



Each student will have a **personalized learning plan** that will prepare them for **college and careers**, with the **interpersonal skills** they need for life success.

As a part of the Board approved Strategic Plan it was important for this committee to remain focused on the three essential pillars stated above. Throughout this report there is evidence of how these pillars are addressed and data will show how the options presented will lead to the achievement of these guiding principles.

This committee in addressing the guiding principles above focused on providing options for consideration that could assist the District in the achievement of the Strategic Plan. The table below provides a visual of the options that will be addressed in more detail within the report. Additionally, the report will provide both anecdotal and empirical data of how each of these options may meet the guiding principles.

<p>Increase Collaboration and plan time for all levels: Elementary, Middle, High</p>	<p>Secondary (High and Middle) teaching 5 sections rather than 6</p>	<p>Elementary Having Two Plan Periods</p>	<p>Consistent PLC Time across all levels</p>
<p>This group will think "outside the box" and research and review any other ways outside of what is mentioned in our action step, ways in which we can increase collaboration and plan time. How are other Districts creatively providing this time for staff. Any other relevant information.</p>	<p>This group will define how our current secondary schools schedule their staff. They will also research models in which school districts provide more than one plan period, how they go about doing it and what are the expectations of teachers during that time. Any other relevant information for the group.</p>	<p>This group will define how our current elementary schools schedule their staff. They will also research models in which school districts provide more than one plan period, how they go about doing it and what are the expectations of teachers during that time. Any other relevant information for the group.</p>	<p>This group will tell the story about what the SMSD's current practice is in providing PLC time at all levels. They will also do research of other school districts in how they provide PLC time to their staff at all levels. Any other relevant information for the group.</p>
	<p>Block Scheduling</p>	<p>Early Release</p>	
	<p>Late Start at all Levels</p>	<p>Late Start with students in the building</p>	
	<p>Early Release at all Levels</p>	<p>Late Start with students not in the building</p>	
	<p>All secondary staff teaching 5 sections, with gradual implementation beginning in the fall of 2020:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Three year Plan ● Four year plan 		



Strategic Plan - Strategy 3:2:2 Final Report - April 8, 2020

During the 2018 - 2019 school year the Shawnee Mission School District, at the request of the Board of Education, and with the full support of Superintendent, Dr. Mike Fulton, began a Strategic Planning process. Born out of that were several areas of focus. During the 2019 - 2020 school year, committees came together in an effort to address the action steps within each of these strategies. The Strategy 3:2:2 committee has been working over the past 8 months and is made up of several teachers and administrators from across all levels of the organization.

Committee Membership

Dr. Michael Schumacher - Chair,
Director of Secondary Human
Resources
Dr. Lachelle Sigg - Director of Human
Resources
Linda Sieck - East Teacher & SM-NEA
Kevin Hansford - Director of Elementary
Services
Dr. Joe Gilhaus - Director of Secondary
Services
Amie Schick - Teacher at SMN
Kathleen Rush - Innovation Specialist at
Comanche
Dr. Chris Kase - Principal at Hocker
Grove
Greg Lawrence - Principal at Trailwood
Dr. Jenny Woolever - Principal at
Roesland

Dr. Todd Dain - Principal at SMS
Dr. Leah Cogswell - Associate Principal
at Trailridge
Erin Scott - Teacher at Merriam Park
Kara Chastain - Teacher at Corinth
Trisha Mcgrain - Teacher at Rising Star
Kari Freivogel - Teacher at
Benninghoven
Whitney Langerud - Teacher at
Brookwood
Aaron Dean - Teacher at SMS
Jessica Schmitt - Teacher at Westridge
Melanie Miller - Teacher at East
Michael Alsin - Teacher at North
Bobbi Darnaby - Teacher at Trailridge
Laura De Adder - Teacher at Shawanoe
Justin Bogart - Associate Principal at
South



Strategy: We will create the climate to cultivate quality educators so they flourish in pursuit of our mission.

Specific Result: Maintain a working environment that promotes the social/emotional health of all staff.

Action Step: Analyze the feasibility of increasing teacher planning and collaboration time by having secondary teachers teach five classes and elementary teachers have one grade level planning period and one individual planning period. Options to explore:

- Provide protected Professional Learning Community time for elementary/middle/high by building time into the schedule for each week
- Provide policy which will ensure that the structure of Professional Learning Communities is consistent and applied at all levels

Meeting 1 Notes - November 8, 2019

- As in all group settings we started out with an effort to establish group norms. The group spent time discussing what the “action step” actually asked us to do. The specific result is very general, but then as you dive into the Action Step it gets very specific. We also discussed what would be our ultimate goal for the group and that would be to investigate fully all options that promote the social/emotional health of all staff.
- After breaking into smaller groups and utilizing some digital organizational documents, the group established 4 potential subcommittees that we would investigate moving forward.
 - Increase collaboration and plan time for all levels: Elementary, Middle, and Secondary.
 - Secondary (High and Middle) Teaching 5
 - Elementary having two plans
 - Looking at a consistent PLC time across all levels
- We established subcommittees and asked them to begin doing research related to their topics and to share those resources in the community drive.



Meeting 2 Notes - January 15, 2020

- Meeting 2 was designed with an effort to share information and resources and to build some good will amongst the team. From the beginning there has been an effort to ensure that the team felt that there are not any preconceived outcomes and to set a tone of fun, collegiality, humor and partnership.
- After reaffirming the norms for the group, we spent some time sharing some data related to the teaching of 5 vs 6 in the SMSD in order to set the stage of what is currently occurring.
- The bulk of the time after this was spent in Gallery Walk activity in which the subcommittees shared out in rotations the work that they had completed. During this time other group members were able to provide feedback, ask clarifying questions and make suggestions. At the end of this activity there was a feel that all team members had a solid understanding of all of the work that had been done by each subcommittee.
- At this point we had a group discussion and talked about next steps:
 - What items do we want to move forward for consideration? Rank them??
 - What additional questions need to be addressed to fully consider the top priorities?
- You can see in the notes the results of this discussion.
- At the end of the meeting we decided to move forward with a focus on two of the four subcommittees and asked that those two subcommittees meet before our next meeting. All members of the whole group would be placed within one of those two subcommittees, again in an effort to add additional voices who could ask critical questions. Those two subcommittees are:
 - **Two Plans @ Elementary**
 - **Secondary Teaching 5 rather than 6**

