

Shared Services Study

Prepared for

**Beekmantown Central School
and
Plattsburgh City School**

*Jessica F. Cohen
Alan D. Pole
Education Consultants
Castallo and Silky
PO Box 15100
Syracuse, NY 13215*

March 2014

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Acknowledgements.....	3
2. Background for the Study.....	5
Purpose of the Study.....	6
Change.....	6
BOCES.....	8
Shared Services, Not Merger.....	9
3. Process and Data Collection.....	10
4. The School Districts.....	12
5. Student Enrollment History and Projections.....	14
6. Instructional Programs.....	21
Organization of the Districts.....	21
3-8 Student Assessments.....	23
Middle/High School.....	28
Student and Teacher Exchange Program.....	40
Using Technology for Instructional Opportunities.....	44
Special Education.....	53
7. Extra-Curricular Activities.....	56
8. Finance.....	60
9. Administrative and Supervisory Services.....	64
Superintendent’s Office.....	65
Business Office Operations.....	67
Food Service Operations.....	73
Operations and Maintenance.....	75
Transportation.....	78
Special Education Supervision.....	80
Athletic Director.....	80
Curriculum Coordinator.....	81
10. Development of Shared Services Through BOCES.....	84
11. Mechanism for Implementing Sharing Initiatives	91
12. Summary	97
APPENDIX #1-Wayne County Shared Courses	99
APPENDIX #2-NERIC Distance Learning Course Offerings	101

CHAPTER 1 ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

A study with this purpose and scope could not have been accomplished without the support and cooperation of many individuals. We would first like to express our appreciation to the Beekmantown and Plattsburgh Boards of Education for their vision and concern for their children and communities by engaging in this study.

We also appreciate the leadership and support of the two superintendents, Dan Mannix in Beekmantown and Jake Short in Plattsburgh. These individuals supported this study in every way. They provided the consultants with information, made arrangements for the consultants to meet with their staffs, and generously gave of their time to ensure that the study was completed in an effective manner.

We also wish to thank the administrators and supervisors from both districts who met with us, provided us with information, and supported the study. From Beekmantown, these people included:

Nelly Collazo, High School Principal
Amy Campbell, Middle School Principal
Garth Frechette, Cumberland Head P-5 Principal
Elaine Dixon, P-5 Principal
Mary Blaine, School Business Executive
LeeAnn Short, Director of Special Services
Gary Lambert, Educational Technology Coordinator
Dan Noonan, Superintendent of Buildings & Grounds
Shane Brink, Transportation Supervisor
Roxann Barnes, School Lunch Manager
Greg Myers, Coordinator of Athletics

From Plattsburgh, these people included:

Glenn Hurlock, High School Principal
Trevor Cameron, Assistant Middle School Principal
NancyJean Osborn, Bailey Avenue K-2 Principal
Carrie Zales, Oak Street 3-5 Principal
Gilles Fortin, Momot P-5 Principal

Jay Lebrun, Associate Superintendent

Claudine Selzer-Clark, Director of Special Education

Norbert Niederer, Director of Buildings, Grounds & Transportation

Charlene O'Connor, Director of Food Services

Dave Baroody, Athletic Administrator

Last, but certainly not least, the superintendents' staff in both districts were most helpful in helping us complete this study. Our sincere thanks go to Joanne Menard, Superintendent's secretary in Beekmantown and Dawn Stetz, Superintendent's secretary in Plattsburgh.

To these individuals and all other individuals who assisted in bringing this study to a successful conclusion, we offer our deepest gratitude.

CHAPTER 2

BACKGROUND FOR THE STUDY

A number of factors are affecting the operation of public school districts in New York State today. State standards continue to rise, requiring students to do more in order to attain a high school diploma. These standards are driven by a rapidly changing world where more skills than ever before are required in order to be successful in college and the world of work. Pressures on schools to increase the number of students who successfully complete high school and are college and career ready continue to mount.

At the same time that communities strive to do more for their students, maintaining and expanding opportunities for students is an especially significant challenge when student enrollments are on a declining or stagnating.

The third challenge facing school districts in New York State is one of resources. As districts strive to provide more for their students, financial challenges continue to grow in our nation and in New York State in particular. Our national economy is stagnating. Our state budget situation continues to be difficult. Fixed costs for school districts continue to rise at a time when state aid to education is being cut and a cap on local property taxes has been legislated. Districts are spending down their fund balances knowing that this is a short-term solution at best. It clearly is time for courageous school leaders to begin discussions about doing business differently.

In June 2013, the Superintendents of the Beekmantown and Plattsburgh school districts engaged in a series of discussions about the sharing of programs and services between the two districts. Their focus was on preserving and enhancing the quality of educational opportunity for students in a cost-effective manner. It was determined that this could be accomplished by providing more for students at the same cost, providing the same level of opportunities for students at a reduced cost, or a combination of both. Given the challenging times, it was also acknowledged that maintaining programs that might otherwise be eliminated might also be a benefit of conducting this study.

Purpose of the Study

The Syracuse based education-consulting firm of Castallo and Silky was engaged to conduct this study. The consultants who were selected to conduct the study were Jessica Cohen and Alan Pole, both former District Superintendents. The consultants made a presentation to a joint meeting of the two boards of education on September 25, 2013.

The scope of the study centered on the following questions.

1. Is there a better way to share instructional programs, support services, and administrative services between the Beekmantown and Plattsburgh school districts?
2. Are there additional instructional programs, support services, or administrative services that could be shared between the Beekmantown and Plattsburgh school districts?
3. If so, (a) what are the financial implications; and (b) what process might be considered for the two districts to plan for and implement these additional sharing opportunities?

In the discussions about doing business more cost effectively, it is a generally accepted principle by the two districts that cost effectiveness can be achieved in one of two ways—getting more service for the same cost or getting the same service for a lesser cost. These two principles form the basis for the options contained in this report.

Change

The main premise undergirding this study is that business as usual in school districts will no longer be an effective way to operate. This implies that change must occur. Generally speaking, people don't like to change!

Change is especially difficult in smaller school districts. Oftentimes the school district is the largest employer in the community. Income earned from school employment is an important factor in sustaining the local economy. People won't go out for dinner as much, buy new cars as often, or remodel their homes beyond necessity if they are not gainfully employed. In addition, the local community is counted on to support the operation of the school district through the annual vote on the district's budget. People

don't want to lose their jobs and, generally speaking, public employers are very reluctant to put people out of work....especially in smaller school districts.

People don't like to do things differently. It is human nature to do things the way they have always been done. Memories of the way school used to be often serve as motivation for leaders of educational institutions. Sharing is difficult. When districts share, issues of distance, incompatible schedules, and convenience often are barriers to making the change. A district gives up something when it decides to share with another district. There is no sharing of services that does not come without its implementation challenges, whether they are contractual, logistical, or perceptual.

Recognizing the reluctance to change and the challenges associated with personnel change, significant change must involve people. Schools are labor-intensive organizations. In general, approximately 70-75% of a school district's budget is comprised of salaries and benefits. Given the financial challenges that schools face, cutting supplies and materials will no longer produce enough savings to make a difference.

Given this background, when is personnel change most palatable? History has shown that school districts are more apt to make a personnel change when a position is vacant rather than when an individual is put out of a job. This is a reality that must be considered when planning for change. In addition, it is recommended that consideration be given to consolidating some positions in the two study districts. In recommending these consolidations, it is fully understood that changes in duties might have to be made, and that some things will be done in different ways by other staff or not done at all. These changes do not mean that people are not busy in their current roles. In smaller districts, everyone pitches in to get the job done. However, these changes would assume that supervisors would spend all of their time supervising and managing their areas of responsibility.

In this report, changes are offered for consideration, they are not recommended. The purpose of this study is to identify areas for possible sharing, not to determine the most attractive option or to develop implementation plans. It is the school districts that will decide which of these changes may work and which may not. One of the best ways to consider considering potential sharing is through the creation of a committee with representation of stakeholders from both districts that can talk through the issues, the challenges, and the advantages.

In framing options, the same pattern has been followed for all areas under consideration that have financial implications. Cost estimates have been made in the most conservative manner so that, if anything, cost savings are underestimated in this report. When looking at alternative staffing structures, current staff members with the highest salaries have been used for estimating savings. In addition, every salary chosen has been increased by 10% to compensate for the individual taking on the responsibility of a second district. There is certainly no requirement that these salaries be increased by 10%. On the other hand, districts may decide to increase salaries by more than 10%. This figure is used simply to recognize the increased responsibilities that are a part of the sharing considerations contained herein.

BOCES

The final comment that should be made about sharing services involves BOCES. There are 37 Boards of Cooperative Educational Services in New York State. Their purpose is to provide cooperative services to school districts more cost effectively than the districts could provide those services on their own. Recognizing the challenges to sharing, New York State pays school districts additional state aid to encourage sharing. This additional state support is called BOCES aid. For most services that are shared through BOCES (special education being the most notable exception), the state pays BOCES aid to districts consistent with the expenditures that districts make for BOCES services. Beekmantown has a BOCES aid ratio of 63% while Plattsburgh's BOCES aid ratio is 67%. However, in reality, both districts receive about half of what they spend with BOCES as an additional expense driven revenue in BOCES aid. There is a cap of \$30,000 on an individual's salary that can be aided through BOCES aid. All other expenditures are eligible for the BOCES aid for sharing. The \$30,000 cap has been included where consideration is presented for a BOCES service.

In reality, BOCES aid is another revenue source for a school district. If these two school districts can find ways to share services through BOCES that they are currently funding in a local district line, they can make the same expenditures but get approximately half of their money back in BOCES aid. This aid can compound the savings that the districts might realize through the sharing of services. Both districts are components of the Champlain Valley Educational Services BOCES.

Shared Services, Not Merger

It should be made clear that this is a study about sharing services between the two districts and not a merger study. In this study, the consultants worked primarily with school staff while a merger study has significant community involvement. This study was completed in approximately six months while a merger study would take 18-24 months to complete. Following this study, each of the districts will remain intact with their individual identities. And while some financial savings can be expected from a shared services study, there will not be the type of significant state financial incentives that could be expected in a merger study. Nor will there be the loss of community identity that some believe occurs in a school district merger.

CHAPTER 3 PROCESS AND DATA COLLECTION

In July 2013, the consultants requested a significant amount of information from both school districts. The consultants made a September 25 presentation to a joint meeting of the boards of education. The consultants also scheduled visits on September 25 and 26, 2013 for Beekmantown and Plattsburgh respectively where conversations were held with the following individuals.

Beekmantown:

Dan Mannix, Superintendent
Nelly Collazo, High School Principal
Amy Campbell, Middle School Principal
Garth Frechette, Cumberland Head P-5 Principal
Elaine Dixon, P-5 Principal
Mary Blaine, School Business Executive
LeeAnn Short, Director of Special Services
Gary Lambert, Educational Technology Coordinator
Dan Noonan, Superintendent of Buildings & Grounds
Shane Brink, Transportation Supervisor
Roxann Barnes, School Lunch Manager
Greg Myers, Coordinator of Athletics

Plattsburgh:

Jake Short, Superintendent
Glenn Hurlock, High School Principal
Trevor Cameron, Assistant Middle School Principal
NancyJean Osborn, Bailey Avenue K-2 Principal
Carrie Zales, Oak Street 3-5 Principal
Gilles Fortin, Momot P-5 Principal
Jay Lebrun, Associate Superintendent
Claudine Selzer-Clark, Director of Special Education
Norbert Niederer, Director of Buildings, Grounds & Transportation
Charlene O'Connor, Director of Food Services

Dave Baroody, Athletic Administrator

Over the course of the study, the consultants gathered information on enrollment, academic programming, class size, athletics, extracurricular activities, facilities, finances, transportation, instructional technology, food service, custodial/maintenance services, staffing, and contractual agreements. The staffs in both schools were helpful in the information gathering process as well as in providing guidance as to possible areas of enhancing academic programs and areas of support service.

CHAPTER 4

THE SCHOOL DISTRICTS

The Beekmantown and Plattsburgh School Districts are both located in the Clinton County in the northeast corner of New York State. They are located along Interstate Route 87 approximately two and one half hours north of Albany and approximately one hour south of Montreal. Plattsburgh is a city school district whose boundaries are co-terminus with the city of Plattsburgh boundaries. The school district has an area of approximately three square miles. Beekmantown is a central school district with an area of approximately 93 square miles.

The town of Beekmantown has a population of approximately 5,545 and is located on the eastern border of the county, north of the city of Plattsburgh. The city of Plattsburgh has a population of approximately 19,989 and serves as the county seat for Clinton County. Both school districts are bordered on the east by Lake Champlain.

Beekmantown has a Pre-K-5 elementary school, a 6-8 middle school, and a 9-12 high school located on the same campus in West Chazy. In addition, there is a second Pre-K-5 elementary school in Cumberland Head. All of the Plattsburgh schools are located within the city of Plattsburgh. There is a K-2 elementary school on Bailey Avenue, a 3-5 elementary school on Oak Street, and a Pre-K-5 elementary school on Monty Street. In addition, the district has a 6-8 middle school and a 9-12 high school. The Beekmantown high school is approximately 7.6 miles/17 minutes from the Plattsburgh high school.

Table 4.1 which follows provides background information on each of the study districts. In examining the table, it can be seen that both districts have nine member boards of education. The year of term expiration for each board member is shown in parentheses. Beekmantown has 1,885 students in grades K-12 while Plattsburgh has 1,804. In examining the entire table, it is readily apparent that the two districts are remarkably similar in the wealth of the districts and the composition of the student bodies. One major difference is that Plattsburgh is a city school district with a small area and Beekmantown is a central school district with a larger geographic area.

**Table 4.1
Background Information on the Study Districts**

	<i>Beekmantown</i>	<i>Plattsburgh</i>
Board of Education (year of term expiration)	Debbie Passno, President (2017) Eric Anderson, Vice President (2017) April Bingel (2014) Andrew Brockway (2018) Cathy Buckley (2015) Michael Hagadorn (2015) Leonard King (2016) Ed Marin (2018) Pauline Stone (2014)	Leisa Boise, President (2015) Tracy Rotz, Vice President (2014) Robert Hall (2017) Amelia Goerlitz (2018) Stephen Krieg (2015) Ronald Marino (2018) Clayton Morris (2016) David Stone (2016) Frederick Wachtmeister (2014)
Superintendent	Dan Mannix	Jake Short
2013-14 K-12 Enrollment	1,885	1,804
Area of District	93 square miles	3 square miles
BOCES	Champlain Valley	Champlain Valley
Transportation Aid Ratio	.694	.713
BOCES Aid Ratio	.633	.671
Selected/Enhanced Building Aid Ratio	.849	.785
Combined Wealth Ratio	.715	.724
Grade Level Configurations	Pre-K-5, 6-8, 9-12	Pre-K-2, 3-5, 6-8, 9-12
Eligible for Free Lunch	36%	38%
Eligible for Reduced Price Lunch	10%	7%
Annual Attendance Rate	95%	94%
Student Suspensions	4%	5%
White	96%	87%
African American	2%	7%
Hispanic or Latino	1%	2%
Asian	1%	3%
Multi Racial	0%	1%

CHAPTER 5

STUDENT ENROLLMENT HISTORY AND PROJECTIONS

Accurate student enrollment projections are essential for district long range planning. Virtually all aspects of a school district's operation, including program, staffing, facilities, and finances, are related to the number of students enrolled. For this reason, updated enrollment projections are critical and serve as the first aspect of analysis for this study.

The procedure for projecting student enrollments is referred to as the Cohort Survival Method. This methodology is highly reliable and is the most frequently used projective technique for making short-term school enrollment projections. To calculate enrollment projections, the following data and procedures are used:

- Five years of district enrollment by grade level
- Calculation of survival ratios by grade level
- Kindergarten enrollment projections based on resident live births

A survival ratio is obtained by dividing a given grade's enrollment by the enrollment of the preceding grade a year earlier. For example, the number of students in grade three in any year is divided by the number of students in grade two of the previous year. The ratio indicates the proportion of the cohort "surviving" to the following year. Cohort refers to the enrollment in a grade for a given year.

Using grade-to-grade survival ratios, an average of these ratios for each cohort progression is obtained. This average is referred to as an average projective survival ratio. This ratio is then multiplied by each current grade enrollment to obtain the projected enrollment for the next successive year. The multiplicative process is continued for each successive year.

Survival ratios usually have values close to one, but may be less than or greater than one. Where the survival ratio is less than one, fewer students "survived" to the next grade. Where the survival ratio is more than one, more students "survived" to the next grade. Grade-to-grade survival ratios reflect the net effects of deaths, dropouts, the number of students who are home schooled, promotion policies, transfers to and from nonpublic schools, and migration patterns in and out of the school district.

Since estimating births introduces a possible source of error into the model, enrollment projections are most accurate when existing data on live residential births can

be used. Live birth data is currently available from the New York State Department of Health for both school districts from 2002 through 2012. Enrollment projections are therefore most accurate for five years into the future for the elementary grades. The live birth data for the two districts is shown in table 5.1 that follows.

Table 5.1			
Number of Live Births, 2002 – 2012			
Calendar Year	Beekmantown	Plattsburgh	Total
2002	145	149	294
2003	153	166	319
2004	136	158	294
2005	135	164	299
2006	139	151	290
2007	133	189	322
2008	153	157	310
2009	145	169	314
2010	147	180	327
2011	137	172	309
2012	146	188	334

As can be seen from the data above, live births in Beekmantown have ranged between 133 and 153 for the past eleven years with an average of 143. In Plattsburgh, the number of live births ranged from 149 to 189 for the past eleven years with an average of 168. This live birth data through 2012 was used to project the kindergarten enrollment through the 2017-18 school year. Birth data used to project kindergarten enrollments from 2018-19 and beyond are an average of the life births per year for the previous 5 years. The enrollment projections for Beekmantown and Plattsburgh follow in tables 5.2 and 5.3.

