

**GREENWICH PUBLIC SCHOOLS**

**Greenwich, Connecticut**

**Date of Meeting:** December 12, 2013

**Title of Item:**

**Discussion of Responses to Questions Regarding Superintendent's Recommended Budget for 2014-2015**

---

---

**REQUEST FOR BOARD ACTION OR PRESENTATION OF INFORMATION ITEMS**

         **Action Required**

  X   **Informational Only**

**Submitted By:** Dr. William McKersie

**Position:** Superintendent

**I will be present at Board Meeting to explain if called upon:**

  X   **YES**          **NO**

**Synopsis of Proposal:** Revisions include the correction of the answer to Question 24 and the attachment of an additional addendum item in response to Question 31.

**Recommended Action (if appropriate):**

Consolidated BOE Questions on  
Superintendent's Proposed 2014-15 Operating Budget  
December 12, 2013

MIDDLE SCHOOL .....	1
DIGITAL LEARNING.....	3
PARENT OUTREACH .....	4
SOCIAL WORKER.....	8
MUSIC PROGRAM.....	8
ASSISTANT PRINCIPALS .....	9
PROFESSIONAL LEARNING.....	10
AVID.....	10
SUMMER SCHOOL .....	11
PRE SCHOOL .....	13
MAINTENANCE .....	18
SBAC .....	19
NEW LEBANON 2014-15 .....	20
MATH.....	20
YOUTH AND IMMIGRATION GRANT .....	21
ADDENDUM	

Consolidated BOE Questions on  
Superintendent's Proposed 2014-15 Operating Budget  
December 12, 2013

MIDDLE SCHOOL

The matter of a "Middle School Study" and related questions has been raised repeatedly during this year's Budget Review process. We would like to clarify with the Board what the administration's thinking has been regarding an exploration of middle school organization and staffing.

Over the years, the method by which the District allocates teaching billets at the middle school has been questioned by the principals. Each spring meetings need to be convened with the Director of HR to examine the billets at one or more schools during which the principal and assistant principal demonstrate the significant challenge of scheduling students with the allocated billets while maintaining teams. Given that the recurring scheduling challenge every spring, District and middle school administrators decided to look at the organization of the three middle schools to see if the *original* intention of the middle school philosophy, as envisioned by the Board of Education some 30 years ago, is being implemented. There was and is no intent to examine the matter of leveling of students in our three middle schools.

The middle school represents the transition of children educationally and developmentally from the self-contained and small environment of an elementary school to the large, predominantly subject-oriented, and more demanding (especially socially/emotionally) high school. Middle schools accomplish their mission through a variety of measures centered on teaming: interdisciplinary planning, creating smaller environments in larger schools, guidance programs, and social-emotional support. Middle schools also are effective when they offer a range of experiential opportunities (electives), arts and culture, community service, and athletics through both interscholastic and intramural programs.

As stated, the primary characteristic of a middle school is teaming. The purpose of teaming is to have a *core* of teachers (usually 4-5 to a team) responsible for one group of students (usually 80-100) so that the teachers get to know each student well, can meet with parents as a team, can mutually plan lessons that are interdisciplinary (the teachers have one common planning period a day), and can offer students and each other support based upon intimate knowledge of the same group of students. When teachers belong to multiple teams or grades, it is less likely that they will plan with colleagues (too many and across grades) or be able to meet with a core group of colleagues to discuss students or get to know students.

Consolidated BOE Questions on  
Superintendent's Proposed 2014-15 Operating Budget  
December 12, 2013

The work that we did at the beginning of the year was to meet with each middle school Principal to discuss their school's current organization and structure. We wanted to gauge the degree to which their organization met the teaming model and if the Principals all supported the traditional middle school model.

We also made an important staffing modification this year to bolster teaming in the middle schools. As of the start of this school year, we ensured that each grade level at each of the middle schools had two special educators assigned to it. This meant that the two special educators would know the students on one grade level thoroughly - - rather than be split among various grade levels. In addition, the special educators would know all the teachers on the grade level working with their students, which would be invaluable in helping their students. The Board was advised of this staffing change in the August 2013 Financial Report, presented at the September 26, 2013 BOE Meeting.

If the teaming model is to be fully implemented, more staff may be needed in the future to allow the three middle schools to create teams at each grade level. It is critical in meeting the goals of social/emotional growth that students feel part of a smaller team in a larger school and that the teachers know those students to the greatest degree possible.

Ideally, all three middle schools in Greenwich would have the same organization. However, there is no "one-size-fits-all" model and that is why there is no unanimity among the three middle schools in following one middle school organization. Greenwich's middle school organizations are tailored to meet local needs. In a variety of ways middle schools in Greenwich do not match what is found in other districts.

A Middle School Study should be implemented once the Board and Administration have had an opportunity to discuss and identify the purpose and parameters of such a review. The Policy-Governance Committee has discussed the need for a Middle School Study, but that has not become a full BOE discussion nor emerged as a directive for the administration.

At this point, in advance of a robust study, our focus has been on trying to ensure that the three middle schools are implementing "teaming," which is essential to both the academic and the emotional/social development of students. This focus on teaming relates to many of the Board's questions in this budget cycle.

Consolidated BOE Questions on  
Superintendent's Proposed 2014-15 Operating Budget  
December 12, 2013

**1. What staff members constitute a team at the middle schools?**

Team membership at the middle school traditionally consists of English, Math, Science and Social Studies teachers. As noted above, beginning with the 2013-214 school year, the District added a Special Education teacher to the team membership model and has deployed two Special Education teachers per grade level at each middle school (total of six per school) to facilitate team membership.

**2. How many additional staff and in what areas would be required to fully implement teaming at each middle school?**

Using the projected enrollment at each middle school for 2014-15 and to implement a team model (core teachers plus a Special Education teacher sharing the same students), we would need 9.2 teachers (CMS – 3.0; EMS – 2.0; WMS 4.2).

