

SCHOOL DISTRICT OF SOUTH ORANGE AND MAPLEWOOD, NEW JERSEY
525 Academy Street, Maplewood, NJ 07040

Peter P. Horoschak, Ed.D.
Superintendent

973-762-5600 X 1821
FAX: 973-378-9464

M E M O R A N D U M

TO: BOE Members

FM: Peter P. Horoschak

DT: 27 January 2004

RE: 2004-05 Preliminary Budget – Analysis of Administrative Staffing

The Board of Education requested a comparative and functional analysis of the current level of administrative staffing, including both central office staff and building/departmental administrators to examine whether we are overstaffed. The Central Office Administration with the assistance of the ASCA leadership:

- Examined administrative positions in other like-size districts;
- Considered the increase/decrease of administrative positions in our own district over the last twenty years; and
- Engaged building principals in a discussion of their administrative and programmatic needs, which lead to the consideration of various models of reorganization and the determination of which one best met their needs.

IS THE SOMSD OVER-STAFFED WITH ADMINISTRATORS?

When we compare the number of supervisory, building level, and central office administrative positions in the South Orange Maplewood School District with those of like-size districts, our total number of certified administrators is on the higher end of the continuum. It is difficult to compare administrative positions district-to-district because of the difference in administrative organization and the variation in the assignments of leadership, supervisory, and managerial responsibilities. However, it is evident that, in those districts with fewer administrative positions, many of the managerial responsibilities presently assigned to our certified administrative staff are assigned to teachers on special assignment. For example, such teachers serve as full or part-time teacher coordinators of assessment, professional development, mentorship programs, special education, or a specific subject content area. Compensation is typically provided by stipends paid to teaching staff in addition to their contractual salaries. Many of these positions may also involve reduced teaching assignments. These costs are reflected as teacher salaries, thereby making administrative costs per pupil lower and the teacher costs per pupil higher. One responsibility that cannot be assigned to these teachers are those related to the formal evaluation of certificated and non-certificated staff for which an administrative or

supervisory certificate is required. In the past, our school district has paid teachers to oversee assessment and special education responsibilities. We have structured a highly competent and experienced administrative leadership team with the authority to conduct formal evaluations of staff, to meet the challenges facing our district. However, we are recommending an administrative reorganization which will assign more of the curriculum support responsibilities to principals and instructional resource teachers.

The reorganization, as described below, will result in the reduction of three (3.0 FTEs) certified administrative positions. Under the proposed reorganization, we believe we will continue to be staffed appropriately to manage and provide leadership in the South Orange Maplewood School District. All districts face similar management responsibilities. Each district organizes itself to meet its responsibilities by taking advantage of the experience and competencies of its administrative personnel to effectively engage teachers and support staff. It is of great importance to preserve consistency of leadership to accomplish the initiatives underway. Additionally, it is important to support principals in their instructional leadership role. We believe the proposed administrative reorganization accomplishes both of these objectives and justifies the administrative staffing level of our district.

Summary of Vital Statistics: NJDOE Comparative Spending Guide (Addendum #1), was reviewed as part of our analysis. Data are based on fall 2002 NJDOE statistics. The comparisons relate to 101 Operating Type K-12 Districts with a student population of greater than 3,500 students. The comparative spending analyses for the 2002-2003 budget year are displayed in three areas:

- ◆ student/administrator ratio
- ◆ total administrative cost per pupil
- ◆ salaries and benefits for administration per pupil

The definitions of total administrative costs and administrators' salaries and benefits are also provided in Addendum #1. In summary, please note the following:

- ◆ districts with a number higher than 175.6 (SOMSD) have fewer administrators per student, and districts with a number lower than 175.6 have more administrators per student.
- ◆ total administrative cost for our district is \$1,136 per pupil. SOMSD is ranked 72nd of 101 comparative districts. Therefore, there are 71 comparable districts with lower total administrative costs per pupil than SOMSD. The state average for the 101 districts is \$1,096.
- ◆ salaries and benefits for administration is \$935 per pupil. SOMSD is ranked 80th of 101 comparative districts. Therefore, there are 79 comparable districts with lower costs than SOMSD. The state average for the 101 districts is \$861.

TWENTY-YEAR OVERVIEW OF THE NUMBER OF ADMINISTRATIVE POSITIONS IN OUR DISTRICT

The number of administrative and supervisory positions has dropped significantly over the years even though student enrollment has increased. Although the number of administrators has decreased, the statutory responsibilities for administration have increased, e.g. NCLB, Special Education, Assessment, Core Curriculum Content Standards.

The following documents (Addendum 2 and Addendum 3, respectively) depict these reductions over time:

- [A Comparative and Functional Analysis of the Current Level of Administrative Staffing \(ASCA\)](#)
- [Twenty Year Summary of SOMSD Central Office Administrative Positions](#)

ARE THE SALARIES OF SOMSD ADMINISTRATORS COMPARABLE TO THOSE IN THE REGION?

Administrator salaries in our district are comparable, not only with other Essex County K-12 school districts, but with similar school districts in adjoining counties. Director salaries are negotiated as part of the ASCA contract. Our ASCA salary guide is in line with comparable districts. A salary guide accounts for years of administrative experience. Salaries for assistant superintendents and other administrators who are not included on the ASCA salary guide are determined annually by the Board of Education. Prior to setting the salaries for these positions, the Board is provided with the results of a survey of like-districts in the region. Data from the survey reviewed before setting administrator salaries for the 2003-04 school year are found in Addendum 4. Please note that the survey does not indicate the experience level of the administrator holding the position. This is an important factor when setting salaries, but is not readily apparent when comparing salaries that are not part of a salary guide. The method of setting the Superintendent's salary is defined in a contractual agreement between the Board of Education and the Superintendent. Contracts are for three to five years in duration, and the Superintendent is the only certificated administrator who does not gain tenure. A comparison of Superintendents' salaries in the region is also provided in Addendum 4.

DESIGN OF THE PROPOSED REORGANIZATION

As part of this analysis, alternative models of administrative reorganization were considered based on the need to address curriculum and instruction in the District. We looked at one model, which reduced the four K-8 supervisor positions to two positions, one for language arts and social studies, and the other for mathematics and science. A variation on this model was the addition of K-8 lead teachers to support the K-8 supervisors.