**Table 5.2
Beekmantown Enrollment Projections**

Grade	2008 -09	2009 -10	2010 -11	2011 -12	2012 -13	2013 -14	Ratio	2014 -15	2015 -16	2016 -17	2017 -18	2018 -19	2019 -20	2020 -21
Births 5 Years Earlier	153	136	135	139	133	153		145	147	137	146	146	146	146
Pre-K	70	70	68	75	68	85								
K	124	123	122	143	143	144	.9743	141	143	133	142	142	142	142
1	154	127	131	125	131	149	1.014	146	143	145	135	144	144	144
2	158	155	121	144	132	125	1.014	151	148	145	147	137	146	146
3	154	152	160	126	146	133	1.011	126	153	150	147	149	139	148
4	150	150	155	163	131	143	1.006	134	127	154	151	148	150	140
5	146	151	152	154	160	132	1.001	143	134	127	154	151	148	150
6	135	143	152	152	147	159	0.987	130	141	132	126	152	149	146
7	168	134	147	154	145	150	1.002	159	130	141	132	126	152	149
8	161	167	146	149	153	144	1.017	153	162	133	144	135	128	155
9	167	172	175	142	159	159	1.039	150	158	168	138	149	140	133
10	188	154	156	166	144	153	0.951	151	142	151	160	131	142	133
11	175	172	143	145	151	124	0.909	139	137	129	137	145	119	129
12	152	175	175	152	146	155	1.023	127	142	141	132	140	149	122
K-12	2032	1975	1935	1915	1886	1870		1850	1862	1850	1845	1850	1848	1837
Un- graded	3	0	1	4	8	15		9 ¹	9 ¹	9 ¹	9 ¹	9 ¹	9 ¹	9 ¹
Total K-12	2035	1975	1936	1919	1896	1885		1859	1871	1859	1854	1859	1857	1846
K-5 Total	886	858	841	856	847	836		842	849	855	876	871	870	870
6-8 Total	464	444	445	455	445	453		442	434	406	402	412	429	450
9-12 Total	685	673	650	608	604	596		567	580	589	567	566	550	517

¹Ungraded students are typically students with disabilities that are not assigned to a particular grade. The calculation of the projected number of ungraded students is based on an average of the three previous years.

**Table 5.3
Plattsburgh Enrollment Projections**

Grade	2008 -09	2009 -10	2010 -11	2011 -12	2012 -13	2013 -14	Ratio	2014 -15	2015 -16	2016 -17	2017 -18	2018 -19	2019 -20	2020 -21
Births 5 Years Earlier	166	158	164	151	189	157		169	180	172	188	173	173	173
Pre-K	79	83	81	78		83								
K	155	151	148	150	152	136	.9044	153	163	155	170	155	155	155
1	143	144	158	152	151	155	1.006	137	154	164	156	157	157	157
2	115	152	131	158	139	150	0.976	151	134	150	160	153	154	154
3	143	118	136	133	154	137	0.979	147	148	131	147	157	149	150
4	149	148	119	139	135	142	1.001	137	147	148	131	147	157	149
5	124	152	145	120	131	125	0.975	138	134	143	145	128	144	153
6	123	123	145	136	118	133	0.976	122	135	131	140	141	125	140
7	144	127	133	146	142	115	1.028	137	125	139	134	144	145	128
8	141	154	123	131	148	142	1.007	116	138	126	140	135	145	146
9	144	140	157	134	129	147	1.016	144	118	140	128	142	137	147
10	150	148	140	154	132	139	1.014	149	146	119	142	130	144	139
11	140	146	139	145	155	137	0.999	139	149	146	119	142	130	144
12	162	147	161	138	145	146	1.017	139	141	151	149	121	144	132
Total K-12	1833	1850	1835	1836	1831	1804		1810	1832	1844	1861	1865	1897	1905
K-5 Total	829	865	837	852	862	845		864	879	891	908	909	927	928
6-8 Total	408	404	401	413	408	390		375	398	396	414	420	415	414
9-12 Total	596	581	597	571	561	569		572	554	557	538	536	556	563

In examining the enrollment data from both districts, we find some important trends. Since 2008-09, the enrollment in Beekmantown has declined from 2,035 to 1,885, a decrease of 150 students (7.4%). For the same five-year period, Plattsburgh’s K-12 enrollment has declined from 1,833 to 1,804, a decrease of only 29 students (1.6%).

For the next seven-year period, the K-12 enrollment in Beekmantown is expected to continue to decline while the enrollment in Plattsburgh is expected to increase. Beekmantown is projected to decrease its enrollment from 1885 students to 1,846 students, a decrease of 39 students or 2.1%. For the same seven-year period, Plattsburgh is projected to increase from 1,810 students to 1,905 students, an increase of 87 students or 5.3%.

Combining the enrollment history of the districts with the enrollment projections, for the period 2008-09 to 2020-21, the enrollment in Beekmantown will decline from 2,035 students to 1,846 students, a decrease of 189 students or 9.3%. For the same twelve-year period, the K-12 enrollment in Plattsburgh will increase slightly from 1,833 students to 1,905 students, an increase of 72 students or 3.9%.

These enrollment projections may change significantly with recent proposals for two additional housing developments in the Beekmantown school district. An apartment complex consisting of 64 1 – 3 bedroom apartments is in progress. Currently waiting for financing, the Homesteads project has been approved by the Town of Beekmantown Planning Board for market rate and affordable units. Once financing is secured, it is estimated that the complex will be completed within a year. The earliest the complex would impact the school district would most likely be September 2015. A planned development of 250 “affordable” houses is in the process of securing approvals from the Town of Beekmantown Board and the Planning Board. There are a number of approval steps required prior to the project moving forward. Once the project is approved, it will be a phased project, beginning with 25 homes.

Current estimates by the school district are that the apartment complex may eventually add up to 60 students to the school system and it is believed that if the housing complex is fully implemented that the enrollment of the Beekmantown district will increase rather than decrease. Because the projects are still in the speculative approval and financing stages, the enrollment projections have not been adjusted for potential growth. This is consistent with the New York State Education Department’s recommendation that “any extensive change in new local housing construction within the school district will inevitably influence student enrollment projections. However, a word of caution is raised here. Only evidence of sales or contracted construction should modify any basic enrollment projections.”

The number of district resident students attending non-public schools is an important consideration when projecting future enrollments, especially if there are a large number of students attending non-public schools and there is the possibility of one or more of the non-public schools closing with students returning to the public school

system. Table 5.4 shows the number of students in both Beekmantown and Plattsburgh that have attended non-public schools since 2008-09.

Table 5.4 Resident Students in Non-Public Schools from 2008-09 to 2012-13		
Year	Beekmantown	Plattsburgh
2008-09	79	48
2009-10	89	45
2010-11	65	28
2011-12	59	26
2012-13	75	29
AVERAGE	73.4	35.2

The number of students attending non-public schools from Beekmantown is more than twice that of Plattsburgh. Beekmantown averaged 73 students a year and Plattsburgh averaged 35 students a year. Given the overall enrollment of these two districts and the grade spread of the students attending non-public schools, even if all students withdrew from the private schools and returned to these two districts, there would be a minimal impact on the enrollment projections.

We also examined the number of students in each district that are home schooled. The following table 5.5 shows the homeschooled populations for both districts.

Table 5.5 Home Schooled Students from 2008-09 to 2012-13				
Year	Beekmantown		Plattsburgh	
	Number	% of total enrollment	Number	% of total enrollment
2008-09	19	<1%	9	<1%
2009-10	18	1%	13	<1%
2010-11	22	2%	17	<1%
2011-12	29	2%	20	1%
2012-13	29	2%	10	<1%

The percentage of home-schooled students in New York State school districts usually ranges from 2-3% and is relatively constant. As can be seen from table 5.5 above, the number of home-schooled students in both districts is on the low end of the state

average in Beekmantown and less than the state average in Plattsburgh. Again, given the overall enrollments of the districts, the home-schooled population is fairly insignificant when projecting future enrollments.

Based on these histories and the make-up of the communities, we see no reason to believe that the number of resident students in non-public schools or the number of home schooled students will change significantly or in any other way influence the student enrollment projections which are made in this chapter.

CHAPTER 6 INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS

The essential function of any school is to educate the students who attend that school. An important activity in analyzing the school districts in this study is to compare the curricular offerings that they currently provide to their students. The purpose of this chapter is to review the academic programs that are available to the students in Beekmantown and Plattsburgh and the opportunities for sharing that might maintain or even expand the program for students.

Organization of the Districts

The grade configuration of school districts varies from one district to another as evidenced by table 6.1 that follows.

Table 6.1 Grade Configurations of the Study Districts	
Beekmantown	Plattsburgh
Elementary-Pre-K-5	Primary-Pre-K-2
	Intermediate-3-5
Middle-6-8	Middle-6-8
High-9-12	High-9-12

As can be seen in table 6.1, Beekmantown has a Pre-K-5, 6-8, 9-12 grade arrangement while Plattsburgh is structured in a K-2, 3-5, 6-8, 9-12 configuration. Beekmantown has two elementary schools, one in Cumberland Head and one on the main campus in West Chazy that also houses the middle school and the high school. Both districts have a Pre-K program. Plattsburgh has a Pre-K-2 primary school, a 3-5 intermediate school, and a Pre-K-5 elementary school. In addition, there is a 6-8 middle school and a 9-12 high school. All five schools are located in different buildings and all are located within the city of Plattsburgh.

If opportunities for sharing student programs are established, most opportunities usually develop at the middle and/or high school levels. Should this be the case in this study, the structure of the two districts at these levels is the same. These grade configurations and the location of the school buildings should not negatively impact

potential sharing arrangements. The two middle schools are located 6.7 miles/14 minutes apart while the high schools are located 7.6 miles/17 minutes apart.

In researching opportunities for sharing student programs, it is important to identify the student day and the staff day for both districts. Table 6.2 looks at those times.

Table 6.2 Daily School Schedules				
	Beekmantown		Plattsburgh	
	Start/End Times	Length of Day	Start/End Times	Length of Day
ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS				
Staff Start	8:45	6 hours, 45 minutes	8:15	6 hours, 45 minutes
Staff End	3:30		3:00	
Student Start	9:05	6 hours, 5 minutes	8:15/8:25	6 hours, 10 minutes
Student End	3:10		2:25/2:35	
MIDDLE SCHOOLS				
Staff Start	7:30	7 hours	8:00	7 hours, 30 minutes
Staff End	2:30		3:30	
Student Start	7:42	6 hours, 37 minutes	8:00	6 hours, 46 minutes
Student End	2:19		2:46	
HIGH SCHOOLS				
Staff Start	7:30	7 hours	7:50	7 hours, 30 minutes
Staff End	2:30		3:20	
Student Start	7:45	6 hours, 37 minutes	7:55	6 hours, 45 minutes
Student End	2:22		2:40	

As can be seen in table 6.2, there are some minor differences in the staff workdays in Beekmantown and Plattsburgh. At the elementary level, the teacher workdays are the same length but the Beekmantown day is one half hour behind the Plattsburgh workday. At the middle school and high school level, the teacher workday in Plattsburgh is 30 minutes longer than it is in Beekmantown. In the event that sharing

student programs necessitated a change in the teacher workday, such change could only be made after negotiating that change with the respective teachers associations.

The student days in Beekmantown and Plattsburgh are much more similar than the teacher workdays. At the elementary level, the student day in Plattsburgh is five minutes longer than in Beekmantown. At the middle and high school levels, the student day in Plattsburgh is 8-9 minutes longer than the student day in Beekmantown. These differences are relatively minor and should not pose major problems for the sharing of services. However, as will be discussed further, the student day in Plattsburgh is 30 minutes behind Beekmantown at the middle school level and 20 minutes behind at the high school level. These differences will have some implications for scheduling the sharing of services.

Table 6.3 that follows presents a summary of the elementary school class sizes of each section. Note again that the Beekmantown has two elementary schools and Plattsburgh has a K-2, 3-5, and a K-5 elementary school.

Table 6.3				
Elementary School Sections/Section Sizes for 2013-14				
Grade Level	Beekmantown		Plattsburgh	
	No. of Sections	Section Sizes	No. of Sections	Section Sizes
Pre-K	4	17, 15, 17, 13	4	17, 19, 17, 9
K	7	20, 20, 20, 20, 20, 19, 19	7	16, 15, 15, 16, 17, 19, 18
K-1			2	18, 20
1	7	19, 19, 19, 21, 21, 18, 21	7	19, 20, 19, 20, 21, 19, 19
2	6	19, 21, 20, 21, 21, 19	7	19, 19, 20, 20, 21, 20, 20
2-3			1	21
3	5	21, 22, 25, 23, 26	7	14, 14, 15, 17, 22, 19, 20
4	5	28, 28, 27, 25, 26	8	17, 17, 19, 19, 19, 15, 18, 17
5	5	28, 29, 20, 20, 21	7	19, 20, 20, 17, 16, 18, 14
Sp Ed	11	12, 5, 7, 6, 7, 5, 4, 10, 8, 3, 10	3	3, 8, 5

3-8 Student Assessments

We now turn our attention to the academic performance of the students in grades 3-8. In New York State, the best way to accomplish this is by examining student

performance on the English/Language Arts (ELA) and Mathematics state tests administered in grades 3-8. Before presenting recent results for Beekmantown and Plattsburgh, it is important to understand the rating system currently used in New York. The following summary describes the current four-level system in place.

Student Performance on State Assessments - Performance Level Descriptors

Level 1-Not Meeting Learning Standards---Student performance does not demonstrate an understanding of the content expected in the subject and grade level.

Level 2-Partially Meeting Learning Standards---Student performance demonstrates a partial understanding of the content expected in the subject and grade level.

Level 3-Meeting Learning Standards---Student performance demonstrates an understanding of the content expected in the subject and grade level.

Level 4-Meeting Learning Standards with Distinction---Student performance demonstrates a thorough understanding of the content expected in the subject and grade level.

Table 6.4								
Percent of Students Scoring at Each Level								
English/Language Arts-Grade 3								
Level	2009-10		2010-11		2011-12		2012-13	
	BEEK (151)	PLAT (121)	BEEK (161)	PLAT (136)	BEEK (135)	PLAT (133)	BEEK (147)	PLAT (139)
1	17%	4%	14%	15%	15%	14%	38%	36%
2	31%	35%	34%	27%	28%	34%	35%	34%
3	39%	46%	50%	54%	53%	41%	25%	26%
4	13%	15%	2%	4%	4%	11%	2%	4%

() indicates the number tested

Table 6.5								
Percent of Students Scoring at Each Level								
Math-Grade 3								
Level	2009-10		2010-11		2011-12		2012-13	
	BEEK (150)	PLAT (121)	BEEK (164)	PLAT (136)	BEEK (136)	PLAT (132)	BEEK (147)	PLAT (138)
1	11%	9%	13%	7%	10%	15%	33%	37%
2	35%	38%	40%	44%	38%	32%	36%	34%
3	39%	38%	42%	40%	47%	44%	23%	22%
4	15%	15%	5%	9%	5%	9%	8%	7%

() indicates the number tested

Table 6.6								
Percent of Students Scoring at Each Level								
English/Language Arts-Grade 4								
Level	2009-10		2010-11		2011-12		2012-13	
	BEEK (153)	PLAT (149)	BEEK (158)	PLAT (119)	BEEK (165)	PLAT (136)	BEEK (124)	PLAT (128)
1	10%	10%	15%	3%	14%	9%	40%	33%
2	38%	38%	41%	37%	36%	32%	47%	41%
3	50%	47%	44%	57%	50%	56%	9%	19%
4	2%	5%	0%	3%	0%	3%	4%	7%
() indicates the number tested								

Table 6.7								
Percent of Students Scoring at Each Level								
Math-Grade 4								
Level	2009-10		2010-11		2011-12		2012-13	
	BEEK (153)	PLAT (149)	BEEK (158)	PLAT (120)	BEEK (165)	PLAT (134)	BEEK (124)	PLAT (127)
1	10%	9%	14%	2%	13%	6%	37%	43%
2	42%	28%	34%	28%	39%	28%	41%	37%
3	35%	42%	41%	50%	37%	41%	17%	15%
4	13%	21%	11%	20%	11%	25%	5%	5%
() indicates the number tested								

Table 6.8								
Percent of Students Scoring at Each Level								
English/Language Arts-Grade 5								
Level	2009-10		2010-11		2011-12		2012-13	
	BEEK (150)	PLAT (158)	BEEK (157)	PLAT (142)	BEEK (154)	PLAT (116)	BEEK (154)	PLAT (119)
1	13%	15%	15%	15%	14%	8%	48%	46%
2	46%	46%	42%	40%	38%	34%	31%	40%
3	33%	32%	42%	44%	47%	55%	18%	12%
4	8%	7%	1%	1%	1%	3%	3%	2%
() indicates the number tested								

Table 6.9
Percent of Students Scoring at Each Level
Math-Grade 5

Level	2009-10		2010-11		2011-12		2012-13	
	BEEK (150)	PLAT (158)	BEEK (156)	PLAT (143)	BEEK (154)	PLAT (114)	BEEK (154)	PLAT (116)
1	10%	9%	11%	8%	14%	5%	51%	59%
2	37%	44%	42%	41%	35%	33%	34%	30%
3	46%	38%	37%	36%	37%	47%	13%	9%
4	7%	9%	10%	15%	14%	15%	2%	2%

() indicates the number tested

Table 6.10
Percent of Students Scoring at Each Level
English/Language Arts-Grade 6

Level	2009-10		2010-11		2011-12		2012-13	
	BEEK (144)	PLAT (129)	BEEK (150)	PLAT (144)	BEEK (157)	PLAT (135)	BEEK (147)	PLAT (107)
1	10%	12%	13%	10%	13%	7%	29%	20%
2	34%	35%	33%	37%	35%	28%	44%	47%
3	53%	44%	51%	49%	50%	63%	18%	20%
4	3%	9%	3%	4%	2%	2%	10%	13%

() indicates the number tested

Table 6.11
Percent of Students Scoring at Each Level
Math-Grade 6

Level	2009-10		2010-11		2011-12		2012-13	
	BEEK (144)	PLAT (129)	BEEK (150)	PLAT (145)	BEEK (157)	PLAT (134)	BEEK (149)	PLAT (104)
1	6%	11%	9%	12%	17%	11%	43%	39%
2	42%	22%	34%	49%	41%	36%	46%	51%
3	38%	38%	41%	26%	33%	29%	7%	10%
4	14%	29%	16%	13%	9%	24%	4%	0%

() indicates the number tested

Table 6.12								
Percent of Students Scoring at Each Level								
English/Language Arts-Grade 7								
Level	2009-10		2010-11		2011-12		2012-13	
	BEEK (139)	PLAT (124)	BEEK (148)	PLAT (128)	BEEK (159)	PLAT (149)	BEEK (142)	PLAT (139)
1	12%	8%	9%	9%	12%	7%	33%	32%
2	38%	36%	38%	31%	36%	37%	35%	42%
3	41%	41%	52%	55%	48%	52%	25%	19%
4	9%	15%	1%	5%	4%	4%	7%	7%

() indicates the number tested

Table 6.13								
Percent of Students Scoring at Each Level								
Math-Grade 7								
Level	2009-10		2010-11		2011-12		2012-13	
	BEEK (137)	PLAT (125)	BEEK (148)	PLAT (130)	BEEK (157)	PLAT (147)	BEEK (142)	PLAT (131)
1	4%	8%	7%	12%	11%	14%	39%	47%
2	32%	42%	17%	40%	19%	35%	41%	33%
3	40%	33%	45%	33%	41%	32%	20%	16%
4	24%	17%	31%	15%	29%	19%	0%	4%

() indicates the number tested

Table 6.14								
Percent of Students Scoring at Each Level								
English/Language Arts-Grade 8								
Level	2009-10		2010-11		2011-12		2012-13	
	BEEK (165)	PLAT (159)	BEEK (143)	PLAT (128)	BEEK (151)	PLAT (128)	BEEK (149)	PLAT (127)
1	8%	8%	8%	11%	7%	6%	29%	31%
2	35%	37%	47%	39%	37%	35%	26%	41%
3	50%	39%	43%	48%	55%	53%	28%	20%
4	7%	16%	2%	2%	1%	6%	17%	8%

() indicates the number tested

**Table 6.15
Percent of Students Scoring at Each Level
Math-Grade 8**

Level	2009-10		2010-11		2011-12		2012-13	
	BEEK (164)	PLAT (159)	BEEK (143)	PLAT (127)	BEEK (152)	PLAT (128)	BEEK (150)	PLAT (120)
1	4%	9%	6%	6%	4%	12%	36%	35%
2	29%	33%	45%	35%	33%	27%	54%	50%
3	57%	33%	43%	46%	52%	48%	9%	8%
4	10%	25%	6%	13%	11%	13%	1%	7%

() indicates the number tested

In examining any assessment results between two school districts, there will always be some differences. Such is the case with Beekmantown and Plattsburgh. There are times when Beekmantown students score higher than Plattsburgh students and there are times when Plattsburgh students score higher than Beekmantown students. However, further analysis was done on these assessments. Clearly the goal of any school district is to get students to levels 3 and 4. Considering that there are twelve assessments for grades 3-8 and assessments were analyzed for four years, there are 48 (12x4) cells showing the percentage of students who have achieved both level 3 and 4 percentages for both districts. In comparing the percentage of students at levels 3 and 4 across these 48 cells, we find that Plattsburgh students scored higher in 26 of the cells, Beekmantown students scored higher in 20 of the cells, and district results were the same in 2 of the cells. Differences between district scores were 5 points or less in 24 of the 48 cells. Recognizing that the differences in performance in many of the cells were fairly small, it is reasonable to conclude the student performance for these two districts is remarkably similar.

