Task Force:

Top Two Models



Oct. 20, 2026 | LTC Building | Planning for the 2027–28 School Year

Agenda

01 Welcome & Norms

02 Pros & Cons of Top Two

03 Four-Campus Financials

04 What Would We Change?

05 Public Input Plan

06 Next Steps & Close

Task Force Operating Norms



Sept. 15, 2026 | High School Task Force

Purpose of Norms

These norms we will review apply to all optimization task forces to ensure consistent, efficient use of time and a clear, credible path for bringing recommendations to the District's Executive Cabinet and Board of Trustees.

Every task force is a recommending body. Final decision authority rests with the District's Executive Cabinet.

If a recommendation is not reached by the task force, decision-making authority will be deferred to Cabinet.

Task Force Norms

Start and end on time regardless of attendance; default length 60–120 minutes.

Discussions, materials, & draft recommendations are confidential until agenda & minutes are posted publicly. Do not share, discuss outside the group, or photograph/screenshot materials.

Participants must not discuss, post about, or reference deliberations or materials on social media at any time; questions about public sharing should be directed to the Task Force facilitator.

One conversation at a time — side conversation topics go to the “Parking Lot” to be addressed by the task force facilitator.

Rely on data/evidence over anecdotes when evaluating options.

Discourse on substance is expected and welcomed — it should remain civil; critique ideas, not people.

Documentation & Transparency

Please refrain from sharing out task force meeting information for 48 hours.

48

Confidentiality

All deliberations are confidential until minutes and agendas are posted publicly. Please, no social media discussion of Task Force work.

What We Produce

Minute meetings, deliberations, action items; video recording of meetings, written summary of outcomes.

Four Goals for Tonight



01

Pros & cons

Discuss the strengths and challenges of Models 4 and 1, the top two vote-getters.



02

Financial impact

Compare both models side by side across all four high schools with Timely.



03

Changes

Name what, if anything, we would change about each model before it goes public.



04

Public input

Plan the Oct. 27 public hearing and the ThoughtExchange that opens Oct. 28.

Where We Are in the Process

Task Force refines the top two models

Oct. 20

Public hearing with the community

Oct. 27

ThoughtExchange opens to the public

Oct. 28 or Oct. 23

Final recommendation to Cabinet

Nov. 10

Tonight's work shapes what the public sees on Oct. 27 · Cabinet holds final decision authority

Top Two Models:

Pros & Cons



Oct. 20, 2026 | Recap of the rubric and both models · 12 min

Rubric Results · All Four Models*

Charge Measure	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Highest score
Maximize learning time	2.42	2.44	2.24	3.80	Model 4, by 1.36
Ensure equitable access	2.69	2.31	2.11	3.31	Model 4, by 0.62
Support staff well-being	2.38	2.07	2.02	2.13	Model 1, by 0.25
Reduce spending	2.02	1.93	1.82	2.47	Model 4, by 0.45
Ranked first	—	—	—	12 of 15	3 chose another model

***Average score per charge measure on the 1–4 rubric scale; Model 4 also had the most consistent scores.**

Model 4 · A/B Block, Teach 7 of 8

Strengths

Students keep today's 90-minute blocks: time for labs, deep instruction and fewer transitions.

Top-rated model, strongest on learning time and access.

Challenges

Teachers plan every other day, with no-planning days. Staff flag burnout risk.

Parents rated it lower on district alignment, CTE allocations and double-block review.

Rubric: 12 of 15 scorers ranked it first · **Savings:** 96 FTE and about $1.05M at Hendrickson

Model 1 · Traditional 8-Period Day

Strengths

Students see every teacher daily. Class Load/Avg. and planning spread evenly. Top score of all four models on staff well-being.

Challenges

Classes under 55 minutes make labs and long activities harder. Less planning time than today, with little built-in time for PLCs or data meeting reviews/planning.

Same savings as Model 4. The real difference is class length, planning rhythm and daily contact.

