH PUBLIC SCHOOLS
'Setting the Standard for Excellence in Public Education'

table that the Superintendent's proposed budget of \$120,067,157 exceeds the "adjusted guideline" by \$515,000, the proposed funding for the magnet program.

However, the BET will not be adjusting their guideline. These variances will need to be explained during the BET budget deliberations, by both District staff and the members of the BET budget committee. It should also be noted that the pro forma Town Budget was not in balance even with the wrong BOE data, so these changes will have an impact on their model. The full BET still has the discretion to approve, increase or reduce the BOE budget that the Board of Education will approve on Dec 14.

Shared Understandings

1. 2006-07 projected certified salary payroll expenditures: ~\$70,700,000.
2. The current year actual projection validates (at this point in the school/fiscal year) budget assumptions used for lines 102 and 199
3. The BET guideline assumed that the full value of 06-07 salary savings could be applied to the 07-08 certified salary base.
4. Only the amount of salary savings (line 199) attributable to a net reduction in FTE can be applied to the following fiscal year. For 2006-07, an estimated \$1.6 million of the \$1.98 budgeted in line 199 represents the permanent reduction of 20 FTE between 05-06 and 06-07 due to declining enrollment. It is only a coincidence that this amount is the same as the projected salary savings budgeted in 2007-08.
5. The BET guideline was based on a 4% increase in certified salaries, actual 06-07 to budget 07-08 (line 102). The actual increase in GEA salaries, budget to budget, is 5.5% and GOSA exceeds 24%. This significant increase in GOSA, while applied to a much lower total base salary amount, is due in large part to costs associated with work year adjustments. The salary increase projected for the six (6) non-represented central office certified administrators was 3.5%.
6. There are currently 881 FTE (GEA, GOSA, non-represented cabinet). This is consistent with the reported table of organization for 2006-07 once the GOSA count is corrected from 51 to 59. This difference is attributed to a misunderstanding about how to account for and report administrators' teaching assignments.

The shared understandings listed above explain in large measure the \$725,424 variance between the Superintendent's budget and the BET guideline which cannot be attributed either to utilities or to the new Hamilton Ave. magnet program.

Difference between Superintendent's Budget & BET Guideline	2,352,316
Amount attributable to costs exceeding 3% for utilities & transportation	-1,111,892
Cost of new Hamilton Ave. Magnet School program (one-time and recurring)	-515,000
Adjusted difference between Superintendent's Budget & BET Guideline	725,424
Amount of difference that can be attributed to the application of 06-07 non-recurring salary savings	-382,925
Adjusted difference between Superintendent's Budget & BET Guideline	342,499

GREENWICH PUBLIC SCHOOLS
‘Setting the Standard for Excellence in Public Education’

Some have asked why it seems to be so difficult to project current year salary costs for the school system’s certified employees, perhaps more so than for other Town departments. There are two main reasons: 1) MUNIS data tools do not work as well or easily for split positions of which there are many in the BOE, and 2) Payroll and FTE data includes both regular table of organization (TO) staff, grant positions, and certified educators handling long-term leave assignments. All of these variables must be considered when projecting end of year actual costs.

The FY 08 certified salary line (102) is determined by “rolling over” all current employees with projected increases based on collective bargaining agreements. It is important to remember that the cost of collective bargaining agreement is comprised of increases (GWI, step, performance incentive pay, employer contributions to tax shelter annuity plans, etc.), offset by savings in such areas as health benefits. While the District budget reflects the increased costs, the Town budget accrues much of the benefits savings. The salary adjustment line (199) reflects the same variables, but year-specific assumptions, regarding resignations, leaves, and reduction in positions due to declining enrollment (7.8 FTE).

The major driver in salary savings (199) has been the number of positions eliminated (retirement vacancies not filled) from one year to the next. The enrollment-based staffing adjustment was much greater from 2005-06 to 2006-07 than it will be between 2006-07 and 2007-08 (20 positions versus 8). Even when it is possible to realize the projected savings, they may not materialize in a way that is consistent with projections about the discrete variables (number of retirements, projected salary differential from resignations, etc.).

GENERAL

- 2. a. How does the administration plan to respond to the identified need for high school guidance counselors to be available to parents and students outside the regular school year?***
b. During the public hearing, there was mention of the lack of high school guidance counselors on staff over the summer and just before school starts. Do you feel that there is a significant need for guidance counseling during these time periods? If deemed to be needed, would we be able to shift schedules and work years around to create coverage without impacting the budget?

Beginning July 1, 2007, the work year for the District Guidance Coordinator, based at Greenwich High School, will increase to 225 days along with all five high school headmasters. These administrators should be able to respond to most if not all requests for information and will be better positioned to contact guidance staff at home during the summer if necessary.

Additionally, within the current budget request (A620 16/13/14/15 50 51020), each guidance counselor at the middle and high school is allocated an additional four days to be used to address the needs that may arise outside the 187 day work year for certified staff. Past practice has been to give the building administrator, in consultation with staff, the discretion to schedule those days to meet the needs of the staff and students at the school. Given that there are currently 17 guidance counselors at GHS, there is an additional allocation of 68 days available to support

GREENWICH PUBLIC SCHOOLS
‘Setting the Standard for Excellence in Public Education’

students during periods when school is not in session. Each middle school has 12 additional days.

3. How can we redirect resources further for 2007-8 to focus on literacy and numeracy gains for all students and on closing the achievement gap while achieving reductions to the proposed budget?