**3. What would be the cost?**

Based on an average teacher salary of \$75,000, the salary cost of an additional 9.2 teachers would be \$690,000.

**4. When was the last time the MS underwent an evaluation by an external partner?**

To the best of our knowledge, the District engaged with an external partner, Howard Johnson, Professor of Secondary Education at the University of South Florida, in 1989 for a review of middle schools. Dr. Johnson returned to the district in 1994 for a follow up study.

**5. What would be the cost of a comprehensive middle school study by an external partner?**

Clear and specific parameters for the study would have to be outlined before the District could estimate a cost of employing the services of an external partner.

DIGITAL LEARNING

**6. When will metrics be ready for the BOE to see? Can they be ready in some form ahead of the BET and RTM Budget review cycles?**

Phase I of the DLE will be evaluated primarily using self-reported student and staff survey data and student assessments. The initial evaluation plan will be shared with BOE at the January 9, 2014 Work Session. The first set of findings will be available in late Spring 2014. By this point, students will have used the iPads in Phase I classrooms for approximately four-five months. As will be explained to the BOE in January, it will be difficult to draw valid and reliable conclusions about the merits of digital learning after only five months. Nevertheless, the evaluation plan is being designed to provide

Consolidated BOE Questions on  
Superintendent's Proposed 2014-15 Operating Budget  
December 12, 2013

benchmarks of interim progress and results that will be instructive of the likelihood of future success.

**7. Will there be funding for device insurance for Free & Reduced Lunch families?**

District-provided device insurance is outside of the scope of the DLE budget. Grades 2-5 will be allowed to take devices home. Families may purchase device insurance from third party insurers for \$50-\$70 per year.

**8. Is the district purchasing or leasing desktop computers for the classroom?**

The District continues to lease desktop computers. Leasing continues to be the most cost-effective approach for the district. We anticipate needing a mixture of tablet, laptop and desktop computers for the next several years.

**9. At what point will digital learning move from the capital budget to the operating budget?**

As the scope of the DLE includes capital funding until SY18-19, there currently is no plan to absorb the cost into the operating budget.

PARENT OUTREACH

**10. What is the district's plan that insures adequate parent outreach?**

In order to answer this question succinctly, we have to start with a definition of terms. We consider "parent outreach" to be part of the larger process of "parent involvement." The term "parent involvement" can be defined as the participation of parents in regular, two-way, and meaningful communication and interactions regarding student academic learning and other school activities. Essential assumptions are that:

- (A) Parents play an integral role in assisting their child's learning;
- (B) Parents are encouraged to be actively involved in their child's education at school;
- (C) Parents are full partners in their child's education and are included, as appropriate, in decision making and on advisory committees to assist in the education of their child;

In Greenwich, there are generally three levels of school-sponsored involvement for parents/families:

*District Level*

- Parent Teacher Association Council – the PTAC is a district wide structure, including a president, which coordinates activities across the schools including parent advocacy at the district level, representation of district committees (Wellness Special Education, Digital Learning, etc.), regular meetings with district administration and Board

Consolidated BOE Questions on  
Superintendent's Proposed 2014-15 Operating Budget  
December 12, 2013

members

- Participation on interview committees for district positions
- Regular participation at Board meeting – organizational comments
- Adult education (GED and English as a Second Language)

*Program Level*

- Graustein Grant – funds parent participation in Parent Leadership and advocacy training (including Spanish workshops)
- Workshops during the day and evening on instructional topics presents by district level staff (“Math in Focus”, “Preschool and Kindergarten Readiness”, “Common Core and the SBAC”)
- “Parents as Partners” conference
- PPS Parent Mini-courses

*School Level*

- Parent Teacher Associations – each school has a PTA which coordinates activities at the school level including advocacy, parent meetings, fund raising, volunteer activities, etc.
- Home visits based on individual student and/or family needs
- School initiatives focused on specific topics or initiatives (for example, visiting incoming kindergarten students)
- Additionally, every school offers a variety of opportunities for strengthening the partnerships between the school and the family. There are common activities like Open Houses and Parent/Teacher Conferences and activities that are reflective of the unique culture, history and needs of the school (see #12 for examples)

**11. Where is the budget line that indicates the dollars allocated for parent outreach?**

There is no separate budget line for parent involvement or “parent outreach.” Parent outreach is considered a responsibility of all certified staff members and, depending on the type/topic of the activity, different staff members coordinate different activities. When the activity requires evening or weekend hours, staff may be compensated through a grant (i.e., IDEA, Title I) or through the school’s or program’s Temporary Services account line (i.e., North Mianus Evening Round Table).

**12. Specifically list the non-SPED parent education opportunities especially those available in the evening for working parents.**

Given the large volume of parent education (non-SPED), we list here examples from several schools—three elementary schools, one middle school, and the high school.

Consolidated BOE Questions on  
Superintendent's Proposed 2014-15 Operating Budget  
December 12, 2013

- **Sample Activities from Cos Cob School (\*evening activities)**
  - ✓ PTA network, Math in Focus evening program, \*
  - ✓ CMT presentation, \*
  - ✓ Kids in Crisis evening PTA meeting, \*
  - ✓ Safe Talks informational meeting for parents \*
  - ✓ Halloween parade/parent involvement sing-a-long
  - ✓ Veteran's Day assembly
  - ✓ Parent classroom coffees (mornings)
  - ✓ Newcomers monthly meetings (Mornings)
  - ✓ K Thanksgiving Feast
  - ✓ Holiday Brunch (Sat Morning)
  - ✓ Book Fairs
  - ✓ PTA fundraisers
  - ✓ Reading around the world
  - ✓ First Responders Appreciation day assembly with Drew Marzullo
  - ✓ Art Night \*
  - ✓ Art Show at CC library \*
  - ✓ Cos Cob Winter Festival at firehouse with CC chorus (sat afternoon)
  