Meeting 3 Notes - February 27, 2020

- This was our most productive meeting to date. In addition, this meeting had the “feel” and collegiality that we have been after. There was certainly an effort by all to hear what others were saying. There appears to be trust that this work is being taken seriously and that it is meaningful. The team had open and productive conversations.
- The meeting began with time spent in the two large subgroups. Those subgroups again reported out to the whole and discussion was had. It was decided that our focus would be to move forward with the two previously determined “Focus”

subcommittees. The belief is that these two subcommittees will be able to also propel forward the other two. So:

- Two Plans @ elementary
- Secondary teaching 5 rather than 6

Will be our focus, but there will also be attention paid to the other two:

- Increase collaboration and plan time for all levels: Elementary, Middle, and Secondary
- Looking at a consistent PLC time across all levels
- Much discussion was also had around doing something with late start or early dismissal at various levels in order to increase plan/PLC time. This idea will be rolled into one or both of the primary focus groups within our report.
- Our plan moving forward:
 - All team members will add to the list of items we feel needs to be addressed within the report. Right now, that list consists of:
 - § Is there anyone modeling it now?
 - § What would be expected immediate benefits?
 - § What would be potential consequences?
 - § What would be the suggested timeline?
 - § Would there be policy implications?
 - § Based on enrollment projections and building capacity, do we have space for additional teachers/classrooms? If not, what adjustments are needed.
 - § What would be the anticipated cost? How many more teachers? Additional facilities?
 - § How can we achieve these priorities AND provide compensation increases in the future?

Subcommittee 1

Secondary (High and Middle) teaching 5 classes rather than 6 - This group will define how our current secondary schools schedule their staff. They will also research models in which school districts provide more than one plan period, how they go about doing it and what are the expectations of teachers during that time. Any other relevant information for the group.



Subcommittee 2

Elementary having two plan periods - This group will define how our current elementary schools schedule their staff. They will also research models in which school districts provide more than one plan period, how they go about doing it and what are the expectations of teachers during that time. Any other relevant information for the group.

Subcommittee 1 Final Report

I. Sub-question Investigated:

What are the best ways to promote the social/emotional health of all staff? How can the district feasibly increase teacher planning and collaboration time and return to having secondary teachers teach five classes?

II. Subcommittee Membership:

- A. Dr. Todd Dain - Subcommittee Co-Chair, Principal @ Shawnee Mission South
- B. Linda Sieck - Subcommittee Co-Chair, Shawnee Mission East Teacher and SM-NEA
- C. Dr. Michael Schumacher - Committee Chair, Director of Secondary Human Resources
- D. Justin Bogart - Shawnee Mission South Associate Principal
- E. Michael Alsin - Shawnee Mission North Teacher
- F. Dr. Leah Cogswell - Trailridge Middle School Associate Principal
- G. Aaron Dean - Shawnee Mission South Teacher
- H. Jessica Schmitt - Westridge Middle School Teacher
- I. Melanie Miller - Shawnee Mission East Teacher
- J. Dr. Chris Kase - Hocker Grove Middle School Principal
- K. Dr. Joe Gilhaus - Director of Secondary Services

III. Basis for the Sub-question:

Based on the recommendations of the 3:2:2 Action Team, this subcommittee was directed to study ways to increase teacher planning and collaboration time. More specifically, our focus was to explore moving secondary teachers from teaching six sections to five.



IV. Review Process:

Our first step was to research secondary schedules and workloads from area school districts that are similar to SMSD. We gathered information about Blue Valley, Olathe, DeSoto/Mill Valley, Gardner-Edgerton, Leavenworth, Spring Hill, and Louisburg through personal visits, email, and phone calls. With the exception of Blue Valley and Olathe, all the other districts run a 4 x 4 or 5 x 5 block schedule with three teaching sections and a plan each day. The block schedule does not provide additional time for PLCs / collaboration. The 5 x 5 block also includes teachers teaching six sections (three per day) with a daily plan. Blue Valley and Olathe have the same 3 x 2 (TTOET) schedule as Shawnee Mission. This schedule allows for creativity for the extra period in a teacher's schedule that could allow for supervision, intervention support, and/or collaboration.

V. Data/Information/Research Presentation:

- A. With investigation into the option of secondary teachers moving from teaching 6 to teaching 5 class periods per day, this subcommittee has investigated alternative options to increase collaboration time for teachers. One consideration in this process was to look into how other local school districts manage their late start and early release options. In addition to collecting what options are being utilized in other districts, the subcommittee investigated ways to support supervision of students during these late start or early release times.
- B. Through investigating other area school districts, we have found a variety of possible options within the majority of school districts. These options include either late start or early release at (minimum) the high school level. The Olathe School District offers late start one time per week for the high school level only. Several other districts do provide late start/early release (or both) at more than just the high school level. For example, the KCK School District offers early release once a week for all levels and has been using this model for several years. Similarly, the Lawrence School District offers early release for all levels once a week. The Spring Hill School District uses Wednesdays for a late start at the middle and high school levels and an early release for the elementary level on the same day. The Park Hill School District provides monthly early release at all levels to support teacher professional learning communities. The Blue Valley

School District previously had a monthly early release option at all levels though this option was not popular in their community. Many of the local districts currently have or have tried to implement late starts or early release options to support additional collaboration time for staff.

- C. SMSD currently offers a late start each Thursday at the high school level. A similar option is not offered at the middle or elementary level. As a result, teachers at these levels have collaboration time less than their high school colleagues. Nevertheless, there are additional supervision considerations that need to be addressed at the elementary and middle school levels. In most scenarios, high school students require less supervision and some are able to transport themselves to and from school during the adjusted time frame. The logistics of providing a late start or early release at the middle and elementary levels are significant and challenging.
- D. The first consideration to be addressed is transportation of students. Currently, the buses for high school run at the same time on the late start days as they do each day. Students are allowed to work in the building while teachers work in their designated PLC. One of the bigger challenges at the elementary and middle school levels is to supervise the younger age students as they are arriving at the building prior to school starting. The subcommittee investigated several options for what supervision might look like including partnerships with Johnson County Parks and Recreation (JCPRD), the CCC program, or other (possible) high school student service organizations. Other options may include utilizing paraeducators as supervisors, use of MVP volunteers, or even the possibility of a rotating supervision schedule for teachers. Each of these possibilities present at least some concern with logistics and feasibility.
- E. Currently, the Shawnee Mission School District partners with Johnson County Parks and Rec (JCPRD) to provide before and after care in elementary schools throughout the district. This subcommittee reached out to JCPRD to determine if they would have the capacity to support supervision during a late start or early release. JCPRD indicated that they anticipate being able to support elementary students during the late start or early release time *if* they are already enrolled in before or after care. Maureen O'Grady, who oversees the programs in SMSD, shared that their program would not be able to supervise or accommodate anyone who was

not enrolled in their program at the elementary level, nor would they have the capacity to support supervision or programming at the middle level. This partnership would help some of our elementary families who utilize before and after care; however, there would still be additional needs at the elementary level for students not enrolled in the program and this does not address any needs at the middle level.