Monies redirected into the literacy and numeracy initiatives include:

- \$301,570 from the Havemeyer Schools budget which will be used to purchase materials for the K-5 program and middle school literacy programs.
- \$63,998 increase in the Mathematics program budget to provide for the annually recurring costs of the Everyday Math program in grades K – 5.
- \$130,000 for extended school day programs at Cos Cob, Glenville, Hamilton Avenue, Julian Curtiss, New Lebanon, and Western Middle School.

The literacy program is funded out of a program improvement fund carried in the Havemeyer Schools budget. This money is being used during the current school year to fund the mathematics improvement and was reallocated to the literacy initiative for 2007-2008. The money for math and supplemental programs was funded through reallocation among the program budgets and the Havemeyer schools budget.

4. Courageous Conversations - What exactly is contained in this program? It's stated purpose? Who developed it? Track record? What level of students is it aimed at?

“Courageous Conversations About Race” by Glenn Singleton and Curtis Linton provide guidance on “the need for candid, courageous conversations about race so that educators may understand why performance inequity persists.” Glenn Singleton founded The Pacific Educational Group (PEG) in 1992. The PEG mission is to address “systemic issues of educational inequity by providing guidance to districts as to how to meet the needs of underserved students of color populations. The consultants at PEG design and deliver individualized, comprehensive support for school districts in the form of leadership training, coaching and consulting. Working at all levels from the superintendent to beginning teachers, PEG helps educators focus on heightening awareness of institutional racism and developing effective strategies for closing achievement gaps in schools.” The program is a continuation of our work in closing the achievement gap and in Whole Student Development in Greenwich. It is targeted at the district as a whole, systemically-parents, teachers and students, providing a critical awareness of “the degree to which racism and other diversity issues are part of educational failure” and providing integrated strategies for addressing inequities.

CLASS SIZE GUIDELINES/CAPS

5. Revisiting Questions 19 and 20: With the strong parental focus on smaller classes (particularly at the elementary level), I am not yet comfortable understanding the average student / teacher ratio “flow” during an average school day. Three or four years ago, I remember seeing a timing schematic that showed the number of students in class and the number of certified staff present as the day unfolded. For example: 4th grade class starts at 8:30 with 23 students and 1 teacher. At 9:00, 4 ALP math students pull out, so now 19:1 ratio for the next hour. At 10:00, ALP math returns but ALP reading pulls out 5 students and a Reading Specialist pushes in for the next hour, so now 18:2 ratio for the next hour, etc. I think that a chart of the average classroom “flow” would really help everyone have a common understanding of the classroom staffing dynamics from which they can then draw their conclusions. Obviously, this is an average; it would also be helpful to have an idea of minimum and maximum deviations from the average.

The elementary staffing models for Special Education, English as a Second Language and Reading Specialists are all based primarily on a “push-in” model of instruction in that the teacher in each of these areas joins the grade level teacher in the classroom to collaboratively provide direct instruction to students. The amount of time these teachers spend in the classroom is dependent upon the number and needs of the students so it varies from classroom to classroom. For example, a reading specialist might have five students in one classroom who require an additional 30 minutes per day of direct reading instruction. In this case, the reading specialist might run a daily reading group with these students while the classroom teacher takes responsibility for the rest of the students. If the students were spread across four sections, the reading specialist might create a “pull-out” reading group. Another option would be for the reading specialist to work with the classroom teacher to plan appropriate remedial instruction that would be delivered by the classroom teacher. It is difficult to gauge the impact of this flexible staffing model on the average class size of elementary homerooms.

The staffing model for the Advanced Learning Program differs from the “push-in” programs in a number of important ways. First, the ALP curriculum differs substantially from the grade level curriculum. For example, students in third grade ALP mathematics are addressing many of the same objectives that are taught in fourth grade to students in grade level classes. Secondly, the ALP instructional delivery model is entirely “pull-out.” ALP students leave their homeroom class and receive separate instruction in an ALP classroom for five hours a week in mathematics, five hours a week in reading and writing, and one and a half hours a week in science. During this time, the class size of the homeroom class is effectively reduced by the number of ALP students in the class. The attached table (Appendix A) describes the total enrollment, ALP enrollment, homeroom class size, and homeroom class size not including ALP students by grade and school. Since the grade two ALP program offers only two hours of instruction per week to identified students, the impact on homeroom class size is minimal.

6. Class size guidelines vs. caps:

- a) From last night’s dialogue, am I correct in saying that the Administration views the Ham Ave K-1 15 student cap as a hard cap and that a 16th student necessitates another class?***
- b) Specifically at K, 1, 4 and 5 grades, the proposal is to go from “guidelines” to lower-***

GREENWICH PUBLIC SCHOOLS
‘Setting the Standard for Excellence in Public Education’

numbered “caps.” Are these being viewed as hard caps also?

- a) Yes, the administration views 15 students in grades pre k – 1 at HAS as a “hard cap”
- b) For all other schools, the following “hard caps” are suggested: K-1 – 21; 2-3 – 24; 4-5 – 26

Class size “caps” are used in other districts. They clearly define the issue of class size for all constituents, and avoid the drain of administrators’ and board members’ time and energy that occurs when the process is not clearly defined and constituents “lobby” for additional staff.