- **Sample Activities from Julian Curtiss School**
  - ✓ Weekly Newsletter
  - ✓ Principal Forums - three scheduled (new this year) two mornings, one evening
  - ✓ Grade level coffees at the beginning of the school year - mornings at drop off
  - ✓ CMT/SIP night at JC - evenings
  - ✓ Parent Math night for Network presented by Irene Parisi
  - ✓ Math night being planned for parents and children
  - ✓ UN Week- parade, International night
  - ✓ Weekly meeting with PTA presidents and principal
  - ✓ Website with parent tabs for extra information
  - ✓ Shutterfly accounts for every classroom maintained by the class parent with input from the teacher (page about the classroom with pictures)
  - ✓ Parent Engagement goal this year to call every parent at least once a marking period with positive news
  - ✓ Five PTA meetings - one of them evening
  - ✓ Three visits per year to Wilbur Peck - evening usually a math, reading , and general meeting (Translation provided)
  
- **Sample Activities from International School at Dundee(evening only)**
  - ✓ Information session about magnet program.
  - ✓ Bullying presentation for parents.
  - ✓ Math Night for students and parents.
  - ✓ Science Night for students and parents.
  - ✓ Book Fairs
  - ✓ PTA meetings
  
- **Sample Activities from Eastern Middle School**
  - ✓ Back to School Night (Evening)
  - ✓ New Parent Meeting (Morning)
  - ✓ ALP Parent Meeting (Morning)
  - ✓ Grade Level Meetings (Morning) - one per grade level
  - ✓ Grade Five Orientation - November (Morning)
  - ✓ Grade Five Orientation - May (Evening)
  - ✓ Special Education Parent Meeting (Morning)
  - ✓ PTA Meetings with the focus on one or more components on middle level education



Consolidated BOE Questions on  
Superintendent's Proposed 2014-15 Operating Budget  
December 12, 2013

(Morning/Evening) - 5

- ✓ Nine Musical Concerts (Evening) - all grade levels
- ✓ Grade Eight Musical Performance (Evening) - 3 Shows
- ✓ Grade Eight Madrigal Feast (Evening) - 2 Shows
- ✓ Grade Eight Washington Trip Orientation (Evening)
- ✓ Capstone Project Presentations (Morning)
- ✓ Strategic Improvement Team Meetings (Afternoons) - 3 meetings
  
- **Sample Activities from Greenwich High School**
  - ✓ Headmaster Forums (monthly) 13-14 all in evening.
  - ✓ Grade level meeting (Fall: 9th and 12th; Spring 12th). Typically in evening.
  - ✓ Open House (9th and 12th one night; 10th and 11th one night)
  - ✓ College Kick Off meetings (one per house, for juniors and parents), evening
  - ✓ College Panel (fall) evening
  - ✓ College Night (fall) evening
  - ✓ Financial Aid (twice) evenings
  - ✓ Student Athletes (Spring) evening
  - ✓ 8th Grade Orientation (spring) evening
  - ✓ House orientation (for 8th grade parents) (spring) evening
  - ✓ Hispanic Parents (4 times a year) evening - in Spanish
  - ✓ Program Awards Presentations (evenings)
  - ✓ National Merit Program Awards Reception (before school)
  - ✓ Senior Awards (evening)
  - ✓ Greenwich Scholarship Award (evenings)
  - ✓ Health Outreach Panel (evening, spring)

**13. Is anyone responsible for overseeing parent outreach district wide?**

There is no one individual. Administrators all view parent involvement as an important component of their job responsibilities. It is a component of the new SEED evaluation system.

**14. How do we insure appropriate documents and notices of meetings go home in Spanish and other languages?**

The loss of grant funding, which to date has covered many of the translation needs for the District, has created the need to conduct an assessment to determine the level of translations needed (written, oral, frequency, District, school, etc..) Once the needs are clearly defined, we will:

- Determine criteria and protocols for translating documents, meetings, etc., and
- Make recommendations for how best to provide the necessary resources to meet the identified needs

**15. Where is the budget line for translation?**

- There is no budget line for translations at the district level. Both Greenwich High School and Hamilton Avenue School budget for translations as needed.
- Translation services have predominantly been funded by grants

Consolidated BOE Questions on  
Superintendent's Proposed 2014-15 Operating Budget  
December 12, 2013

- The ESL program budgets for Technical Services for some translations for non-Spanish needs

SOCIAL WORKER

**16. Social Worker -What would be the cost of adding a social worker for each elementary Network?**

There are currently 10.1 Social Workers in the district with an average salary (excluding summer school) of \$96,575 plus benefits. The cost of a new hire is generally computed at the level of Step 7/Master's degree, which is \$80,244 plus benefits. If we maintain the current district wide Social Worker and add three positions (one for each network), at the "new hire" rate, the cost would be \$240,732. If we assign the current position into a network and add two positions (at the new hire rate) that estimated cost would be \$160,408.

**17. Social Worker/Psychologist -What is the cost to implement a social worker-psychologist team for multiple schools?**

This suggestion was made in response to the Board's inquiry into adding social workers at the elementary level. It is not currently part of the Superintendent's proposed 2014-2015 Budget. According to the Director of PPS (using district comparison data along with anecdotal information regarding the current ability of staff to respond in a timely and appropriate manner) the district employs an adequate number of social workers. The suggestion on the implementation of a psychologist/social worker team was made in that context. It is an emerging need that is not currently funded, and should be considered under the "value added" category as opposed to "necessary." The cost to add one social worker/psychologist team would be approximately \$160,488. The actual cost would vary based on salary Step, and the number of teams that would be implemented.

**18. Would this service be limited to SPED or potential SPED students?**

All mental health providers (social workers, psychologists and guidance counselors) in every school provide support to all students. We prioritize students with services mandated on IEPs and 504 plans as well as students with services described in Response to Intervention plans. All other student needs are addressed through collaboration and discussion with the administration and Student Assistance Teams.