A second model reduced the four K-8 supervisor positions to two K-5 supervisor positions, one for language arts and social studies, and the other for mathematics and science. This model required that the four 9-12

subject chairs who teach one class become 6-12 supervisors with no teaching responsibilities. A variation on this model was the addition of K-5 lead teachers to support the K-5 supervisors.

A third model abolished the four positions of K-8 supervisors and the four positions of 9-12 subject chairs and replaced them with four K-12 directors with no teaching responsibilities. A variation on this model was the addition of four K-8 lead teachers.

The model we are recommending reduces administrative positions by 3, increases teaching positions by .8, and increases teacher instructional support by 1.7. In effect, this model abolishes the four K-8 supervisor positions, creates a new position of K-5 Supervisor of Curriculum and Instruction, requires the 9-12 subject chairs to become 6-12 supervisors with no teaching responsibilities, and provides an Instructional Resource Teacher in each elementary school to replace the present position of assistant to the principal. We first considered providing each elementary school with a full-time Instructional Resource Teacher. However, to reduce the cost even further, as the model reflects, the time allocation for this position will vary from .5 FTE to 1.0 FTE based on the student enrollment of each elementary school and the tasks required for the grade level clusters served.

Both administrative and programmatic needs at the elementary and secondary levels were considered via input from members of the Central Office Council and building level administrators. Addendum 5 shows our present program model. Addendum 6 presents the recommended program model. We believe that our new administrative/supervisory reorganization model provides a blend of elements that are both cost conscious and administratively effective.

PROPOSED REORGANIZATION PLAN

- *Responds to the expressed needs of the principals*

Elementary principals want to spend more time in classrooms to do developmental supervision and professional development and to have more responsibility for the evaluation of staff. Principals will work closely with the Assistant Superintendent for Elementary and Middle School Education and the Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum and Instruction to facilitate the development, implementation, and assessment of a consistent K-5 program, and the articulation of this program to the community.

- *Creates the position of Instructional Resource Teacher (IRT) in each elementary building to replace the present position of Assistant to the Principal*

The position of Instructional Resource Teacher will provide more time for the elementary principals to strengthen their leadership role in curriculum and instruction. This new position will be allocated

based on the enrollment and responsibilities at each elementary school. The IRT will provide curricular, instructional, professional development, and administrative support within their building. This support will include: assisting the principal in the operation of the building intervention team; coaching teachers; presentations to parent groups to help them understand and value our instructional program; involvement in grade level meetings when appropriate to effect horizontal and vertical continuity of the K-5 program; assistance to the principals in implementing the testing and assessment programs under the direction of the Director of Planning and Assessment; acting as a resource to the staff for the ordering and distribution of textbooks, supplies, and equipment needed for school programs; being responsible for building coverage in the principal's absence; and assisting with discipline and lunch duty. We will draw upon the experience and expertise of our principals to provide curriculum leadership in their building and, through the mentoring of their IRT, provide opportunities to them for future leadership roles in our district.

- *Creates the position of a K-5 Supervisor of Curriculum and Instruction*

This position will provide curricular and instructional support to the elementary principals and coordinate the efforts of the Instructional Resource Teachers in order to facilitate a consistent implementation of our K-5 program in our schools. In addition, this person will: assist with the implementation, together with the 6-12 supervisors, of the district's curriculum as it applies to the K-12 content areas; assist in the development and administration, together with the two assistant superintendents, the principals and the Instructional Resource Teachers, of the K-5 budget to support the instructional program; be available to teachers to model best classroom practices; assist with the identification of teachers who will provide leadership in the area of professional development and curriculum development; participate in the program assessment process; oversee the utilization of appropriate materials; and be available upon request to assist principals in the evaluation process.

- *Creates the positions of four 6-12 supervisors, one in each subject area of language arts literacy, mathematics, science, and social studies*

The four 6-12 supervisors will replace the four 9-12 subject chairs and the four K-8 supervisors. This new configuration will strengthen the transition and articulation between the middle school and high school programs. The 6-12 supervisors will have primary responsibility for their high school department and will work closely with the middle school principals and assistant principals in the following areas of responsibility: participating in the program assessment process; reviewing, ordering and distributing curriculum and instructional materials; assisting in the evaluation of non-tenured staff; and conducting 6-12 department/curriculum/professional development meetings.

The elementary and middle school principals will continue to report to the Assistant Superintendent for Elementary and Middle School Education. The K-5 Supervisor of Curriculum and Instruction, the four 6-12 supervisors, and the four K-12 subject area directors will report to the Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum and Instruction.

The Assistant Superintendent for Elementary and Middle School Education will provide leadership in the following major areas: supervision and evaluation of the elementary and middle school principals; oversight for the administration, organization, and management of the elementary and middle schools; development and implementation of the demonstration school model at the elementary level; and response and effective resolutions to community issues and concerns. In addition, under the new organization, the Assistant Superintendent for Elementary and Middle School Education will assume the responsibility of overseeing and coordinating the implementation of the District K-5 program in collaboration with the principal, K-5 supervisor, the IRTs, and the Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum and Instruction.

The Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum and Instruction will provide leadership in the following major areas: supervision and evaluation of all curriculum supervisors K-12; monitoring the development, implementation, and assessment of the K-12 curriculum; supervision of the development, implementation, and evaluation of professional development training programs for professional personnel in consultation with the Assistant Superintendent for Elementary and Middle School Education; assist in the development of those sections of the district budget that pertain to curriculum and instruction; oversee the Project Ahead Program, the Enrichment Programs, and the NCLB mandates. Under the new organization, the Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum and Instruction will regularly collaborate with the Assistant Superintendent for Elementary and Middle School Education, the K-5 Supervisor of Curriculum and Instruction, and the 6-12 supervisors to ensure the success of the K-12 program.

