



FAIRFIELD PUBLIC SCHOOLS

BOE Budget Review
January 15, 2019
Responses to Board Questions

Christine Vitale.....pgs. 1-8
Jennifer Jacobsen.....pgs. 9-15
Jeff Peterson.....pgs. 16-19
Jessica Gerber.....pgs. 20-28
Jennifer Leeper.....pgs. 29-30
Philip Dwyer.....pg. 31
Jennifer Maxon-Kennelly.....pgs. 32-35
Trisha Pytko.....pg. 36-37

***Updated responses for questions 7, 14, 41,134, 149, 153 and 157
appear in gray highlight; question 65 is an updated chart*

Christine Vitale

Page 5

1. What type of materials need to be purchased for middle school science?

Materials and resources would include written or online texts, experiment or phenomena supplies, online databases, etc. The actual materials, and for what grades and units, will vary depending on availability of quality materials.

Page 6

2. Mind Up Program: I don't recall hearing much/anything about this program. What are we doing now, what will be happening next year, how many students does this effect.

We spoke about Mind Up during our District Improvement Plan discussions. It is part of our Work Plan this year and will be next year. DBT has several modules, and mindfulness is one module. Mind Up is a mindfulness program which will help to make sure that all 11 elementary schools approach mindfulness from the same curriculum framework. Mill Hill and Sherman were trained in 2016-2017 through a grant, and they are leading the way for FPS.

There is \$25,000 proposed in the 2018-19 budget to achieve full implementation of the Mind Up curriculum at all elementary schools. (Riverfield will be trained in DBT implementation during the 2019-20 school year.

Page 9:

3. How many expelled students do we have, and what is cost of providing these students with individualized programming. Hoping we have so few students that you can't fully answer this question because of FERPA. Due to the low number of current expelled students and FERPA requirements this question can not be answered directly.

If a student with disabilities is expelled and placed at Walter Fitzgerald Campus the District is saving the cost of tuition for out placement at a minimum of approximately \$60,000 annually per student. Generally there are three or less expulsions per year.

4. Any idea how much money was saved by change in physical restraint and seclusion training.

The District invested approximately \$9,000 to have two staff members become district wide trainers in the use of physical and psychological management (PMT) training through PMT Associates, Inc. in Middletown, CT. This training includes a five day course in PMT and two full days of a practicum where the trainee is supervised for two full days by a PMT trainer in facilitating training sessions. Additionally, consultation with PMT Associates Inc. staff as needed is included as part of training PMT trainers.

Currently training was provided to CLC staff and other high priority staff. A training schedule to train all crisis response teams in each school is being developed. Training sessions have a maximum of thirty participants per session (fifteen for practicum sessions). Newly trained staff require one full day of training with a two hour training every year thereafter in order to maintain current with PMT requirements.

With the change in legislation that no longer requires all staff be trained the savings realized would include the cost of additional district trainers plus the time needed in order to train all buildings. PMT Associates, Inc. currently charges districts \$125 per person to be trained in the use of PMT if trained by PMT Associates, Inc. and not by our district trainers.

5. With teacher turnover lower than expected this year are we seeing any savings in mentoring costs, training costs, recruitment?

The real savings comes from avoiding more training in curriculum areas, such as literacy and numeracy. Also, note below the following mentor stipends for new staff:

2017-2018 56 mentors \$62,865

2018-2019 43 mentors \$47,434 Savings \$15,522 for fewer mentors

We have 14 teachers who will be TEAM trained this year. Twelve teachers have completed their training, two teachers will be doing the Initial training in the Spring or June.

We also had 2 teachers who were already Mentors but did not receive reviewer training in previous years do the reviewer training last week.

2017-2018 TEAM Budget

| | | | |
|---|---------------------|--------------------|---------------------|
| Mentor Stipends (56 Mentors) | \$ 62,865.00 | | |
| State Funds To Offset Mentor Stipends | \$ - | | |
| Training (Initial Mentor Training) | \$ - | | |
| Training (Reviewer Training) | \$ - | | |
| Collaborative (WEBSITE) Fee | \$ 8,750.00 | | |
| Total | \$ 71,615.00 | | |
| 2018-2019 TEAM Budget | | Paid to date | Balance |
| Mentor Stipends (43 Mentors total) | \$ 47,434.50 | \$ - | |
| State Funds To Offset Mentor Stipends | \$ - | | |
| | \$ 47,434.50 | \$ - | \$ 47,434.50 |
| Training (Initial Mentor Training) | \$ 1,950.00 | \$ 1,650 | \$ 300.00 |
| Training (Reviewer Training) | \$ 1,350.00 | \$ 150 | \$ 1,200.00 |
| Collaborative (WEBSITE) Fee (\$150 x 49 teachers) | \$ 7,350.00 | \$ 6,300.00 | \$ 1,050.00 |
| Total | \$ 58,084.50 | \$ 8,100.00 | \$ 49,984.50 |

6. Have any new initiatives/programming/PD come out of results of Foundations of Reading Survey. If so, costs associated with new programming, and have student outcomes improved because of our efforts?