- F. The subcommittee also consulted with SMNW CCC teacher, Sarah Dent, to determine the feasibility of using high school students to support supervision of students during these times. She shared that the 120 to 130 students in her program each year currently have the flexibility to choose where, when, and how they support in classrooms. She shared that it would be a challenge to require these students to provide supervision and/or support weekly. The CCC program is unique to SMNW but other buildings may have NHS or other service-based organizations that may be able to support or assist? Supervision will require consistency; it would be unwise to rely on this program or similar programs to provide more than supplemental support. Additionally, the high school students would only be able to support supervision in collaboration with other certified/classified adults in the building.
- G. Third, the subcommittee considered the possibility of using paraprofessionals and educational aides to supervise students during the late start or early dismissal times. The subcommittee found that each building varies substantially with regard to the number of paraprofessionals and aides available. There may not be enough staff to provide appropriate supervision, especially at the middle school level. While there may be an option to use district volunteers or MVPs for this role, there was again the question of whether consistency of supervision can be ensured.
- H. Finally, the subcommittee considered a rotational model for supervision where a specific PLC was responsible for supervision of students on a rotating basis. This could work for supervision but has the downside of reducing the PLC time for that group for the week.
- I. Ultimately, the option of providing for a late start or early release would provide for additional planning and collaboration time for teachers at the middle and elementary levels. However, if the SMSD Board of Education determines that they are interested in pursuing this option at the middle

and elementary levels, this subcommittee suggests consulting with our community prior to implementation to ensure that the community supports that choice. Given the options above, SMSD families may have some additional need to support supervision of students during these time frames to support teacher professional learning communities.

VI. Answer:

The secondary subcommittee examined the best ways to promote the social/emotional health of all staff, specifically focusing on ways the district can feasibly increase teacher planning and collaboration time. Based on the findings above, the subcommittee concluded that to address these concerns the district should first concentrate on returning secondary teachers to teaching five sections instead of six. This action would not only contribute to a working environment that promotes the social/emotional health of all staff, but would also potentially increase collaboration time for teachers, allow SMSD to better compete with area districts that either have a five section workload or a daily block of planning, and provide appropriate supervision of the school.

The transition to five sections would require implementation over time due to the district's current budgetary reality and inevitable staffing challenges. Therefore, to best implement this change, the following initial steps would need to be taken:

1. Determine the total number of additional staff needed to move teachers to five sections and begin hiring additional teachers over the next three years in order to phase in the change.
2. Find the necessary funds to hire the required number of teachers over the three-year period through budget reallocation and potential additional state funding.

Current FTE staffing indicates that transitioning from teaching six sections to teaching five sections would mean hiring an additional 38.6 high school general education teachers, and an additional 22.0 middle school general education teachers. Accordingly, SMSD would need to set a goal to hire between 18-20 additional secondary teachers per year (12-13 additional high school teachers; 7-8 middle school teachers), beginning with the 2020-2021 school year.

When working toward this goal, the subcommittee suggests emphasizing the hiring of the most highly qualified teacher candidates, beginning with core teachers. Of course, fulfilling this goal is dependent upon the available pool of qualified candidates and the highest critical needs as determined by the building leadership. Possible priorities to consider when hiring are as follows:

High School:

1. Freshman Core teachers (ELA, Math, Science, SS)
2. AP/College NOW certified teachers
3. English teachers (Writing / Grading / State Assessments)
4. Math teachers (Algebra 2 readiness / State Assessments)
5. Science teachers (ACT readiness / State Assessments)

Middle School:

1. English teachers (Writing / Grading / State Assessments)
2. Math teachers (Algebra 2 readiness / State Assessments)
3. Science teachers (ACT readiness / State Assessments)

In addition to transitioning from six to five, the district might continue to work with educators to determine more ways to improve the social and emotional health of staff. This collaboration could include surveying teachers and analyzing different schedule options and/or adjustments to the current schedule such as late start and early release.

VII. Reflections & Additional Considerations:

A. Is there anyone modeling it now?

1. High schools in the Olathe and Blue Valley school districts (with the exception of Blue Valley West that uses a 4x1 schedule) utilize a modified block schedule--traditional day, traditional day, odd-block day, even-block day with late-start PLC, traditional day (TTTOET). In this model, teachers instruct 5 sections out of 7 hours with one hour devoted to teacher plan time, and one hour devoted to collaboration, intervention, and/or supervision time.

B. What would be expected immediate benefits?

1. One of the immediate benefits of this instructional schedule (teaching 5 sections instead of 6) lies in the reduction of a teacher's course load, potentially reducing the total number of students a teacher meets with over the course of a semester or year. With fewer students to instruct

and manage (assuming class sizes remain similar to current conditions), teachers will be better able to provide more effective and immediate feedback to students to increase their achievement. A second, immediate benefit of a reduced teaching load is the potential for teachers to create a more sustainable work/life balance, which, in turn, supports the social/emotional health of teachers who are more rested and rejuvenated.