It should also be noted that the 2012-2013 assessments were based on new standards so that comparisons with prior years are difficult to make.

Middle/High School

The section sizes and course offerings at the middle and high school levels were reviewed to identify possible areas for sharing. Table 6.16 that follows presents an overview of the curriculum in each district's middle school. In addition to identifying the

courses taught during 2013-14, the number of sections of each course and each section size is also shown in this table. For example, in Beekmantown there are six sections of English 6 with section sizes of 20, 19, 26, 25, 21, and 25 students; Plattsburgh has eight sections of English 6 with section sizes of 13, 17, 21, 17, 22, 20, 9 and 5 students. The middle school curriculum required by New York State regulations provides classes in the core curriculum of English, mathematics, social studies, and science as well as opportunities to explore coursework in foreign languages, technology, art, music, and technology. Opportunities for students to accelerate their studies and take courses that will earn high school credit in mathematics, science, and foreign languages are also encouraged under the middle school regulations.

Table 6.16 Middle School Curriculum Offerings-2013-14		
Course	Beekmantown	Plattsburgh
6th GRADE		
English 6	20, 19, 26, 25, 21, 25	13, 17, 21, 17, 22, 20, 9, 5
Reading	25, 12, 27, 28, 28, 17	10, 25, 19, 15, 16, 24, 6, 7
Math 6	26, 20, 25, 23, 16, 27	6, 9, 24, 24, 19,
Advanced Math 6		17, 24
Math Explorations 6/7		8, 19, 1
Science 6	15, 20, 25, 25, 27 25, 22	17, 20, 23, 19, 12
Advanced Science		16, 17
Social Studies 6	22, 28, 18, 23, 25	20, 16, 24, 16, 27, 21
Home and Careers	24, 18, 23, 25	12, 15, 22, 20, 15, 14
Technology	18, 24, 23, 25	
Computer		19, 12, 12, 8, 22, 20
Art	12	13, 9
Music		7, 4, 9, 4, 15
Chorus		44, 5
AIS (Combined Subjects)	11, 11, 8 9, 7 10, 10	7, 6, 5, 4, 2, 7, 4, 7, 4, 2, 3
7th GRADE		
English 7	19, 25, 24, 23, 26, 17	20, 19, 23, 24, 17, 9
Reading	10	4
Math 7	16, 26, 24, 24, 23, 21	3, 7, 17, 16, 24
Advanced Math		16, 17
Integrated Algebra 7		8
Science 7	24, 21, 24 23, 23, 19	16, 26, 15, 16, 20
Advanced Science		8
Social Studies 7	28, 10, 27, 25, 28, 16	9, 12. 22, 25, 12, 14, 19
Home and Careers		

Technology		19, 18, 20, 8, 17, 10, 5, 9
Art	24, 28, 27, 25, 25, 24	15, 19, 17, 11, 20, 7, 4
AIS (Combined Subjects)	8, 9, 8, 7, 5, 6, 7	6, 3, 5, 2, 5, 5, 5, 4, 2, 5, 5, 7
Music	28, 26, 21, 27, 26, 25	10, 12, 8, 7, 10
Chorus	30	53
Band	20	36, 29, 41
Orchestra		53
Health	24, 26, 27, 28, 22, 25	
French 7		26, 13
Spanish 7		
8th GRADE		
English 8	25, 21, 28, 17, 24 15	23, 20, 16, 22, 15, 21, 19, 9
Reading	7	9, 2
Math 8	17, 18, 23, 21, 23	9, 7, 8, 13, 18, 13, 12
Geometry		11
Algebra	25	30, 28
Science 8	18, 21, 23, 25, 17	15, 19, 13, 17, 12, 19
Earth Science	26, 26	21, 20
Social Studies 8	27, 15, 24, 23, 19, 22	15, 24, 12, 16, 17, 22, 12, 18
Home and Careers	16, 26, 23	10, 19, 13, 15, 11, 15, 13, 14
Technology	16, 26, 16, 23	17, 16, 17, 11, 16, 18, 13, 15
Art	28, 13, 22, 27	9
AIS (Combined Subjects)	4, 7, 6, 8, 2, 3, 3	11, 5, 5, 5, 11, 9
French 1A	27, 25, 18	
French 8		22, 14, 19
Spanish IA	27, 22	
Spanish 8		18, 24, 15
Health		9, 8, 28, 25, 24, 22, 29
Computer 8		20, 21
SPECIAL EDUCATION		
English A	11, 13	
English B	9, 9,	
English C	7	
English 6, 7, 8		6
Math A	14, 12	
Math B	9, 10	
Math C	7,	
Math 6, 7, 8		6

Social Studies A	11, 11	
Social Studies B	9, 9	
Social Studies C	7	
Social Studies 6, 7, 8		6
Science A	11, 12	
Science B	9, 9	
Science C	7	
Science 6, 7, 8		6
Reading A	11, 12	
Reading B	9, 9	
Reading C	7	
Reading 6, 7, 8		6
Support	5, 2, 4	
Study Skills	12, 9	
Resource 6		6, 5, 3, 4, 1
Resource 7		3, 3
Resource 8		1, 5, 4, 4
English 8:1:2		1
Math 8:1:2		1
Skills 8:1:2		2, 2, 1, 1, 3

Both districts offer solid middle school programming; however, Plattsburgh offers more opportunities for acceleration than does Beekmantown. Students in Plattsburgh have more opportunities to accelerate beginning in the 6th grade with advanced math and science courses that lead to opportunities to take integrated algebra and geometry while still in middle school. Students are also able to begin foreign languages in Plattsburgh during 7th grade allowing students to take the Foreign Language Proficiency exam at the end of 8th grade.

Table 6.17 that follows presents an overview of the curriculum in each district's high school. In addition to identifying the courses taught during 2013-14, the number of sections of each course and each section size is also shown in this table. For example, in Beekmantown there are six sections of English 9 with section sizes of 14, 27, 29, 16, 28, and 26 students; Plattsburgh also has six sections of English 9 with section sizes of 22, 27, 26, 18, 26, and 23 students.

Table 6.17
High School Curriculum Offerings-2013-14

Course	Beekmantown	Plattsburgh
ENGLISH		
English 9	14, 27, 29, 16, 28, 26	22, 27, 26, 18, 26, 23
English 10	26, 27, 27, 21, 28, 20	21, 25, 26, 21, 26
English 9 & 10 AIS	15, 15, 15, 15, 15, 15, 15, 14	
AIS English (1 / 4 year)		1, 2, 1, 1, 3, 4, 3, 1, 4, 1, 1, 3, 2
AIS Literacy (1 / 2 year)		3, 3, 5, 3, 5, 5, 4, 4, 3, 2
English 11	22, 21, 26, 28, 22	24, 15, 23, 19, 20, 29
English 12	28, 19	
English 12 Honors		30
Women's studies (1/2 year)	24	
Creative writing (1/2 year)		27
Creative Writing II (1/2 year)		1
Folklore (1/2 year)	12	
Classical mythology (1/2 year)		25, 7
Research paper (1/2 year)		4
Literary analysis (1/2 year)		24, 7
Public speaking (1/2 year)		15, 20
Advanced writing (1/2 year)		18
Understanding comedy and humor (1/2 year)	20	
Film and Literature (1/2 year)		21, 29, 13
Culture and cuisine (1/2 year)	10	
AP English Literature	15, 16, 24	
Reading & Writing in Content Area (1/2 year)	9, 8	
SOCIAL STUDIES		
Global History 9	29, 16, 19, 22, 25, 26, 13	26, 21, 20, 27, 20, 20
Global History 10	28, 17, 29, 23, 22, 29	21, 18, 23, 30, 20, 11
Global Studies AIS	9, 5	
US History & Government	22, 21, 26, 21	33, 20, 24, 19
AP US History	20, 11	22, 12
US History AIS	3, 4	
AIS Social Studies (¼ year)		2, 1, 4, 3, 2, 1
Introduction to Economics (1/2 year)	26, 22, 20, 14, 28, 26	27, 8, 25, 16, 25, 15

Participation in Government (1/2 year)	29, 17, 27, 11, 19, 30	19, 25, 25, 27, 30
Sociology (1/2 year)	17	
Psychology (1/2 year)	27, 23	
Psychology		6
AP/CAP Psychology		10
Diversity through Film (1/2 year)	20	
World War II (1/2 year)		24, 15
Vietnam War	17	
MATH		
Algebra Yr. 1 of 2	24, 10, 10, 13, 12, 28, 20	
Algebra Yr. 2 of 2	27, 22	
AIS Algebra (Day 1) (Day 2)	15, 15, 15, 15, 15, 15, 15, 15, 15, 15	
Algebra (Yr. 1)		8, 10, 13, 11
Algebra (Yr. 2)		20, 21, 26
Pre Algebra		8
Algebra and Geometry Concepts		12, 12, 12, 22
AIS Math (1/4 year)		6, 6, 3, 4, 4, 1, 2, 1, 5, 1, 2,
Geometry	14, 19, 21, 28, 22	21, 20, 14, 11
Geometry Honors		14, 10
Foundations of Geometry	13	
Trigonometry	26, 25, 22	
Intermediate Algebra I		11
Intermediate Algebra II		17, 18
Foundations of Trigonometry	18	
Algebra II and Trigonometry		16
Algebra II and Trigonometry Honors		23, 14
Algebra II and Trigonometry (Part 1)		18, 12, 9
Math Applications		9
Pre Calculus	20, 20	
Pre Calculus College		7, 14, 30, 18
Calculus College		21
AP Calculus AB	9	2
AP Calculus BC	12	
Statistics A (1/2 year)	31	
Statistics B (1/2 year)	31	
SCIENCE		
Earth Science	18, 24, 26, 18	21, 22, 24, 24, 19
Living Environment	27, 25, 28, 27, 24,	21, 17, 22, 24

	23	
Living Environment, Honors		18, 23
AIS Living Environment (1/2 year)	3, 3	
AIS Science (1 / 4 year)		2
Chemistry	26, 30, 29	18, 14, 10
Chemistry, Honors		22, 14
Physics	15, 28	16, 17
AP Environmental Science	22, 25	
Environmental Science A (1/2 year)		24
Environmental Science B (1/2 year)		24
AP Physics		5, 20, 12
AP Biology		15
Unified Science A (1/2 year)		13
Unified Science B (1/2 year)		12
Foundations of Chemistry I	15	
Foundations of Chemistry II	15	
Field Biology I (1/2 year)	16	
Field Biology II (1/2 year)	14	
Geology	14	
Forensic Science (1/2 year)	27	
Forensics A (1/2 year)		27
Forensics B (1/2 year)		19
Science Olympiad		7
Science Olympiad (1/2 year)		2, 3
Science Olympiad 2		6, 4
FOREIGN LANGUAGE		
Spanish I	19	14
Spanish II	20, 20	14, 22, 22
Spanish III	25	27, 19
Spanish IV		11, 14
German I		20
German III		11
Spanish IV CAP	18	
Spanish V CAP	10	
Spanish V		14, 2
French I	24	
French II	22, 12, 21	14, 23
French III	22, 24	23, 8
French IV		7
French IV CAP	9	
French V		7
French V CAP	14	
Farsi I		1

Farsi IV		1
BUSINESS		
Marketing	10, 24	
Personal Computer Applications (1/2 year)	29, 29, 28,24, 13, 14	
Microsoft Office I (1/2 year)		17, 12, 11, 17, 10, 14, 17
Career Development		4, 5
TECHNOLOGY		
Global Career & Technology (1/2 year)	7	
Robotics (1/2 year)	14	
Architectural Drawing (1/2 year)		17, 9, 16
ART		
Studio Art	23,27,26,16,29	
Studio in Art I (1/2 year)		18, 21, 24
Studio in Art II (1/2 year)		17, 23, 23
Video Production (1/2 year)	6, 6	
Creative Crafts (1/2 year)	23,21,14,11	
Ceramics I (1/2 year)	19, 20	17
Ceramics II (1/2 year)	14, 18	12
Photography I (1/2 year)		18
Photography II (1/2 year)		15
MUSIC		
Senior Chorus	58	
Select Chorus	4	
Band		39
Chorus		90
Senior Band	40, 40	
Band/Chorus		27
Jazz Ensemble	9	12, 1
Orchestra		15
Orchestra/Chorus		12
Band/Orchestra		5
Piano (Day 2)	8	
Business of Music	1	
Music in our Lives		17
Music Theory		10
HEALTH		
Health (1/2 year)	20, 24 26, 22, 21, 22, 19	18, 24, 28, 9, 9, 21, 13
Food & Fitness (1/2 year)	23	
Single Survival (1/2 year)	19	

PHYSICAL EDUCATION		
Physical Education	23, 15, 13, 8, 27, 32, 33, 28, 20, 20, 25, 12, 27, 28, 28, 28, 23, 16, 32, 16, 29, 23, 29, 18, 16, 13, 26	18, 17, 11, 13, 42, 27, 35, 23, 23, 25, 23, 29, 32, 25, 26, 22, 9, 11, 12, 21, 27, 22, 18, 13, 18, 11, 32, 21, 36, 30, 20, 26, 22, 33, 30, 26, 21, 22, 13, 14, 21, 29, 21, 3
Heart Smart (1/2 year)		23, 13, 7
Strength Training (¼ year)		18, 16, 14, 10
SPECIAL EDUCATION		
Reading	7, 12, 4	2, 2, 3, 2
Keyboarding	9, 16	
8:1:1 English		7
12:1 ELA		8
English		6, 6
English 9	12, 12, 13	
English 10	10	
English 11	15	
English 12		
8:1:1 Social Studies		7
12:1 Social Studies		5
Global 9	15, 7	
Global 10	9	
US History	14	
Participation in Government (1/2 year)	12	
Introduction to Economics (1/2 year)	12	
Living Environment	11	
12:1 Science		6
General Science	8, 13	
Environmental Science	3	
Pre-Algebra	14, 8	
12:1 Math		5
Algebra	13	
Math Functions	13	
Life Skills Math	4	
Career Prep	4	
12:1 Home and Careers		5
Occupational Education	4	
Support 9	5, 3	

Support 10	6, 4, 5	
Support 11	5	
Support 12	5	
Resource Room		16, 2, 1, 2, 2, 3, 3, 2, 3, 3, 3, 2, 6, 6, 4, 4, 3, 4, 2, 3, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 3, 2, 1, 3, 1,
Guided Support Team (1/2 - 1 year)		2, 1, 3, 2, 4, 1, 1, 3, 1, 1, 2, 2, 1, 3, 5, 1, 4, 2, 1, 1, 1, 1, 2, 1, 1, 2, 1, 2, 2, 1, 1
NOTES: 1. Does not include labs 2. Does not include study halls		

Both districts have a solid program in the core areas of English, math, science, and social studies and these courses are well enrolled. Both districts have Advanced Placement courses in US History and Calculus AB with Beekmantown also offering AP English, Calculus BC, and Environmental Science. Additional AP courses offered at Plattsburgh include AP (CAP) Psychology, AP Physics, and AP Biology. Both districts offer college credit through the College Advanced Placement (CAP) program through Clinton Community College: Beekmantown offers Spanish IV and V and French IV and V; Plattsburgh offers Psychology, Pre Calculus and Calculus for college credit. Both districts offer numerous electives in these four core academic areas. Some elective courses have small enrollments. French and Spanish are offered in both districts. Plattsburgh also offers German and Farsi.

The business area has a limited number of offerings. Other than Personal Computer Applications at Beekmantown and Microsoft Office at Plattsburgh, each district only offers one additional elective (Marketing in Beekmantown and Career Development at Plattsburgh.) Technology is another area that has few offerings in either district.

Where one district offers a different array of course offerings, discussions should be held to discuss ways that these expanded opportunities could be made available to students from the other district. Not only would this serve the altruistic function of increasing opportunities for the students in these districts but this sharing would also

serve to increase the class sizes for some low enrollment classes thereby stabilizing the ability to offer these courses into the future. This may especially be true in the AP courses and in foreign languages.

In addition to the courses listed in Table 6.17, high school students from both districts have access to a wide array of Career and Technical Education courses from the Champlain Valley BOCES. Table 6.18 which follows shows the number of students from each district who are currently taking CTE courses at BOCES:

Table 6.18 Enrollment in BOCES Career & Technical Education Courses-2013-14		
	Beekmantown	Plattsburgh
Junior Class		
No. of Students in Class	145	137
No. of students in BOCES CTE	48	30
Senior Class		
No. of Students in Class	152	146
No. of Students in BOCES CTE	43	25
No. of Juniors and Seniors in BOCES CTE Courses	91	55
% of Juniors & Seniors in BOCES CTE Courses	30.6%	19.4%
There are also 3 students from Beekmantown who are 10 th graders and attend the CTE program at CV-TEC.		