We do not have specific initiatives tied to the survey results. We work continually with all classroom teachers through some district professional learning and a lot of school-based grade and team professional learning to improve reading instruction. Student reading results are improving. Please see answer to question 85-it shows our STAR data for this year.

Page 17

7. Any insights into why summer school income is down?

We expect fewer students due to a slight decline in elementary enrollment.

Page 25

Any insight why Building Rental income is down?

We are projecting Building Rentals at a decrease due to many summer camps finding alternative space based on 2017-2018 field repairs and work projects that displaced them, as well as 2018-2019 projections are lower.

8. Our estimated actual in maintenance for 2018-2019 is \$204,493. What isn't getting done in order to help full budget gap?

This estimated actual \$ 204,493 is our budget vs actual. The majority of this is Technology.

The maintenance portion we are planning ahead to hold some good funds for utilities and snow removal potential overages as well as unexpected emergencies.

The following accounts are helping with this:

- Painting Account
- Paving Account
- Maintenance Equipment Account
- Maintenance Equipment Repair
- Other Contracted Services

9. Tuition--very happy that we are anticipating a savings, but is there anything in due process now that might change those numbers (appreciate how volatile that line item can be). Again, appreciate this question may not be able to be answered because of FERPA.

We always take into consideration the estimated actual for the following year based on everything we know about our families. We are working hard to not be in due process with our families as the Connecticut Burden of Proof falls on the district and the result is usually a tarnished school and family relationship and an outplacement.

10. Please provide an update on last year's initiatives and Chromebooks.

18-19 Initiatives

Instructional Program

Science curriculum implementation continues as teachers work to develop and refine curriculum units in high school courses. Middle school staff is beginning that process this month. There will be professional learning for all 6-12 science teachers this spring in the instructional methods required in NGSS implementation. NGSS supportive materials are slowly beginning to become available but quality remains a concern.

Work continues to strengthen core instruction through the improvement of coaching, assessments, and the looking at student work protocols.

3-5 STEAM has been a strong success and engages both students and staff in investigative and hands-on learning.

Inquiry instruction is a primary focus of a cohort of elementary teachers who are working in a collaborative model.

Use of Teams and Data to Increase Effectiveness

The examination of student data is a regular feature of all administrative level meetings, SRBI meetings, and building leadership team meetings. We are working with middle and high school staff to improve the understanding of data use in relation to student achievement and integrating the PSAT and SAT data, as well as

the World Language data, into department meetings in an effort to identify student learning and instructional needs. Sharing practices across K-12 occurs in district leadership meetings, department meetings, data systems, and improving student transitions across levels.

Leadership Capacity

Elementary Program Facilitators have received extensive training in special education and SRBI protocols. A fewer number of teachers of Gifted students has enabled a more consistent sharing of practices across schools. Administrators share leadership practices as part of learning cohorts within the District Leadership Team.

Use of Resources

A survey was conducted this year which affirmed the value of the 6-day rotation while demonstrating that finding a more consistent method of providing teachers with common planning time at grade level was needed.

Bridges implementation continues and the use of Number Corner in particular is more consistent across the district. Teachers demonstrate a greater understanding of the methodology.

IMPACT

The IMPACT Program is a District Program that services our high school students with the most significant social and emotional needs. Many of these students would not be able to be provided an appropriate program within the Fairfield Public Schools if not provided this high level of mental health support. The average annual cost of an out placement in a therapeutic day program is approximately a minimum of \$60,000 per student with significantly increased costs for residential placements. The IMPACT program services up to fifty high school students throughout the district and is our in-house program that replaced our previous contracted service providers from Effective School Solutions (ESS). Students enrolled in the IMPACT Program receive daily group support and weekly individual support facilitated by our Licensed Clinical Social Workers. Bi-weekly psychiatric consultation with our consulting psychiatrist from Yale also provides IMPACT staff the opportunity to strengthen their clinical skills and to discuss student challenges and interventions to promote student success.