2. One of the most significant benefits of keeping our modified block schedule (TTOET) is that it maintains our Thursday late-start collaboration time in Professional Learning Communities. This sacred PLC time is not built into a full block schedule or a 5 by 5 block schedule; however, alternative schedules might be an option to maintain PLC time and benefit the well-being of students and staff. Our current modified block schedule mirrors the PLC timeframe and structures established in Blue Valley and Olathe.
3. High schools have been functioning without access to daily targeted intervention resources as well as proper building supervision. With teachers teaching 5, that allows for a 6th period to be dedicated to establishing writing labs, math labs, testing centers, and other opportunities to provide learning interventions for students to enhance building RTI and ultimately improve student learning. In addition, 6th period assignments for teachers would involve building supervision. Having teachers to supervise hallways, bathrooms, exterior exits, & lunchroom. These are an important part of improving learning. It helps deter students from 'wandering', 'vaping', and/or skipping classes, which means students spend more time in class and have less opportunities to 'avoid' learning.
4. Additional benefits from the reduction of teaching load exist in the potential for increased and dedicated collaboration time among teachers to improve instruction for all students. From this increased collaboration time, teachers can dedicate time for academic interventions and guarantee support for students in need of additional instruction to reach grade-level achievement and/or enrichment. Furthermore, the additional FTE utilized in the effort to reduce teacher section loads could provide students additional elective class opportunities that are not currently available, especially in

career-oriented courses (accounting, networking, web design, fashion merchandising, etc.) Last, additional FTE can provide more adequate supervision of hallways, cafeterias, and learning spaces to better ensure a safe and effective learning environment.

C. What would be potential consequences?

1. One of the potential consequences of reducing section assignments from 6 to 5 may be the constriction of section availability in small departments such as auto mechanics and woods--departments generally staffed by a single FTE. Moving from 6 sections to 5 sections in these and similar content areas would reduce the available space in these courses by up to 28 students. Section reduction may disproportionately impact course offerings in visual arts, performing arts, and CTE. A solution to this concern may be found in the Blue Valley model in which teachers that voluntarily teach 6 courses are provided additional compensation (approximately 10%-20% for forgoing a supervision or plan/collaboration period). Naturally, teachers with six sections lose planning and collaboration opportunities, and buildings may lose the benefit of increased supervision.
2. Increased FTE impacts the load on buildings, and, in buildings where teachers outnumber available rooms, teachers may have to share classrooms and may be displaced during their plan periods--away from the classroom where their instructional resources exist. Teachers without rooms will teach in multiple classrooms, and the additional travel between classrooms and the need to adapt each new classroom for teaching and learning may consume instructional time. If these traveling teachers leave classrooms early to avoid crowded hallways, student supervision may be compromised. Additional resources may be required to support teachers that travel including carts to move from room to room, and file cabinets, shelving, and secure storage for school and personal items.

D. What would be the suggested timeline?

1. To add 60 FTE across the district's secondary schools would require a three-year implementation beginning in the 2020-21 school year and concluding with the 2022-23 school year. Each year of implementation would include the addition of up to 20 FTE across middle schools and

high schools, with up to 8 FTE added across middle schools and up to 13 FTE added across high schools.

2. To add 60 FTE across the district's secondary schools would require a four-year implementation beginning in spring/summer of 2020 and concluding with the 2023-24 school year. Beginning in spring/summer of 2020, every attempt would be made to hire quality, qualified additional teachers, as the budget allows for the 2020-21 school year with a total of 20 additional FTE staff to be hired prior to the 2021-22 school year. The next two years of implementation would include the addition of up to 20 FTE across middle schools and high schools, with up to 8 FTE added across middle school and up to 13 FTE added across high schools.
- E. Would there be policy implications?
1. This plan includes potential policy implications regarding teachers who 'choose' to teach 6 sections and therefore receive financial compensation for the additional teaching load.
- F. Based on enrollment projections and building capacity, do we have space for additional teachers/classrooms? If not, what adjustments are needed?
1. Secondary buildings would need to accommodate for additional teaching spaces that would result in teachers who 'travel' and/or 'share' classrooms each day. Initially, this may begin with teachers self-selecting who would choose to travel and possibly begin a rotation. The potential consequences of this procedure are discussed in paragraph 4 of this section.
- G. What would be the anticipated cost? How many more teachers? Additional facilities?
1. General Education Costs The Shawnee Mission School District determines secondary staffing by using a staffing ratio currently set at 20.8. If the District decided to move to a model in which teachers taught 5 courses rather than 6 we would need to reduce that staffing ratio. The reason for the reduction of the ratio is that 1.0 FTE wouldn't account for the same number of students. Find below an example in Tables 1 (Middle School) and 2 (High School) of possible associated costs of moving from teaching 6 to teaching 5. In general terms it would cost approximately 60 FTE and \$4.5 Million annually. This of course is dependent on enrollment and the staffing ratio that is applied.

Table 1

	HG	IH	IW	TR	WR	Total
Teaching 6	38.5	43.5	39.7	37.3	44.0	203.0
Teaching 5	42.5	48.3	44.2	41.5	48.5	225.0
Difference (FTE)	3.9	4.9	4.5	4.2	4.6	22.0
Additional Cost	\$ 296,000.87	\$ 366,053.06	\$ 334,468.84	\$ 314,222.54	\$ 342,567.36	\$ 1,653,312.68

Table 2

	SMS	SMW	SMNW	SMN	SME	Total
Teaching 6	69.3	83.5	79.7	75.8	83.7	392.0
Teaching 5	76.1	91.9	87.6	82.7	92.2	430.6
Difference (FTE)	6.9	8.5	8.0	6.8	8.5	38.6
Additional Cost	\$ 514,081.01	\$ 634,786.24	\$ 596,335.03	\$ 512,119.61	\$ 638,030.12	\$ 2,895,352.01

2. SPED Additional Costs

1. After having a brief conversation with Sherry Dumolien, Dr. Schumacher believes that there would need to be additional Special Education resource positions added eventually to ensure equity across our teaching staff. However, this will depend upon SPED staffing ratios and any potential implementation plan determined by the BoE.

H. How can we achieve these priorities AND provide compensation increases in the future?

1. There are clearly significant costs associated with adding this many new staff members. The question of how to pay for these additions and still budget for providing necessary increases to the salary schedule will include several departments along with of course the Executive Leadership Team.

I. Due to the reality of budget restrictions, what can be done in the interim while the district transitions teachers from 6 to 5?

1. High school - One possible option would be to look at potential schedules that would improve teachers' and students' social and emotional health. For instance, consider schedules that reduce the number of students teachers instruct and/or number of classes teachers plan for each day, without increasing FTE, such as Blue Valley West which uses a 4x1 instead of a 3x2 (TTOET).



2. Middle school - While a block schedule might benefit high school, research shows that block schedules are not best practice at the middle school level. However, a late start or early release schedule that provides dedicated collaboration time each week would support personalized learning and career and college readiness through PLCs and address the well-being of middle school staff members.