MUSIC PROGRAM

**19. The two part time music teachers who are split with other schools will now be assigned to the high school F/T (no change in cost there other than slight reduction in time/travel costs.) What will the 85K pay for exactly?**

The proposed \$85,000 pays for two things:

- Expansion of the Orchestra Program at the HS - This is a different scenario than with

Consolidated BOE Questions on  
Superintendent's Proposed 2014-15 Operating Budget  
December 12, 2013

- the addition of the art courses (proposed and approved by the BOE this fall), which will replace lower enrolled art courses. For the orchestra program, an expansion of the sections is required, without the parallel reduction, due to increased enrollment.
- To replace the part-time assignments of those teachers being made full-time at the high school. For example, any teacher split between the high school and another school creates significant schedule and coverage issues. Currently the GHS Orchestra Teacher is split with an elementary school. Due to her responsibilities at the HS, she cannot meet with the students in the before school rehearsals and has to find another teacher to “cover” until she arrives.

**20. What is the evidence that cohorts from the Hamilton Ave. Suzuki program are matriculating to the high school orchestra?**

- There is no evidence of this yet as the first class of students who started Suzuki in K are only now in grade 7.
- Thirty-seven (37) students that began a string instrument at Hamilton Avenue are now participating in Orchestra at Western Middle School.

ASSISTANT PRINCIPALS

**21. How many middle school APs are not currently being paid at the full time rate?**

For 2014-2015, there would be two MS APs not paid at the full-time rate.

**22. Will additional staff be required to teach classes currently taught by APs?**

It is possible, but not yet known depending upon final enrollments and course needs. For example, the EMS AP provides student support assistance. Those numbers and needs – and alternatives are not yet known. At CMS, the AP currently teaches two classes.

**23. What will be the cost of covering those classes?**

Each class could be \$15,000 per year.

**24. How many elementary APs are not being paid at the full time rate?**

One AP is not paid at the full time rate.

**25. What if any instructional duties will need to be covered if the position(s) are made full time**

As indicated in question #22, that answer is not known at this time. We would work within budget, however.

Consolidated BOE Questions on  
Superintendent's Proposed 2014-15 Operating Budget  
December 12, 2013

**26. Please explain the discrepancy, estimated cost of expanding 3 AP positions not already being paid for under the grandfather clause is \$35K, versus \$60K in Budget Book (p. 25)**

The discrepancy represents some money to be used for possible instructional duties to be covered as mentioned in question #25.

PROFESSIONAL LEARNING

**27. How does the budget for professional learning compare from last year to this year in total costs?**

- The total delta between last year and the proposed budget is \$75,804.
  - Professional Learning for FY13-14 was \$670,818
  - Projected Professional Learning for FY14-15 is \$746,622
- Professional Learning budget codes are explained on pages 257-258 of the Superintendent's Proposed Budget.
- The Major Object Summary beginning on page 35 illustrates the change from previous FY. Point of reference: the object codes ending in "7" refer to funds allocated for professional learning
- **Key changes:**
  - Consultants decreased by \$12,900
  - Registration/Tuition for conferences increased by \$19,274 due to need for Common Core and Next Generation Science Standards implementation
  - Growth and Development (139-7) has decreased by \$15,130
  - Increase in substitutes to support professional learning totals \$46,510
    - Network Facilitators see three primary purposes for the increase in substitutes:
      - Support embedded professional learning (within the school day)
      - Support more effective data teams
      - Support planning for Common Core Math (MS) and Math-in-Focus
- **Network Impact:**
  - The content and structure of the budget for professional learning at the district level has changed significantly in order to support the Network Structure and its responsibility for development of professional learning. Approximately 50% of the program budget for professional learning has been pushed to the Networks through a per pupil allocation formula. The table on page 273 illustrates the funds allocated to buildings by Network to support professional learning.

AVID

**28. What will be total cost of AVID when fully implemented in middle schools and the high school? What will that cost include e.g., staffing and professional development etc?**

- The District AVID administrator (ESL Program Coordinator) has provided

Consolidated BOE Questions on  
Superintendent's Proposed 2014-15 Operating Budget  
December 12, 2013

projected costs through 2015 for WMS, CMS and GHS. The program serves a specific group of students. 20-25 students is needed per class. Total projections for CMS, WMS and GHS including salary, printing, tuition, travel, transportation, Teaching Supplies, and misc. supplies is as follows:

- FY13-14 = 133,917
  - FY14-15 = 172,576
  - FY15-16 = 189,974
- EMS is not included in these calculations. At this point in time, EMS has not identified a pressing need for a program such as AVID

SUMMER SCHOOL

**29. What would be the cost of providing summer school (at only \$24.00 per student charge for all K-3 students not reading at grade level?)**

Calculating the possible increased enrollment in summer school of only K-3 students who are not reading at grade level is particularly challenging. Simply budgeting for all K-3 students not reading at grade level would provide an inaccurate estimate for budgeting purposes—it likely would be a substantial overestimate.

Instead, we have established an estimate based on our experience with who is likely to attend Summer School when given the opportunity. We focused our analysis on determining the estimated cost of providing summer school to the students who were invited to attend (due to performance issues), but chose not to attend. This is a pool of students we can more easily use as the basis of a cost calculation.

To arrive at a reasonable estimate, we grounded our calculations in the enrollment data from previous summer school programs and the protocol we use to “invite” elementary (K-5) students to the program.

*Methodology to Calculate Cost:*

**Step I – Number of Students Invited But Did Not Attend**

In 2013 the District “invited” 548 elementary students and 191 (34.9%) attended.

255 of the 548 “invited” students were eligible for F/R lunch and therefore were eligible for reduced summer school tuition and free transportation. Of the 255, 130 (50.9%) chose to attend.

The District offered 50 additional reduced tuition slots to Title I schools and ISD for “invited” students who fell just above the F/R lunch criteria. 40 slots were offered to “invited” students and 22 chose to attend.