Additionally, there is monthly clinical psychological consultation for our IMPACT staff with clinical psychologists from Yale focused primarily on student anxiety and school avoidant behaviors. Students enrolled in the IMPACT also are also enrolled in a Learning Center to promote their academic success. IMPACT staff, including special education teachers, receive monthly consultation with Dr. Peg Dawson on executive skills coaching in an effort to strengthen students' executive functioning skills and academic growth.

IMPACT staff at FLHS, FWHS and WFC also facilitate monthly parent meetings as part of our IMPACT program.

CLC-S

This district program was developed to meet the social and emotional needs of our elementary students who otherwise would not be able to be provided an appropriate program within the Fairfield Public Schools. Program enrollment is intended to serve approximately eight students. If students enrolled in this program were placed out of district the average annual tuition cost for a therapeutic day program placement is approximately \$60,000 - \$90,000 per student.

11. McKinley and HH both have .5 for the EPF position. I'm assuming the other .5 funded by Title 1 as that grant covers 1.9 FTEs? If so, what is the other .9 in teaching staff covered by Title 1.

Title 1 and all grants funds are covered in the Budget Book in the "Support Information-staffing section in pages 136-147.

Income

Page 12:

12. For Medicaid, now that initial outreach was completed, will maintenance of this program decrease? Over the course of several years maintenance of this program may somewhat decrease. Our Medicaid clerk currently monitors staff billing patterns in to ensure staff remain current with billing practices, monitors completion and special education transportation logs for in-district students and continues to work with our outplacement programs in an effort to maximize potential revenue. The Medicaid clerk also monitors administrative compliance with requirements in order to be eligible for reimbursement.

13. Do parents need to fill out the form every year? No. Parents only need to provide consent one time, but can withdraw consent at anytime.

14. Has there been any progress with ad sales for high school fields/gyms?

As of the most recent update, one advertisement has been sold. We are waiting for the next update from the company.

Program Implementation

15. Page 150

For Language Arts, what is cost for SRBI consultant fees? Is the reading workshop development at Burr tied to ELL population (wondering why it is only happening in one elementary school?)

The total cost for SRBI consultants is \$22,000 of which \$8,000 is for elementary and \$14,000 for grades 6-12.

The reading workshop development at Burr is not tied to the EL program. We are working with the Burr staff to review our workshop practices as a means of assessing practices at all schools. What we learn from Burr will be applied to the other elementary schools. It is important that we are continually improving elementary literacy as it is the most crucial curricular area.

16. Who is receiving Cognitive Coaching Training?

The Language Arts specialists at the elementary and middle schools.

17. Can you provide more detail/background on Inquiry Academy and associated costs?

Costs - \$36,393 for 44 teachers to attend the training

\$2,200 for materials for the attending teachers

The following is from the budget proposal submitted by Dr. Pugliese and Mr. Wakeman

In order to better prepare students for the world in which they will live and work, we will foster inquiry-based instructional methodologies that create and sustain authentic investigative, solution-focused learning through teacher professional development.

Traditional methods of instruction alone, where the focus is entirely on the knowledge of the teacher, are no longer sufficient to prepare students for a rapidly changing world in which their ability to apply content knowledge to solve complex problems will be essential. It is increasingly vital for students to develop transferable skills in critical and creative thinking, collaboration, and communication. Inquiry-based instruction provides for increased student ownership of the learning process by requiring them to develop their own questions, engage in the investigative process, communicate conclusions, and reflect on their learning.

Expected change of the proposal

The professional development associated with this initiative will support teachers in making this instructional shift. The specific focus in 2019-20 will be to train a core group of elementary teachers in inquiry-based instructional strategies. The proposed plan includes a weeklong intensive workshop in the summer of 2019, followed by a series of sessions throughout the 2019-20 school year in which teachers will collaboratively put into practice inquiry strategies and deepen their own knowledge of core content. The intent of the training is to develop a core group of teachers at each elementary and middle school that will then assist in building the capacity of their colleagues in their respective schools.

The training will focus on best practices in designing student-centered tasks that encourage investigation, collaboration, communication, and reflection. Specific areas of learning will include fostering quality student-generated questions, organizing and prioritizing questions around essential understandings, the investigative process, and communicating solutions. Participating teachers will be an integral part of leading the initiative to build the capacity of all elementary teachers across the district in making the shift towards student-centered methodology.