The suggested process is this:

Each year as of a designated date, August 15 for example, current actual enrollment in all elementary schools is assessed. The number of sections at each grade is determined, based on the number of students enrolled at that date. For example, if, on August 15, there are 64 students in grade 1, four sections are formed. Even if three students withdraw from grade 1 after August 15, four sections remain. If there are 63 students in grade 1, three sections are formed. Even if three students register in grade 1 after August 15, three sections remain. Principals continue to have the discretion to deploy support staff according to grade levels as needed.

This practice has been in place for many years in Darien I’m sure Superintendent Donald Fiftal or Board Chairman John Boulton would be happy to discuss its advantages.

7. Class sizes: I know we have been given the estimated class sizes for 2007-08. It would be helpful for me to compare the budgeted class sections to our experience this year. Please provide a chart with the elementary school class sizes for this year by grade and school.

See Appendix B.

8. GHS Class Size: At our meeting last week, it was mentioned that many of the small classes reflected advanced language or science courses. Can we get a list of the non-core academic classes that have less than 15 students – ie., art, business, family and consumer science, and technology – a total of about 20 classes?

See Appendix C.

ENROLLMENT, FACILITY UTILIZATION, RACIAL BALANCE

9. Facility Utilization/Racial Balance project: I am concerned that there will not be sufficient progress (including time for community involvement) on this project in advance of the 2008-09 budget process. While specifics can be developed after the budget cycle, I believe we need to have reached agreement on the broad approach prior to the start of the budget season. Can you describe your expectation for the process, timing and deliverables for this project? How much funding is included in the budget for this study?

GREENWICH PUBLIC SCHOOLS
'Setting the Standard for Excellence in Public Education'

The process needs to be transparent to all stakeholders, provide opportunities for community discussion, and present the Board of Education with recommended options prior to the beginning of the 2008-2009 budget development process. The administrative staff has begun working with a consultant to frame this project and should be ready by January to specifically outline the timing and deliverables. Since much of the work will be completed during the 2006-2007 school year, there is no specific funding in the 2007-2008 budget.

BENCHMARKING

10. Benchmarking and staffing: non-certified: To follow up on an earlier question: I am interested in the benchmarking analysis for our non-certified staff and in what the non-certified staffing headcount was at our peak enrollment in 04-05 vs what it is projected to be in 07-08?

See Appendix D. In 2004-2005, the total FTE for non-certified staff was 481.9 or 52.9 non-certified staff per thousand students. This staffing ratio was slightly higher than ERG B (52.3 non-certified staff per thousand students) and slightly lower than ERG A (53.0 non-certified staff per thousand students). The budgeted table of organization for non-certified staff in 2007-2008 is 438.5 FTE. In the last three years, there have been significant redesigns of the staffing models for custodial, food service and office staff resulting in part of the reduction.

PLEASE NOTE: All data provided to the State are self-reported and there are idiosyncrasies and inconsistencies in the way that districts interpret the categories.

HAMILTON AVENUE MAGNET PROGRAM & PRESCHOOL

11. I would like to encourage the administration to look again at the Ham. Ave. proposal.

I continue to be seriously concerned about the proposed cap for Ham Ave grades K and 1. I do not believe that we wish to be committed to hiring another teacher if 16 children show up for one of the 4 kindergarten or 1st grade classes. That would result in our having five classes of 11 children each in that grade.

With New Leb, Cos Cob, and JC all having significant populations of at-risk students (ISD has some as well), I don't think we can justify such a heavy investment in Ham. Ave., when we are not prepared to do the same for other needy schools.

I should add that I have received phone calls today from people who attended last night's meeting, who told me that they, too, are very concerned about this proposal, and that it is already fomenting divisiveness among PTA groups.

I'm extremely aware that Dr. Sternberg is new to the district. and that she has been confronted with MANY challenges in a short period of time. However, I hope she and the administration will look again at the Ham. Ave. proposal in light of other compelling needs in the district. I would be willing to accept a cap of 17 for Ham. Ave., K and Grade 1 in order to make it an

GREENWICH PUBLIC SCHOOLS
'Setting the Standard for Excellence in Public Education'

attractive magnet school, but not a cap of 15.

The decision to limit class size to 15 students in grades preK – 1 came about during the process of designing the new Hamilton Avenue Magnet School. During the process of design Dr. Leverett expressed his commitment to small class size as a way to ensure additional attention to students during this critical time in their early educational development. Simultaneously, there an effort on the part of the building committee to include preK classrooms within the limited space of the school's designed footprint. At that time, it was decided to limit class sizes to 15 in preK-1 to address both of these important goals.

The classrooms for kindergarten and grade one are 900 and 940 sq. ft respectively sq. ft – large enough for a cap of 17 students in those grades. The question which remains is the effect of this larger class size number on the magnet – will this negatively affect its attractiveness to the parents whom we wish to attract?

Attached are the HAS educational specifications (Appendix E) and a memo from Dr. Larry Leverett (Appendix F) which support class sizes of 15 students in preK-grade 1.

12. Hamilton Avenue Magnet: I'm still trying to understand how we can be comfortable in advance that the Suzuki program will provide the "best return on our investment" in terms of attracting magnet students to the school - in addition to the other features such as preschool and small class sizes. Can you provide us with a list of other magnet schools that have used this program as one of their "hooks"?