548 (“invited” students) – 255 (eligible for F/R lunch) = 293

Consolidated BOE Questions on  
 Superintendent's Proposed 2014-15 Operating Budget  
 December 12, 2013

293 – 22 (Title I “invited” and attended) = **271** students who were invited in 2013 but did not attend.

**Step II – Identifying Cost Reasons for Not Attending**

Using the results of a 2011 survey of parents whose child(ren) were “invited” to summer school but did NOT attend, we found that 33% of those parents who responded listed tuition and transportation as a barrier to attendance. We believe this is the pool of students most likely to respond to a financial incentive (i.e., nearly free program) to attend.

**Step III – Calculating Increased Enrollment**

33% of 271 = 89 students

We used this step to calculate possible increased enrollment of students who would choose to attend summer school if “invited” AND were offered reduced tuition and free transportation regardless of F/R lunch ineligibility.

Conclusion – to estimate the cost of offering reduced tuition and free transportation we will base our calculations on 89 students.

*What would be the cost of an additional 89 students in summer school?*

Staffing - 5.0 staff members (classroom teachers and support services) \$ 63,371

Transportation (one bus)	\$ 11,417
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 74,788</b>

An important consideration in calculating the cost beyond the two items above is the grade level of the 89 students. In 2013, K – 1 students made up 37% of the “invited” students and 51% of the “invited” and attended students. If we apply these percentages to the possible additional enrollment (89 students), we could anticipate that of the 89 students anywhere from 33 to 45 would be K – 1 students. This would mean an additional two to three sections. This is important since K-1 students can only be taught in classrooms on the first floor of Cos Cob School (CCS) and the first floor and specially designed classrooms on the second floor of Hamilton Avenue School (HAS). In 2013, all of the classrooms at HAS that could accommodate K and 1 students were used for sections of Pre-K, K and 1. CCS used all but one of its first floor classrooms for K and 1 sections during summer school. If the District needs to open more than one section of K – 1 as a result of offering reduced tuition and transportation, we would need to open an additional summer school site.

*Costs of opening a third summer school site?*

Site Supervisor	\$ 18,960
Clerical Support	\$ 8,332
Nurse	\$ 8,663
Crossing Guard	\$ 922
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 36,877</b>

Consolidated BOE Questions on  
Superintendent's Proposed 2014-15 Operating Budget  
December 12, 2013

*Additional Consideration*

In 2013, 39 out of the 191 students who were "invited" and attended paid full tuition. By offering reduced tuition, the revenue generated by these students would be lost and must be included in the cost calculation. **\$ 18,000**

**Grand Total without a third summer school site** **\$ 92,788**  
(\$74,788 + \$18,000)

**Grand Total with a third summer school site** **\$129,665**  
(\$74,788 + \$18,000 + \$36,877)

**30. Is there the opportunity of offering more kids at risk spaces at reduced cost; perhaps using a sliding scale fee structure particularly for those who don't qualify for F/R lunch but costs might prevent students from attending?**

Yes. However, any decision that could result in increased Kindergarten and first grade enrollment at summer school would have to be carefully considered in light of the information included in the response to Question #29.

PRE SCHOOL

*Overarching Statement Submitted with Pre-School Questions: Cost of two additional sections is \$355,000 with no transportation. Additional preschool sections are currently not in the budget. There appears to be an opportunity to review our preschool enrollment: make sure all seats are filled; work with private preschools to place children at risk.*

**31. By school how many of our current kindergartners did not attend pre k?**

See attached addendum: Preschool Experience of 2013-2014 Kindergarten

**32. Are we utilizing all our current spaces? 15 (10 typical and 5 with disabilities) in 7 sections at 3 locations (105) and 15 in 4 sections at HA (11 typical and 4 with disabilities) should = 165 vs. 150 shown.**

Preschool classes are set up using two staffing ratios. For the Hamilton Avenue classes, the ratio is 11 typically developing children and 4 children with disabilities. These classes admit more typical students as a strategy to increase the number of neighborhood (Ham Ave zoned) children who attend the full day program. The other seven classes ("Community classes") are designed for 10 typically developing children and 5 children with disabilities. All current 3 year old children in the program are offered seats in the program as are their siblings without going through the lottery. All other "typical" seats are filled through the lottery while balancing classes for age and gender. It is not

Consolidated BOE Questions on  
 Superintendent's Proposed 2014-15 Operating Budget  
 December 12, 2013

uncommon to have children withdraw from the program after the classes are set up and the open seats are filled with identified children with risk factors and/or students from the lottery who were not selected in the initial round. There may be a delay in filling these seats due to individual circumstances but each vacant typical seat is filled as soon as possible. Children with disabilities are admitted into the program as they turn 3 years old. Each year we estimate the number of classes that will be needed based on the number of returning three year olds, the number of children (known to the program) who will be turning three and the average of children added over the previous years. Most classes begin the year with at least one vacant seat for a child with a disability to accommodate the children who will enter during the year. The information below shows the current enrollment in the 11 classes (typical/children with IEPs).

**Current Preschool Enrollment by Class 2013-2014**

<u>"Community Classes"</u>	<u>Ratio 10:5</u>	<u>Hamilton Avenue Classes</u>	<u>Ratio 11:4</u>
Class 1	9/4	Class 8	10/4
Class 2	10/4	Class 9	12/3
Class 3	11/3	Class 10	11/3
Class 4	10/4	Class 11	9/4
Class 5	8/4		
Class 6	9/4		
Class 7	10/4		

- Ten Available seats for children with IEPs turning three (8 children currently in process)
- Six Available seats for typical children –seats have been offered to families, waiting for confirmation/registration

**33. How many seats are reserved for Birth to 3?**

We don't "reserve" seats but we use prior years' data to anticipate how many classes we will need to accommodate all of the children with disabilities. We generally project adding about 15-18 children who turn three during the course of the year. For example, if we know we are moving up 40 three year olds, and we project adding 17 children (for a total of 57), we would project that we may need an additional section since the preschool classes can serve about 51 children with disabilities given our current configuration.