Recap · Baseline vs. the Top Two Models*

Department	Current Schedule		Top two models		Notes
	FTE	S:T Ratio	FTE	S:T Ratio	
English	14	28	12	28	
Math	14	27	12	29	
Science	15	28	12	29	
Social Studies	18	26	16	28	Multiple sports coaches
Language	6	25	5	27	
PE/Health	5	25	5	24	No change to coaching assignments ADs still released
CTE	25	22	25	20	Staffing reductions would require cuts to programming
Arts	13	20	9	24	Dance and theatre reduced from 2 to 1 Band reduced from 5 to 3
Total	**110**	**25**	**96**	**25**	**14 fewer FTE = $1.05M**

***Hendrickson High School staffing at $75k per FTE; Models 1 and 4 produce the same department totals.**

Financial Impact:

All Four High Schools



Oct. 20, 2026 | Modeling data from Timely · 14 min

Financial Impact · All Four Campuses*

Measure	Connally	Hendrickson**	Pflugerville	Weiss	All four campuses
Current FTE	110	110	100	105	425
Current Average Class Size	20.8	25.0	23.2	26.1	
7 of 8 FTE	102	100	91	99	392
7 of 8 Average Class Size	20.0	24.7	22.1	24.5	
7 of 8 FTE change	-8	-10	-9	-6	-33
7 of 8 yearly savings	**$600k**	**$750k**	**$675k**	**$450k**	**$2.475M**

*** Modeling a move to 7 of 8 (Models 1 and 4). PfISD HR reports $75k per FTE.**

**** You'll notice that Hendrickson's savings are lower than what was shared on Sept. 22. In the modeling above there were no changes made to athletics, performing arts, or CTE which accounts for the 4 FTE difference.**

High School Savings · Where We Stand

$2.475 M

Projected savings across the four high schools

12 FTEs moved to the CTE Center/ Ath., Fine Arts, & CTE not included

Savings fall well below the $3–5 million target.

Athletics, Fine Arts and CTE programs were not adjusted in these models.

The District must revisit the number of double-blocked courses to confirm the need.

Human Resources, Athletics, Fine Arts and CTE must collaborate to reach the optimum savings target.

The model(s) will need additional consideration in order to meet the savings target.

What Would We Change?



Oct. 20, 2026 | Three rounds, 15 minutes

PLUS |DELTA Review for Models 1 & 4

<u>Discuss at your tables</u>:

- **Model 1 (7/8 Traditional)**
- **Model 4 (7/8 Block)**
  ***(*_What are the strengths and weaknesses of each model; what changes would you suggest, if any?)_**

<u>Share outs</u>:

- **Create a PLUS/Delta Chart for each Model**

Public Input Plan

Oct. 27 hearing · Oct. 28 ThoughtExchange



Oct. 27 Public Hearing · Proposed Format

Open	Inform	Listen	Invite
Welcome, purpose and the Task Force's role	Overview of Models 4 and 1 and their financial impact	Public comment from parents, students, staff and community	How to keep giving input: ThoughtExchange opens Oct. 23 or Oct. 28…

Draft for Task Force input · Presenters, speaker sign-up, time limits and interpretation to be decided

ThoughtExchange · Opens Oct. 23 or Oct. 28



01

Review

Participants review survey format and questions.



02

Discuss

Participants read, share out, and suggest other ideas to consider for survey.



03

Review results

Themes can be viewed by Task Force to analyze responses (parents, students, staff)



04

Input...

Final thoughts on format, the close/open date, and how each campus and the district promotes it.

Next Steps

- Mr. Hill and Dr. Olivarez compile tonight's proposed changes and send them to Timely and district staff.
- Timely finalizes four-campus financial data for the Oct. 27 public hearing.
- Finalize the hearing format, presenters and speaker sign-up before Oct. 27.
- Finalize the ThoughtExchange question and close date before it opens Oct. 23 or 28.

Thank you!