- Hartford, Connecticut Public Schools –in their 6th year of Suzuki violin instruction in 12 elementary schools
- Harris Integrated Arts/Core Knowledge Magnet School, Durham , North Carolina
- Longfellow Elementary School, Kansas City Missouri
- Parker Music Academy, Houston, Texas

13. Hamilton Ave Magnet School: Please clarify the breakdown of the \$30,000 for swimming and skating instruction and transportation. How would approval of this program effect gym utilization? Does a GPS physical ed teacher provide the swimming/ skating instruction?

For 292 students (15 sections) at HAS, costs are projected as follows:

Swim Instruction:

\$6,000 – two non-school district instructors per class for 8 weeks

\$7,000 – transportation

\$1,600 - swim caps

Skating Instruction:

\$3,000 – skating guard

\$7,000 – transportation

Total = \$24,600

GREENWICH PUBLIC SCHOOLS
'Setting the Standard for Excellence in Public Education'

These off-site programs will reduce the utilization of the gym for physical education, freeing it for use for other purposes such as meetings of all students in a grade level, or special events, such as science fairs or other celebrations.

Yes, the physical education teacher at HAS will lead instruction in both swimming and skating, as he does now.

14. What evidence is available that Suzuki instruction contributes to student growth and development?

Research points to an advantageous connection (sometimes called the “Mozart Effect”) between students who play string instruments and their progress and achievement in school, particularly in math. Sites below offer information:

http://www.pbs.org/newshour/bb/education/july-dec98/music_11-10.html
<http://www.jhu.edu/~jhumag/0298web/math.html>

15. What would be the financial impact if this program was phased in over 3 years (K-1, K-2, PreK-2)?

If the program were to be phased in over three years, costs would be approximately one third of the total of \$115,000 each year at the rate of \$15, 000 - \$20,000 for a part-time teacher, \$17,000 for instruments. During the second and or third year, when the teacher FTE grows to over .5, cost of benefits would need to be added.

16. What is the breakdown of the \$240,000 for expanded PreK? Are we using the same staffing model in all PreK classes across the district?

Taken from the HAS update dated November 16:

<i>Magnet Program Component</i>	<i>Cost</i>
<i>Two additional certified full day pre-school teachers</i>	<i>130,000</i>
<i>Four full-day instructional aides (2 per classroom)</i>	<i>100,000</i>
<i>Materials and supplies for two new classrooms</i>	<i>10,000</i>
<i>Total</i>	<i>240,000</i>

Certified staffing will be the same in all classes. The district preschool classes currently include one, full-time instructional aide and two, .7 instructional aides for each class. With reduced numbers of special needs students in the HAS classes, we propose two, full-time paraprofessionals for each class.

GREENWICH PUBLIC SCHOOLS
‘Setting the Standard for Excellence in Public Education’

17. I would like to understand the cost structure that the Board has established with the other two magnet programs. Can you provide the annual incremental costs (costs above the usual operating costs for a non-magnet elementary school) for the magnet programs run at ISD and JCS?

At the present time the only incremental costs associated with the three (3) District magnet programs (ISD, JC, HA) are related to offering foreign languages in grades K-2. Non-magnet students begin foreign languages in 3rd grade. This magnet feature common across the three schools requires an additional 1.7 FTE certified teacher at an estimated cost of \$110,000 each year. At the present time there are no additional student transportation costs, though this could change with different guidelines.

Other magnet program costs, including but not limited to professional development, memberships and dues related to magnet program-specific affiliations (IB), arts partnerships, and accreditation costs are covered by each school’s regular budget. PTAs routinely provide supplemental funding as reported through the annual gift report. For example, the ISD PTA provides significant funding for partnership relationships with arts program providers and Hamilton Avenue has had some success attracting external funding and organizational partnerships.

The District program budgets, including that administered by the Deputy and Assistant Superintendents, has on occasion funded magnet program costs on a case-by-case basis, for example, financial support for the IB accreditation process. The District also provided support for the alternative physical education program offered to Hamilton Ave. students during their stay in the modular facility.

CURRICULUM & INSTRUCTION

18. I'd like to see a copy of the earlier ALP review study. It's possible that some of the other "new" BOE members would like to see it as well.

See Appendix G.

19. ALP study: How much funding is included in the budget for conducting the study of the ALP program? Can you describe your expectation for the process, timing and deliverables of this study?

While there are no funds specifically earmarked for a study of the Advanced Learning Program, the superintendent’s budget includes funds which may be used to pay for experts in areas we are studying, including ALP.

The study of ALP is estimated to take a year. The process will be guided by a steering committee which will conduct research, presentations and discussions among stakeholders about current best practices, model programs and results in educating gifted, talented and high-

GREENWICH PUBLIC SCHOOLS
'Setting the Standard for Excellence in Public Education'

performing students. The committee will make recommendations to the Superintendent for consideration in the 2008-09 budget.

20. Assured Experiences and Honor Choir: If I understand correctly from our discussion this week, the proposed budget would increase funding for these from \$19K this year to \$50K. Is this funding being provided for all students or just for Title 1 schools and free and reduced lunch students? If it's the former, what would the number be to pay for the latter? What funding is envisioned for Honor Choir?