With respect to offerings in career and technical education, there is always the possibility of districts offering their own CTE programs or even having Beekmantown and Plattsburgh offer shared CTE programs. While this approach might warrant investigation, the cost of equipment in many CTE courses is often very expensive. In addition, these courses are often offered at the BOCES center because one or two districts often do not have sufficient enrollment to justify offering such specialized courses. And, finally, if districts decide to offer their own CTE courses, they would forfeit the BOCES aid that they receive on the tuition costs they pay for their students to attend CTE courses

at BOCES. Having identified these questions to be considered, it still might be in the best interest of the districts to consider offering some CTE courses within their own district.

An analysis of course sections with small enrollments was done. For the purpose of this analysis, small is defined as an enrollment of fewer than ten students. It should be noted that there is nothing inherently wrong with class sections of fewer than ten students. Especially in higher-level courses, small enrollments allow personal attention and small group interaction that is critical for students to get the most from these experiences. However, the financial pressures that school districts will face in the future will jeopardize the ability to offer classes that have such few students. To illustrate the magnitude of these small class sections, the following table 6.19 is developed. This table excludes classes for special education students and academic intervention services classes.

Table 6.19 Section Sizes with Fewer Than Ten Students				
Course Area	Beekmantown		Plattsburgh	
	Number of Sections	Number of Sections with Fewer than 10 Students	Number of Sections	Number of Sections with Fewer than 10 Students
English	36	2	31	4
Social Studies	36	0	32	2
Math	24	1	34	6
Science	23	0	33	6
Languages Other Than English	14	1	20	6
Business	8	0	9	2
Technology	2	1	3	1
Art	15	2	10	0
Music	7	4	10	2
Health	9	0	7	2
Physical Education	27	1	51	3
Total	201	12 (6.0%)	240	34 (14.2%)

As can be seen in table 6.19 above, Beekmantown offers 201 sections of high school courses in the curricular areas listed above while Plattsburgh offers 240 sections. The number of courses with small enrollments is very low in Beekmantown and fairly

low in Plattsburgh. This will lessen the possibility of cutting courses because of low enrollment when budgets require reductions.

It is still true, however, that fiscal pressures may make it difficult to maintain the current level of student programming, especially for electives. It is for this reason that Beekmantown and Plattsburgh should give consideration to sharing academic courses or sharing teachers to be able to maintain and expand opportunities for students. Potential areas for sharing and/or expansion are in foreign language, AP and college courses, and advanced technology programs such as Project Lead the Way.

Student and Teacher Exchange Program

It is particularly important that members of the Beekmantown and Plattsburgh school communities engage in discussions about increasing options for high school students in a cost-effective manner at this time. This topic is clearly on the front burner for educators nationally and is a major priority for New York State's Board of Regents as well. The following is taken from a November 9, 2009 memorandum from then Deputy Commissioner John King to the EMSC Committee of the Board of Regents:

“It may be time to rethink secondary school design to increase student engagement and to ensure that secondary schools equip students with the skills they will need to succeed in college and the global economy and society of the 21st century. Redesigning secondary school means looking at many issues, including, 1) high school diploma requirements, 2) Regents examinations, 3) seat time requirements vs. earning course credit through demonstration of competency, 4) innovative secondary models including virtual high schools and on-line courses, and 5) alternative secondary models designed to engage students including career and technical education (CTE), science, technology, engineering and mathematics (STEM) programs, arts programs, and early college high school programs. It also means developing standards of excellence for all students, including high performing students, that could possibly include the International Baccalaureate (IB), Advanced Placement tests, the British A-level examinations, and others.”

The foundation of this study from an instructional perspective is maintaining and enhancing the quality of instructional programs available to Beekmantown and Plattsburgh students in a cost-effective manner.

Sharing academic opportunities will, in some cases, involve the availability of courses and programs outside the individual school districts. As a result, mileage and student travel time between the school facilities are important. Accordingly, it has been determined that Beekmantown High School and Plattsburgh High School are 7.6 miles apart requiring 17 minutes of travel time. It will be assumed in this study that the required travel time for school buses would be 20 minutes. For students from Beekmantown, this distance is similar to the travel to the BOCES, which is 8.5 miles away. It is slightly more than the 2.5 miles that students from Plattsburgh High School travel to get to BOCES.

The first manner of sharing academic programs that should be considered involves sharing students between the two high schools. It is clearly understood that this option cannot be realized without a great deal of planning and problem solving. Issues of scheduling and transportation alone will present significant challenges to making this student exchange program work. However, given the current and future fiscal challenges, it is important to examine the possibilities.

The enrollments in the four core academic courses for both districts are solid as are the enrollments in the electives that are offered. The opportunities for creating a richer program of electives in the core areas as well as in technology, business, music, and art can come from sharing either students or sharing teachers.

Adding additional courses may be difficult financially for one district but the potential for creating a cost effective approach to sharing courses between districts would make it more of a possibility. In a student exchange, students would move to the other district's high school for part of the day, similar to the model that is used to have students in career and technical education classes spend part of their day at BOCES.

What might a student exchange program look like for the students in Beekmantown and Plattsburgh? As an example, let us assume that the districts are interested in restarting the Project Lead the Way program in Plattsburgh and adding business offerings in Beekmantown. Beekmantown students interested in the engineering field would spend part of their day in Beekmantown and part of their day in Plattsburgh.

While in Plattsburgh, these Beekmantown students might take two to three classes including one or more Project Lead the Way classes. This would stabilize the enrollment in the Project Lead the Way courses and ensure that these courses would be available to students into the future. Likewise, the Plattsburgh students who have an interest in the business world would spend part of their day in Beekmantown taking classes such as marketing, business math, financial math, or accounting. Given sufficient student interest in business at Beekmantown, the business offerings could grow to add additional business courses such as business law or sports management.

There will be issues associated with implementing this student exchange program. The time that students spend on the bus is the first hurdle to be addressed. The cost of that transportation and the logistics associated therewith will be the second challenge. Negotiating necessary changes with the teacher unions will also present challenges. Much like students who attend BOCES programs, it is anticipated that students should be scheduled for classes in the other high school for 2-3 periods per day. Could upper level students from Plattsburgh take their upper level English, Social Studies, and business classes in Beekmantown while upper level Beekmantown students take their upper level math, science, and engineering courses in Plattsburgh? If this were to occur, clearly the two high school schedules would have to be adjusted to allow for the appropriate programming and the 20-minute bus ride between schools. Clearly, this is no small task...but if providing the richest program possible to the students of both districts is the top priority, consideration must be given to this idea.

School districts in Wayne County, New York offered similar student exchange programs for the first time in 2011-12. Following up on a study of regional high schools in the county, the BOCES is now offering satellite academic programs at host districts to be shared by surrounding school districts. Sharing the course offerings allows a pooling of resources and creates a critical number of students to maintain or expand curriculum offerings for students. A listing of the courses offered is shown in Appendix 1.

A similar type of arrangement began five years ago among three school districts located south of Syracuse. Fabius-Pompey, Lafayette, and Tully High Schools had a program of sharing in which Fabius-Pompey offered business courses, Lafayette offered the pre-engineering program, Project Lead the Way, and Tully offered agriculture. Students from any of these districts that wished to take the cluster of courses offered in

the either of the other districts are transported to that high school for the program. While the sharing existed for four years, in the current year there are no students taking part in the process even though the districts still support the concept.

There would be a cost associated with this student exchange program. Other than agreement on the part of both the sending and host high schools, and a convenient scheduling arrangement for the students, there would ordinarily be transportation and program costs. However, there would also be savings associated with this program if small sections could be reduced in each high school. Depending on the number of students and the number of programs affected, the costs/savings could vary widely. It appears that students in both high schools could potentially benefit from this exchange program. It is for this reason that, as part of the planning for this exchange program, an agreement should be reached that for the first three years, the student exchange program would be offered by both districts without charging any type of tuition. Further, each district would assume the cost of transporting its students to the other high school. All costs would be monitored for this three-year period. At the end of the three-year pilot period, further discussions would be held to develop appropriate financing for the student exchange program.

The other type of sharing is through the sharing of teachers. In many ways, it is easier to move one teacher than 15 students. For teachers whose course enrollments may be low, having the teacher offer classes in the other district for 2 or 3 periods a day may enable the expansion of electives available to students in both districts. Barriers to sharing a teacher may include contractual restrictions in one or both of the districts' teacher contracts, complexities related to the implementation of the APPR, and staff resistance. Another approach that has been used for many years across the state is to contract with BOCES for an itinerant teacher to provide instruction in one or both of the districts. The advantage to this approach is that it may be easily expanded to additional districts. The other advantage is that BOCES aid is provided for itinerant teachers. BOCES is allowed to offer itinerant teachers for advanced or remedial courses as well as for courses in foreign language, technology, business, home and careers, art and music.

Using technology for shared instructional opportunities

Sharing high school and college classes using technology is growing in usage. E-learning, or electronic learning, is a term that is being used to describe student learning through a digital medium. E-learning can be divided into the following two types of course delivery:

a. *On-line courses*-designed to be taken on a self-paced schedule, these courses can be accessed and completed by students anywhere and anytime. While this type of learning is not for everyone, it is utilized in many New York State high schools. Currently, there are a number of applications that might enhance student-learning opportunities. These include credit recovery, homebound students, electives, and low enrollment classes.

Opportunities for on-line courses exist throughout the state. AccelerateU is a form of online learning that is currently a service offered by the Wayne-Finger Lakes BOCES. This program has been used by a number of school districts in New York State for a number of years. Each online course is “instructor-led” meaning that every student is guided by a teacher. Each of the teachers is a certified teacher in New York State and every course offers high school credit. The teacher provides information, answers questions, grades projects, and informs the student’s home school district on the student’s weekly progress. Teachers communicate with students several times per week through messaging or email. The amount of material and level of difficulty is at least equal to that of a traditional high school class.

The courses that are available through AccelerateU for the 2013-14 school year are as follows:

Accounting A	Algebra 2B
Accounting B	American History 1A
Advanced Composition	American History 1B
Advanced Phys Ed A	Anthropology 1
Advanced Phys Ed B	Anthropology 2
Algebra 1A	AP Biology A
Algebra 1B	AP Biology B
Algebra 2A	AP Calculus A

AP Calculus B	Chemistry 1B
AP Chemistry A	Chinese 1A
AP Chemistry B	Chinese 1B
AP Computer Science A	Civics
AP Computer Science B	Consumer Math 1A
AP English Language & Comp A	Consumer Math 1B
AP English Language & Comp B	Creative Writing A
AP French A	Creative Writing B
AP French B	Criminology
AP Microeconomics	Digital Photography 1
AP Music Theory A	Digital Photography 2
AP Music Theory B	Earth Science 1A
AP Physics A	Earth Science 1B
AP Physics B	Economics
AP Psychology	English 9A
AP Spanish A	English 9B
AP Spanish B	English 10A
AP Statistics A	English 10B
AP Statistics B	English 11A
AP US Government	English 11B
AP US History A	English 12A
AP US History B	English 12B
AP World History A	Exercise Science
AP World History B	Flexibility Training
Archeology	Forensic Science 1
Astronomy	Forensic Science 2
Beginning Composition	French 1A
Calculus 1A	French 1B
Calculus 1B	French 2A
Career Planning	French 2B
Chemistry 1A	French 3A

French 3B	Mythology & Folklore
French 4A	Nutrition & Wellness
French 4B	Nutrition
Geometry 1A	Oceanography
Geometry 1B	Participation in Government
German 1A	Personal Economics & Finance
German 1B	Personal Fitness & Health
German 2A	Personal Psychology 1
German 2B	Personal Psychology 2
German 3A	Philosophy
German 3B	Phys Ed 1
German 4A	Phys Ed 2
German 4B	Physical Science 1A
Global Studies A	Physical Science 1B
Global Studies B	Physics 1A
Gothic Literature	Physics 1B
Great Minds in Science	Pre-Algebra 1A
Group Sports	Pre-Algebra 1B
Health & Personal Wellness	Pre-Calculus 1A
Health Science	Pre-Calculus 1B
Hospitality & Tourism	Real World Parenting
Human Geography	Running
Individual Sports	Social Problems 1 Social Problems 2
International Business	Sociology 1
Law & Order-Legal Studies	Sociology 2
Life Skills	Spanish 1A
Living Environment 1A	Spanish 1B
Living Environment 1B	Spanish 2A
Music Appreciation	Spanish 2B
Music Theory A	Spanish 3A
Music Theory B	Spanish 3B

Spanish 4A

Trigonometry

Spanish 4B

Veterinary Science

Strength Training

Walking Fitness

There are numerous online courses that are currently available through the other BOCES throughout New York State as well as SUNY colleges. Course content, access to courses, and costs for participation vary from one BOCES and institution to another. The districts are encouraged to explore the various options and determine which might best meet the needs of the students in Beekmantown and Plattsburgh.

In recommending consideration of on-line learning opportunities for students, it is clear that not everyone thinks that on-line learning is an ideal way of learning for all students. However, with the financial pressures that will demand that districts look more closely at the viability of offering low enrollment classes, new options must be explored. On line learning is a growing phenomenon in higher education. Most students in their college careers will be exposed to one or more E-learning courses and there is evidence that this experience will be incorporated into secondary education programs more and more.

b. *Distance learning* - designed to have students at various locations take the same course at the same time through the use of technology. Distance learning has been delivered for the past twenty years through specially designed labs in high schools. More recently, less expensive options have also been made available through the use of specially equipped moveable carts that are rolled in and out of classrooms as needed.

The North East Regional Information Center (NERIC) provides technology support to these two districts and also offers distance learning and on-line course programs for districts. Currently neither district uses distance-learning services from NERIC.

More than 113 class sessions are available through the NERIC's distance learning system that uses stand-alone distance learning labs. The range of available course opportunities is varied and is determined by the consortium of participating districts. Courses range from Virtual Advanced Placement courses in Economics, Art History, and English Literature to courses in Japanese, Chinese, Business Law, and Marine Biology. A full listing of the courses offered for this year is available from the NERIC website at

http://dl.neric.org/bdlp/Schedule_Grid_Fall_2013_All_Schools.htm or can be found in Appendix 2.

The distance-learning approach that is used is a synchronous video model with a teacher in one district teaching to students in two or three other districts. Utilizing the distance learning system requires a dedicated distance-learning classroom that is equipped with technology that enables teachers to easily operate the equipment without interfering with teaching. The cost to build a dedicated distance-learning classroom is approximately \$80,000. The ongoing costs for participating in the program would be \$57,000 for each district for up to 9 courses offered a day. (The actual cost for the distance learning service is \$75,000 including participation in the Wide Area Network (WAN). Both districts currently participate in the WAN and pay for that part of the service). All of these costs are eligible for BOCES aid.

Table 6.20 provides a model of the cost for providing courses through the distance-learning model. Although participating districts may access 9 courses a day, this model conservatively assumes the use of only 4 courses. The model includes a local cost for supervising the students while they are in the distance-learning environment. For this example, it is assumed that supervision is provided by a teaching assistant, at an estimated cost for the four periods of supervision of \$12,150 (assuming a base salary of \$18,000, 35% in benefits, and one half-day of the teaching assistant’s assignment). Supervision may include basic supervision of one or more students participating in a distance learning course or ancillary support for a student with a disability. For purposes of the financial model, it is also assumed that the cost of the teaching assistant is not eligible for BOCES aid reimbursement.

Table 6.20 Cost of Providing Distance Learning for 4 courses		
Item	Expenditure	Annual Local Cost, After 50% BOCES aid
Dedicated distance learning classroom (one time cost)	\$80,000	\$40,000
BOCES Program Charge	\$57,000	\$28,500
Local Supervision	\$12,150	\$12,150
Total – Initial Year	\$149,150	\$80,650
Total – Following Years	\$69,150	\$40,300

The net cost of the first year of \$80,650 is a significant investment. However, if either or both districts are looking for ways to maintain and expand high school offerings, the first year's investment will pay off in future years.

Another e-learning service that is available uses portable "electronic learning" systems. These rolling carts are equipped with a large flat screen TV, computer, camera, microphone, and related technology that allow a teacher to communicate with students in multiple classrooms in multiple locations and to see and hear each other in real time.

The electronic learning systems along with their related technology are currently available on the New York State purchasing contract. A teaching station costs approximately \$20,000 - \$25,000. If this equipment is purchased as part of a BOCES E-learning service, the equipment and other costs related to this delivery method could be eligible for BOCES aid.

In creating a model for this E-learning option, it is assumed that each high school would serve both as a host site for course transmission as well as a receiving site. The transmitting district would have its students sitting in the classroom where the teacher is teaching the course; the receiving district would have its students sitting in its high school receiving the course electronically. To illustrate the programmatic and financial viability of this distance learning arrangement, a model is provided that assumes four current courses to be transmitted from each high school to other district.

The "model" cost calculation assumes that each district would annually purchase one expanded distance learning system through BOCES. The unit purchased in each successive year would serve as an additional unit or as a replacement unit. The model assumes that the current cost of an E-Learning unit is approximately \$25,000. If the districts' BOCES aid ratio averages 50%, the purchase of an E-Learning system would be offset by half of the cost in BOCES aid received in *the following school year*. In this case the district would receive \$12,500 in BOCES aid the following year. If the district was to use this \$12,500 in BOCES aid as a revenue source for the purchase of an additional \$25,000 unit, the district could purchase this additional unit at a net cost of \$12,500. Continuing to roll over BOCES aid as an annual revenue source, the district can continue to keep state of the art technology at a relatively moderate annual cost. The

purchase of one E-Learning system per year is sufficient, since each unit can be relocated from room to room.

Beyond the technology cost, the current BOCES charge for participation in this service is \$19,000. This again is offset by the 50% BOCES aid, bringing the local net cost for the four courses to \$9,500.

Lastly, the example includes a local cost for supervising the students while they are in the distance-learning environment. For this example, it is assumed that supervision is provided by a teaching assistant, at an estimated cost for the four periods of supervision of \$12,150 (assuming a base salary of \$18,000, 35% in benefits, and one-half day of the teaching assistant’s assignment). Supervision may include basic supervision of one or more students participating in a distance learning course or ancillary support for a student with a disability. For purposes of the financial model, it is also assumed that the cost of the teaching assistant is not eligible for BOCES aid reimbursement.

The total cost for providing four courses the expanded distance learning is illustrated in the table that follows.