18. What is going on with the School Climate Survey? Thought there was some discussion about using a different survey, are costs for survey included in this budget? The TELL survey being explored just stopped producing. Staff are working on a condensed version at no additional cost.

Page 152

Contracted Services

19. Page 33

Summary Object 307. What type of speech services are students receiving that are not provided by SLPs. Does this have to do with assistive technology? Students who receive speech services receive these services from a certified speech and language pathologists. In few instances a certified speech assistance may assist the speech and language pathologist in the implementation of services.

20. Capital Outlay

Annual Refresh of Computer Hardware:

Can you provide more detail about the 330 K-5 instructional devices? Are they Chromebooks? iPad? Are they on carts in LMC?

There is \$103,620 allocated for chromebooks with touch for use at the elementary schools. They will be available for "checking out" from the LLC via the cart.

21. Chromebooks:

Since students are to charge Chromebooks at home, is there any way to estimate possible savings in electricity that comes from not needing to charge carts?

No, it would be nearly impossible.

No. There are too many other pieces of equipment that use electricity added to the schools, and we are migrating existing carts to other uses.

22. With the cart model, do you need to have 1 cart per classroom? Would it have been possible to have less than 1977 devices on the carts?

See above answer.

23. An update on how have 1:1 model is changing instruction.

How are becoming more innovative?

Access to computers and to other technologies is changing our instructional model for the better. Rather than be the sole providers of information teachers are now asking questions of students who then do the research and with the teacher's facilitation, make meaning of what they are learning. It is enabling topics to be more

student-centered while still aligning to the curricular goals. We are working with teachers to support their development of questions that will deepen student learning.

24. Have we identified new resources that are being used by all teachers within a subject area?

Teachers are identifying resources continually and sharing them at department meetings and in their grade, team, and PLC meetings.

25. Have we found cost efficiencies by using online resources instead of print materials?

The district technology plan has been to replace print materials with online resources when possible. This has been a distinct trend over the last three years and will continue. Because it has been a phased in approach, specifically putting a dollar figure to it is difficult. For example, the Social Studies curriculum relies on digital materials more than texts. The use of the online library to deliver online copies of books, both for casual reading and books required for English class have been in place, and the collections augmented over the past several years. The World Language curriculum uses a number of online resources.

26. On May 6th and 7th, CES will offer the new ISTE Teacher Certification, "ISTE Certification is a national, competency-based, vendor-neutral teacher certification based on the ISTE Standards for Educators. It recognizes educators who used EdTech for learning in meaningful and transformative ways." The ISTE student and teacher standards have been adopted by the CT Dept. of Ed. Are any of our teachers certified? Are we looking to have any teachers certified as part of our Innovative Learning Initiative?

This Educator Certificate program was announced in the Spring of 2018. Due to the recent adoption of this certification by the CT Department of Education, we currently do not have any ISTE Teacher Certifications. Moving forward, FPS will likely offer training to Technology Integration 6-12 Specialists and Library Media Specialists (K-12).

27. Maintenance Projects

Page 41

Painting: What schools will be painted?

Based on available funding we are planning as follows:

- FLHS exterior soffits
- FWHS exterior soffits
- Districtwide restrooms
- FWMS exterior doors
- FWHS large seminar room
- RLMS interior corridors
- Burr interior corridors
- McKinley interior corridors

28. Playground Maintenance Safety: Which elementary school is getting "dig out". [Riverfield Elementary School](#)

Do you have a list of playgrounds/repairs being addressed?

Yes.

We have a consultant that inspects all playgrounds every year, Childscapes.

They have provided a thorough list of repairs and fixes in a report that is approximately 50 pages.

29. Would it be possible to post page 154 as a separate document on Budget webpage? (for easier access).

We will look into this.

30. For FLHS and FWMS HVAC replacement projects, would it be possible to get some history on what repair costs have been on the HVAC units that need replacement, number of service calls needed, and if possible number of days units were not functioning.

It is possible to gather history on HVAC equipment but very time consuming.

We meet weekly to discuss financials as part of the budget and these types of maintenance repairs come up weekly. Our in-house maintenance staff are first to investigate and/or our preventative maintenance contractors provide valuable feedback. We would need to reach out to the schools PM books and try to gather reports on HVAC equipment repairs throughout the year (and multiple years) as well as research our Work Orders for these two schools and cross reference it with our budget purchase orders.