These activities are currently funded partly by the District budget and partly by school PTAs and/or the parents of students. Who is paying for what varies from school to school and is currently being researched by PTA Council and Dr. Wallerstein. Pending the completion of this research, an additional \$31,000 could be set aside to be applied in an equitable manner across all schools or the assured experiences identified in the original proposal could be fully funded at the Title 1 schools at a cost of approximately \$13,100. It is important to consider that the Title 1 schools already make significantly smaller contributions toward defraying the costs of some experiences (Greenwich Symphony Youth Concerts for example). It is also important to note that the Greenwich Public Schools' share of the Youth Concert series is only \$10,000 of the \$85,000 it costs to stage them; the rest of the costs are absorbed by the Greenwich Symphony. Parent fund-raising is currently used to cover the following Honor Choir costs: recording technician and accompanists, custodial fees, retreat, and sheet music. The certified staff who serve as Honor Choir advisors are funded under Schedule C.

STAFF DEVELOPMENT

21. What would be the impact (financial and teaching/learning) of having 181 student days in 2007-8 and using the 182nd day for staff development? Does the Administration support this idea from an educational standpoint? Alternatively, are there creative ways to increase effective staff development time without impacting student learning time and simultaneously reducing budgeted costs?

The impact on teaching and learning of reducing the school year by one day is difficult to determine. It should be noted that the statutory requirements are 180 days of school and 900 hours of instruction per year. GPS would meet these requirements even if the school year for students was reduced by one day. Using this day for professional learning would have considerable financial benefits and potential benefits for increased student learning. For example, by shortening the school year by two days for students in 2005-2006, the district saved \$80,000 on training for the Everyday Math program and the balanced literacy program. 100% of the staff was trained in these programs unlike the previous summer where 80% of the staff was trained and the district incurred the costs of the training. Given the number of instructional initiatives currently in progress, additional training time during the contractual year would be both useful and efficient.

GREENWICH PUBLIC SCHOOLS
‘Setting the Standard for Excellence in Public Education’

SUMMER SCHOOL

22. Referencing Question 42 on the ESY: With the changing of the definition of who qualifies for free tuition, is there concern that some of last year’s students that attained the Proficiency level may “backslide” because they wouldn’t have free tuition ESY available to them next summer?

Yes, this is quite possible.

23. Extended School Year Program: As I mentioned at the last Board meeting, I would like to know how much it would cost us incrementally to provide ESY to those free/reduced lunch students not making goal and if there are design efficiencies/lessons learned from last year that would help finance that incremental cost?

Tuition is \$450 per session per student, or a total of \$900 for six full weeks of instruction. For 2007, registration into the program will occur earlier in the spring than last year. This will allow earlier assessment of the program’s financial position. If finances allow, free/reduced lunch students who have not met goal will be invited to join the program.

SPECIAL EDUCATION/PUPIL PERSONNEL SERVICES

24. Can you place the goals and budget requests in the context of the district’s broader response to the MGT Report?

The district’s response to the MGT report can be viewed through the four focus areas:

Early Intervention:

The goals of early intervention are to identify struggling learners and to provide supports and services prior to the consideration of the presence of a disability. All of the activities and funds towards closing the achievement gap should be viewed as early intervention strategies.

Additionally, the funds associated with the revised model of providing Extended School Year/Summer School increases summer learning opportunities for students who are below Mastery on standardized assessments. These are students who have not been identified under IDEA. (A620 17 55)

There are other district, program and schools initiatives and funding allocations that should be considered as responsive to the recommendations for expanded early intervention strategies:

- The elementary special education coach will be gathering the data and compiling the report on the current status of school-based implementation of the student assistance team process. (A620 17 53 51020).
- The social work goal toward providing summer reading support to students in the Boys and Girls Club program who have been identified as at-risk or failing, (A620 17 62 516/5295/310)
- Supplemental programs at school locations including: materials, instructional software, supplemental educational programs before and after school, curriculum development,

GREENWICH PUBLIC SCHOOLS
'Setting the Standard for Excellence in Public Education'

teacher release for meetings, conferences, observations and workshops.

Strategic Planning and Organizational Structure.

There was not general consensus (as expressed at the focus groups and planning committee) that the staffing recommendations contained in the MGT Report would result in the desired outcomes. However, the district is in the process of conducting a review of the current administrative structure and the MGT recommendations will be considered at the time the administrative review is presented.

District, program and schools initiatives and funding allocations that should be considered as responsive to the recommendations regarding procedures and compliance include:

- procedures have been modified to include new strategies and clarified roles/responsibilities to further compliance at the school level
- recommendation to increase the preschool coordinator position to 1.0

Curriculum Development and Instructional Practices

Initiatives in this area can be viewed in two groups: those activities will not require additional funding requests but will refocus existing activities and new initiatives that will require funding supports

- Expand the range of professional learning activities in the areas of differentiation and universal design.
- Summer paraprofessional academy
- Professional development activities in the speech and psychology departments
- Systematic approach to encoding/decoding (district, program and school levels).

Collaboration and Inclusive Practices

The recommendations in this area are related to the current staffing and scheduling models that do not support regular meeting times for discussion of individual students, coordinated planning and joint professional development. The topic will be addressed by a subcommittee of the planning group and it is expected that recommendations will be made for inclusion in the 2008-2009 budget request.

TECHNOLOGY

25. Digital photography, video technology, I-books, V-cycles and the I-Pods. Correct assumption that the dollar amounts requested are to purchase and make all of these items "plug and play" and that additional networking / programming needs to make this items operational will not be forthcoming?

The assumption is correct. All costs include the necessary technical infrastructure to make the equipment fully operational.