Table 6.21 Cost of Providing E-learning		
Item	Annual Expenditure	Annual Local Cost, After 50% BOCES aid
E-Learning System	\$25,000	\$12,500
BOCES Program Charge	\$19,000	\$9,500
Local Supervision	\$12,150	\$12,150
Total	\$56,150	\$34,150

This net cost of \$34,150 compares favorably to the cost for providing the teachers for four academic classes. Moreover, it clearly demonstrates the cost effectiveness, through collaboration, that can be achieved by the two districts in the future as they seek to maintain the quality of their instructional programs. Again, it should be remembered that BOCES aid follows the year after the service is purchased so that it is incumbent on the district to generate the full cost of the program in its first year of operation.

Finally, once distance learning is made available in a high school, there is no limit to the course opportunities, thereby significantly enhancing the learning opportunities for

students. The addition of other distance learning opportunities in a district becomes even more cost effective. Since the BOCES program charge is only paid once per year and since the E-Learning system has the capability to serve several classrooms in a day, adding more courses is an attractive, cost effective option.

This section of the report examines the performance of high school students on Regents examinations. Table 6.22 that follows looks at this data.

Table 6.22 High School Regents Exam Performance									
Regents Examination	Year	No. Tested		% at or above 55%		% at or above 65%		% at or above 85%	
		BKN	PLH	BKN	PLH	BKN	PLH	BKN	PLH
English	09-10	175	43	96	81	89	67	48	19
	10-11	156	133	97	95	93	87	42	39
	11-12	132	153	96	90	83	80	36	25
	12-13	141	159	97	94	92	85	43	30
Algebra	09-10	189	149	97	99	92	93	11	20
	10-11	177	162	93	92	85	83	12	16
	11-12	83	190	98	91	82	76	11	17
	12-13	111	199	95	95	77	74	10	14
Geometry	09-10	83	101	96	97	86	81	12	26
	10-11	131	106	95	96	76	87	13	26
	11-12	3	109	100	99	100	89	33	30
	12-13	104	100	92	94	84	77	26	28
Global History	09-10	108	139	94	92	83	81	33	41
	10-11	166	149	94	95	86	86	37	35
	11-12	147	163	98	94	87	84	46	40
	12-13	121	138	90	91	80	80	36	30
US History	09-10	175	150	95	98	88	95	51	59
	10-11	154	137	94	96	89	89	58	53
	11-12	128	141	95	98	88	94	49	50
	12-13	151	136	95	96	85	93	64	60
Living Environment	09-10	142	126	99	98	96	96	59	49
	10-11	172	127	95	99	92	98	41	49
	11-12	121	153	97	99	93	96	41	50
	12-13	151	121	96	100	89	92	33	50
Earth Science	09-10	186	122	95	95	89	83	29	37
	10-11	134	151	93	89	82	78	29	31
	11-12	86	119	92	91	86	82	28	33
	12-13	65	116	97	91	92	75	25	34
Chemistry	09-10	82	58	95	97	76	86	10	14

	10-11	92	27	100	100	84	93	25	15
	11-12	87	58	97	93	86	67	22	10
	12-13	97	63	99	97	88	79	22	8
Physics	09-10	28	23	86	100	71	100	18	78
	10-11	38	-	89	-	79	-	34	-
	11-12	38	45	95	98	79	87	32	36
	12-13	26	72	100	97	81	82	19	32

As is the case when comparing any student achievement data, there are times when the performance of Beekmantown students exceeds that of the Plattsburgh students and there are other times when the performance of Plattsburgh students exceeds that of Beekmantown students. All in all, however, it is again true that the student performance results on Regents examinations are fairly similar. This is an important insight for districts that are considering the sharing of student academic services. When student performance is dramatically differently in two schools, one district or the other is often reluctant to consider sharing arrangements. However, given the similarity of student performance in the grades 3-8 assessments and the Regents examinations, there should be a genuine interest and openness to sharing in the academic arena.

Any time that a discussion begins about sharing academic services between two high schools, the issue of the bell schedule always arises. Table 6.23 which follows shows the high school bell schedules for the two districts.

Table 6.23 High School Bell Schedules				
Beekmantown			Plattsburgh	
Period	Time		Period	Time
1	7:45 – 8:30		1	8:05 – 8:45
2	8:33 – 9:14		2	8:49 – 9:31
3	9:17 – 9:58		3	9:35 – 10:15
4	10:01 – 10:42		4	10:19 – 10:59
5	10:45 – 11:26		5	11:03 – 11:43
6	11:29 – 12:10		6	11:47 – 12: 27
7	12:13 – 12:54		7	12:11 – 12:20
8	12:57 – 1:38		8	1:15 – 1:56
9	1:41 – 2:22		9	2:00 – 2:40

It is apparent from Table 6.23 above that the daily high school schedules of the two districts are relatively similar. The student day begins twenty minutes earlier in

Beekmantown than in Plattsburgh and ends eighteen minutes earlier. The length of the periods in the two districts is similar. Regular Beekmantown periods are 41 minutes in length while most of the Plattsburgh periods are 40 minutes long, one period is 42 minutes and one is 41 minutes long.

High school bell schedules are vitally important since they form the structure for sharing academic and other services for students. It will be important for the staffs from both districts to meet to discuss their current schedules and tweak them in order to develop a more similar high school bell schedule to allow for program sharing. This may require negotiation and agreement with one or both of the districts’ unions depending upon contract provisions.

There is good news for staff who choose to undertake this work. In southern Onondaga County, four school districts have recently agreed to develop a common high school bell schedule so that sharing of students and other programs could be facilitated. Fabius-Pompey, Tully, Lafayette, and Onondaga have recently adopted the same high school bell schedule in order to facilitate sharing.

Special Education

Both districts pursue a variety of options in educating their students with disabilities. Beekmantown had 363 students with disabilities in the 2012-13 school year representing 19.1% of its K-12 population of 1896. In 2012-13, Plattsburgh had 319 students with disabilities that represented 17.4% of its K - 12 enrollment of 1,831 students.

Table 6.24 Percentage of Students with Disabilities (SWD)					
Year	Beekmantown			Plattsburgh	
	# SWD	% SWD		# SWD	% SWD
2010-11	365	18.9%		396	21.6%
2011-12	364	19.0%		427	22.8%
2012-13	363	19.1%		319	17.2%
2013-14	362	19.2%		351	18.7%

Beekmantown currently runs 31 special education classes and Plattsburgh runs 36 classes. Both districts have 6:1:1, 8:1:1, 12:1:1, 12:1:2, 12:1:3, and 15:1:1 programs. In

addition to these classes, some students are sent out of the district for services. This can be shown in the following table.

Table 6.25 Out of District Placements for Students with Disabilities			
Beekmantown		Plattsburgh	
Number of Students	Placement	Number of Students	Placement
11	CVES BOCES	13	CVES BOCES
4	Residential Programs <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mountain Lake Academy • The Kessler Center • Tradewinds Education Center • George Junior Republic 		

Each district educates the vast majority of its students with disabilities in district with only a very small percentage of students attending programs at the BOCES.

Consideration should be given to sharing opportunities in special education. It may well be possible to share placement of students in programs in the other district when specific student needs or ages are difficult to meet within the district. One approach to developing increased sharing of special education classes would be to plan regular meetings of the special education administrators or CSEs from both districts to become familiar with the programs that are available in all locations. It is not within the purview of this report to calculate the cost savings that might be associated with sharing students in special education classrooms. An analysis of each child would have to be made to determine if placement in the other district would be appropriate and if there is room in the appropriate classroom.

Special education staffing is comprised of teachers, related service providers, and teaching assistants. Special education teacher staffing in both districts is similar with 33 special education teachers in Beekmantown and 34 in Plattsburgh.

In addition to the teaching positions, both districts use a number of staff to provide related services to students. The table that follows shows the current level of related service providers.

Table 6.26 Related Service Staff		
Service	Beekmantown	Plattsburgh
Occupational Therapy	2.0 FTE	3.0 FTE
Physical Therapy	1.8 FTE	1 .0 FTE
Speech	7.0 FTE	7.0 FTE
Psychology	4.0 FTE	8.5 FTE
Teacher of the Deaf		.5 FTE (BOCES)
Interpreter		.5 FTE (BOCES)
Counselor		1 hour per week (BOCES)

As can be seen from the table above, the provision of related services to students is also fairly similar in the two districts. They differ in the number of psychologists and Plattsburgh’s use of the services of a teacher of the deaf, interpreter, and a counselor who signs are all because of the IEP requirements for one student.

It is clear that most of the related service providers in the two districts are full time employees. For that reason, there is probably little reason for considering the sharing of these positions. However, should the need for these types of positions increase but without requiring full time employees, there may be the opportunity to have discussions about the potential for sharing related service providers. Consideration should also be given to having these services provided through BOCES part-time employees. If these services are all provided to students with disabilities, there will probably be no aid advantage to running these services through BOCES. However, if these services are provided to regular education students, there may be financial advantages to sharing this staff through BOCES.

CHAPTER 7 EXTRA-CURRICULAR ACTIVITIES

School athletic teams are often a great sense of pride for a community. In addition, there is a significant amount of research that shows a strong correlation between participation in extra-curricular activities and student success in high school. Oftentimes, districts are highly protective of their teams.

This chapter shows each of the sports that are offered in Beekmantown and Plattsburgh as well as the participation levels for each of the sports. It should be emphasized that the participation rates for these sports were taken from the 2012-13 school year only. Table 7.1 that follows shows the athletic teams that were offered by each district along with the district's participation for each sport.

Table 7.1 Athletic Participation-2012-13		
Sport	Beekmantown	Plattsburgh
Baseball, Varsity	14	12
Baseball, JV	13	18
Baseball, Modified	15	20
Basketball, Varsity Boys	11	14
Basketball, JV Boys	13	13
Basketball, Modified Boys	13	12
Basketball, Varsity Girls	14	12
Basketball, JV Girls	13	11
Basketball, Modified Girls	12	12
Bowling, Boys	14	14
Bowling, Girls	7	10
Varsity Football Cheerleading	12	10
Varsity Basketball Cheerleading	16	8
Cross County Boys and Girls	26	8
Girls Varsity Cross Country	7	11
Girls Modified Cross Country	1	4
Boys Varsity Cross Country	12	16
Boys Modified Cross Country	1	7
Modified Cross Country	12	
Football, Varsity	26	22
Football, JV	37	31
Football, Modified	54	38
Golf, Boys	10	14
Gymnastic, Varsity	8	16

Gymnastics, Modified	4	12
Hockey, Girls	17	
Hockey, Boys	24	18
Indoor Track, Boys	-	15
Indoor Track, Girls	-	40
Soccer, Varsity Boys	18	21
Soccer, Junior Varsity Boys	14	19
Soccer, Modified Boys	14	18
Soccer, Varsity Girls	19	18
Soccer, Junior Varsity Girls	18	18
Soccer, Modified Girls	19	15
Softball, Varsity	11	15
Softball, JV	12	18
Softball, Modified	12	20
Swimming, Boys Varsity	-	29
Swimming, Boys Modified	-	19
Swimming, Varsity Girls	-	25
Swimming, Modified Girls	-	8
Swimming	1	
Tennis, Boys	-	11
Tennis, Girls	15	11
Track, Boys	39	17
Track, Girls	32	34
Track and Field, Modified Boys/Girls	24	
Volleyball, Varsity	15	15
Volleyball, JV	12	14
Volleyball, Modified	14	14
Wrestling JV/Varsity	21	
Wrestling, Modified	5	

In examining the participation rates in the previous table, it is clear that many sports are offered at both schools. In addition, both districts are able to offer most of the major sports at the varsity, junior varsity, and modified levels. Swimming is not offered in Beekmantown but is offered in Plattsburgh. Wrestling is not offered at Plattsburgh but is offered in Beekmantown. In the 2013-14 school year, Plattsburgh had to cancel most of its varsity football season because of having too few students on the team. Beekmantown has a gymnastics team whose participation level has not been strong....and there are only three districts in the area that compete in gymnastics.

In order to provide a larger number of athletic opportunities for the students in both districts, there is some sharing of athletic teams that is currently occurring.

Beekmantown shares boys' ice hockey with Chazy, gymnastics with Saranac, girls' swimming with Peru, and boys' swimming with Plattsburgh. Plattsburgh also shares a hockey team with Seton Catholic. In addition, there is a girls' hockey team that is shared between six school districts in the region but this team is not school sponsored.

Consideration should be given to beginning a conversation about the sharing of athletic teams between the two districts in the future. It is clearly understood that the discussion of changing a school district's athletic program in any way is a very difficult conversation. This is not an urgent conversation. However, the time will come for this conversation given the current and future challenges associated with interscholastic athletics at Beekmantown and Plattsburgh. These conversations must focus on creating as many opportunities as possible for the students. Competition to win and athletic memories must take a back seat to increasing opportunities for students.

Table 7.2 presents a summary of the clubs and extracurricular activities offered by each district's high school in 2012-13 and the number of students participating in each. It should be noted that clubs and extra-curricular activities are those activities for which no academic credit is given. In addition to those activities listed in table 7.2, both districts offer solid programming for high school credit as well as the opportunities to participate in recognition activities such as All-County, Area All State, and the New York State School Music Association (NYSSMA) chorus, band, and orchestra.

Table 7.2 High School Clubs/Extra-Curricular Activities-2012-13		
Activity	Beekmantown	Plattsburgh
College for Every Student		10
Creative Arts Club		15
Drama Club		100
Future Business Leaders of America (FBLA)		10
French Club		10
Gay Straight Alliance		10
Green Team		20
German American Partnership Program (GAPP)		30
Key Club		60
Model UN	25	10
Multicultural club		20
National Honor Society	35	25
Peer Mentoring	20	20
Science Olympiad		30
Spanish Club		10
Student Association		5
Team ACT		10
Harvard UN	8	

In analyzing the table above, many activities have significant levels of participation while others might benefit from having participation from a larger number of students. Consideration should be given to allowing students from each district to participate in the clubs of the other district.

Additional clubs could also be started that could be shared between the two districts. Most districts are usually willing to start any club in which there is sufficient student interest and a faculty advisor can be secured. Districts find clubs much more affordable than inter-scholastic athletics and much easier to administer. This would appear to be a relatively easy area for the two study districts to share services. Especially where participation rates are relatively low, opening participation to students from the other district would provide stability to the activities. Arranging opportunities for student activities to be shared would also open up the opportunity to expand the number of activities available to students of the two districts.

CHAPTER 8 FINANCE

In addition to enhancing educational opportunities for students, a second major consideration in any discussion of sharing services involves finances. Therefore, this section of the report provides an overview of the financial condition of each study district and offers insight into the potential financial ramifications of the districts sharing financial services.

As table 8.1 below illustrates, the residents of both Beekmantown and Plattsburgh typically support annual spending plans put forth by their respective boards of education.

Table 8.1 Budget Vote History*									
	Beekmantown					Plattsburgh			
Year	YES	NO	Total	% YES		YES	NO	Total	% YES
2003-04	542	466	1008	53.8		662	402	1064	62.2
2004-05	445	424	869	51.2		465	378	843	55.2
2005-06	455	583	1038	43.8		515	404	919	56.0
05-06 Revote	858	742	1600	53.6					
2006-07	677	415	1092	62.0		534	317	851	62.7
2007-08	572	388	960	59.6		392	313	705	55.6
2008-09	393	215	608	64.6		453	149	602	75.2
2009-10	554	225	779	71.1		301	171	472	63.8
2010-11	418	111	529	79.0		610	491	1101	55.4
2011-12*	746	730	1476	50.5		554	429	983	56.4
2012-13	900	579	1479	60.9		729	1365	2094	34.8
2013-14	654	385	1039	62.9		795	745	1540	51.6

*The Commissioner of Education ruled that the 5/17/2011 vote was voided and a revote was to be held on 6/30/2011. The results of the 6/30/2011 revote was 843 Yes votes and 1335 No votes.

Over the past eleven years, the budget vote has passed in each district every year but one. This is truly a remarkable record for both districts and shows tremendous community support for their school spending plans.

With respect to recent capital project votes, support has been equally impressive. In 2008, the Beekmantown voters approved a capital project by a vote of 385 yes to 211 no. In 2004, Beekmantown approved a capital project by a vote of 380 yes to 358 no and

in 1994, a vote for a project was also approved 147 to 86. Similar success for capital project votes in Plattsburgh occurred in 2008 with a vote of 428 yes to 151 no, in 2007 with a vote of 437 yes to 252 no, in 2003 with a vote of 299 yes to 207 no, and in 2000 with a vote of 667 yes to 128 no.

It is quite apparent that these two districts have received significant community support for their schools. As a result, both districts have facilities that are in good condition.

Both school districts are large businesses in their communities. They employ a large number of people and represent a significant investment on the part of their communities. The districts are also quite similar in the expenditures represented in their school budgets. The 2013-14 budget in Beekmantown is \$38,606,071 and in Plattsburgh it is \$39,632,807.

As noted elsewhere in this report, school districts are facing the most challenging fiscal times ever. Increases in costs, reductions in state aid, and a cap on the amount that can be raised by local property taxes have made the financial management of public schools very difficult. Table 8.3 that follows shows the operating surplus or deficit of the districts' school budgets over the past five years.

Table 8.2 Operating Surplus or Deficit		
Year	Beekmantown	Plattsburgh
2007-08	-0.30%	3.90%
2008-09	6.30%	3.00%
2009-10	1.20%	3.60%
2010-11	-7.91%	-3.29%
2011-12	-3.25%	-2.99%

As can be seen in table 8.2, these two districts are operating very close to their budget limits. Where a deficit is shown in the table above, the use of reserve funds from the district's budget must be used to balance the expenditures and the revenues.

Another tool that school districts use to deal with the difficult fiscal times is to create and fund reserve accounts as a means to mitigate against future cost obligations. Table 8.3 that follows tracks the unreserved fund balance for the study districts for the past five years.

Table 8.3 Unreserved Fund Balance as a Percent of Total Expenditures		
Year	Beekmantown	Plattsburgh
2007-08	19.30%	7.30%
2008-09	24.50%	7.50%
2009-10	26.70%	9.60%
2010-11	8.63%	4.14%
2011-12	6.62%	3.77%

As can be seen in table 8.3, the unreserved fund balance has been declining in both districts over the past five years. This is not an unusual trend for school districts in New York State and is indicative of the financial challenges facing these districts.

Finally, we examine the full value tax rate history of the two districts. The full value tax rate is the only way to compare tax rates from one district to another even though it is not the same assessed rate that drives the actual calculation of taxes for a property owner.