31. Page 163

Fuel Oil Tank Relocation Project: Just want clarification, was relocation of this tank value engineered out of Riverfield renovation by building committee?

Yes.

32. Page 164

Gymnasium Bleachers Power Assist Equipment Project:

Can you provide clarification to the statement "funding was not available to add the power assisted system to the bid"?

Yes.

The original bid did not include power assist, the awarded contractor brought it up to our attention however, there was a change order with the concrete subfloor which costs us the money we would of liked to put into the power assist extra.

33. Who determined funding wasn't available, was cut made by Superintendent, BoE, or as a budget adjustment after town budget approved?

Extra to the project not budgeted, nor was the contractor able to get the bleacher power assist equipment in time to complete the project before school started.

34. Were these bleachers installed when new floors were installed?

Yes.

35. In looking at past budgets, in 2016-2017, a budget request of \$170,000 was made to replace the gymnasium floors. In 2015-2016, \$16,650 was requested to refinish floors (were these the same floors?). I didn't see anything about the bleachers, but could be missing it.

Do RLMS and FWMS have these type of bleachers?

Yes.

2015-2016 \$ 16,650 was requested for TMS large gymnasium floor refinish.

This project did not happen because during the contractor walk through it was determined by the professionals that the entire gym floor was in very poor condition and more than half of the flooring would need to be replaced.

2016-2017 \$ 170,000 was requested for TMS large gymnasium floor replacement.

This project did get completed.

The bleachers were an add alternate to the project if there was enough funding during the bidding process which it was determined we had enough to provide new bleachers.

RLMS has power assist.

FWMS does not.

Jenn Jacobsen

36. Can you please detail how each school and department was impacted by the “10% give back” from remaining school balances and the “surrender of available balances” from other departments to account for the overage in staff? (exec. summary page 24)

This detail is not available because we utilize site based budgeting. A 10% reduction is applied by each principal as he or she chooses. Most principals will apply the 10% to each account bringing a total from \$1,000 to \$900 having little impact on materials or supplies.

In terms of the district, one large portion was the science textbook funds which again are not needed due to lack of resources available.

Targeted Enhancements page 5-7

37. What is the dollar amount associated with each of the targeted enhancements?

Instructional Program

STEAM in K-2: 1.9 FTE

Professional development in elementary and middle science

- Elementary \$100,580
- Middle \$41,200 (to be shared with high school)

Continue high school science course implementation - no cost

Complete innovative learning access for grades 6 and 8

Strengthen the examination of student work protocols - inherent costs in existing professional learning times.

Continued focus on interventions for PK -12 - inherent costs in existing professional learning times, professional learning in elementary and middle for SRBI consultants - \$34,000 (8,000 elementary, \$12,000 for EL teachers and co-teachers, \$14,000 for secondary consultant)

Use of Teams and Data to Increase Effectiveness - inherent costs in existing professional learning times.

Leadership Capacity - inherent costs in existing professional learning.

Use of Resources

Define and enhance planning time in elementary - 1.9 FTE for K-2 STEAM implementation

Year Two of IMPACT - The cost of operating year two of our high school IMPACT program includes the following costs:

- 5.0 FTE Licensed Clinical Social Workers (two at FLHS, two at FWHS, one at WFC): \$474,074
- Continued psychiatric consultation through Yale: \$50,000
- Continued clinical psychological consultation through Yale: \$15,000
- Total Program Cost: \$539,074

Implement CLC-S cohort in Middle School - The initial cost of developing a CLC-S at the middle school level includes the following costs:

1.0 FTE special education teacher:\$91,000
1.0 FTE licensed clinical social worker: \$91,000
3.0 FTE para-professionals:\$ 112,300 (to be hired as dictated by enrollment)
Total Program Cost: \$294,300

Introduce DBT at Riverfield - The total cost to begin implementation of DBT at Riverfield schools during the 2019-20 school year is \$13,750

Full Implementation of Mind Up, K- 5: \$25,000 has been allocated in the proposed 2019-20 budget to achieve full implementation of Mind Up in all of our elementary schools. (Riverfield School will be trained in the implementation of DBT for the 2019-20 school year.

Continued implementation of DBT- The total implementation cost of continued implementation and expansion of DBT at the elementary, middle and high school level for the 2019-20 school year is \$77,650

Development of Initial Evaluation Teams at the ECC and High Level: The initial implementation cost to implement initial evaluation teams is as follows:

- 1.0 FTE special education teacher at the ECC: \$91,000
- 1.0 FTE special education teachers at the high school

Total cost: **\$182,000**

(Additionally a 1.0 FTE school psychologist and a 1.0 FTE speech pathologist will be reallocated from existing FTE to be core members of each team each initial evaluation team)

38. Can you elaborate on what “Strengthen the examination of student work protocols for consistency across the district” entails?