26. Laptop initiative: If this pilot were to implemented, what would be the long term strategy for integration of a program. Would it be just for middle schools? Is the expectation that if it

GREENWICH PUBLIC SCHOOLS
'Setting the Standard for Excellence in Public Education'

proved to be academically successful, it would be expanded to all middle school language arts students eventually. how would these laptops be secured to prevent theft? Would there be professional development provided to the teachers who would be using them? Which group of students would be identified to use them (gen ed? ALP?, etc.).

The development and implementation of a 1:1 laptop initiative is part of the Board approved five year technology plan (Appendix H) submitted to the State Department of Education as required. The proposal to pilot the program at the middle school level in 07-08 was an effort to accelerate this implementation, on a limited basis, sooner than originally planned. The effective use of educational technology is always guided and informed by the research base about teaching and learning in general, and the use of specific technologies in particular. As such, the technology plan always incorporates professional development and teacher readiness as necessary prerequisites. Infrastructure, maintenance and support are also key considerations when planning for change. Assuming the 1:1 laptop initiative is not piloted in 2007-08, District technology leaders will continue with the existing plan which includes assessing 1:1 infrastructure needs and determining where to begin to “grow” the program beginning in 2008-09. An underlying assumption is that by some point in time, most if not all students at all grade levels will have equitable access to computers any time, any place.

About 1000 of the District's 3000 computer workstations are currently leased on a staggered schedule/cycle. The introduction of a 1:1 laptop initiative assumes revisiting the current deployment model which includes a number of computers in each classroom and a number of computer labs in each school. Based on some preliminary assumptions about teaching and learning with 1:1, there will likely be a transition away from the current hardware deployment model, and a shift from leasing workstations to leasing laptops. It is not possible to project the extent of the shift or the distribution of computers (workstations vs. laptops) at this time, but District leaders will make strategic decisions about the number and timing of laptop acquisitions based on the existing lease cycles. Laptop leasing programs include insurance costs.

APPENDIX A

Advanced Learning Program Class Size

GREENWICH PUBLIC SCHOOLS
'Setting the Standard for Excellence in Public Education'

Greenwich Public Schools
Elementary Class Size with and without Students Enrolled in ALP

Grade 3	Sections	Enrollment	Class Size	ALP Enrollment	% ALP Enrollment	Class Size w/o ALP
Cos Cob	3	61	20.3	10	16%	17.0
Dundee	3	58	19.3	11	19%	15.7
Glenville	3	69	23.0	10	14%	19.7
Hamilton Avenue	3	48	16.0	12	25%	12.0
Julian Curtiss	3	63	21.0	9	14%	18.0
New Lebanon	3	45	15.0	9	20%	12.0
North Mianus	4	77	19.3	13	17%	16.0
North Street	4	76	19.0	14	18%	15.5
Old Greenwich	3	60	20.0	11	18%	16.3
Parkway	3	52	17.3	10	19%	14.0
Riverside	5	98	19.6	18	18%	16.0
District	37	707	19.1	127	18%	15.7

Grade 4	Sections	Enrollment	Class Size	ALP Enrollment	% ALP Enrollment	Class Size w/o ALP
Cos Cob	3	75	25.0	13	17%	20.7
Dundee	3	62	20.7	17	27%	15.0
Glenville	3	52	17.3	12	23%	13.3
Hamilton Avenue	2	43	21.5	10	23%	16.5
Julian Curtiss	3	54	18.0	12	22%	14.0
New Lebanon	2	32	16.0	8	25%	12.0
North Mianus	3	71	23.7	15	21%	18.7
North Street	4	94	23.5	17	18%	19.3
Old Greenwich	3	68	22.7	13	19%	18.3
Parkway	3	56	18.7	12	21%	14.7
Riverside	3	68	22.7	14	21%	18.0
District	32	675	21.1	143	21%	16.6

Grade 5	Sections	Enrollment	Class Size	ALP Enrollment	% ALP Enrollment	Class Size w/o ALP
Cos Cob	3	66	22.0	11	17%	18.3
Dundee	3	65	21.7	17	26%	16.0
Glenville	3	68	22.7	13	19%	18.3
Hamilton Avenue	2	46	23.0	10	22%	18.0
Julian Curtiss	3	70	23.3	13	19%	19.0
New Lebanon	2	47	23.5	7	15%	20.0
North Mianus	3	73	24.3	16	22%	19.0
North Street	3	63	21.0	15	24%	16.0
Old Greenwich	2	50	25.0	11	22%	19.5
Parkway	3	57	19.0	12	21%	15.0
Riverside	3	76	25.3	19	25%	19.0
District	30	681	22.7	144	21%	17.9

Note: Students enrolled in ALP are pulled out of their homeroom class 5 hours per week for mathematics, 5 hours per week for literacy, and 1.5 hours per week for science.

12/4/2006

APPENDIX B

Elementary Class Size

APPENDIX C

Greenwich High School Class Size

GREENWICH PUBLIC SCHOOLS
'Setting the Standard for Excellence in Public Education'

Greenwich High School
Art, Business, Family & Consumer Science and Technology Classes with
Enrollment under 15 Students
Fall 2006