VIII. Works Cited

- Blue Valley School District. (2019). *Blue Valley High School Bell Schedule* [Fact sheet]. Retrieved from <https://district.bluevalleyk12.org/schools/high/BVH/FormsAndDocsBackToSchool/Bell-Schedule.pdf>
- Blue Valley School District. (2019). *Blue Valley West High School Bell Schedule* [Fact sheet]. Retrieved from <https://district.bluevalleyk12.org/schools/high/BVW/FormsAndDocsBackToSchool/Bell-Schedule.pdf>
- Olathe Schools. (2019). *Bell Schedule Final* [Fact sheet]. Retrieved from <https://www.olatheschools.org/cms/lib/KS01907024/Centricity/Domain/70/Bell%20schedule%20final.pdf>
- Spring Hill High School. (2019). *SHHS Bell Schedules 2019-20* [Fact Sheet]. Retrieved from [https://shhs.usd230.org/UserFiles/Servers/Server_56297/File/Students%20and%20parents/Handbook/SHHS%20Bell%20Schedules%202019-2020%20\(1\).pdf](https://shhs.usd230.org/UserFiles/Servers/Server_56297/File/Students%20and%20parents/Handbook/SHHS%20Bell%20Schedules%202019-2020%20(1).pdf)
- USD 231. (2019). *2019-20 Bell Schedule* [Fact Sheet]. Retrieved from https://core-docs.s3.amazonaws.com/documents/asset/uploaded_file/421043/2019-20_Bell_Schedule.pdf
- USD 232. (2019). *Printable Copy of Bell Schedule* [Fact sheet]. Retrieved from <https://www.usd232.org/site/handlers/filedownload.ashx?moduleinstanceid=10068&dataid=10949&FileName=MVHS%20Bell%20Schedule.pdf>
- USD 453. (2019). *Leavenworth High School Bell Schedule* [Fact sheet]. Retrieved from https://lhs.usd453.org/UserFiles/Servers/Server_433908/File/Updated%20Bell%20Schedule.pdf
- USD 460. (2019). *2019-2020 LHS Handbook,6*. Retrieved from <https://www.usd416.org/vimages/shared/vnews/stories/47bb169f0c2b9/2019-2020%20LHS%20Handbook.pdf>



IX. Appendix/Supportive Material

Appendix A: Electronic mail communication to area high school principals

Friday, November 22, 2019

Dear [REDACTED]

As you may know, currently in our district, secondary teachers teach 6 out of 7 periods with the '7th' period protected as their plan. We are currently working through our task force to research different models to look at how we can reduce our teaching load and maximize our time for plan, collaboration, and/or building supervision.

I would appreciate your short feedback on the questions:

Do you have a modified block schedule or a 'full-block' schedule? Do your teachers teach 5 or 6 sections? Do you currently have any teachers that have 2 plan periods? I know that there were some years when I was at Olathe Northwest that we would have all the geometry teachers who would have a plan period, and then a common 3rd hour plan/collaboration as well. Let me know if you have any scenarios like that or if all your teachers have a supervision hour every day?

Thank you in advance for your time!

Dr. Todd Dain, Principal
Shawnee Mission South High School
5800 West 107th Overland Park, KS 66207
913.993.7500 Twitter: @SMSouthTDain

Appendix B: Table with comparative data received from area high schools

High School	Teach 6	Teach 5	Plan Hour	Super vision Hour	Collab- oration hour	Who collaborates	Times per week	Supervision Roles	ISS Supervisor	Bell Schedule model
Blue Valley	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	n/a	n/a	bldg sub; hallway; lunchroom super; writing lab; math lab; attn/tardy assistance	*full time ISS classified	modified block
Blue Valley North	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	n/a	n/a	bldg sub; hallway; lunchroom super; writing lab; math lab; attn/tardy assistance	*full time ISS classified	modified block
Blue Valley Northwest	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Selected PLC Teams	core teachers who teach 3 preps	1 day PLC; 3 days supervise	bldg sub; hallway; lunchroom super; writing lab; math lab; attn/tardy assistance	*full time ISS classified	modified block schedule
Blue Valley West	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Selected Teams	4 AVID teachers; BLT - (DC's)	1 day PLC; 3 days supervise	bldg sub; hallway; lunchroom super; writing lab; math lab; attn/tardy assistance	*full time ISS classified	4 x 1 block schedule
Blue Valley Southwest	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	n/a	n/a	bldg sub; hallway; lunchroom super; writing lab; math lab; attn/tardy assistance	*full time ISS classified	modified block schedule
Olathe North	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Selected PLC Teams	Grade level core share supervision & collaborate	2 days PLC; 2 days supervise	ISS; bdg sub; hallway; lunchroom super; writing lab; math lab; attn/tardy assistance	teacher supervision	modified block
Olathe South	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Selected PLC Teams	Freshman Core teachers only	2 days PLC; 2 days supervise	ISS; bdg sub; hallway; lunchroom super; writing lab; math lab; attn/tardy assistance	teacher on supervision	modified block
Olathe East	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Selected PLC Teams	Grade level ELA, Alg 1, Int & Applied Math	3 days PLC; 1 day supervise	ISS; bdg sub; hallway; lunchroom super; writing lab; math lab; attn/tardy assistance	teacher on supervision	modified block

Olathe Northwest	No	Yes	Yes	Yes		Selected PLC Teams	ELA; Hist., AP SS, Spanish, eComm, Engineering	3 days PLC; 1 day supervise	ISS; bdg sub; hallway; lunchroom super; writing lab; math lab; attn/tardy assistance	teacher on supervision	modified block
Olathe West	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No		n/a	n/a	ISS; bdg sub; hallway; lunchroom super; writing lab; math lab; attn/tardy assistance	teacher on supervision	modified block
Spring Hill	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No		n/a	n/a	Bldg sub; hallway; lunchroom super; writing lab; math lab	*full time ISS classified	Full block schedule
Louisburg	Yes	No	Yes	Some	No		n/a	n/a	Bldg sub; hallway; lunchroom super; writing lab; math lab	Teacher on supervision	4x4 block schedule
Leavenworth	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes		Core PLC during plan one day each week.	4 days plan; 1 day PLC	Bldg sub; hallway; lunchroom super; writing lab; math lab	*full time ISS classified	4x4 block schedule
Gardner Edgerton	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes		Core PLC during plan one day each week.	4 days plan; 1 day PLC	Bldg sub; hallway; lunchroom super; writing lab; math lab	*full time ISS classified	5x 5 block schedule
Mill Valley	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No		Core teachers PLC after school only.	n/a	Bldg sub; hallway; lunchroom super; writing lab; math lab	*substitute teacher for ISS	full block schedule
DeSoto	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No		Core teachers PLC after school only.	n/a	Bldg sub; hallway; lunchroom super; writing lab; math lab	*substitute teacher for ISS	full block schedule

Subcommittee 2 Final Report

I. Sub-question Investigated:

How do we increase collaboration and plan time at the Elementary level?