This proposed reorganization plan reduces administrative staff by 3 FTEs.

c: Patricia Barker
James Corino
Marilyn Davenport
Jim Memoli

JM/JC/PPH/sas

SUMMARY OF ADDENDA:

1. Summary of Vital Statistics: NJDOE Comparative Spending Guide, including definitions of total administrative costs and administrators' salaries and benefits from NJ Comparative Spending Guide
2. A Comparative and Functional Analysis of the Current Level of Administrative Staffing (ASCA)
3. Twenty Year Summary of SOMSD Central Office Administrative Positions
4. Results of Survey Used in Setting SOMSD Administrative Salaries for 2003-2004 SY
5. Current District Table of Organization
6. Proposed Reorganization Plan/Proposed Table of Organization

Addendum #1

**Selected relevant portions of the N.J. Department of Education
2003 Comparative Spending Guide
(see <http://www.nj.gov/njded/guide/2003/>)**

Summary of Vital Statistics
Comparative Spending Guide 2003
Operating Type K-12 / 3501 + (Total of 101 School Districts)

COUNTY	DISTRICT	2002-03 Comparative Cost Per Pupil	-----Revenue Sources-----						Fall 2002 -----Certified Staff-----			10/15/02 % of Classified Students to Total Students
			State	Local Taxes	Federal	Tuition	Use of Fund Bal.	Other	Student / Teacher Ratio	Student / Support Ratio	Student / Admin Ratio	
ATLANTIC	ATLANTIC CITY	\$10,238	18%	66%	3%	6%	7%	0%	13.1	131.3	205.1	11.0%
ATLANTIC	EGG HARBOR TWP	\$7,771	49%	47%	2%	0%	0%	2%	13.9	97.7	233.9	13.1%
ATLANTIC	PLEASANTVILLE CITY	\$11,986	73%	11%	5%	0%	9%	2%	10.9	69.2	143.0	10.8%
BERGEN	BERGENFIELD BORO	\$9,111	25%	73%	2%	0%	0%	0%	14.4	94.2	159.2	13.0%
BERGEN	FAIR LAWN BORO	\$10,704	9%	85%	2%	0%	1%	3%	13.3	97.9	188.0	13.1%
BERGEN	GARFIELD CITY	\$9,353	59%	33%	4%	0%	0%	4%	12.9	111.8	177.0	9.1%
BERGEN	HACKENSACK CITY	\$10,290	16%	73%	3%	6%	1%	1%	13.2	100.2	170.7	12.7%
BERGEN	PARAMUS BORO	\$10,751	8%	88%	2%	0%	0%	2%	12.7	99.0	157.4	12.5%
BERGEN	RIDGEWOOD VILLAGE	\$10,197	6%	89%	1%	2%	1%	1%	14.0	96.1	165.9	9.8%
BERGEN	TEANECK TWP	\$11,871	8%	85%	2%	0%	4%	1%	13.1	81.8	154.1	10.3%
BURLINGTON	BURLINGTON TWP	\$7,214	40%	56%	2%	0%	2%	0%	13.7	122.9	174.9	11.0%
BURLINGTON	MOORESTOWN TWP	\$8,795	10%	85%	1%	1%	2%	1%	14.5	89.4	168.7	14.1%
BURLINGTON	PEMBERTON TWP	\$11,398	75%	12%	2%	1%	8%	2%	11.4	75.8	176.8	18.2%
BURLINGTON	WILLINGBORO TWP	\$9,110	62%	32%	3%	0%	2%	1%	11.7	76.3	161.4	12.5%
CAMDEN	CAMDEN CITY	\$12,541	87%	3%	9%	0%	1%	0%	11.4	87.1	103.3	17.3%
CAMDEN	CHERRY HILL TWP	\$9,272	13%	84%	1%	0%	0%	2%	14.8	89.1	241.8	10.8%
CAMDEN	PENNSAUKEN TWP	\$8,925	52%	38%	3%	1%	5%	1%	14.6	111.1	214.9	17.5%
CAMDEN	WINSLOW TWP	\$8,248	59%	35%	3%	2%	1%	0%	11.6	70.9	216.0	16.3%
CUMBERLAND	BRIDGETON CITY	\$11,514	82%	6%	6%	3%	3%	0%	11.3	89.8	137.9	15.9%
CUMBERLAND	MILLVILLE CITY	\$10,299	78%	11%	4%	3%	2%	2%	12.1	79.6	158.4	16.4%
CUMBERLAND	VINELAND CITY	\$11,377	77%	12%	4%	1%	4%	2%	11.0	59.5	176.7	15.4%
ESSEX	BELLEVILLE TOWN	\$7,845	41%	56%	2%	0%	0%	1%	14.5	88.7	158.9	13.3%
ESSEX	BLOOMFIELD TWP	\$7,941	26%	68%	2%	1%	2%	1%	14.0	98.3	171.8	12.8%
ESSEX	CITY OF ORANGE TWP	\$10,958	78%	12%	4%	0%	0%	6%	13.8	86.5	102.6	11.1%
ESSEX	EAST ORANGE	\$11,165	80%	10%	4%	0%	4%	2%	13.6	95.9	202.8	11.9%
ESSEX	IRVINGTON TOWNSHIP	\$10,853	75%	13%	3%	0%	2%	7%	15.2	98.7	178.7	6.8%
ESSEX	LIVINGSTON TWP	\$11,482	6%	91%	1%	0%	0%	2%	12.3	67.0	161.3	13.5%
ESSEX	MILLBURN TWP	\$10,466	6%	93%	1%	0%	0%	0%	12.7	78.5	182.2	10.1%
ESSEX	MONTCLAIR TOWN	\$10,093	11%	86%	2%	0%	0%	1%	12.0	78.1	182.2	14.8%
ESSEX	NEWARK CITY	\$13,546	80%	11%	7%	0%	1%	1%	12.1	69.9	126.5	11.1%
ESSEX	NUTLEY TOWN	\$8,668	15%	80%	2%	0%	2%	1%	15.6	109.0	177.2	10.5%

Summary of Vital Statistics (Cont'd)
Comparative Spending Guide 2003
Operating Type K-12 / 3501 + (Total of 101 School Districts)