Class	Enroll	Comment
Honors Art	8	Junior and senior portfolio preparation
Advanced Drawing	10	End of course sequence
Honors Art	11	Junior and senior portfolio preparation
Advanced Digital Photography	12	End of course sequence
Introduction to Photography	14	Schedule distribution, average class size over 15 students
Sculpture	14	End of course sequence
Student Leadership 3x	7	Schedule distribution, average class size over 15 students
Career Planning	8	Class connected to work-study program
Keyboarding	14	Schedule distribution, average class size over 15 students
Interior Design 3x	9	Schedule distribution, average class size over 15 students
Cardinal Cooks 3x	11	Schedule distribution, average class size over 15 students
Honors Culinary Skills	13	End of course sequence
Independent Living	13	Schedule distribution, average class size over 15 students
Advanced Fashion	13	End of course sequence
Interior Design	14	Schedule distribution, average class size over 15 students
Fashion 1	14	Schedule distribution, average class size over 15 students
Fashion 1	14	Schedule distribution, average class size over 15 students
Graphic Communication	8	Computer lab limits class size to 15
Architectural CAD	10	End of course sequence
Introduction to Graphics 3x	11	Computer lab limits class size to 15
Graphic Communication	13	Computer lab limits class size to 15
Graphic Communication	13	Computer lab limits class size to 15

Impact of running these classes at a minimum of 15 students: 254 students are enrolled in these courses. If a minimum class size was set at 15, it would require 17 sections to run these courses, rather than 22 at a savings of approximately 1.0 FTE teacher. Setting the minimum class at 15 would eliminate the singleton courses listed above including Advanced Drawing, Advanced Digital Photography, Sculpture, Career Planning, Honors Culinary Skills, Advanced Fashion and Architectural CAD. Students enrolled in these courses would be forced to choose another course.

APPENDIX D

Non-Certified Staff Benchmarking Report

APPENDIX E

Hamilton Avenue School Educational Specifications Matrix

GREENWICH PUBLIC SCHOOLS
'Setting the Standard for Excellence in Public Education'

**Space Matrix for the
Hamilton Avenue Elementary School**

These are space guidelines suggested to fit the program of the school. The architect will make adjustments, as needed, to support the design and to maintain the overall size of the building.

<u>Facility</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Size (NSF)</u>	<u>Total NSF</u>	<u>Total</u>
Classrooms (Pre-K) with toilets	4	940	3,760	
Classrooms (K) with toilets	4	940	3,760	
Classrooms (1) with toilets	4	900	3,600	
Classrooms (2-5)	12	850	10,200	
Teacher Planning/Work Rooms	3	150	450	
Classrooms				18,370
Special Education Resource	2	450	900	
Instructional Support	3	350	1,050	
ESL	1	850	850	
Advanced Learning Program	1	900	900	
World Languages	1	260	260	
OT/PT	1	150	150	
Speech	1	150	150	
Instructional support				4,260
General Music	1	1,200	1,200	
Instrumental	1	800	800	
Art with Kiln, Storage	1	1,200	1,200	
Gymnasium (divisible)	1	3,770	3,770	
Phys Ed Office, Storage	1	750	750	
Media Center	1		3,800	
Small Instruction Area	1	inc		
Literacy Resource Center	1	inc		
Work Room	1	inc	inc	
Computer Lab	1	inc	Inc	
Cafetorium	1	2,300	2,300	
Kitchen	1	1,000	1,000	
Stage, Back-stage, Storage	1	600	600	
Total Enrichment/Support Facilities				15,390

GREENWICH PUBLIC SCHOOLS
'Setting the Standard for Excellence in Public Education'

Space Matrix – Continued:

<u>Facility</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Size (NSF)</u>	<u>Total NSF</u>	<u>Total</u>
Principal	1	180	180	
Assistant Principal	1	150	150	
Main Office, Clerical	1	500	500	
Copy, Mail, Work	1	500	500	
Conference Room	1	225	225	
School Nurse/Health Suite	1	400	400	
Psychologist	1	150	150	
Social Worker	1	150	150	
Community Activities Coordinator	1	150	150	
Community/Parent ResourceRoom	1	1,300	1,300	
Parent Resource Room				
Faculty room with toilet facilities	1	600	600	
School Administration/Student Support				4,305
Custodial Office	1	150	150	
Workshop/Storage/Receiving	1	1,000	1,000	
Building support				1,150
Total Net Space (Sq. Ft.)			43,475	43,475
Gross square feet (NSF x 1.4)				60,865

APPENDIX F

Hamilton Avenue School February 17, 2005 Update Memo

GREENWICH PUBLIC SCHOOLS
'Setting the Standard for Excellence in Public Education'

MEMORANDUM

TO: *Board of Education*

FROM: Larry Leverett, Ed.D, Superintendent of Schools

DATE: February 17, 2005

Problem Statement:

The Board of Education adopted educational specifications for Hamilton Avenue School on September 10, 2004. The action taken by the board limited the net square feet to 72,555 net square feet; established a grossing factor of 1.4; approved a space matrix detailing specific square footage requirements for instructional and non-instructional spaces; and supported program initiatives to address program goals and increase attractiveness of new school as an educational alternative for families not resident to the school attendance zone.

Related Factors:

- 1.4 grossing factor is aggressive and influences accommodation of spaces for mechanicals, storage, etc.
- Parking structure and required basement space increases project costs
- Limitations on the size of the present site make it difficult to prevent encroachment on existing commitment to “green space”
- Cost estimates exceed original estimates prepared by URS. Primary factors for higher estimate include underground parking solution (\$1,899,000) and an estimated 4000 – 4500 sq.ft. for basement space required to house building mechanicals

Background Discussion

Declining elementary enrollment:

Current enrollment projections for elementary schools project a decline of 341 students by the 2014-2015 school year. The rate of decline is expected to be gradual and there is no data to determine impact on any specific elementary school. Further, it is noted that many factors can influence projections over the next decade, which are not known at present.