Table 8.4 History of Full Value Tax Rates		
Year	Beekmantown	Plattsburgh
2008-09	\$16.91	\$20.60
2009-10	\$16.35	\$20.60
2010-11	\$15.46	\$20.96
2011-12	\$16.71	\$21.36
2012-13	\$16.88	\$21.56
2013-14	\$17.22	\$21.36

As can be seen from the table above, the local tax rates for the two districts have remained quite constant over the past six years. Over the past six year period shown in the table, the tax rate in Beekmantown has increased by 1.8% while the tax rate in Plattsburgh has increased by 3.7%. It is clear that both boards of education have placed a high priority on keeping the tax rate in their communities very level.

Given the data that has been reviewed in this study, it is clear that these two school districts have planned well for the challenging fiscal times ahead. However, it is anticipated that the challenging times of the past will continue into the future. Programs and staff are being eliminated in many school districts. Fund balances are being depleted to finance recurring expenses without being replenished. Studies across the state are

projecting the year in which school districts will run out of money. School districts in New York State are now fighting for their financial survival. These are the very real challenges that are also facing Beekmantown and Plattsburgh. While the districts have managed their money well and are in a sound fiscal condition today, the future is very challenging. From a financial perspective, this is the basis for this shared services study. Both districts are interested in continuing to provide the best possible education for their students while maintaining the tax rate for their residents at manageable levels. Sharing services might help to accomplish this goal.

CHAPTER 9

ADMINISTRATIVE AND SUPERVISORY SERVICES

As school districts all over New York State look to optimize student programming with limited resources, consolidations or staff reductions are often necessary. Seventy to seventy-five percent of most school district budgets are devoted to paying staff salaries and fringe benefits. Significant savings can only be realized by reducing staff. If staff reductions, either through lay offs or through attrition, are inevitable, districts generally want to make changes by reducing their instructional program only as a last resort.

Given this priority to maintain student programs, districts often look to consolidate functions that support the educational program rather than to make reductions at the classroom level. It has become quite commonplace in the last decade for school districts to look to consolidate support services. This has become known as functional consolidation. This initiative is based on the belief that not every school district has to provide its own support services or its own supervision for support services. Typical school support functions like operations and maintenance, business, food service, and transportation would be categorized as support services and would be under prime consideration for functional consolidation. The purpose of this chapter is to examine those opportunities for functional consolidation that may exist in Beekmantown and Plattsburgh, with the recognition that sharing administrative and supervisory services may save money but may also impact the way that services are delivered.

Organizational Structure

The organizational structure in Beekmantown is relatively flat. The Superintendent directly supervises eleven staff members including the four building principals, the Director of Special Services, the Technology Coordinator, the School Business Executive, the Superintendent of Buildings and Grounds, the School Lunch Manager, the Coordinator of Athletics, and the Transportation Supervisor.

In Plattsburgh, the instructional portion of the organization is similar to Beekmantown in that the five building principals and the Director of Special Education report directly to the Superintendent. However, in Plattsburgh, the Director of Buildings, Grounds, and Transportation, the Technology Coordinator, and the Director of Food Service all report to the Associate Superintendent who reports directly to the

Superintendent of Schools. The Chief Information Officer also reports directly to the Superintendent.

Superintendent's Office

The superintendent is the chief executive officer of the school district. Both Beekmantown and Plattsburgh have a superintendent and a superintendent's secretary. This is very standard practice in New York State. However, in light of the current economic conditions, there has been an increasing interest in having school districts share a superintendent.

Section 1981 of the New York State education law allows school districts to share a superintendent. For the 2012-13 school year, the St. Regis Falls and Brushton-Moira central school districts in northern New York are sharing a superintendent. In addition, a shared superintendent can be found in Downsville and Roscoe in the southern tier as well as in Barker and Roylton-Hartland in the western part of New York State. These arrangements are being watched carefully by school districts across the state. A limited number of other shared superintendent arrangements exist across the state but those involve tiny K-6 or K-8 districts.

There are advantages and disadvantages to sharing a superintendent that are generally accepted across the state. One advantage is obvious-it can save the school districts money. Another advantage is that the superintendent's immediate access to both districts may provide opportunities to discover ways to develop efficiencies between the two districts and save the districts even more money.

On the other hand, there appear to be some disadvantages. Can a superintendent effectively serve two communities? If the perceptions of the effectiveness of the superintendent vary from one board of education to another, problems could arise. How will the superintendent show allegiance to both communities? Will the longevity of the superintendent be shortened by having to attend twice as many board meetings, school concerts, and athletic events? How will a crisis be handled in District A if the superintendent is in District B? The shared superintendent arrangements that are being used in New York State this year will hopefully shed additional light on this way of sharing services.

In light of the issues surrounding the sharing arrangement for superintendents, consideration should be given to the two study districts sharing a superintendent. In offering this consideration, it is suggested that each district would maintain its superintendent's secretary. Currently, the cost of operating the superintendents' offices, the cost of sharing a superintendent, and the savings realized are seen in table 9.1 that follows. In determining the salaries of the shared personnel, the salary of the higher paid individual in any position is used. That salary is then increased by 10% for the responsibilities associated with a second district.

Table 9.1 Personnel Cost of the Superintendents' Offices-Salaries and Benefits @ 35%	
Item	Cost
1 superintendent in Beekmantown	\$190,193
1 superintendent in Plattsburgh	\$237,519
Total cost	\$427,712
1 superintendent shared 50%/50%	\$261,270
Total savings by sharing position	\$166,442
Individual district cost for sharing position 50%/5%	\$130,635
Savings for Beekmantown by sharing position	\$59,558
Savings for Plattsburgh by sharing position	\$106,884

In examining the costs associated with the personnel costs of the superintendents' offices, it should be noted that salaries always differ from one school district to another. Factors that influence these costs can change periodically so that one office that might appear to be more costly in one year may turn out to be less costly in another year.

In calculating the cost of the shared superintendent, the higher superintendent's salary was used. The salary was then increased by 10% to cover the additional responsibilities of serving both districts. Assuming a 50%/50% share of the position, each district would pay \$130,635 for the shared superintendent. Using this model, Beekmantown would save \$59,558 and Plattsburgh would save \$106,884. This scenario is being offered for consideration; it is not being recommended. It will be up to each

district to determine whether or not the savings identified above is worth the “loss” of a superintendent for half of the time.

Savings for the districts are determined by calculating the difference between the current cost in a particular area and the cost for that district as part of a shared service. This calculation will yield different levels of savings for the two districts. In most cases, the district that initially has the higher cost will end up showing the larger amount of savings in a shared arrangement.

Business Office Operations

Beekmantown’s general fund budget is \$38,606,071 while the budget in Plattsburgh is \$39,632,807. Both Beekmantown and Plattsburgh have a business office that is responsible for managing the financial affairs of the districts. Both of the business offices are operated quite similarly. Both business offices have a chief financial officer called School Business Executive in Beekmantown and Associate Superintendent in Plattsburgh.

Consideration should be given to consolidating the management of the two business offices in Beekmantown and Plattsburgh. In offering this consideration, it is understood that the business officials are more than managers of people and that they also perform some of the daily business functions of the office and supervise other staff members. For purposes of this report, it is assumed that the position of business official is shared equally between the two districts and that the higher paid of the current business officials is hired for this position with a salary increase of 10% added to this individual’s salary for handling both districts. Based on these assumptions, the following table shows the savings that would result.

Table 9.2 Personnel Cost of District Business Officials-Salaries and Benefits @ 35%	
Item	Cost
1 School Business Executive in Beekmantown	\$105,300
1 Associate Superintendent in Plattsburgh	\$132,100
Total cost	\$237,400
1 business official shared 50%/50%	\$145,310
Total savings by sharing position	\$92,090
Individual district cost for sharing position 50%/5%	\$72,655
Savings for Beekmantown by sharing position	\$32,645
Savings for Plattsburgh by sharing position	\$59,445

In addition to the chief financial officers, each district has other staff in the business office as well. Beekmantown has a treasurer, a payroll and benefits clerk, a purchasing/accounts payable clerk, and a 20% payroll clerk. In addition to the Associate Superintendent, Plattsburgh has a treasurer, a payroll/human resources clerk, a purchasing/accounts payable clerk, and a health insurance clerk who also serves as the office manager and the district's receptionist. In total, there are 7.2 full time equivalent staff in the two business offices in addition to the chief financial officers.

Consideration should be given the consolidation of the two business offices. In researching other school districts with 3,500-4,000 students, it appears that less than 7.2 FTE staff are employed in the business offices of those districts. For purposes of analysis, it is assumed that there would be five people employed in the shared business office with the following titles; treasurer, payroll clerk, benefits clerk, purchasing clerk, and accounts payable clerk. Once again, it is assumed that the higher paid of the current staff is hired for each position with a salary increase of 10% added to these individuals' salaries for handling both districts. Based on these assumptions, the following table shows the savings that would result.

Table 9.3 Personnel Cost of Business Office Staff-Salaries and Benefits @ 35%	
Item	Cost
1 treasurer, 1 payroll/benefits clerk, 1 purchasing/accounts payable clerk, and 20% payroll clerk in Beekmantown	\$175,702
1 treasurer, 1 payroll/HR clerk, 1 purchasing/accounts payable clerk, and 1 benefits clerk/office manager in Plattsburgh	\$301,382
Total cost	\$477,084
5.0 shared business office staff to include 1 treasurer, 1 payroll clerk, 1 benefits clerk, 1 purchasing clerk, and 1 accounts payable clerk shared 50%/50%	\$368,622
Total savings by sharing position 50%/50%	\$108,462
Individual district cost for sharing position 50%/5%	\$184,311
Savings for Beekmantown by sharing positions	(\$-8,609)
Savings for Plattsburgh by sharing positions	\$117,071

It is clear that this business office staff scenario creates an unusual situation for the two districts. It clearly points out one of the problems of sharing positions. In this example, Beekmantown would actually see an increase in their costs of \$8,609. On the other hand, Plattsburgh would save approximately \$117,071.

If two school districts are interested in sharing more services, it is important to understand that the savings for the two districts will never be the same. As is the case in the consolidation of business office staff, one district might even end up paying more than it is currently spending. However, it is imperative that the districts look at the sharing on a much broader scale understanding that they will save money on some services and may save little or nothing on other services....indeed, they may even spend more in some cases. It is the broader view of sharing that is important.

There is another option for sharing services that should be discussed at this time. Boards of Cooperative Educational Services or BOCES were created by the state legislature as a vehicle through which school districts could share services. There are currently 37 BOCES across the state that provide a large variety of shared services for their component school districts.

Sharing is difficult. However, it is not at all cost effective for each of the 700 school districts in the state to do everything on their own without sharing. Because the state understands that sharing has its challenges, the state provides a financial incentive for school districts to share services through BOCES called BOCES aid. The BOCES aid ratio for Beekmantown is 63.3% and for Plattsburgh it is 67.1%. This form of state aid is paid at these rates to the two study districts in order to encourage them to share services.

Having identified the BOCES aid ratios for the two school districts, it should be understood that there is more to the BOCES aid formula than just returning approximately 65% to each of these districts for all of their BOCES expenditures. In fact, BOCES aid is calculated with a salary limit of \$30,000 for each individual working in a BOCES service. Any individual's salary at BOCES that exceeds \$30,000 has the excess salary above \$30,000 excluded for purposes of calculating BOCES aid. If a BOCES service had people working in that service who all had salaries of \$30,000 or less, Beekmantown would get 63.3% of their BOCES costs reimbursed by the state and Plattsburgh would get 67.1% of its costs reimbursed by the state. BOCES aid on every service is calculated separately and every BOCES service has people with salaries that are both above and below \$30,000. For this reason, it will be estimated in this study that the BOCES aid received by the two districts for sharing services through BOCES will be 50%.

Given this explanation of BOCES aid, let us now reexamine tables 9.2 and 9.3 above. If the business official who is shared in table 9.2 was employed through BOCES and generated BOCES aid for the districts, table 9.2 would be revised as follows in table 9.4.

Table 9.4 Personnel Cost of District Business Officials Through BOCES (Salaries and Benefits @ 35%)	
Item	Cost
1 School Business Executive in Beekmantown	\$105,300
1 Associate Superintendent in Plattsburgh	\$132,100
Total cost	\$237,400
1 business official shared 50%/50%	\$145,310
BOCES aid estimated at 50%	\$72,655
Net cost to districts after BOCES aid	\$72,655
Total net savings by sharing position through BOCES	\$164,745
Cost/district for sharing position 50%/50% after BOCES aid	\$36,327
Savings for Beekmantown by sharing position through BOCES	\$68,937
Savings for Plattsburgh by sharing position through BOCES	\$95,773

To summarize tables 9.2 and 9.4, if the business official is shared 50%/50% by the two districts and BOCES is not used, Beekmantown would save \$32,645 and Plattsburgh would save \$59,445. However, if the shared business official is shared through BOCES, Beekmantown would save \$68,937 and Plattsburgh would save \$95,773.

Similarly, one could compare the business office staff costs in table 9.3. There are BOCES all across New York State that are offering centralized business office services exactly like those that are currently being provided by the business office staff in Beekmantown and Plattsburgh. These centralized business offices are being run very successfully because there is really no reason why every one of the 700 school districts in New York State has to have its own business office. If the shared business office service described in table 9.3 were to be provided as a BOCES service, the financial implications could be shown in the following table.

Table 9.5 Personnel Cost of Business Office Staff Through BOCES (Salaries and Benefits @ 35%)	
Item	Cost
1 treasurer, 1 payroll/benefits clerk, 1 purchasing/accounts payable clerk, and 20% payroll clerk in Beekmantown	\$175,702
1 treasurer, 1 payroll/HR clerk, 1 purchasing/accounts payable clerk, and 1 benefits clerk/office manager in Plattsburgh	\$301,382
Total cost	\$477,084
5.0 shared business office staff to include 1 treasurer, 1 payroll clerk, 1 benefits clerk, 1 purchasing clerk, and 1 accounts payable clerk shared 50%/50%	\$368,622
BOCES aid estimated at 50%	\$184,311
Net cost to districts after BOCES aid	\$184,311
Total savings by sharing position through BOCES	\$292,773
Cost/district for sharing positions 50%/50% after BOCES aid	\$92,155
Savings for Beekmantown by sharing positions through BOCES	\$83,547
Savings for Plattsburgh by sharing positions through BOCES	\$209,227

To summarize tables 9.2 and 9.5, if the business office staff is shared 50%/50% by the two districts and BOCES is not used, Beekmantown would spend \$8,609 more and Plattsburgh would save \$117,071. However, if the shared business office staff is shared through BOCES, Beekmantown would save \$83,547 and Plattsburgh would save \$209,227.

The financial incentive that is provided to school districts as BOCES aid should never be used by a BOCES as justification for the costs of its services. However, as financial challenges become more intense for school districts, it will be to these districts' advantage to explore ways to generate new sources of revenue. BOCES aid is one source of revenue for school districts that is an expense driven aid. This means that this form of state aid increases as more services are purchased from BOCES. Other opportunities for sharing in this study will also be examined as possibly being purchased from BOCES.

Food Service Operations

Both districts have an individual who supervises the food service programs for the districts. In Beekmantown that individual reports directly to the superintendent and is called the School Lunch Manager. In Plattsburgh, that individual reports to the Associate Superintendent and carries the title of Director of Food Service. Both individuals have the supervisory responsibility for overseeing the entire food service program provided in each of the districts' buildings. In addition, the Director of Food Service in Plattsburgh is also responsible for the food service program at the Champlain Valley BOCES. Management responsibilities routinely involve menu planning, hiring, budgeting, ordering, and completing required paperwork. Meal prices for both districts are shown in the table that follows.

Table 9.6 School Meal Prices		
Meal	Beekmantown	Plattsburgh
Pre-K-5 Breakfast	\$1.20	\$1.40
Pre-K-5 Lunch	\$2.05	\$2.20
Grades 6-12 Breakfast	\$1.45	\$1.40
Grades 6-12 Lunch	\$2.30	\$2.40

Table 9.7 that follows shows the costs associated with food service management for the two school districts. Consideration should be given to consolidating the management of the two districts' food service management. The savings that would accrue to each district are also indicated in table 9.7, assuming a 50%/50% share of the food service management responsibilities.

Table 9.7 Personnel Cost of District Food Service Supervisors -Salaries and Benefits @ 35%	
Item	Cost
1 School Lunch Manager in Beekmantown	\$63,898
1 Director of Food Service in Plattsburgh	\$80,360
Total cost	\$144,258
1 Food Service Manager shared 50%/50%	\$88,396
Total savings by sharing position	\$55,862
Individual district cost for sharing position 50%/5%	\$44,198
Savings for Beekmantown by sharing position	\$19,700
Savings for Plattsburgh by sharing position	\$36,162

While table 9.7 shows that savings would accrue to both districts by sharing a food services manager, additional savings could be generated by sharing this position through BOCES. As discussed in the previous section on restructuring the business offices, BOCES aid could be generated for both districts if the food services management position was shared through BOCES. This is illustrated in table 9.8 that follows.

Table 9.8 Personnel Cost of Food Service Management Through BOCES (Salaries and Benefits @ 35%)	
Item	Cost
1 School Lunch Manager in Beekmantown	\$63,898
1 Director of Food Service in Plattsburgh	\$80,360
Total cost	\$144,258
1 Food Service Manager shared 50%/50%	\$88,396
BOCES aid estimated at 50%	\$44,198
Net cost to districts after BOCES aid	\$44,198
Total net savings by sharing position through BOCES	\$100,060
Cost/district for sharing position 50%/50% after BOCES aid	\$22,099
Savings for Beekmantown by sharing position through BOCES	\$41,799
Savings for Plattsburgh by sharing position through BOCES	\$58,261

Looking at tables 9.7 and 9.8 together, Beekmantown could save \$19,700 by sharing the food services management position with Plattsburgh but could save \$41,799 if that share was done through BOCES. Likewise, Plattsburgh could save \$36,162 by sharing the position but could save \$58,261 by sharing the position through BOCES.

Operations and Maintenance

The facilities in both Beekmantown and Plattsburgh have been well maintained. In addition, recent capital projects in both districts have given the students of these districts facilities that serve their educational needs very well.

The Beekmantown Central School District has a Pre-K to 12 campus located in West Chazy and one Pre-K -5 elementary building located in Cumberland Head. The district office is located across the street from the Pre-K to 12 campus. The district’s bus garage is also located on the West Chazy campus.

The Plattsburgh facilities are more spread out than are the Beekmantown facilities. All of the district facilities are located within the city of Plattsburgh and are within 1-2 miles of each other. However, there are five separate school buildings with a high school, a middle school, and three elementary buildings. In addition, the district office is located in a former elementary school building located at 49 Broad Street. The following table shows the square footage of these major buildings.