COUNTY	DISTRICT	2002-03 Comparative Cost Per Pupil	-----Revenue Sources-----						Fall 2002 -----Certified Staff-----			10/15/02
			State	Local Taxes	Federal	Tuition	Use of Fund Bal.	Other	Student / Teacher Ratio	Student / Support Ratio	Student / Admin Ratio	% of Classified Students to Total Students
ESSEX	SOUTH ORANGE-MAPLEWOOD	\$9,464	8%	90%	1%	0%	0%	1%	13.7	103.5	175.6	9.7%
ESSEX	WEST ORANGE TOWN	\$9,834	10%	88%	1%	0%	0%	1%	12.5	87.6	185.1	10.4%
GLOUCESTER	DEPTFORD TWP	\$7,924	44%	52%	3%	1%	0%	0%	15.3	100.7	217.3	14.4%
GLOUCESTER	MONROE TWP	\$7,603	51%	43%	3%	0%	2%	1%	14.1	121.5	189.0	14.9%
GLOUCESTER	WASHINGTON TWP	\$9,075	49%	46%	2%	0%	2%	1%	13.2	88.0	186.6	11.0%
HUDSON	BAYONNE CITY	\$8,916	40%	52%	3%	0%	2%	3%	13.7	95.9	196.6	15.7%
HUDSON	JERSEY CITY	\$12,436	72%	14%	4%	0%	3%	7%	12.6	74.5	121.7	13.5%
HUDSON	KEARNY TOWN	\$9,290	37%	60%	2%	0%	0%	1%	14.4	112.9	182.6	9.0%
HUDSON	NORTH BERGEN TWP	\$8,636	48%	41%	4%	3%	4%	0%	15.5	144.7	173.4	10.3%
HUDSON	UNION CITY	\$12,223	80%	10%	4%	0%	4%	2%	12.7	111.3	138.1	10.2%
HUDSON	WEST NEW YORK TOWN	\$10,908	74%	14%	4%	0%	2%	6%	13.1	106.7	122.8	10.2%
MERCER	EAST WINDSOR REGIONAL	\$9,745	28%	66%	2%	1%	2%	1%	13.1	90.7	207.1	12.7%
MERCER	EWING TWP	\$10,216	15%	78%	2%	0%	3%	2%	12.0	79.5	128.3	13.0%
MERCER	HAMILTON TWP	\$8,359	40%	55%	2%	0%	2%	1%	14.0	85.8	205.3	15.5%
MERCER	HOPEWELL VALLEY REGIONAL	\$10,257	8%	91%	1%	0%	0%	0%	12.3	73.5	145.6	10.0%
MERCER	LAWRENCE TWP	\$10,373	10%	81%	2%	7%	0%	0%	13.3	92.6	162.9	14.2%
MERCER	PRINCETON REGIONAL	\$11,295	8%	83%	2%	4%	2%	1%	13.2	87.4	154.3	9.3%
MERCER	TRENTON CITY	\$12,878	82%	8%	5%	0%	0%	5%	13.3	79.7	230.2	12.8%
MERCER	W WINDSOR-PLAINSBORO REG	\$10,474	8%	88%	1%	0%	2%	1%	12.6	89.8	188.1	9.0%
MIDDLESEX	CARTERET BORO	\$8,443	48%	49%	3%	0%	0%	0%	14.2	102.0	182.7	8.5%
MIDDLESEX	EAST BRUNSWICK TWP	\$9,267	19%	78%	2%	0%	0%	1%	13.9	92.6	260.5	12.6%
MIDDLESEX	EDISON TWP	\$9,200	10%	88%	2%	0%	0%	0%	13.3	111.8	233.8	9.9%
MIDDLESEX	MONROE TWP	\$10,172	8%	84%	1%	5%	1%	1%	12.9	80.3	193.7	13.3%
MIDDLESEX	NEW BRUNSWICK CITY	\$13,351	71%	21%	4%	0%	1%	3%	12.0	69.7	91.1	15.6%
MIDDLESEX	NORTH BRUNSWICK TWP	\$8,556	14%	83%	1%	0%	0%	2%	13.5	107.9	166.2	11.6%
MIDDLESEX	OLD BRIDGE TWP	\$8,537	35%	62%	2%	0%	0%	1%	15.0	123.4	242.3	7.6%
MIDDLESEX	PERTH AMBOY CITY	\$11,011	78%	13%	4%	0%	4%	1%	13.4	86.7	189.8	9.4%
MIDDLESEX	PISCATAWAY TWP	\$9,215	16%	78%	2%	0%	3%	1%	13.6	87.3	211.2	11.7%
MIDDLESEX	SAYREVILLE BORO	\$6,803	27%	66%	1%	0%	2%	4%	14.9	107.2	242.4	11.0%
MIDDLESEX	SOUTH BRUNSWICK TWP	\$9,221	21%	74%	1%	0%	3%	1%	12.9	86.4	182.0	10.0%
MIDDLESEX	SOUTH PLAINFIELD BORO	\$9,131	19%	71%	2%	0%	6%	2%	13.5	90.6	181.5	11.4%

Total Administrative Cost - Indicator 8
Operating Type K-12 / 3501 + (Total of 101 School Districts)
Ranked Low Cost to High Cost

	Actual 2000-01 Per Pupil Cost	2000-01 Ranking	2000-01 % of Total Comparative Cost / Pupil	Actual 2001-02 Per Pupil Cost	2001-02 Ranking	2001-02 % of Total Comparative Cost / Pupil	Budget 2002-03 Per Pupil Cost	2002-03 Ranking	2002-03 % of Total Comparative Cost / Pupil
State average - Operating type K-12	\$1,043			\$1,131			\$1,096		
State median - Operating type K-12	\$1,013			\$1,086			\$1,085		
State average - All operating types	\$1,083			\$1,165			\$1,142		
State median - All operating types	\$1,104			\$1,176			\$1,194		