One of our fundamental efforts is to improve the use of protocols, or processes, by which teachers examine student work during existing professional learning times including Tuesday afternoons, team and grade level meetings, and high school professional learning community meetings. Teachers bring samples of student work to determine if the desired learning was achieved and if not, what must be done instructionally to improve results. We are strengthening this work over time and will continue to rely on it, and build capacity of all staff to participate and benefit from it, in 19-20 and beyond. It is also a key component of effective SRBI practices.

39. Student evaluation teams are being implemented at the ECC, High schools to compliment the Elementary program Facilitators at the elementary level? Is there something in the works for middle school as well?

As we roll out our Initial Evaluation Teams at the ECC and high school levels there are ongoing discussions with elementary and middle school staff regarding the development of initial evaluation teams at the elementary and middle school levels. Potential staff configurations utilizing existing FTE will be reviewed.

A critical component of the 2019-20 special education high school budget proposal includes the addition of a second high school special education coordinator to increase oversight and consistency of special education program implementation at the high school level with a particular focus on increasing efficiencies and oversight of the PPT process.

Instructional Services pages 30-32 and detail pages

40. Walter Fitzgerald and Community Partnership are not slated to receive any funds for supplies/other expenses. They have no need for supplies in the next year?

These accounts are funded with school allocations at the discretion of the principal. \$500 was budgeted previously, but not used in that account. See pages 111 for detail about WFC and Community Partnership budgeting. There is an increase in line 400 Supplies, Books & Materials at WFC.

41. Why are the estimated 2018-2019 amounts lower than appropriated for Freshman orientation, Student programs and consultation services?

Freshman orientation happens at the beginning and the end of the year. FLHS also saved a little bit on printing this year.

Student programs happen during the year. FLHS has a program which is just now being paid for, and FWHS has a driver safety program in the spring.

Consultation services are based on actual student needs and can go up or down.

42. What makes up student programs and consultation services?

In the special education department consultation services falls under Pupil Personnel Services (page 31 in the budget book) and includes consultation with the Center for Children with Special Needs (CCSN) who oversees all of our CLC programs and trains our ed trainers and CLC paras, consultation with Cognitive Behavioral Consultants (CBC) who consults and trains our staff in DBT implementation as well as our psychiatric and clinical psychological consultants from Yale Child Study Center as part of our high school IMPACT program. Additionally this area includes consultation with Dr. Peg Dawson from the Center for Learning and Attention Disorders in Portsmouth, NH on strengthening students executive functioning skills as part of our high school IMPACT program. This area also includes additional district wide psychiatric consultations and evaluations on students through the PPT process.

43. Please breakdown Program Assessment by item

| | |
|-------------------------------|-----------|
| STAR Assessment | \$115,700 |
| Reading, Math, Early Literacy | |
| PSAT 9 | \$7,200 |
| PSAT/NMSQT | \$20,800 |
| Review 360 Screener | \$3,450 |
| World Language Latin | \$4,650 |
| World Language STAMP | \$74,630 |

The STAMP test is currently paid by the schools for a total cost of \$27,686 (17-18). This cost covered two course levels, 20 and 40. The cost of testing will no longer be carried by the schools and we will also assess levels 10, 30, 50 and 60.

44. Please delineate the difference between this year and next year for Program Assessment

The change in cost is due to the additional STAMP testing for all levels of World Language classes.

45. Curriculum development has a significant decrease for next year. Is that due mainly to Science or other reasons?

We have completed revisions for the larger curricular areas. Art, Health, and PE will be revised but they require fewer staff and resources.

Supplies Materials and Texts pages 38-39 and detail pages

46. In general, a lot less was spent across these areas than what was appropriated.

When the money was available at the end of the year the principals utilized those funds primarily on the capital outlay line instead of frivolous end of the year spending. While the materials and supplies appears not restored, the capital outlay lines increased providing flexible furniture, innovation space materials, and items which could be utilized by the whole school. (See page 110)

47. The board last year restored the 20% per pupil allocation, which a large part of that goes to Supplies Materials and Texts. Across all material/supplies/text items (400, 401, 402, 403, 404, 411, 415, 424, 429) we appropriated \$4,017,534 for this year. Estimated to be spent this year is \$3,305,142- over \$700, 000 less than appropriated, or almost 20% less. Why is that?