II. Subcommittee Membership:

- A. Jennifer Woolever, Subcommittee Chair, Roesland Elementary Principal
- B. Laura De Adder- Teacher at Shawanoe Elementary
- C. Lachelle Sigg - HR Director
- D. Erin Scott - Merriam Park Elementary
- E. Whitney Langerud - Brookwood Elementary
- F. Greg Lawrence - Trailwood Elementary
- G. Trisha McGrain-Rising Star Elementary
- H. Kevin Hansford - Elementary Director
- I. Kathleen Rush - IS Comanche Elementary

III. Basis for the Sub-question:

Based on the recommendations of the 3:2:2 Action Team, the elementary subcommittee researched approaches to increase collaboration through Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) without the loss of teacher plan time.

Providing more collaborative communities within the elementary setting can have positive effects for teachers and students. Existing research has shown that increasing collaboration can improve teacher self-efficacy (Puchner & Taylor, 2006), teacher effectiveness and expertise (Hattie, 2015; Graham, 2007). In addition to the positive effects for educators, other studies have found that collaboration can increase student achievement (Hargreaves and Fullan, 2012; Goddard et al., 2010). Having time dedicated for teachers to deconstruct relevant student data from both formative and summative assessments creates shared responsibility. Teachers begin to collaborate together on instruction and what the next steps could be to increase the level of academic rigor.

It is important to understand the positive outcomes associated with teacher collaboration, as these factors can also play a vital role within the district's vision for creating individualized learning plans that encompass college and career readiness. When teachers begin to share ideas a larger repertoire of instructional methods and creative approaches are explored. The key is acknowledging, understanding, and working diligently to overcome the



challenges for creating higher-quality teacher collaboration. In the next section, the elementary subcommittee will explore ways to increase collaboration time at the elementary level.

IV. Review Process:

Plan Time

- a) The elementary subcommittee group defined how current SMSD elementary schools schedule staff.
- b) The subcommittee researched school districts that provide more than one plan period for teachers. The areas explored included (1) how they go about structuring it and (2) what are the expectations for teachers during that time.

Professional Learning Community (PLC) Collaboration Time:

- a) Review SMSD's current model for providing PLCs (collaboration) at all educational levels (K-12).
- b) The subcommittee interviewed personnel from surrounding school districts to investigate how they provide PLC time at the elementary level (Appendix B)
- c) Findings & PLC Research Presentation - [Presentation Link](#)

Elementary Subcommittee Conclusion & Future Objectives

- a) When compared to other districts, SMSD has significantly less PLC time at the elementary level. For example, SMSD has 20 minutes a week, compared to Desoto who has 60 minutes and Blue Valley who has 40 minutes a week (Appendix B)
- b) The importance of teachers having time to collaborate during the school/contract day in order to build their professional practice and foster shared responsibility for student learning is critical for high-performing teams (Mourshed, Chijiole, & Barber, 2010). Many educators at SMSD realize this is not enough time, therefore grade level teams use more of their plan time (additional time beyond the 20 minutes devoted to PLCs) to achieve the goals of the PLC team.
- c) At SMSD, a few elementary buildings have created schedules to allow for additional coverage by classified, specials and support staff to offer additional weekly PLC time/Plan time for educators. [Schedule Example](#)

- d) Other options explored by the subcommittee involved increasing the ABCD specials schedule and/or increasing specialists (i.e. technology, STEM, Spanish) to create a weekly PLC time (50 minutes) for teachers that is beyond the daily 50 minute plan. For example, Belinder utilizes a community funded innovative specialist that teaches STEM classes during the ABCD specials rotation. The additional staffing for Belinder created a 50 minute block for educators to collaborate within their grade level PLC. At the elementary level, increased staffing within the specials rotation could be an option. However, the subcommittee acknowledged that this approach could be the most costly option to implement district-wide because very few elementary schools are allocated community funded positions.
- e) The elementary subcommittee wants to increase time for PLCs (collaboration time). The subcommittee felt the benefits PLCs provide for staff and students outweigh the decrease in instructional time (20 minutes) that is currently being devoted to students (Appendix C).

Possible Considerations:

- a) Increase PLCs to 50 minutes a week and reduce personal plan time by 30 minutes. This would take one plan time away from teachers' weekly allotment. The negotiated agreement for teachers' plan time would have to change from 230 minutes to 200 minutes weekly. Therefore in a five day week, teachers would have 4 days with 50 minutes devoted to personal plan and 1 day to a 50 minute PLC with no plan. According to the survey data collected, this approach would not increase total minutes (250) of collaboration + plan time. It would just reallocate the time from the teacher's current personal plan to PLCs. This option provided more time for collaboration, but at the expense of losing personal plan time for teachers.
- b) Increase elementary teachers' contract time by 20 minutes a day. This model would involve a change in the negotiated agreement concerning daily contract time from 7.2 hours to 7.5 hours. Currently, the secondary's contract day is 7.5 hours. Increasing the elementary's contract day by 20 minutes, would provide consistency across the district. The 20 minutes of contract time added to the day could be an option for the elementary schools to create more time for PLCs. Thus increasing the current 20 minutes a week to 40 minutes a week. This option of adding contract time at the beginning and/or end of the day,

does not guarantee a full “40 minute block” because teacher’s plan time is given throughout the day and not at the start/end (230 minutes personal plan + 20 minute PLC + 20 minute PLC = 270 minutes). Therefore this option increases PLC time by 20 minutes. In a five day week, teachers would have 4 days with 50 minute personal plans and 1 day with a 30 minute personal plan + two 20 minute PLCs.

- c) Early dismissal and/or late start for students. This model would be similar to what the High Schools at SMSD currently implement. This model would require additional wording/modifications to the negotiated agreement for educators. Such as, a revision of minutes allocated for plan time/PLCs and a clear definition of the difference between PLCs and plan time expectations. This option would provide 50 minutes of collaboration time a week for educators. In a five day week, 4 days would be dedicated to 50 minutes of personal plan (200 minutes) and 1 day “late start” having a 50 minute personal plan + 50 minute PLC (100 minutes) totaling 300 minutes of collaboration + personal plan. This option would be more equitable to the amount of minutes other districts in surrounding elementary schools receive.