Low to High Ranges		\$507 — \$1,951		0.0%—25.9%	\$624 — \$1,993		8.2%—26.0%	\$573 — \$1,600		7.8%—15.1%
COUNTY	DISTRICT									
ATLANTIC	ATLANTIC CITY	\$1,156	84	12.1%	\$1,185	78	12.0%	\$1,161	78	11.3%
ATLANTIC	EGG HARBOR TWP	\$760	12	10.4%	\$762	10	10.1%	\$738	5	9.5%
ATLANTIC	PLEASANTVILLE CITY	\$1,196	89	13.2%	\$1,993	101	18.3%	\$1,481	99	12.4%
BERGEN	BERGENFIELD BORO	\$886	27	10.4%	\$1,020	52	11.4%	\$890	26	9.8%
BERGEN	FAIR LAWN BORO	\$1,120	80	11.5%	\$1,131	73	11.3%	\$1,108	67	10.3%
BERGEN	GARFIELD CITY	\$898	32	10.4%	\$912	34	9.4%	\$776	9	8.3%
BERGEN	HACKENSACK CITY	\$910	34	9.8%	\$1,049	54	10.6%	\$1,038	51	10.1%
BERGEN	PARAMUS BORO	\$967	53	10.0%	\$1,077	61	10.7%	\$1,086	63	10.1%
BERGEN	RIDGEWOOD VILLAGE	\$1,201	90	12.7%	\$1,211	81	12.2%	\$1,236	87	12.1%
BERGEN	TEANECK TWP	\$1,108	78	10.0%	\$1,187	79	10.3%	\$1,216	83	10.2%
BURLINGTON	BURLINGTON TWP	\$927	39	14.1%	\$927	36	13.5%	\$802	13	11.1%
BURLINGTON	MOORESTOWN TWP	\$768	13	9.4%	\$798	15	9.3%	\$835	17	9.5%
BURLINGTON	PEMBERTON TWP	\$1,145	83	11.9%	\$1,320	89	12.2%	\$1,379	95	12.1%
BURLINGTON	WILLINGBORO TWP	\$952	48	11.1%	\$1,072	59	12.1%	\$1,045	53	11.5%
CAMDEN	CAMDEN CITY	\$1,268	94	12.0%	\$1,404	93	12.4%	\$1,447	98	11.5%
CAMDEN	CHERRY HILL TWP	\$949	47	11.1%	\$982	42	11.3%	\$1,046	54	11.3%
CAMDEN	PENNSAUKEN TWP	\$942	43	11.5%	\$898	29	10.7%	\$952	34	10.7%
CAMDEN	WINSLOW TWP	-----	-----	0.0%	\$837	18	9.7%	\$835	17	10.1%
CUMBERLAND	BRIDGETON CITY	\$1,380	95	12.8%	\$1,272	87	11.7%	\$1,343	94	11.7%
CUMBERLAND	MILLVILLE CITY	\$918	37	10.3%	\$1,013	49	10.1%	\$1,038	51	10.1%
CUMBERLAND	VINELAND CITY	\$994	61	10.4%	\$1,016	50	9.6%	\$1,008	45	8.9%
ESSEX	BELLEVILLE TOWN	\$981	59	12.3%	\$1,019	51	12.5%	\$995	42	12.7%
ESSEX	BLOOMFIELD TWP	\$790	16	10.9%	\$850	20	10.9%	\$864	21	10.9%
ESSEX	CITY OF ORANGE TWP	\$1,881	99	21.5%	\$1,477	95	15.5%	\$1,320	93	12.0%

Total Administrative Cost - Indicator 8 (Cont'd)
Operating Type K-12 / 3501 + (Total of 101 School Districts)
Ranked Low Cost to High Cost

	Actual 2000-01 Per Pupil Cost	2000-01 Ranking	2000-01 % of Total Comparative Cost / Pupil	Actual 2001-02 Per Pupil Cost	2001-02 Ranking	2001-02 % of Total Comparative Cost / Pupil	Budget 2002-03 Per Pupil Cost	2002-03 Ranking	2002-03 % of Total Comparative Cost / Pupil
State average - Operating type K-12	\$1,043			\$1,131			\$1,096		
State median - Operating type K-12	\$1,013			\$1,086			\$1,085		
State average - All operating types	\$1,083			\$1,165			\$1,142		
State median - All operating types	\$1,104			\$1,176			\$1,194		

Low to High Ranges		\$507 — \$1,951		0.0%—25.9%	\$624 — \$1,993		8.2%—26.0%	\$573 — \$1,600		7.8%—15.1%
COUNTY	DISTRICT									
ESSEX	EAST ORANGE	\$1,253	93	12.9%	\$1,321	90	12.0%	\$1,431	97	12.8%
ESSEX	IRVINGTON TOWNSHIP	\$1,119	79	12.5%	\$1,094	66	12.2%	\$1,310	92	12.1%
ESSEX	LIVINGSTON TWP	\$1,212	91	11.4%	\$1,270	85	11.4%	\$1,262	89	11.0%
ESSEX	MILLBURN TWP	\$944	45	10.3%	\$1,004	47	10.3%	\$1,031	48	9.9%
ESSEX	MONTCLAIR TOWN	\$890	30	9.6%	\$898	29	9.2%	\$941	33	9.3%
ESSEX	NEWARK CITY	\$1,475	96	13.1%	\$1,891	98	15.0%	\$1,600	101	11.8%
ESSEX	NUTLEY TOWN	\$1,001	62	12.5%	\$1,095	67	13.2%	\$1,101	66	12.7%
ESSEX	SOUTH ORANGE-MAPLEWOOD	\$1,126	81	13.0%	\$1,176	77	12.8%	\$1,136	72	12.0%
ESSEX	WEST ORANGE TOWN	\$1,107	77	12.8%	\$1,271	86	12.9%	\$1,178	81	12.0%
GLOUCESTER	DEPTFORD TWP	\$921	38	11.5%	\$1,073	60	13.7%	\$916	30	11.6%
GLOUCESTER	MONROE TWP	\$1,173	87	17.0%	\$1,424	94	19.2%	\$1,145	73	15.1%
GLOUCESTER	WASHINGTON TWP	\$887	28	11.8%	\$1,954	99	24.3%	\$1,049	55	11.6%
HUDSON	BAYONNE CITY	\$888	29	10.0%	\$896	28	10.1%	\$940	32	10.5%
HUDSON	JERSEY CITY	\$1,100	75	10.9%	\$1,139	74	10.6%	\$1,410	96	11.3%
HUDSON	KEARNY TOWN	\$878	26	10.3%	\$759	9	8.6%	\$971	35	10.4%
HUDSON	NORTH BERGEN TWP	\$991	60	13.6%	\$998	46	12.8%	\$1,090	64	12.6%
HUDSON	UNION CITY	\$904	33	9.8%	\$1,083	63	10.8%	\$1,223	85	10.0%
HUDSON	WEST NEW YORK TOWN	\$1,168	85	11.9%	\$1,220	83	12.0%	\$1,202	82	11.0%
MERCER	EAST WINDSOR REGIONAL	\$807	19	9.3%	\$869	24	9.3%	\$907	28	9.3%
MERCER	EWING TWP	\$1,013	65	11.0%	\$1,098	69	11.3%	\$1,145	73	11.2%
MERCER	HAMILTON TWP	\$751	10	9.9%	\$763	11	9.5%	\$793	11	9.5%
MERCER	HOPEWELL VALLEY REGIONAL	\$942	43	10.6%	\$945	38	10.0%	\$989	38	9.6%
MERCER	LAWRENCE TWP	\$953	49	10.6%	\$982	42	10.3%	\$1,080	62	10.4%
MERCER	PRINCETON REGIONAL	\$1,016	66	10.4%	\$1,149	75	10.5%	\$1,159	76	10.3%