This year it is due to the reduction in 6-12 science materials.

48. For 2018-2019 we appropriated \$626,568 to support the new Science Curriculum. Estimated for this year to be spent however is \$228,557. Why is so much less being spent this year from what was requested?

We have not found NGSS materials for high school resources.

49. For next year there is an additional combined -\$911,494 across these areas. Taking out the Science reduction from last year (\$560,368) there is still \$351,126 less going to these areas. When combined with this years' unexpended amounts we are over a million dollars less on materials, supplies, texts, books, instructional supplies, supplies district support, etc.

Were there any denied requests that fell within the appropriated amounts in any of these 9 areas? If so, what?

There were no denied requests.

50. Were some of these due to the 10% give back?

No. The principals make the deductions across their schools in many different areas according to their needs.

51. Do every classroom, support staff, office, nurse, custodian etc. all have ample amounts and quantities of supplies, materials, texts, books, office supplies and all items contained within these 9 areas for this year and next?

Yes.

52. To where are the 700K+ in these areas being shifted to in this year's budget?

Salaries, Benefits, and Operations and Maintenance.

53. How much are we spending on the Chromebook cases? See Question# 64.

54. How much are we spending on the elementary math and science software?

A total of \$126,217 is projected for elementary math and science software. Of this total, \$85,262 is for multiple grades (K-8 or K-12). \$12,453.75 is for math. \$6995 is for science, and \$106,768 is for multi-disciplinary resources.

Other Purchased Services pages 36-37 and detail pages

55. Any reason we suspect an increase in postage for next year from what is estimated to be spent this year?

This year we are utilizing balances on account with the post office for postage and bulk mailing. Next year we anticipated a rate increase, which accounts for the higher costs next year despite lower costs this year.

Tuition pages 34-35 and details pages

56. For this year's budget there is an almost 624K less estimated to be expended than what was appropriated. Almost 500K of that is due to less SPED tuition. To what are you attributing the lower expenditure in SPED tuition for this year?

Several students with disabilities have been able to be returned to the Fairfield Public Schools from out placements through the PPT process and programmed for in our in-district programs.

We are also retaining students in our district who would have previously been outplaced keeping our outplacement number from rising dramatically. We had a peak of 120 outplacements in 2016-2017. We are also working to be less litigious with our families. The average outplacement costs \$114,662 based on our current projected students. The average settlement is \$73,881.

57. Why is excess cost reimbursement expected to run almost 500K less than budgeted for this year? Did we not meet the 4.5x requirement as we thought, or were there less funds available from the state?

The rate of reimbursement is expected to be less than the 75% projected for the current year for students whose programming costs exceeds the excess cost threshold (4.5 x over the PPE). In the 2019-20 proposed budget excess cost reimbursement is projected at 73% over the threshold. There are also fewer students projected that

will be eligible for excess cost reimbursement in the current year due to several student returning to district through the PPT process from outplacements.

58. Are we not anticipating any change in our eligibility for excess cost amounts for next year, as the amount is held constant?

Excess cost reimbursement is being projected at 73% over the threshold for the 2019-20 school year with fewer students projected who will be eligible for reimbursement.

Contracted Services pages 32-33 and details pages

59. The technical consultants line item is increased by \$155K. I know \$50K of that is for enrollment/facilitates studies. What is the remaining increase for?

On page 33 in section 305 - Professional/Technical Services

There are professional services for design documents for bidding the mechanical means of fresh air and air-conditioning for all schools estimated at \$100,000 that make up the remaining increase.

60. Professional Services increase is \$395,727 for next year. I know 100K of that is to bid out AC. What is the remaining increase for? On page 33 in section 305 - Professional/Technical Services There are technical consulting services for enrollment and facilities study to help us with new enrollment projections, facilities capacities, racial imbalance, and other district goals.

61. Professional services are also estimated to run about 245K over the appropriated amount this year. To what is that increase attributed to?

Capital pages 42-43 and details pages (152,153)

62. It looks like the \$403,602 of the pre-purchase is being counted in both FY 18 and 19. Can you break down the 2017-2018 Actual Budget and the 2018-2019 Actual Budget please?

It is not counted twice. The 17-18 Actual and 18-19 Projected Actual are on page 98 in the budget book.