V. Answer:

- A. After further investigation, the elementary subcommittee recommends the late start model to be the most feasible option for the district to consider with regards to increasing collaboration time at the elementary level. The major pros and cons discussed by the subcommittee are listed below:

Pros for late start model:

1. More consistency between secondary and elementary late start schedule
2. Increased weekly PLC time (40-50 minutes) **According to existing research quality collaboration time can translate to increased teacher self-efficacy, effectiveness, and higher student achievement/college career readiness through improved personalized learning for all students.*
3. Little to no cost for District

Cons for late start model:

1. Loss of instructional minutes for student (20 minutes)
2. Daycare/work schedules for parents and guardians
3. Possible increase cost for parents with childcare

Items to consider and/or assess public feedback:

1. The district could send out a survey to see how it would impact the community.
 2. Looking at “on-campus” solutions for parents, who are not able to adjust their work schedules and/or have daycare options available (Y-Care/JCPRD)
- B. Next, the elementary subcommittee explored various late start models from surrounding districts (Lansing, KCK, & Lee Summit) to propose two options for SMSD to implement for 2021-2022: (Option 1) Late start with students still in attendance/at the building and (Option 2) Late start students not in the building.

VI. Reflections & Additional Consideration

A. Option 1: Late start with students in the building

- a) One day a week, teachers will have their plan time from 7:50-8:30am. Students will arrive from 7:50-8:10 for normal routine/breakfast. Next students would participate in assemblies, social-emotional lessons, morning meetings, etc. offered by classified, support staff and administration. At 8:30am, teachers would pick up their students and begin the “late start” day. The teacher’s plan time for the “late start” day will now be dedicated to PLCs (50 minutes). This model will require additional wording/modifications to the negotiated agreement for educators. Such as, a revision of minutes allocated for plan time, time frame 7:50-8:10, clear definition of the difference between PLCs and plan time expectations.

B. Considerations

- a) Is there anyone modeling it now?
 1. While investigating surrounding districts (Gardner-Edgerton, DeSoto, & Blue Valley) at the elementary level, one plan time a week was dedicated to PLCs. Approximately 30-50 minutes within the school day was set aside for collaboration weekly.
 2. At SMSD, elementary schools have 20 minutes a week built into their schedule for PLCs. In accordance with the negotiated agreement, elementary teachers are provided 230 minutes per week for plan time. Currently, teachers have 50 minutes daily for plan time, which exceeds the negotiated agreement by 20 minutes. This additional time (20 minutes) has been dedicated to PLCs and grade level collaboration.

3. After PLC implementation many elementary buildings acknowledged that 20 minutes did not provide enough time to conduct a successful PLC. Several buildings began to explore different approaches within their schedule to create additional PLC time (30-40 minutes of collaboration that does not impede daily plan time) and was in accordance with the negotiated plan time concerning contract day (7 hours and 40 minutes per day work schedule) from 7:50am-3:30pm for elementary staffing. Elementary examples that have demonstrated this model are presented below:

a. Roesland & Pawnee utilize a Monday-Friday PLC schedule that creates an opportunity for teachers to conduct a PLC from 7:50am to 8:30am. For example, students at Roesland arrive at school, eat breakfast, listen to announcements, and then participate in an additional morning activity supervised by specials (PE, Art, Music, Library) and the social worker. By 8:30am the teachers arrive and begin their day with the student similar to a “late start” model. Specials then have a short break, before classes begin. Each grade meets on their assigned day at 7:50am (Start of contract time).

[Roesland Specials/PLC](#)

b. Mill Creek Elementary utilizes a similar morning approach 7:50am to 8:30am, however their time with students is offered by support staff conducting morning meetings and social-emotional lessons. See schedule link: [MILL CREEK](#)

c. Merriam Park has specialists, aides, and other classified staff cover from 7:50 to 8:40am. During this time, students are completing a task left by the classroom teacher for a support staff member to implement. Much of this time is devoted to morning meetings and our building initiative “Leader in Me” content. There is an 8 day rotation system established, so each grade/teacher receives a PLC every 8 school days.

b) What would be the immediate potential benefits?

- Research indicates that professional learning communities that effectively collaborate together can increase teacher effectiveness and proficiency (Hattie, 2015; Graham, 2007). Educational research

points to the teacher as the most influential factor affecting school improvement and student achievement. Furthermore, Fullan (2001) elaborated on the power of collaboration: “The litmus test of all leadership is whether it mobilizes people’s commitment to putting energy into actions designed to improve things. It is individual commitment, but above all it is collective mobilization” (p. 9). Incorporating PLCs, could harness collective mobilization of shared values, commitments, and actions to meet overarching goals such as individualized learning plans, college and career readiness, and interpersonal skills for life success.

- Another benefit for SMSD utilizing a late start model, would be a more consistent plan for implementing a larger block of time for PLCs district-wide (50 minutes) at the elementary level.
- Option 1 also has the arrival/departure time for students remaining the same. Therefore, parents/guardians will not have to worry about additional child care coverage on late start days. However, depending on the enrollment size of each elementary, coverage/support schedules would look different.

c) What would be the potential consequences?

1. Loss of student instructional time (decrease 20 minutes a week) from 8:10-8:30am.
2. Coverage/personnel can change yearly based on the FTE provided to each building (social worker/IS/support staff). Therefore the PLC coverage schedule may change year to year.
3. Not all buildings have the same staffing and building availability to provide similar coverage/supervision, so each building plan may look different.

d) What would be the suggested timeline?

1. Fall 2021

e) Would there be policy implications?

1. Negotiated Agreement: Elementary student contact time
2. Negotiated Agreement: Revisions/clear definitions for plan time, planning time frame, and PLCs

C. Option 2: Late start with students not in the building

- a) One day a week, students will not arrive at school until 8:30am. Similar to every morning, a 10 minute window will be allotted for students to arrive, check-in, and eat breakfast. Students will then report into their classrooms by 8:40am.
- b) For late start days, a modified schedule will take place to incorporate all events within the elementary school day. Specials will be 40 minutes, instead of 50 minutes and lunch will be 25 minutes instead of 30 minutes. This schedule will be similar to half day schedules that many SMSD elementary schools currently run with shortened days.