**34. For each of the past three years how many of those seats have been filled?**

2010-2011 Ended the year with 43 students	3 under the maximum number of seats
2011-2012 Ended the year with 52 students	1 over the maximum number of seats
2012-2013 Ended the year with 49 students	2 under the maximum number of seats



Consolidated BOE Questions on  
Superintendent's Proposed 2014-15 Operating Budget  
December 12, 2013

**35. Do all birth to three students receive free transportation?**

Most of the students who transition into the Preschool program from Birth to Three are recommended for special transportation as a related service on their IEPs; however, most families chose to drive the children to school, at least for the first year. This year, currently 17 of the 51 children with IEPs are accessing the transportation provided by STA (Hamilton Ave 5, Parkway 9, Old Greenwich 2, North St 1).

**36. How many tuition students attend pre-school?**

Please see addendum.

**37. If we eliminate tuition students would that open enough spaces to better provide for students who are Town residents?**

As we currently have 15 tuition students, this would not have a significant impact on the lottery, although it would make 15 more seats available to residents.

**38. Please provide the figures for total revenue collected from the pre-k program and a breakdown of such revenue.**

Please see addendum.

**39. Please provide the actual breakout of the administrative staff and explain their role and responsibilities.**

There is one Administrator for the preschool program. That administrator is the primary evaluator for the eleven classroom teachers, the community preschool support staff and the evaluation team members. She coordinates all professional learning for the preschool staff and works with other administrators to provide joint professional learning for preschool and kindergarten teachers. The administrator is responsible for ordering the preschool materials. She facilitates the preschool lottery procedure and oversees the configuring of the preschool class rosters. The administrator represents the GPS at local early childhood meetings (School Readiness, Preschool Directors) as well as regional and state forums. The administrator functions as the LEA Representative at many of the preschool PPTs and IEP Team meetings. The Preschool Administrator is also the district PPS coordinator for contracted Occupational and Physical Therapies.

In addition to the Preschool Coordinator (administrator), there are certified staff who provide services to all GPS preschool classes and children, classes, and programs in the

Consolidated BOE Questions on  
Superintendent's Proposed 2014-15 Operating Budget  
December 12, 2013

community:

**The Parent Facilitator**

- Attend team meetings as scheduled for each of 11 classes
- Chair /attend PPTs for students who qualify for the program (annuals and ongoing program reviews)
- Provide parent workshops to support behavior and other issues families face at home
- Provide workshops to support home/school collaboration, new family orientations, articulation etc.
- Provide individual home visits for families of children with IEPs
- Provide workshops for community preschool staff and families/parents
- Attend SES meetings 1x monthly
- Work with GPS preschool staff to support students accessing the curriculum (COACH)
- Participate in lottery/class placements for typical students
- Attend weekly intake team meetings and participate in placement for students with IEPs

**The Psychologist/Evaluator**

- Attend PSTs/PPTS/all other staff meetings plus PLA
- Administer and interpret psychological tests with preschoolers (also for elementary if requested by evaluation team) for both English and Spanish speaking children
- Compose multidisciplinary reports for multiple audiences
- Report out on individual student evaluation results to parents/teachers in both Spanish and English
- Interview/counsel parents in English and Spanish
- Visit preschools in order to respond to requests for assistance
- Coordinate the development of Functional Behavioral Assessments and Behavior Intervention Plans (BIPs)
- Coach/ consult with teachers in our classrooms and community preschools
- Presentations/workshops if time permits

**The Special Educator/Evaluator**

- Respond to *Requests for Assistance* for Community and GPS Preschools
- Conduct and write Educational Observations
- Conduct and write Educational Evaluations
- Classroom support/consult for GPS and Community Preschools
- RTI in Community Preschools
- Attend Preschool Intake Team PPT's

**The Speech Therapist/Evaluator**

- Participate in weekly preschool Intake Meetings
- Participate in monthly Family Centers meetings
- Conduct and write Initial Multidisciplinary Evaluations
- Conduct Screenings
- Consult to nursery schools (provide workshops)
- Support/consult w/classroom GPS Staff speech therapist
- RTI
- Consult w/families during the evaluation process

Consolidated BOE Questions on  
 Superintendent's Proposed 2014-15 Operating Budget  
 December 12, 2013

- Attend and participate in PPTs

**40. Describe any incremental costs for administrative staff if we were to add additional sections?**

The need for additional administrative support is both a function of the number of sites/schools as well as the number of teachers. Adding one or two additional classes would have a greater impact on support staff (clerks and speech most directly since they are provided by the host school) than it would on the ability of the administrator to oversee the program. However, adding a new site/school has a significant impact on the administrator's time.

**41. What % of preschoolers qualifies for F/R lunch? Per last Strategic School Profile (2011-12 from state web site), District has 96% of students attend preschool. New Lebanon: 83.3% or 35 students attended; total 42 students 7 students did not attend preschool. Hamilton Ave: 87.1% or 54 students attended; total 62 students, 8 students did not attend preschool.**

The information below describes the number of typical preschool students whose families meet the federal guidelines for Free/Reduced Meals eligibility. This eligibility impacts the amount of tuition the family pays. Since students with disabilities attend the program at no cost under the IDEA, their numbers are not included. Below each annual eligibility statistic are the locations of the preschool classes for that school year. This is particularly important to note since it can be seen that when the classes were moved from the more centralized locations of New Lebanon and Cos Cob to schools that are further from the center of town (Parkway and North Street), the percentage of students eligible for F/R Meals dropped noticeably. Our general assumption is that parents find it difficult, and in some cases impossible, to transport their children that far away due to transportation availability and/or work hours.