Table 9.9 Square Footage of District Facilities		
Building	Beekmantown	Plattsburgh
High School		151,851
Pre K - 12	312,643	
Bailey Avenue Elementary School		47,266
Oak Street Elementary School		69,609
Momot Elementary School		71,812
Cumberland Head Elementary	72,381	
Stafford Middle School		146,834
Bus Garage	12,160	2,400
District Office	6,650	18,299
PHS Concession Stand/Press Box		2,130
Total Square Footage	403,834	510,201

The operations and maintenance department in each district is responsible for the ongoing maintenance of the school facilities. This includes daily cleaning of the buildings, grounds maintenance, athletic field preparation, and building systems maintenance. In addition to this routine work of maintaining the campuses, specialized work in carpentry, plumbing, electrical, and masonry is sometimes required. Both districts have maintenance persons who can do some of this type of work. When district staff cannot handle this work, both districts may contract with private vendors to get this work completed.

Table 9.10 that follows shows the personnel costs of managing and supervising the operations and maintenance departments in Beekmantown and Plattsburgh. The director of facilities in Beekmantown carries the title of Superintendent of Buildings and Grounds and reports directly to the superintendent. The corresponding individual in Plattsburgh is called the Director of Buildings, Grounds, and Transportation and reports to the Associate Superintendent. Because the transportation function in Plattsburgh is so limited, for purposes of this study, it will be assumed that this individual spends all of his time with the buildings and grounds responsibilities.

Table 9.10 Personnel Cost of District Operations & Maintenance Supervisors (Salaries and Benefits @ 35%)	
Item	Cost
1 Superintendent of Buildings and Grounds in Beekmantown	\$78,860
1 Director of Buildings, Grounds, & Transportation in Plattsburgh	\$99,736
Total cost	\$178,596
1 Superintendent of Buildings and Grounds shared 50%/50%	\$109,710
Total savings by sharing position	\$68,886
Individual district cost for sharing position 50%/5%	\$54,855
Savings for Beekmantown by sharing position	\$24,005
Savings for Plattsburgh by sharing position	\$44,881

While table 9.10 shows that savings would accrue to both districts by sharing a Superintendent of Buildings and Grounds, additional savings could be generated by

sharing this position through BOCES. As discussed in previous sections, BOCES aid could be generated for both districts if the buildings and grounds management position was shared through BOCES. This is illustrated in table 9.11 that follows.

Table 9.11 Personnel Cost of District Operations & Maintenance Supervisors Through BOCES (Salaries and Benefits @ 35%)	
Item	Cost
1 Superintendent of Buildings and Grounds in Beekmantown	\$78,860
1 Director of Buildings, Grounds, & Transportation in Plattsburgh	\$99,736
Total cost	\$178,596
1 Superintendent of Buildings and Grounds shared 50%/50%	\$109,710
BOCES aid estimated at 50%	\$54,855
Net cost to districts after BOCES aid	\$54,855
Total net savings by sharing position through BOCES	\$123,741
Cost/district for sharing position 50%/50% after BOCES aid	\$27,428
Savings for Beekmantown by sharing position through BOCES	\$51,432
Savings for Plattsburgh by sharing position through BOCES	\$72,308

Looking at tables 9.10 and 9.11 together, Beekmantown could save \$24,005 by sharing the operations and maintenance management position with Plattsburgh but could save \$51,432 if that share was done through BOCES. Likewise, Plattsburgh could save \$44,881 by sharing the position but could save \$72,308 by sharing the position through BOCES.

Consideration should be given to consolidating the management of the two districts' operations and maintenance supervisors. One manager could supervise both programs. In suggesting this option, it may well be that some additional staff would have to be hired at one or both of the districts to do the work that the current supervisors are performing. However, these individuals, if necessary, will be hired at salaries that are significantly less than the current cost of supervising these operations.

Transportation

The transportation systems in Beekmantown and Plattsburgh are dramatically different. This is due in large part to the size of the school districts. Beekmantown is a school district with 93 square miles. The area of the Plattsburgh school district is the same as the City of Plattsburgh and covers only three square miles. In addition, the policy of the Plattsburgh school district is that all regular education students must provide their own transportation to school and back. The transportation aid ratios for both school districts are approximately 70%. The following table provides an overview of the bus fleet in each district.

Table 9.12 Overview of District Bus Fleets		
	Beekmantown	Plattsburgh
Number of Buses/(Vans)	44 (2)	7
Number of Spare Buses	15	1
Year of Buses	1999-2011	1999-2012
Capacity of Buses	60-65 (40) 42 (1) 7 (2) WC/Lift (3)	60-66 (3) 48-54 (4)
Mileage Range of Buses	46,939-167,573	21,887-93,250

Beekmantown has a very traditional transportation system for a rural/suburban school district. Because the main campus is located in a rural setting, the vast majority of students are transported to school with 29 regular daily bus runs. The cost of student transportation in Beekmantown is relatively high including the cost of purchasing buses when compared with Plattsburgh. Beekmantown had been on a regular schedule of replacing buses but due to the current fiscal pressures facing school districts, Beekmantown has not purchased a new bus since 2011. Plattsburgh, on the other hand, uses only three buses on regular runs to transport 54 students with disabilities to school and back. The rest of the bus runs are used for BOCES, athletics, field trips, and other special runs as needed. Regular education students are responsible for their own transportation. The cost of student transportation is relatively low when compared with Beekmantown. Plattsburgh does not have a regular bus replacement schedule.

Both districts have special runs for students attending BOCES. It appears that there is little potential for sharing these runs. Having said that, this is not an in-depth transportation study. If the districts are interested in a more detailed study for sharing special bus runs, such a study should be undertaken. However, there is probably little financial benefit that would be gained from such a study given the number of special runs, the number of students involved, the capacity of the buses, and the transportation aid ratios of the districts. This is not to say, however, that a BOCES wide transportation study for all its component school districts might not yield positive results.

Because of the very limited transportation system in Plattsburgh, the district employs very few staff in this area. The Director of Buildings and Grounds also serves as the director of the transportation program in Plattsburgh while Beekmantown has a full time transportation supervisor. Beekmantown has 29 bus drivers while Plattsburgh has two part time drivers and one full time driver. Beekmantown has its own bus mechanics while Plattsburgh gets its routine bus maintenance performed by Champlain Peterbilt and contracts with the Saranac Central School District to complete the required Department of Transportation inspections of its buses. In the past year, Plattsburgh paid Champlain Peterbilt \$53,288 for bus maintenance while there was no charge from Saranac Central for the bus inspections.

Strong consideration should be given to having Beekmantown take over the transportation system for Plattsburgh through a contract arrangement. The transportation supervisor in Beekmantown could take on the responsibility of overseeing the transportation system in Plattsburgh. Routine maintenance of Plattsburgh buses as well as DOT inspections could be accomplished in Beekmantown with minimal impact on the Beekmantown system. Should Plattsburgh pay Beekmantown the same amount that they paid Champlain Peterbilt, Beekmantown could benefit from the additional revenue that would be generated by this arrangement. In addition, Plattsburgh would see a reduction in its non-aidable bus mileage. Plattsburgh would also know that the supervision of the transportation program, the routine maintenance of its buses, and all DOT inspections were all being centralized with the Beekmantown school district. This should provide convenience and efficiency for Plattsburgh.

Special Education Supervision

Both districts have individuals who are responsible for the leadership, oversight, and supervision of the special education programs. In Beekmantown, this individual has the title of Director of Special Services while in Plattsburgh, the individual is called the Director of Special Education. While the titles are different, the responsibility for the special education and related services aspects of the districts are clearly vested in these two individuals. In addition to the directors, Beekmantown has 2.5 clerical staff and Plattsburgh has two clerical staff supporting the special education programs.

Beekmantown has 362 students with disabilities representing 18% of the district population. Plattsburgh has 361 students with disabilities representing 15.2% of its student population. Beekmantown contracts with the BOCES for the education of ten of its students and has four other students in residential placements. Plattsburgh sends thirteen special education students to BOCES. It is clear that the vast majority of special education students on both districts are being educated in their home districts.

In previous shared services studies, consideration has been given to sharing the leadership position for special education. However, those considerations were made in districts that were much smaller than Beekmantown and Plattsburgh. Together, the two districts have 723 students with disabilities. This is a large number of students by any definition. Even if the director positions were to be combined, it is apparent that additional administrative assistance would have to be put in place to provide the support that would be needed to oversee a program of this magnitude. It is therefore recommended that the staffing for the special programs remain as currently constituted. It is further recommended that the directors of the two programs meet on a regular basis in order to consider ways to share student programming efforts or staff associated with these students.

Athletic Director

At the current time in Beekmantown, there is a single athletic director. This individual teaches four periods per day, has no supervisory duty, and receives a \$15,000 stipend for being the athletic director. Plattsburgh has an athletic coordinator who teaches

three periods per day and receives a \$6,000 stipend for being the athletic coordinator. In addition, the assistant principal in the high school acts as the athletic administrator.

There may be potential to share athletic director duties in these two districts. However, the districts are now structured very differently and there would have to be agreement about how the shared position should be structured. The districts will also have to clearly delineate the responsibilities of this athletic administrator.

Curriculum Coordination

New York State has initiated numerous instructional changes within the past five years. The move to the common core curriculum has challenged school districts to revise the content that is delivered to students as well as the manner in which that content is delivered. In addition, the implementation of the annual professional performance review process has taxed staff in local districts to spend far more time than ever before in the evaluation and development of instructional staff. These state requirements are especially onerous for smaller school districts that have limited district office staff who are devoted to the leadership of the instructional program.

At the current time, neither Beekmantown nor Plattsburgh has a district office individual who has the overall responsibility for the instructional program. This is a bit unusual for school districts that have enrollments of nearly 2,000 students, especially given the state demands on local school districts for instructional change. Consideration should be given to sharing a curriculum coordinator between the two districts on a 50%/50% basis, preferably through BOCES. It is further recommended that consideration be given to the following listing of duties for the shared curriculum coordinator:

- Attend training on all things related to the Regents Reform Agenda—common core, data driven instruction, teacher & leader effectiveness—in order to turnkey the information to staff
- Provide professional development as appropriate, including facilitation of book studies/book talks
- Meet with department or grade level teams to facilitate discussion around curriculum and instruction
- Support teachers with new requirements of common core standards (resources, coaching, discussion, modeling, etc)

- Facilitate curriculum management—curriculum map updates, new curricular materials (textbooks, trade books, modules, math manipulatives, etc)
- Support staff with facets of the APPR rubric – what types of practices lead to better “scores”, as well as coaching; work with administrators so there are common understandings of evidence and score ratings to maintain inter-rater agreement, if not reliability
- Support staff who will have a Teacher Improvement Plan
- Help with coordination of assessments throughout the district – grade level benchmarks, SLO pre/post assessments, data driven conversations and planning
- Assist with SLO reviews and feedback, including working with administrators so that expectations across the district are consistent
- Help plan conference days and early release days
- Help with reports due to SED for Race to the Top and Title grants.
- Compile data from various sources to help inform administration and the Board of Education
- Work with APPR committee to revise and resubmit APPR plan to SED as necessary

Table 9.13 that follows has been prepared to show the financial impact of sharing a curriculum coordinator through BOCES for the two districts, assuming a salary of \$90,000 for the coordinator.

Table 9.13 Personnel Cost of Shared Curriculum Coordinator Through BOCES (Benefits @ 35%)	
Item	Cost
1 Shared Curriculum Coordinator	\$90,000
Fringe Benefits @ 35%	\$31,500
Total cost of Coordinator	\$121,500
Cost/district for curriculum coordinator shared 50%/50%	\$60,750
BOCES aid estimated at 50%	\$60,750
Net cost to districts after BOCES aid	\$60,750
Cost/district for sharing position 50%/50% after BOCES aid	\$30,375

Since neither district currently has a central office administrator who is responsible for leading the instructional program, this cost will be a new expense for both

districts. However, should the districts choose to pursue any of the cost saving measures outlined in this report, it is recommended that some of the savings be directed toward a leadership position for the districts' instructional programs.

CHAPTER 10

DEVELOPMENT OF SHARED SERVICES THROUGH BOCES

This study has looked at a number of services that might be shared by the two school districts. In addition to the opportunities presented earlier in this study, there also appear to be a number of other possible services that could be developed. As financial pressures on school districts have increased over the past five years, many districts have looked to share services in order to do business more cost effectively. In most cases, these school districts have looked to their BOCES as the vehicle through which these services might be developed. In addition to BOCES having the ability to work with districts to develop shared services, the opportunity to generate BOCES aid on these shared services is certainly a financial advantage for the districts.

Both Beekmantown and Plattsburgh contract with the Champlain Valley BOCES for the standard services in career and technical education, special education, itinerant teachers, regional information services from the Capital Region BOCES, and instructional support services. In addition, Table 10.1 that follows shows the other services costing \$5,000 or more that the two districts obtain from the BOCES.

Service	Beekmantown	Plattsburgh
Instructional Printing		\$13,012
Microcomputer Repair		\$12,250
Musical Instrument Repair		\$7,250
Cooperative Bidding (thru St. Lawrence BOCES)	\$5,735	\$5,536
Health/Workers Compensation Insurance Consortium	\$24,163	\$25,655
Teacher Certification	\$5,405	\$5,117
Safety Risk Management	\$13,523	\$13,037
School Public Relations (Billed as Used)		\$9,500
Employer/Employee Relations	\$24,335	
Emergency Communications	\$7,386	\$3,163

An examination of table 10.1 points out that the two study districts have not made great use of shared services through BOCES other than the very traditional services that are offered by any BOCES. This may be because the appropriate services are not available or have not been developed by the BOCES. Consideration should be given to

taking a leadership role in conversations with the BOCES and the other component school districts to expand the number of services that are shared through BOCES.

The first analysis that should take place is with the current services that are purchased by the two districts. How is Beekmantown getting its printing, repair, and public relations needs met? How is Plattsburgh negotiating its labor contracts and getting assistance with other employee relations matters? Are the two districts acquiring these services as cost effectively as possible or would they be better off turning to the BOCES for these services?

In addition to the current BOCES services, there is great potential to add other shared services through BOCES. When comparing this BOCES with others across the state, the number of offerings available to component districts is relatively small. It is recommended that district and BOCES representatives begin very serious discussions about increasing the number of service offerings for the component school districts. Among those services that might be added are the following, all of which are being offered in other BOCES across the state that are similar to the Champlain Valley BOCES region.

Enrichment Services for Students

Regional Summer School- Provides middle and high school students with opportunities for enrichment and remediation. Students are referred by school districts for a six-week intensive learning experience. Program offerings meet State requirements for credit and provide opportunities for Regents testing. May be more cost effective than providing summer school through the local district.

Elementary Regional Summer School-Using a variety of models, component districts cooperate to design and implement remedial and enrichment programs for elementary students.

Summer Regents Review-For students who have successfully completed a Regents level course during the school year, but did not pass the Regents exam, or wish to improve their Regents exam grade. The course is held in the five days leading up to the August Regents.

Adirondack Field/Cranberry Lake Studies-Multi-day environmental education program designed for 10th-12th graders to explore aquatic and terrestrial habitats. Staffed by college instructors and high school teachers, students gain insight into biological research through individual and group research projects.

Foreign Language Immersion Program-A summer Foreign Language Immersion Program that could be offered in any language of interest. The program immerses students in the language and culture of another country that could be easily accessed given the proximity to Montreal.

Marine Studies Enrichment Program-Offers students the opportunity to learn about various marine environments. Students visit salt marshes, sand dunes, rock jetties and sand flats to collect marine specimens and learn about the characteristics and importance of each ecosystem. Time will also be spent in the laboratory for dissections and lectures. This program is offered in Long Island but a similar program could be developed to study Lake Champlain.

Summerfame-A week-long program that provides students in grades 8-12 the opportunity to participate in acting, technical theater, dance, or vocal music courses. The program provides students the opportunity to work with professional artists, participate in a wide variety of workshops, group activities, and solo competitions. One half unit of arts credit toward high school graduation is available through home school districts. Could be developed in conjunction with SUNY Plattsburgh.

Programs for At Risk Students

Alternative Education Program-An alternative educational experiences for students identified as capable learners experiencing limited success in school. Targeted at students grade 7 through completion who have a high potential for dropping out, the program Efforts to increase student understanding in key academic disciplines are made through an emphasis on learning to learn and problem solving within a team environment.

Math Camp-A 4-6 week summer program for students entering grade 9 who would benefit from hands-on, project-oriented, career and technical math instruction. Students study the Integrated Algebra curriculum through a jointly structured Integrated Algebra - CTE exploratory experience. Students can receive one half high school math credit.

Management Services

Central Business Office-Provides various accounting functions for school districts and BOCES. Components of the service could include:

- Preparation of normal bi-weekly and special payrolls (coaching, advisors, etc.) along with required NYS and Federal quarterly reporting;
- Assistance in the processing of civil service, TRS, ERS, and TSA monthly billings;
- Staff attendance;
- Preparation and mailing of purchase orders;
- Preparation of accounts payable and mailing of checks;
- General ledger entries;
- Reconciliation of bank statements, preparation of treasurer's reports and board reports;
- Claims Auditing;
- Preparation of ST-3 financial information and related Supplemental Schedules; Federal grant FS-25's, FS-10A's, and FS-10F's;
- Assistance with Capital Project reporting;
- Assistance to new business officials with financial issues;
- School tax collection: reconciliation of payments and tax records from daily bank data feeds; application of software updates; reporting to Board and transmission of file to County; and
- Cooperative payment and fingerprinting of sports officials

Special Education Finances-Assists districts with calculating and reporting High Cost Special Program services for students. The service is designed to be a collaborative effort between BOCES staff and each district's CSE Chairperson and Business Officer; working together to determine which students qualify for High Cost aid and ensuring that reporting is completed accurately and in conjunction with State Aid guidelines and deadlines. This service will provide:

- STAC consultation regarding high-cost students and programs (both Summer and 10-Month);
- Assistance in identifying all students who qualify for High Cost Aid—including District Educated, BOCES educated, Private Placement, Homeless and incarcerated students;
- Regular monitoring of changes in High Cost State Aid;
- Updates and/or trainings on High Cost policies and procedures;
- AVL completion
- Consultation on state aid issues

Energy Management-Provides assistance to schools by coordinating school district efforts to utilize energy efficiently and economically. School energy usage assessments, staff development and training, and review of school district utility billing information services are provided. Provides schools with a structured approach to control and reduce energy costs.