D. Considerations

- a) Is there anyone modeling it now?
 1. KCK: Ends 2 hours early on Wednesdays
 2. Lee's Summit: 9:20am on Wednesdays
 3. Lansing: 2 hour delay on Wednesdays
- b) What would be expected immediate benefits?
 - Well designed PLCs provide structures to promote collaboration, leadership, and shared decision-making. The literature supports the notion that professional learning communities are shown to be successful in improving student achievement and enhancing professional growth within teachers (Hattie, 2015; Dufour, Dufour, & Eaker, 2008). An improved PLC process should result in higher student achievement/college and career readiness due to more effective personalized learning plans for all students.
 - Another immediate benefit would be a larger block of time (50 minutes) being dedicated to weekly PLC meetings that does not impede on the teacher's personal plan time and allows for transitions for staffing coverage.
 - It would also provide consistency among all elementary schools with regard to PLC expectations/practice. As well as, consistency from high school to elementary schools with regards to a late start model.
 - Unlike option 1, every elementary building could utilize this late start model now district-wide and year to year because it is not dependent on staffing, coverage, etc. since students are not in attendance.



c) What would be potential consequences?

1. Parents/guardians may have difficulty with a late start model due to the students' age, daycare options, and transportation issues.

d) What would be the suggested timeline?

1. Fall of 2021

e) Would there be policy implications?

1. Negotiated Agreement: Elementary student contact time
2. Negotiated Agreement: Revisions/clear definitions for plan time, time frame for planning periods, and PLCs
3. How might this affect minutes and services for Special Education. Student's days would be shortened and it may affect their IEP minutes, requiring rewriting of plans when first implementing.



VII Works Cited:

- Darling-Hammond, L., Hyster, M. E., and Gardner, M. (2017). *Effective Teacher Professional Development*. Palo Alto, CA: Learning Policy Institute.
- DuFour R., DuFour, R., & Eaker, R. (2008). *Revisiting Professional Learning Communities at Work*. Bloomington, IN: Solution Tree.
- DuFour, R., DuFour, R., Eaker, R., & Karhanek, G. (2004). *Whatever it takes: How Professional Learning Communities Respond When Kids Don't learn*. Bloomington, IN: Solution Tree.
- Eaker, R., DuFour, R., & DuFour, R. (2002). *Getting started: Reculturing Schools to Become Professional Learning Communities*. Bloomington, IN: National Educational Service.
- Fullan, M. G. (2001). *Leading in a culture of change*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Hargreaves, A., and Fullan, M. (2012). *Professional Capital: Transforming Teaching in Every School*. New York, NY: Teachers College, Columbia University
- Hattie, J. (2015). *What Works Best in Education: The Politics of Collaborative Expertise*. London: Pearson.
- Graham, P. (2007). Improving teacher effectiveness through structured collaboration: a case study of a professional learning community. *Res. Middle Level Educ.* 31, 1–17.
- Goddard, Y. L., Miller, R., Larsen, R., Goddard, G., Jacob, R., Madsen, J., et al. (2010). "Connecting principal leadership, teacher collaboration, and student achievement," in *Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting* (Denver, CO).
- Kansas City Kansas Public Schools. (2019). *Bell Schedules* Retrieved from <https://kckps.org/school-information/bell-schedules/>
- Mourshed, M., Chijioke, C., & Barber, M. (2010, November). *How the world's most improved school systems keep getting better*. London: McKinsey & Company.



Puchner, L. D., and Taylor, A. R. (2006). Lesson study, collaboration and teacher efficacy: stories from two school based math lesson study groups. *Teach. Teach. Educ.* 22, 922–934.

Spring Hill School District. (2019). *PLC for Parents*. Retrieved from https://www.usd230.org/parents___students/p_l_c

Spring Hill School District. (2019). *PLC- Time Schedule*. Retrieved from https://www.usd230.org/UserFiles/Servers/Server_56130/File/PLC/PLC-Time%20Schedule.pdf



VIII Appendix:

Appendix A: Email to Principals Requesting Input

Monday, January 13, 2020

Dear (Elementary Administrator),

Good afternoon. I was hoping to seek some input from a (Name of District) Elementary Principal. I am reaching out to you as I am working on a sub-committee for our strategic plan at SMSD. They are asking for us to research how other districts are achieving plan time/collaboration at the elementary level. Below are a few brief questions I have:

1. How long do elementary teachers have for plan time (daily):
2. Do they have any other designated times for collaboration (i.e. PLC, team plan, etc.)? If so, how long and is it daily or weekly,
3. Is your building plan time & team/grade collaboration consistent across the district or by individual building?

I appreciate you feedback and wish you well!

Thank you,

Dr. Jennifer Woolever, Roesland Principal

Roesland Elementary
4900 Parish Drive
Roeland Park KS, 66205
(913) 993-4700





Appendix B: Table with comparative data received from surrounding elementary schools

District	Personal Plan Time		Other Designated Times for Collaboration (* Late-Start Schools)		Total Minutes (Personal Plan + Collaboration)	Plan Time & Collaboration Consistent Across District
	5 day week	Weekly Total (m)	# of times weekly	Minutes	Minutes	(Yes or No)
SMSD	4 days 50m 1 day 30m	230	1	20	250	No
Blue Valley	4 days 60m 1 day 0	240	1	60	300	Yes
Gardner-Edgerton	4 days 60m 1 day 30m	270	1	30	300	Yes
DeSoto	4 days 60m 1 day 10m	250	1	50	300	No
KCK	4 days 50m *1 day 120	200	*1	*120	320	Yes



Appendix C: SMSD Comparison with Option 1 or Option 2 Late Start

SMSD	Personal Plan Time		Other Designated Times for Collaboration (* Late-Start Schools)		Total Minutes (Personal Plan + Collaboration)	Plan Time & Collaboration Consistent Across District	Student Instructional Time
	5 day week	Weekly Total (m)	# of times weekly	Minutes	Minutes	(Yes or No)	Weekly Total (m)
2019-2020	4 days 50m 1 day 30m	230	1	20	250	No	1,700
2021-2022 Option 1 or 2	4 days 50m 1 day 40 m	240	*1	*50	290	Yes	1,680

- For students in grades K-11, KSDE notes that the school year must consist of a minimum of 1,116 hours.