School Year	Count Date	Typical Students	FRL Students	Percent of FRL Students
<b>2010-11</b>	10/1/10	100	35	35%
Classes OG/2, NS/1, PK/1, HA/4, CC/1, NL/1				
<b>2011-12</b>	10/1/11	101	27	27%
Classes OG/2, NS/1, PK/1, HA/4, CC/1, NL/1				
<b>2012-13</b>	10/1/12	111	19	17%
Classes OG/2, NS/2, PK/3, HA/4				

**42. How do we meet the needs of the remaining 4% (or 15 students per analysis below at NL & HA) of the population?**

While the vast majority of incoming kindergartners have attended some type of preschool program, there are a small number of students who come to school with little or no

Consolidated BOE Questions on  
Superintendent's Proposed 2014-15 Operating Budget  
December 12, 2013

formal preschool experience. There are a variety of reasons why children do not participate in preschool, including:

- Families are new to the district and they did not have access or chose not to access preschool programs at their former district:
- Parents have made a unilateral decision to educate their children at home during their preschool years (generally ages 3-5); and /or
- Transportation and/or work schedule makes it difficult for the parents to pick up and drop off their children at the designated preschool hours.

If a prospective kindergarten student has not had prior preschool experience, the school staff will often describe the Summer School program to parents, which will give the child a school experience prior to entering kindergarten in the fall. Once in the kindergarten class, the teachers closely monitor those students to identify any areas in which they feel the child would benefit from support or interventions.

**43. Are there updated Strategic School Profiles to get most current information?**

No, the Strategic School Profiles have not been available for the most recent two years.

**44. It appears there are students who wish to attend GPS Pre-School who are unsuccessful in the lottery. How many typical students do we turn away each year?**

The percentage of typical students admitted each of the last two school years has averaged 31% as depicted below; this means we are turning away approximately 70% of typical student applicants.

School Year	Children in Lottery	Admitted 3 yr. olds	Admitted 4 yr. olds	Percentage Admitted
2011-12	144	26	20	31.9%
2012-13	154	28	19	30.5%

**45. Do we have data on how many FRL students we might want to attend our pre-schools?**

No, but many of the families of young children who qualify for F/R Lunch are enrolled in the HeadStart program in order to take advantage of the additional services which include a longer day and comprehensive health services.

MAINTENANCE

**46. Describe the distinction between routine maintenance and capital projects.**

Routine maintenance is generally planned work on asset. Routine planned maintenance tasks are scheduled adjustments, which prolong the assets life. There may be occasion

Consolidated BOE Questions on  
Superintendent's Proposed 2014-15 Operating Budget  
December 12, 2013

where maintenance work is unplanned due to unexpected repairs initiated from asset failure. Capital projects are necessary when the asset can no longer be maintained or repaired. This occurs because the asset has exceeded its rated useful life or the cost of repairs becomes financially significant.

**47. Total annual maintenance in the operating budget appears low in comparison to the capital budget request. What qualifies a project for the capital budget versus annual routine maintenance under the operating budget?**

Capital expenditures are generally warranted for asset class purchases, repairs or restoration in excess of \$10,000. By its nature, it is planned based on repair history, failure rate, rated useful life or technological improvement.

**48. Please provide information on the last outside engineering review of the physical condition of our school buildings (including useful life of the structure) and what it would take to get an update of that review.**

There were two facilities studies conducted during summer 2013. One involved the mechanical assets and the other was the building envelope. The BOE contracted to have a preventive maintenance plan formulated. Part of that contract included capturing and rating the mechanical assets. The information includes a rated useful life and it varies by equipment. The greatest area of concern captured in this survey was the condition of the High School's mechanical assets and it will be included in subsequent Capital Improvement Plans.

At the request of the BET the building envelope study included a high percentage of repair work. We focused on the older brick buildings and found the areas of most need to be within Julian Curtiss and Old Greenwich. We have already rebuilt one chimney at Old Greenwich and we have contracted to complete another repair at OG.

SBAC

**49. Please explain the district's costs if any for administering the SBAC and the interim SBAC assessments?**

The SBAC summative assessments and Interim Assessments are provided to all Connecticut district at **no cost**.

**50. What part of the testing does the State pay for?**

The state has purchased the entire assessment package from SBAC. They are providing it to all districts for free.

Consolidated BOE Questions on  
Superintendent's Proposed 2014-15 Operating Budget  
December 12, 2013

NEW LEBANON 2014-15

**51. Are there sufficient funds to address the space needs of New Leb in 2014-15?**

The Administration is currently exploring short-term space options for New Lebanon Elementary School. The Superintendent's Budget does not have any money budgeted for temporary space. The Board can either reallocate existing budget items (e.g. Achievement Gap) or propose an addition to the Superintendent's requested Budget. The Superintendent's Budget does include funding for staff-based solutions within New Lebanon's current facility.

MATH

**52. Last year there were insufficient funds to cover math materials for SPED and ALP. Are their sufficient funds to cover materials for those areas as well as the materials for all the various levels in grades 6 to 8?**

YES. The proposed budget will fund all necessary materials for implementation of the new Math curriculum at the middle schools, both academic and accelerated levels i.e., Geometry, Pre-Algebra, Algebra, Advanced courses. The 2014-15 budget also includes the following:

- Funding for Math teachers to attend content area workshops to support the implementation of the Math in Focus Program and the digital tools with consultants
- Funding to compensate teachers for developing and revising new Math units (Growth and Development)
- Considerations were made to account for the increase of cover price as the quote expires after thirty days. Textbook prices increase 6-10% after January 2014.
- District Administration in coordination with the Math Curriculum Review Committee will determine appropriate online versus paper resources

**53. If consumables for Math in Focus for K-5 students are an annual expense, why is there a delta year over year?**

Providing consumables each year to the schools is common practice. We calculated and budgeted K-5 for MIF using the latest enrollment numbers. The total projected cost, listed on p. 273, is \$86,585. The delta reflects increases in elementary sections.