Medicaid Reimbursement Service-Assists districts with Medicaid billing. This service is designed to be a collaborative effort between our staff and each district's CSE Medicaid designee, working together to make sure all students are claimed appropriately. This service will provide:

- On-site Medicaid inputting and uploading to MedWeb;
- Monitoring of all documentation to make sure the district is in compliance for billing;
- Retrieval of web reports and monitoring of the claims process;
- Track student eligibility;
- Updates and trainings on new Medicaid regulations and protocols;
- Compliance plan support and monitoring; and
- Consultation on Medicare cost reporting

Records Management/Fixed Assets Service-Provides records inventory, consultation, files management, microfilm/scanning and retrieval of records according to the State Archives Guidelines. The service provides conversion of Microfilm to Electronic Image and Microfilm/Scanning to CD's. The service will also provide records management grant writing service. The Fixed Asset portion provides inventory updates, reporting in compliance with the GASB 34 regulations and inventory checks as needed.

As districts have turned to their BOCES for sharing services, they have focused on how to increase sharing of non-instructional or management services in order to save money that can then be redirected toward instructional programs. Examples of the types of management services that are offered by BOCES across the state are identified in the table that follows. While a few of the allowable services are currently provided through the Champlain Valley BOCES or through cross-contracts with other BOCES, it is clear that there is the potential for much more sharing through BOCES.

Table 10.2 Management Services Approvable by SED
Personnel Service
Negotiations
Recruiting
Employee Assistance Service
Teacher Certification
Staff Development: Bus Drivers
Staff Development: Clerical
Staff Development: Maintenance
Staff Development: Board of Education
Substitute Coordination
Business Office
Cooperative Bid Coordination
Microfilming
Textbook Coordination
Business Manager
Business Office Support
Medicaid Reimbursement Processing
Internal Auditor
Computer Service: Management
Telecommunications
Health Care Benefit Coordination
Transportation
Bus Maintenance
Transportation: Occupational Ed
Transportation: Handicapped
Transportation: Chapter 853
Transportation: Drug & Alcohol Testing
Emergency Communications
Transportation: Home to School
Transportation Director
Planning Service
GASB 45 Planning and Valuation
Facility Services
Facility Director
Telephone Interconnect
Engineering Service
Energy Management
Safety/Risk Management
Fingerprinting
Coordination of Insurance Management
Public Information Coordination
Public Information Service
School Food Management: Itinerant
School Food Management: Central

This listing of approvable management services is provided to illustrate the many services that BOCES could be providing to local districts. It is not suggested that all of these services are appropriate for the local BOCES to be offering. Only the BOCES

working in close conjunction with its component school districts can determine which services are appropriate for this region.

As a final comment regarding the development of additional services through BOCES, it is apparent that the capabilities and/or usage of the printing service could be greatly expanded. Other than convenience copying, consideration should be given to moving all high volume copying to BOCES. This would allow districts to reduce their acquisitions of high volume copiers while generating BOCES aid on all copying. This is an area where there is significant potential for savings.

CHAPTER 11

MECHANISM FOR IMPLEMENTING SHARING INITIATIVES

Change of the magnitude described in this study will take time and will be difficult to implement. Successful implementation of any one of these initiatives will be aided by considering the large body of research on the change process in schools. Heifetz provides us with some guidance as to the type of leadership that is necessary in difficult times when he says that change leadership is one of "mobilizing people to tackle tough problems", the problems that have never yet been successfully addressed. Michael Fullan, in his 2001 book, **Leading in a Culture of Change** reminds us of the complexities of the change process and the need to understand that "the goal is not to innovate the most and it is not enough to have the best ideas." He goes on to say that it is essential to "appreciate the early difficulties of trying something new--what I call the implementation dip." The challenge for the two districts' leadership is to create an environment that allows for resistance, that creates understanding, and that develops a culture that is open to new ways of providing additional alternatives for students.

Sharing is difficult. Each partner in a sharing relationship gives up things in order to contribute to an effective sharing relationship. There may be a perceived loss of control with a shared service. The service might be delivered in a location that is away from the district. Scheduling and staffing issues often complicate the sharing arrangement. Oftentimes it is just easier to do something alone. However, these are not ordinary times. Maintaining and enhancing programs in the face of today's financial challenges demand a different model for doing business. We believe that model must involve sharing services. Finally, our experience has been that students react very positively to meeting new students from other districts; it is the adults that often have a greater time adjusting to the changes.

Sharing also takes time. The tendency for a superintendent or a board of education may be to quickly approve the implementation of one or more of these programs. In order to develop any of the sharing arrangements suggested in this study, relationships must be developed between the two districts. This will take much conversation and many shared experiences in order to develop trust between the staff of the two districts. Our recommendation, however, is that the process for consideration and implementation be

carefully designed so as to insure long term success of shared programs. Essential components in the process are the involvement of stakeholders, clear communications between the districts, and the development of trust among those involved.

One of the first issues that will have to be addressed is whether or not the districts, in implementing some of these changes, will put people out of jobs. It is not unusual for districts not to involuntarily put people out of work but rather to handle staff reductions only through attrition. While this is a fairly common practice, it does delay the savings that are identified in this study.

The sharing of personnel also has numerous implications for the districts' unions. Changes in working conditions, contracting bargaining unit work, and other changes that impact the staff will almost certainly find their way to the bargaining table. This may cause delays in implementing change as well.

One of the issues that has emerged during discussions regarding the implementation of shared services is the long-term impact of legacy costs on the districts. While the districts may save money in the short-term, there is a concern that if there is no up-front agreement regarding costs for health insurance in retirement, then one district may end up being responsible for costs that over time will exceed the savings.

While this is not an issue that has any simple resolutions, we would suggest that there are approaches that may allow for the short-term savings to occur through the development of shared services agreements as well as protecting the long-term financial status of the districts. These approaches should be one of the areas that are discussed during the development of any agreements regarding services and should be vetted through each district's attorney as well as the state education department.

It may be helpful to use a specific shared position to understand the potential issues. If the two districts decide to share, for example, a director of curriculum and instruction, the decision must be made as to which organization will be the employing district; Beekmantown, Plattsburgh or the Clinton-Essex BOCES. If the shared position is under the auspices of the BOCES, then the salary and benefits will be that of the BOCES and will be subject to the BOCES employment contract. The employee will receive the benefits of the BOCES, both in the short-term and upon retirement. In this

case, the legacy costs will not only be supported by the two districts but will also be shared by all 17 districts in the BOCES through the BOCES administrative budget.

If, the districts decide that sharing through BOCES is not appropriate for a particular position (or if the BOCES is not legally allowed to provide the service requested), the districts may turn to the development of a shared service agreement with the other district. Education Law 1981 allows for agreements between districts to share personnel (who are in a position for which tenure may be granted) to designate one of the districts as the principal employing district. Decisions regarding the compensation package are to be made by the employing district in consultation with the other district. The language of Education Law 1981.2.b indicates

“...Any such shared personnel shall be considered to be employed by the principal employing district, provided that any decisions regarding the probationary appointment and compensation package of such shared personnel shall be made with the consent of a majority of each of the boards of education of each participating district. Decisions regarding the termination, discipline or tenure of such shared personnel shall be made by the principal employing district in consultation with all other participating districts, and services rendered by such shared personnel under such agreement in any other participating district shall be deemed to have been rendered in the principal employing district for all purposes under this chapter, including tenure credit, seniority, and discipline.”

Discussions should held between the two districts to determine the appropriate allocation of salaries, benefits, and long-term legacy costs. One approach may be to work towards a solution that has both districts agreeing to pay for its share of the legacy costs according to an agreement developed at the time of the initial implementation of each position. The issue of legacy costs should be an issue that is discussed with both districts’ legal counsel and considered as part of the entire implementation process.

Finally, it should be remembered that legacy costs will be reduced by sharing positions. Should the districts decide to share any current positions, legacy costs in the future will be reduced because they will be paid only on the one shared person instead of the two people that currently hold those positions.

If the two boards of education are interested in supporting the ongoing investigation into ways the sharing can benefit their districts, then each Board of Education should formally commit to a collaboration process. This may be done through the formation of a single standing Collaboration Committee for the purpose of continued communication and collaboration. The committee should be appointed by the boards of education and should contain an equal number of individuals from each district. The committee should be large enough to offer the expertise that is necessary to move its work forward yet not be so large that the committee becomes cumbersome. Consideration might be given to constituting the committee as follows:

- 2 superintendents
- 2 business officials
- 2 athletic directors
- 2 teachers
- 2 administrators
- 2 support staff
- 2 community members

The committee should be given the charge by the two boards of education to assess needs, prioritize needs, plan, develop shared programs, and evaluate whether or not the shared initiatives are successful.

The Collaboration Committee should meet on a regular basis. The committee should be co-chaired by the two superintendents or by a respected individual who has the trust of both school communities and is jointly selected by the two districts. The location of the meetings should be regularly alternated between the two districts.

The work of the collaboration committee is staff work. Having said that, it is important that the boards of education sanction the work of the committee, give the committee its charge, and have regular reports from the committee on board agendas to monitor the progress of the committee.

There is no one correct way to begin this process but we suggest several potential approaches to the process. Initially, it may be helpful to involve an external facilitator for these meetings to assist in the committee's work. The first meeting's agenda should

include a review of the committee's charge as well as a review of the report, its data, and its recommendations. Developing a statement of principles guiding the collaboration process may also be helpful in assisting committee members to develop a shared understanding of the purpose and direction of the committee's work.

At one of the initial meetings, it will be important to develop a work plan for the committee that provides a road map for committee initiatives. One way to begin the work plan is to have committee members prioritize the report's recommendations to determine which are the first areas to be assessed for their viability for implementation.

Identifying the recommendation areas to be considered and approximate time frames for the work will assist in the development and implementation of the work plan. Sharing with the two boards of education the work plan, time lines, and accomplishments may also be helpful in providing the ongoing framework for communications.

School districts that have engaged in this work have also found it helpful to utilize small subcommittees of representatives who have interest and expertise in specific areas to provide background information and implementation considerations. The subcommittee members meet between meetings of the collaboration committee and then provide the background information to the entire committee for consideration.

A topic that could well become a significant dimension of the Collaboration Committee is staffing. From a very real human perspective, the impact of decreased staffing levels has a profound impact on those affected and those around them. Efforts must be carefully undertaken to mitigate the negative impact that staff reductions would have. Careful planning could boost morale and benefit the districts individually as well as collectively.

Consideration of the development of policies in each district supporting sharing as well as the development of shared processes that may be utilized when vacancies occur may also be helpful. Examples of such policies and processes from other districts are available upon request.

Ongoing communication of the process may be enhanced by having a section of each district's website that is devoted to the shared service process. Access to information including the shared services report, listing of committee members, the

collaboration committee charge, committee agendas and minutes, as well as any reports may be easily provided electronically.

Effective sharing of services by the Beekmantown and Plattsburgh school districts could also be enhanced through the cooperation of the BOCES organization. Staff from the BOCES can serve as resource persons and can work cooperatively to assist the districts in their planning. BOCES staff can help the districts identify and organize their needs, can find model programs across the state for the districts to visit, and can, at the behest and direction of the districts, assist in the development of numerous shared services.

It is recommended that the two districts form a standing Collaboration Committee to address priorities for sharing, implementation strategies, and evaluation approaches.

CHAPTER 12 SUMMARY

Numerous ideas for sharing have been discussed in this study. Care has been taken to ask the districts to consider these changes rather than recommending that the districts implement all of the changes. Only the districts will know which of these changes will work and which might better be left for a later time. Great care, patience, and thought must be given to the changes that are made and to the way that changes are made.

In summarizing the possible shared services that are contained in this report, consideration of the following changes are contained herein:

- ✓ Development of a student and teacher exchange program-page 39
- ✓ Development of an electronic learning program-page 43
- ✓ Development of a common high school bell schedule-page 52
- ✓ Development of a shared special education classrooms-page 54
- ✓ Sharing of related service providers-page 55
- ✓ Sharing of interscholastic athletic teams-page 57
- ✓ Sharing of high school clubs/extra-curricular activities-page 59
- ✓ Shared superintendent-page 65
- ✓ Shared business official-page 67
- ✓ Shared business office-page 68
- ✓ Shared food service manager-page 72
- ✓ Shared superintendent of buildings and grounds-page 74
- ✓ Shared transportation program-page 77
- ✓ Shared curriculum coordinator-page 79

In examining the opportunities for sharing listed above, it is clear that some of these options will provide greater opportunities for students while others are focused on saving the districts money or providing appropriate levels of administrative leadership. These opportunities deal primarily with program areas that currently exist with the two school districts. In addition, this study also recommends that these two districts consider of taking a leadership role with the BOCES and the other component school districts to investigate the wisdom of starting the following services through BOCES:

- ✓ Regional Summer School
- ✓ Elementary Regional Summer School
- ✓ Summer Regents Review Program
- ✓ Adirondack Field/Cranberry Lake Studies Program
- ✓ Foreign Language Immersion Program
- ✓ Marine Studies Enrichment Program
- ✓ Summerfame
- ✓ Alternative Education Program
- ✓ Math Camp
- ✓ Central Business Office
- ✓ Special Education Finances
- ✓ Energy Management Program
- ✓ Medicaid Reimbursement Service
- ✓ Records Management/Fixed Assets Service

Finally, the table that follows estimates the potential savings that could be realized should the shared positions contained in this report be implemented.

Table 12.1 Potential Savings From Sharing Positions*				
Potential Shared Position(s)	Beekmantown Savings W/out BOCES Aid	Beekmantown Savings With BOCES Aid	Plattsburgh Savings W/out BOCES Aid	Plattsburgh Savings With BOCES Aid
Superintendent	\$59,558	\$59,558**	\$106,884	\$106,884**
Business Official	\$32,645	\$68,937	\$59,445	\$95,773
Business Office Staff	-\$8,609	\$83,547	\$117,071	\$209,227
Food Service Manager	\$19,700	\$41,799	\$36,162	\$58,261
O & M Supervisor	\$24,005	\$51,432	\$44,881	\$72,308
Total Potential Savings	\$127,299	\$305,273	\$364,443	\$542,453
* In addition, a shared curriculum coordinator is being recommended for consideration **BOCES aid is not available on the position of shared superintendent				

This is a daunting yet very exciting time to be a leader in public education. The challenges are great but the opportunity to reinvent our schools in invigorating. Courageous leaders, like those in Beekmantown and Plattsburgh, will try new things. Some will work and others will not. However, this innovative work will serve the students and the communities extremely well for the future.

Appendix 1

High School Course Sharing in Wayne County, New York

1. Project Lead the Way-Williamson, Lyons, and Palmyra-Macedon High Schools:
 - Design and Drawing for Production (DDP)
 - Principles of Engineering (POE)
 - Digital Electronics (DE)
 - Civil Engineering and Architecture (CEA)
 - Computer Integrated Manufacturing (CIM)
 - Biotechnical Engineering (PLTW)
 - Engineering Design and Development (PLTW)
 - World of Technology
 - Construction
 - Manufacturing Materials and Processes
 - Robotics
 - Digital Imaging
 - TV & Video Production
 - 3D Computer and Design

2. Small “Green Business” Academy-Clyde-Savannah High School
 - Young Entrepreneurs Academy
 - SUPA Entrepreneurship
 - Environmental Science
 - Understanding and Using Data
 - Marketing Analysis and Application
 - Sales and Advertising
 - Green Construction I and II
 - Green Recreation
 - Green Internships

3. Agri-Business Academy-Sodus High School
 - Basic Welding
 - Small Gas Engines
 - Basic Woodworking
 - Basic Electricity
 - Plant and Soil Science
 - Environmental Science
 - Accounting
 - Agricultural Internship/Externship
 - College Accounting
 - Presentational Speaking
 - Entrepreneurship
 - Seminar Series

4. Advanced Placement (AP) Academy- Newark and North Rose Wolcott High School
 - AP Art

AP Biology
FLCC AP Calculus 1
Syracuse University English
Cap US History 201 (Cayuga Advantage Program)
Cap US History 202 (Cayuga Advantage Program)
Accounting
Agricultural Internship/Externship
College Accounting
Presentational Speaking
Entrepreneurship
Seminar Series
AP English Language and Composition
AP English Literature and Composition
AP Statistics
AP Calculus
AP/FLCC Chemistry
AP/FLCC European History
AP/FLCC American History
AP/FLCC Psychology
AP/FLCC Physics B
AP/FLCC Biology
AP Studio Art

5. 21st Century Technology-Marion High School
Computer Generated Images
Tech Tools
Digital Audio and Radio
Video Production and Animation
Mac for Beginners
Mac Advanced

6. College-Level Courses-Lyons High School-Partnership agreements currently exist with Finger Lakes Community College, Cayuga Community College, Syracuse University and Rochester Institute of Technology. Students may earn up to 41 college credits prior to high school graduation.

CCC Advanced College Biology
CCC Forensic Chemistry (Chemistry 108 Forensic Science)
FLCC English (English 101, 102 and Intro to Literature
FLCC Economics (Economics 100 – Survey Economics)
FLCC Government (Political Science 100 American Government)
FLCC US History I (110) and II (111) (Also serves as Junior US History
and Government)
FLCC US History II
FLCC Pre Calculus (Math 152 – Pre Calculus)
SUPA Calculus (Math 295 – Calculus)

Appendix 2

NERIC Distance Learning Program Course Offerings-2013-14

Accounting	Japanese II
Accounting – Financial	Journalism/Creative Writing
Agriculture Intro	Management, Principles of
Agri-science Explorations	Mandarin Chinese I
Anatomy and Physiology	Marine Biology
AP Calculus	Marine Science
AP Economics	Math, College Prep
AP European History	Meteorology
AP Government	Meteorology/Astronomy
AP Macroeconomics	Music In Our Lives
AP Psychology	Music Theory
AP US History	Nanotechnology
AP World History	Semiconductor/Nanotech HVCC
Bio Ethics	Poetry
Biology 105 HVCC	Political Science and Government
Broadway Performances	Pre-Calculus SUNY
Business Law	Pre-Calculus Physics Review
Business Management/International Bus.	Probability and Statistics
Calculus I and II	Sign Language I
Calculus SUPA	Sign Language II
Career and Financial	Sociology 111/112
Child Growth and Development	Sociology Criminology
Chinese	Spanish I & II
Chinese Language and Culture	Spanish I Culture and Tradition
Civil War	Spanish III
Digital Photography	Spanish IV/V
Economic Ideas Issues	Spanish Review
English 101/108	Spanish SUNY
Environmental Science	Sports in American History
Equine Studies	Sports Management/Marketing
Financial Survival	Statistics
Forensic Science	Statistics, Elementary
Forensics	VAP Art History
French II	VAP Economics
French IV	VAP English Literature
French IV Honors	VAP Psychology
Health	Video Games Development
Human Development	Vietnam Issues
Italian I	
Japanese I	