This situation has generated discussion and ideas about the appropriate response to this modest enrollment decline. The following are representative of some conversations:

- Proposed school is too large and capacity should be reduced
- Exploration of redistricting elementary schools, absorbing the total HAS population, and possibly closing a school

GREENWICH PUBLIC SCHOOLS
'Setting the Standard for Excellence in Public Education'

- Do not construct new HAS and redistribute students to other district elementary schools
- Fear that new HAS will have the capacity to absorb entire New Lebanon School population and there exists an unspoken plan to close New Lebanon

The “conversations” reflect the opinions of diverse individuals and groups. The administration has a responsibility to monitor enrollment and to make decisions necessary to move the district toward the twin goals of effectiveness and efficiency. However, the very gentle decline projected over the next five years is not cause to immediately initiate action planning.

Desegregation Advisory

Commissioner of Education Betty Sternberg notified the school district in an April 12, 2004 letter that “Hamilton Avenue School is racially imbalanced.” She continued, “I am sure that you are aware that the Greenwich board of education was previously cited because of racial imbalance in this school. A plan was filed and approved to correct the imbalance, and statistics for the past years have indicated a positive downward trend. This year, there is a slight incline.”

The racial imbalance of HAS is perhaps, attributable to two major factors. First the school has experienced significant physical challenges that made it a less desired choice for families with other options. Second, student performance results have been consistently lower than district averages for the past decade.

The proposed new school will contribute to the generation of renewed energy and focus on student performance. The emphasis on early intervention including four full day pre-school sections and maximum class size of 15 students Pre-K through 1 is a significant attraction. The administration believes that a high performance facility that is fully air-conditioned, good Indoor Air Quality and effective lightning will also increase the “magnetism” of Hamilton Avenue School.

1.4 Grossing Factor

The 1.4 grossing factor was adopted by the BOE to maximize efficiency in the allocation of space. This is an aggressive target, which partially contributed to the expansion of square feet in the Swanke Hayden Connell initial schematic design. Typically, schools use an 1.5 grossing factor and are able to address cost and efficiency. 1.4 clearly addresses cost but adds complexity to satisfying needs for space beyond the net square feet allocated for instruction or school organization spaces.

Green Space

This is a very tight site and the demands are many. The school presently has approximately 49 parking spaces and the educational specifications call for a minimum of 91 spaces. Cost issues, subsurface rock and green space are interacting factors that mitigate against the underground parking solution. The HAS building committee is keenly aware of the need to do what it can to

GREENWICH PUBLIC SCHOOLS
‘Setting the Standard for Excellence in Public Education’

prevent reduction in the current availability of green space. The underground parking approach would increase ability to maintain existing green space.

LEED Silver Level

The educational specification adopted by the BOE on September 10, 2004 (see board minutes, September, 10, HAS educational specifications, attachment h) includes the following statement:

“Hamilton Avenue School will be designed using LEED (Leadership in Energy and Environmental design) principles with specific attention to energy efficiency, the use of renewable resources, and recyclable materials. At a minimum, the designer will assure that the LEED silver level will be met.”

This recommendation has been challenged throughout deliberations on the approach to the new school. The educational specifications released the designer and building committee from engaging in the formal LEED certification process and encouraged both to achieve the minimum of 32 points to meet the silver level.

The board-adopted recommendation continues to be problematic. The SHCA engineers concluded in their “life cycle cost analysis” that the initial costs of the technology are somewhat higher. However, they affirm that the technology is sound; significant energy savings will accrue over time; decreased maintenance is required and less space is required to accommodate equipment than is required by conventional HVAC plants. The technology is sound and the evidence supports the financial benefits.

Educational Implications of Proposed Reductions

Area	Educational Impact
Pre-K (including toilets), 940 sq.ft. 4 sections	With expectation that class sizes limited to 15
Kindergarten (including toilets), 940 sq.ft., 4 sections	With expectation that class sizes limited to 15
Grade One (including toilets), 900 sq.ft., 4 sections	With expectation that class sizes limited to 15
Grades Two –Five, 850 sq.ft. 12 sections	None
Parent and Community Room	One parent resource room of 500 sq.ft. and one community room of 1,000 sq.ft. to new combined parent resource/community room totaling 1,300 sq.ft.
Gymnasium	Space reductions from bleacher space only (200 to 120); no impact on play area

GREENWICH PUBLIC SCHOOLS
'Setting the Standard for Excellence in Public Education'

Area	Educational Impact
LEED Silver requirements	The designer shall strive to incorporate appropriate LEED principles into the design of the new Hamilton Avenue School
Media Center w/ Computer Room	Consistent with district average and instructional delivery system
World Languages	None because instructional model is push-in rather than pull-out; office space only required for teachers
ESL	None
Cafeteria	None. Based on estimate of three (3) lunch shifts of 150 students max.
Art Room	None; exceeds district average
Instructional Support	None; consistent with instructional delivery model
Faculty Room	Separate teacher work area and additional meeting spaces available as well

APPENDIX G

Advanced Learning Program 2003 Curriculum/Program Review

APPENDIX H

***Excerpt from Technology Plan
Submitted to Board of Education
June 2006***

GREENWICH PUBLIC SCHOOLS
'Setting the Standard for Excellence in Public Education'

2006-2009
Technology Plan – Page 41 Excerpt
Board Approved June 15, 2006