Salaries & Benefits for Administration - Indicator 9
Operating Type K-12 / 3501 + (Total of 101 School Districts)

Ranked Low Cost to High Cost

	Actual 2000-01 Per Pupil Cost	2000-01 % of Total 2000-01 Comparative Cost / Pupil	2000-01 % of Sal/Ben To Total Admin	Actual 2001-02 Per Pupil Cost	2001-02 % of Total 2001-02 Comparative Cost / Pupil	2001-02 % of Sal/Ben To Total Admin	Budget 2002-03 Per Pupil Cost	2002-03 % of Total 2002-03 Comparative Cost / Pupil	2002-03 % of Sal/Ben To Total Admin
--	--	---	--	--	---	--	--	---	--

State average - Operating type K-12	\$837			\$903			\$861		
State median - Operating type K-12	\$808			\$839			\$860		
State average - All operating types	\$857			\$922			\$893		
State median - All operating types	\$845			\$908			\$921		

Low to High Ranges

\$396 — \$1,846

0.0% — 24.5%

0.0% — 94.6%

\$512 — \$1,852

6.3% — 24.2%

59.2% — 93.3%

\$461 — \$1,297

5.9% — 11.5%

66.6% — 88.4%

COUNTY DISTRICT

ATLANTIC	ATLANTIC CITY	\$805	64	8.4%	69.6%	\$846	68	8.6%	71.4%	\$876	71	8.6%	75.5%
ATLANTIC	EGG HARBOR TWP	\$589	7	8.1%	77.5%	\$604	10	8.0%	79.3%	\$577	8	7.4%	78.2%
ATLANTIC	PLEASANTVILLE CITY	\$838	74	9.2%	70.1%	\$1,555	99	14.3%	78.0%	\$1,015	93	8.5%	68.5%
BERGEN	BERGENFIELD BORO	\$758	46	8.9%	85.6%	\$814	57	9.1%	79.8%	\$759	32	8.3%	85.3%
BERGEN	FAIR LAWN BORO	\$983	90	10.1%	87.8%	\$990	88	9.9%	87.5%	\$968	87	9.0%	87.4%
BERGEN	GARFIELD CITY	\$744	41	8.6%	82.9%	\$754	35	7.8%	82.7%	\$647	14	6.9%	83.4%
BERGEN	HACKENSACK CITY	\$790	58	8.5%	86.8%	\$890	74	9.0%	84.8%	\$882	74	8.6%	85.0%
BERGEN	PARAMUS BORO	\$811	66	8.4%	83.9%	\$839	64	8.4%	77.9%	\$878	72	8.2%	80.8%
BERGEN	RIDGEWOOD VILLAGE	\$988	91	10.4%	82.3%	\$993	89	10.0%	82.0%	\$1,036	96	10.2%	83.8%
BERGEN	TEANECK TWP	\$836	72	7.5%	75.5%	\$902	75	7.8%	76.0%	\$921	78	7.8%	75.7%
BURLINGTON	BURLINGTON TWP	\$758	46	11.5%	81.8%	\$782	41	11.4%	84.4%	\$645	12	8.9%	80.4%
BURLINGTON	MOORESTOWN TWP	\$663	21	8.1%	86.3%	\$690	22	8.0%	86.5%	\$727	24	8.3%	87.1%
BURLINGTON	PEMBERTON TWP	\$992	93	10.3%	86.6%	\$1,099	94	10.1%	83.3%	\$1,034	95	9.1%	75.0%
BURLINGTON	WILLINGBORO TWP	\$708	31	8.3%	74.4%	\$792	46	8.9%	73.9%	\$785	43	8.6%	75.1%
CAMDEN	CAMDEN CITY	\$957	87	9.1%	75.5%	\$966	85	8.5%	68.8%	\$1,054	98	8.4%	72.8%
CAMDEN	CHERRY HILL TWP	\$782	57	9.1%	82.4%	\$826	59	9.5%	84.1%	\$865	62	9.3%	82.7%
CAMDEN	PENNSAUKEN TWP	\$717	33	8.8%	76.1%	\$694	24	8.2%	77.3%	\$732	25	8.2%	76.9%
CAMDEN	WINSLOW TWP	----	----	0.0%	0.0%	\$715	25	8.3%	85.4%	\$703	20	8.5%	84.2%
CUMBERLAND	BRIDGETON CITY	\$1,063	96	9.9%	77.0%	\$953	82	8.7%	74.9%	\$989	90	8.6%	73.6%
CUMBERLAND	MILLVILLE CITY	\$668	23	7.5%	72.8%	\$804	52	8.0%	79.4%	\$797	48	7.7%	76.8%
CUMBERLAND	VINELAND CITY	\$808	65	8.5%	81.3%	\$798	48	7.5%	78.5%	\$762	33	6.7%	75.6%
ESSEX	BELLEVILLE TOWN	\$836	72	10.5%	85.2%	\$875	72	10.8%	85.9%	\$865	62	11.0%	86.9%
ESSEX	BLOOMFIELD TWP	\$606	11	8.3%	76.7%	\$632	12	8.1%	74.4%	\$650	15	8.2%	75.2%
ESSEX	CITY OF ORANGE TWP	\$1,557	98	17.8%	82.8%	\$951	80	10.0%	64.4%	\$887	75	8.1%	67.2%

Salaries & Benefits for Administration- Indicator 9 (Cont'd)
Operating Type K-12 / 3501 + (Total of 101 School Districts)

Ranked Low Cost to High Cost

	Actual 2000-01 Per Pupil Cost	2000-01 % of Total 2000-01 Comparative Cost / Pupil	2000-01 % of Sal/Ben To Total Admin	Actual 2001-02 Per Pupil Cost	2001-02 % of Total 2001-02 Comparative Cost / Pupil	2001-02 % of Sal/Ben To Total Admin	Budget 2002-03 Per Pupil Cost	2002-03 % of Total 2002-03 Comparative Cost / Pupil	2002-03 % of Sal/Ben To Total Admin
--	--	---	--	--	---	--	--	---	--