Consolidated BOE Questions on  
Superintendent's Proposed 2014-15 Operating Budget  
December 12, 2013

YOUTH AND IMMIGRATION GRANT

**54. How will the district address the need for oral translators in the schools now that the Youth and Immigration grant has been discontinued? Will the ELL Asst. noted in the budget questions have the ability to address non-English speaking parents' needs at conferences or last minute discussions with teachers as structured?**

- Yes, the ELL Assistant will have the ability to address non-English speaking parents. There is flexibility in the ELL Assistant's schedule that can allow for attendance at meetings on an as-needed basis
- GHS and Hamilton Avenue have allocated funds for support in providing oral translations
- The ELL Coordinator will be analyzing the requests for translations this year and the nature of the translations in order to determine the need to create/propose a district translator position that would be part of the budget in FY15-16 and beyond.

**Greenwich Public Schools  
Preschool Experience of 2013-2014 Kindergarten**

**By Elementary School**

	GPS	Public	Private	Other	None	Total	% PreK
CC	9	5	53	13	4	84	95.2%
GL	9		23	28	7	67	89.6%
HA	21	12	4	7	5	49	89.8%
ISD	2	4	47	9		62	100.0%
JC	5	9	32	11		57	100.0%
NL	5	22	4	7	6	44	86.4%
NM	8		38	20	3	69	95.7%
NS	6	2	42	13		63	100.0%
OG	8	1	51	13		73	100.0%
PK	7		28	4	2	41	95.1%
RV	2	1	72	6	3	84	96.4%
Total	82	56	394	131	30	693	95.7%

**By First Language**

	GPS	Public	Private	Other	None	Total	% PreK
English	51	33	321	88	12	505	97.6%
Not English	31	23	73	43	18	188	90.4%
Total	82	56	394	131	30	693	95.7%

**By Qualification for Free or Reduced Price Lunch**

	GPS	Public	Private	Other	None	Total	% PreK
No FRPL	56	26	388	123	17	610	97.2%
FRPL	26	30	6	8	13	83	84.3%
Total	82	56	394	131	30	693	95.7%

**By Receiving Special Education Services**

	GPS	Public	Private	Other	None	Total	% PreK
No SPED	60	56	392	131	30	669	95.5%
SPED	22		2			24	100.0%
Total	82	56	394	131	30	693	95.7%



ADDENDUM

<b>Students</b>	<b>2007-2008</b>	<b>2008-2009</b>	<b>2009-2010</b>	<b>2010-2011</b>	<b>2011-2012</b>	<b>2012-2013</b>	<b>2013-2014</b>
Special Needs (No Tuition)	52	46	50	43	38	31	36
Certified Staff BOE (Extended Day)	22	0	0	3	6	3	1
Certified Staff BOE	0	27	26	16	9	6	10
Town Employee (Extended Day)	5	4	3	2	1	1	0
Town Employee	0	1	5	3	2	2	4
Full Tuition (Extended Day)	3	17	19	10	14	12	16
Full Tuition	49	34	26	26	33	49	44
Free Lunch (No Tuition)	14	18	14	26	22	17	22
Reduced (Extended Day)	12	13	10	10	7	5	9
Reduced	3	0	1	2	4	6	3
Total Pre-Kindergarten	160	160	154	141	136	132	145

<b>Tuition Rate Schedule</b>	<b>2007-2008</b>	<b>2008-2009</b>	<b>2009-2010</b>	<b>2010-2011</b>	<b>2011-2012</b>	<b>2012-2013</b>	<b>2013-2014</b>
Certified	5%	5%	5%	5%	15%	15%	15%
Town Employee	25%	25%	25%	25%	25%	25%	25%
Reduced Lunch	17%	17%	17%	\$20.00	\$21.00	\$22.00	\$23.00
Full Tuition	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

<b>Tuition Basis</b>	<b>2007-2008</b>	<b>2008-2009</b>	<b>2009-2010</b>	<b>2010-2011</b>	<b>2011-2012</b>	<b>2012-2013</b>	<b>2013-2014</b>
Tuition	\$4,510	\$5,000	\$5,200	\$5,720	\$6,292	\$6,454	\$6,583
Tuition (Extended Day)	\$6,095	\$6,750	\$7,000	\$7,700	\$8,470	\$8,688	\$8,862

<b>Revenue</b>	<b>2007-2008</b>	<b>2008-2009</b>	<b>2009-2010</b>	<b>2010-2011</b>	<b>2011-2012</b>	<b>2012-2013</b>	<b>2013-2014</b>
Certified Staff BOE	\$6,705	\$6,750	\$6,760	\$5,731	\$16,117	\$9,718	\$11,204
Town Employee	\$7,619	\$8,000	\$11,750	\$8,140	\$5,264	\$5,399	\$6,583
Reduced	\$14,734	\$14,918	\$12,784	\$240	\$231	\$242	\$276
Full Tuition	\$239,275	\$284,750	\$268,200	\$225,720	\$326,216	\$420,502	\$431,444
Total	\$268,332	\$314,418	\$299,494	\$239,831	\$347,828	\$435,861	\$449,507

	2010-2011		2011-2012		2012-2013	
	Classroom	Clinic	Classroom	Clinic	Classroom	Clinic
Number of seats available for Children with IEPs	46		51		51	
Number of children with IEPs on October 1	41	9	41	9	28	10
Number of children with IEPs who left during the school year			3		2	
Number of children with IEPs who moved in during the year	1		2			
Number of children with IEPs who turned 3 during the year	10	3	11	5	22	
Number o seats available for typical children	104		104		114*	
Number of typical children enrolled on October 1	100		101		111	
Number of typical children who left during the year	2					
Number of children with IEPs who left during the year			2			
Number of typical children who entered as 'Move-ins'					2	
Number of typical children who are children of staff	18		15		10	
Number of typical Greenwich children who are children of staff	6		5		6	
Number of typical children who are children of town employees	6		3		5	
Number of typical Greenwich children who are children of town employees	4		2		4	
Number of typical children who qualify for F/R Lunch	35		27		19**	
Number of typical children who rode the bus			1			

\*Added Parkway class due to projected enrollment

\*\*Classes moved from New Lebanon and Cos Cob to Parkway