State average - Operating type K-12	\$837			\$903			\$861		
State median - Operating type K-12	\$808			\$839			\$860		
State average - All operating types	\$857			\$922			\$893		
State median - All operating types	\$845			\$908			\$921		

Low to High Ranges

\$396 — \$1,846

0.0% — 24.5%

0.0% — 94.6%

\$512 — \$1,852

6.3% — 24.2%

59.2% — 93.3%

\$461 — \$1,297

5.9% — 11.5%

66.6% — 88.4%

COUNTY DISTRICT

ESSEX	EAST ORANGE	\$1,018	94	10.5%	81.2%	\$978	86	8.9%	74.0%	\$1,050	97	9.4%	73.4%
ESSEX	IRVINGTON TOWNSHIP	\$847	76	9.5%	75.7%	\$768	40	8.5%	70.2%	\$945	82	8.7%	72.1%
ESSEX	LIVINGSTON TWP	\$988	91	9.3%	81.5%	\$983	87	8.8%	77.4%	\$1,006	91	8.8%	79.7%
ESSEX	MILLBURN TWP	\$761	49	8.3%	80.6%	\$797	47	8.2%	79.4%	\$825	53	7.9%	80.0%
ESSEX	MONTCLAIR TOWN	\$761	49	8.2%	85.5%	\$782	41	8.0%	87.1%	\$802	50	7.9%	85.2%
ESSEX	NEWARK CITY	\$1,210	97	10.8%	82.0%	\$1,553	98	12.3%	82.1%	\$1,297	101	9.6%	81.1%
ESSEX	NUTLEY TOWN	\$833	71	10.4%	83.2%	\$875	72	10.5%	79.9%	\$908	77	10.5%	82.5%
ESSEX	SOUTH ORANGE-MAPLEWOOD	\$863	79	9.9%	76.6%	\$922	78	10.0%	78.4%	\$935	80	9.9%	82.3%
ESSEX	WEST ORANGE TOWN	\$936	86	10.8%	84.6%	\$1,062	93	10.8%	83.6%	\$982	89	10.0%	83.4%
GLOUCESTER	DEPTFORD TWP	\$775	53	9.7%	84.1%	\$758	37	9.7%	70.6%	\$765	36	9.7%	83.5%
GLOUCESTER	MONROE TWP	\$908	83	13.2%	77.4%	\$1,125	95	15.2%	79.0%	\$872	67	11.5%	76.2%
GLOUCESTER	WASHINGTON TWP	\$719	34	9.6%	81.1%	\$1,795	100	22.3%	91.9%	\$847	59	9.3%	80.7%
HUDSON	BAYONNE CITY	\$722	36	8.1%	81.3%	\$731	29	8.2%	81.6%	\$752	29	8.4%	80.0%
HUDSON	JERSEY CITY	\$964	88	9.6%	87.6%	\$962	83	9.0%	84.5%	\$1,122	99	9.0%	79.6%
HUDSON	KEARNY TOWN	\$707	30	8.3%	80.5%	\$638	13	7.2%	84.1%	\$776	40	8.3%	79.9%
HUDSON	NORTH BERGEN TWP	\$781	56	10.8%	78.8%	\$802	51	10.3%	80.4%	\$878	72	10.2%	80.6%
HUDSON	UNION CITY	\$674	24	7.3%	74.6%	\$783	44	7.8%	72.3%	\$833	56	6.8%	68.1%
HUDSON	WEST NEW YORK TOWN	\$879	81	9.0%	75.3%	\$834	62	8.2%	68.4%	\$801	49	7.3%	66.6%
MERCER	EAST WINDSOR REGIONAL	\$643	15	7.4%	79.7%	\$692	23	7.4%	79.6%	\$734	26	7.5%	80.9%
MERCER	EWING TWP	\$823	69	8.9%	81.2%	\$908	76	9.3%	82.7%	\$954	85	9.3%	83.3%
MERCER	HAMILTON TWP	\$665	22	8.8%	88.5%	\$679	19	8.5%	89.0%	\$701	18	8.4%	88.4%
MERCER	HOPEWELL VALLEY REGIONAL	\$720	35	8.1%	76.4%	\$749	34	7.9%	79.3%	\$795	47	7.7%	80.4%
MERCER	LAWRENCE TWP	\$759	48	8.5%	79.6%	\$800	49	8.4%	81.5%	\$857	60	8.3%	79.4%
MERCER	PRINCETON REGIONAL	\$804	63	8.2%	79.1%	\$921	77	8.4%	80.2%	\$935	80	8.3%	80.7%

From the New Jersey Department of Education 2002-03 Comparative Spending Guide, at:
<http://www.nj.gov/njded/guide/2003/ind.shtml#ind8>

Indicator 8 - Total Administration

This indicator includes the expenditures related to the four areas of the annual school district budget statement - general administration, school administration, and business and other support services, both business and central. Total administration includes the costs associated with the activities concerned with establishing and administering policy for operating the district, the costs associated with the overall administrative responsibility for the individual schools within the district, and business support services and central support services such as research and development, planning, evaluation, information services, data processing services, and staff services. It also includes the costs associated with the assistance of instructional staff in planning, developing, and evaluating the process of providing learning experiences for students. Included here would be the board of education services and executive administration services such as the superintendent, assistant superintendents, board secretary/business administrator, and treasurer of school moneys. Also included in the definition of administration are the activities performed by the principal, assistant principals, and other assistants while they supervise operation of the school, evaluate staff members, supervise and maintain the records of the school, and coordinate instructional activities. Also included here would be the activities of department heads and the work of clerical staff in support of teaching and administrative duties as well as supervision of instruction services, curriculum development, techniques of instruction, child development and understanding, and staff training. Total administration would include the full-time, part-time and prorated salaries and allocated benefits of all employees performing the aforementioned activities, both professional and administrative as well as amounts paid to non-district personnel performing those services. Benefits are applied as a direct allocation or as a percentage of salaries and the calculation of that ratio of benefits to total salaries is shown as a separate indicator in this document. Purchased professional services such as legal services, outside auditors, bond-paying agents, election services, staff relations and negotiation services, curriculum developers, workshop presenters, and other consultants are also included in total administration. The district-wide costs for telephone and communication services, including expenses for postage equipment rental and postage are included here. Total administration includes the cost of forms, office supplies, and other supplies used to perform these functions. It would also include the rental or lease purchase of equipment related to these services, outside workshop fees and the travel of these staff as well as the costs of their dues and fees for membership in professional or other organizations, including a school board association.

Indicator 9 - Administration Salaries and Benefits

Administration salaries includes the amounts paid to district personnel for the provision of services related to the four areas of the annual school district budget statement - general administration, school administration, and business and other support services, both business and central. Please note that improvement of instruction services and instructional staff training with all the appropriate associated allocated benefits were removed from this indicator for all three fiscal years and are now included in Total Support Services and Salaries and Benefits for Support Services. This indicator is a sub-component of **Total Administration**. It includes the full-time, part-time and prorated salaries of superintendents, assistant superintendents and other general administrators, board secretaries/school business administrators and other business and central office staff, principals, assistant principals, department chairpersons, supervisors of instruction, curriculum coordinators, and the related secretarial and clerical staff for these activities. Amounts paid to non-district employees for such services are considered part of the total administration cost, but are not included here since such expenditures are for purchased services rather than for salaries. Benefits are applied as a direct allocation or as a percentage of salaries and the calculation of that ratio of benefits to total salaries is shown as a separate indicator in this document.

Addendum #2

	Comparative Staffing Analysis Between Districts										
District	South Orange-Maplewood	Livingston	Princeton Regional	East Brunswick	South Brunswick	W. Windsor-Plainsboro	Scotch Plains-Fanwood	Teaneck	Montclair	West Orange	Parishipp-Troy Hills
DFG	Essex	Essex	Mercer	Middlesex	Middlesex	Mercer	Union	GH Bergen	Essex	Essex	GH Morris
Enrollment Group	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Central Office Positions											
Superintendent	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Ass't. Superintendent	3	1	2	2	2	3	1	2	2	1	2
Business Administrator	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Ass't. Business Administrator	1		1	1	1			1	1		1
Director of Human Resources		1		1		1	1	1	1	1	1
Director of Special Education	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
Ass't. Director of Special Education	1							1			
Director of Planning/Assessment	1				1						
Administrative Assistants*					1				1		
Sub Total	9	5	6	7	8	7	5	8	8	5	6
K-12 Directors											
Director of Guidance	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Director of Media & Technology	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Director of P.E. & Health	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Director of Athletics & Student Activities	1	1	1	1	1		1	1	1	1	1
Director of Art/Music	1	2	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1
Director of World Language/ESL	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1
Curriculum Supervisors**											
Language Arts Literacy	2	2	1	1	1	3	2	1	1	1	1
Mathematics	2	2	1	1	1	3	2	1	1	1	1
Science	2	2	1	1	1	2	2	1	1	1	1
Social Studies	2	1	1	1	1	2	2	1	1	1	1
Sub Total	14	14	10	10	11	16	14	10	10	10	10
Total	23	19	16	17	19	23	19	18	18	15	16
* Certified Positions											
** K-5, 6-8, 9-12											

ADDENDUM # 4

COMPARISON OF 2003-2004 SALARIES OF
 CERTIFICATED ADMINISTRATORS
 (Not Affiliated With an Employee Union)

DISTRICT	SUPERINTEN- DENT	ASST. SUPT(S).	SCHOOL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATOR	OTHER NON-UNION DIRECTORS
Belleville	\$148,800	\$148,844	\$122,025	\$115,784
Chatham	155,000	144,000	134,500	
Livingston	166,200	144,500	131,000	128,000
Madison	162,290	121,312	119,830	
Millburn	210,000	147,500	145,290	131,250
Montclair	176,000	126,890 and 136,520	125,749	121,953
South Orange- Maplewood	160,265	JM: 135,490 MD: 135,130 JC: 125,000	123,187	103,812
Summit	187,958	145,254	135,000	
Westfield	154,802	134,935 and 137,659	128,221	
West Orange	184,236	141,750	138,000	-----

Addendum # 5**PRESENT PROGRAM MODEL**

Subject Area	Position	Grade Levels	Comments
Language Arts	Supervisor	K-8	
	Subject Chair	9-12	.2 Teacher (teach one class at CHS)
Mathematics	Supervisor	K-8	
	Subject Chair	9-12	.2 Teacher (teach one class at CHS)
Science	Supervisor	K-8	
	Subject Chair	9-12	.2 Teacher (teach one class at CHS)
Social Studies	Supervisor	K-8	
	Subject Chair	9-12	.2 Teacher (teach one class at CHS)
Fine Arts	Director	K-12	
Media/Technology	Director	K-12	
Health/PE	Director	K-12	
World Lang./ESL	Director	K-12	
Special Education	Director	K-12	
	Assistant Director	K-12	
Guidance	Director	6-12	

Total District Cost: \$1,800,000

ADDENDUM # 6**Recommended Program Model**

The average costs used for table 2 are as follows:

Supervisor/Director/Assistant Director	\$120,000
Instructional Resource Teacher	\$ 79,000 (includes a stipend for before and after school responsibilities)
.2 Classroom Teacher	\$ 14,880

Subject Area	Position	Grade Levels	Comments
Curriculum and Instruction (Generalist)	Supervisor	K-5	
Language Arts	Supervisor	6-12	Does Not Teach a class
Mathematics	Supervisor	6-12	Does Not Teach a class
Science	Supervisor	6-12	Does Not Teach a class
Social Studies	Supervisor	6-12	Does Not Teach a class
Fine Arts	Director	K-12	
Media/Technology	Director	K-12	
Health/PE	Director	K-12	
World Languages/ESL	Director	K-12	
Special Education	Director	K-12	
	Assistant Director	K-12	
Guidance	Director	6-12	
The position of Instructional Resource Teacher will be created in each elementary school. This position will vary from .5 FTE to 1.0 FTE based on the student enrollment of each elementary school (Tuscan 1.0 FTE; South Mountain 1.0 FTE; Clinton .8 FTE; Seth Boyden .8 FTE; Jefferson .6 FTE; Marshall .5 FTE) for a total of 4.7 FTEs. These positions will replace the present .5 FTE assistant to the principal in each elementary school (3.0 FTEs). This results in a net increase in teaching staff of 1.7 FTEs.			

Total District Cost: \$1, 633,820

Net Savings Compared to Present Model: \$ 166,180