The original budget request for fiscal year 2019 was \$1,407,349. This amount was reduced to \$1,003,747 for the pre purchase. The approved budget for fiscal year 2018 was \$1,731,516. It was increased to \$2,368,118. This may be clearer when reviewing the chart on page 152 that shows the budget vs the actual and projected amounts for both fiscal years.

63. The 2017-2018 Capital Outlay actual budget is \$636,602 higher than appropriated. If \$403,602 of that is attributable to the pre-purchase of Chromebooks, what is the remaining \$233K attributed to?

The increase is attributed to the shift from materials and supplies at the end of the year to site based accounts for capital outlay. Instead of frivolous end of the year spending, the funds were targeted at the school level.

Principals/Headmasters utilized the restored materials and supplies to enhance something which would impact the entire building like flexible seating in their media centers, innovation spaces, and equipment like standing student desks and requested items for the classroom which were a capital item in nature and not consumable.

64. The 450K proposed in the 2019-2020 budget for tech acquisition:

a. How much of that is for Chromebook purchases for 6th and 7th graders? \$360,000

b. How many devices are you looking to purchase? 1600

c. What is the cost per unit, device and any other associated costs?

The price per unit is \$225, which includes the device and the chrome. For middle school purchases, we add a case at \$23.50 each.

- d. Last year it was stated that a system for the monitoring of losses, damages, replacements, feedback, etc. on this initiative was being put into place can you provide an update on how that is looking at this time? The chart below shows the repairs and replacements. The 21 units with non-warranty repairs are the losses to date. Please note, these units are used for parts for other in house repairs, such as replacement of cracked bezels.

| School | Non warranty | warranty | in house repair | total |
|--------|--------------|----------|-----------------|-------|
| FLHS | 5 | 35 | 2 | 42 |
| FWHS | 4 | 43 | 2 | 49 |
| FWMS | 6 | 4 | 0 | 10 |
| RLMS | 4 | 15 | 1 | 20 |
| TMS | 2 | 16 | 1 | 19 |
| | 21 | 113 | 6 | 140 |

| 65. Updated Allocation Chart | | School Allocation History | | | | | Capital 2017-2018 | | |
|----------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------------|----------------------|-------------------|--------------------------------------|----------------------|------------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| School | 2017-2018 Allocation | 2017-2018 Actual | 2018-2019 Allocation | Give Back | 2018-2019 Allocation After Give Back | 2019-2020 Allocation | Capital Allocation 2017-2018 | Capital Expended 2017-2018 | Additional Capital Expended 2017-2018 |
| 10 - BURR | 50,180 | 51,147 | 55,755 | 2,304 | 53,451 | 51,786 | 5,900 | 8,719 | 2,819 |
| 12 - DWIGHT | 38,758 | 36,364 | 44,955 | 3,889 | 41,066 | 40,278 | 5,900 | 8,887 | 2,987 |
| 14 - HOLLAND HILL | 47,628 | 45,136 | 52,920 | 4,400 | 48,520 | 50,005 | 5,900 | 9,426 | 3,526 |
| 16 - JENNINGS | 34,992 | 34,589 | 40,095 | 3,136 | 36,959 | 40,278 | 5,900 | 8,857 | 2,957 |
| 18 - MCKINLEY | 54,068 | 48,931 | 60,075 | 5,827 | 54,248 | 58,910 | 5,900 | 8,301 | 2,401 |
| 20 - MILL HILL | 42,282 | 39,940 | 46,980 | 2,023 | 44,957 | 46,980 | 5,900 | 860 | 0 |
| 22 - NO. STRATFIELD | 44,348 | 43,414 | 51,165 | 1,608 | 49,557 | 50,005 | 5,900 | 8,963 | 3,063 |
| 23 - OSBORN HILL | 50,423 | 51,049 | 56,025 | 1,322 | 54,703 | 54,937 | 5,900 | 9,062 | 3,162 |
| 24 - RIVERFIELD | 49,937 | 46,863 | 56,295 | 4,234 | 52,061 | 56,581 | 5,900 | 9,021 | 3,121 |
| 26 - SHERMAN | 57,348 | 53,613 | 63,720 | 3,920 | 59,800 | 59,047 | 5,900 | 8,900 | 3,000 |
| 28 - STRATFIELD | 53,703 | 54,058 | 59,670 | 3,470 | 56,200 | 52,387 | 5,900 | 8,647 | 2,747 |
| 30 - FAIRFIELD WOODS MS | 137,344 | 131,803 | 152,604 | 11,834 | 140,770 | 145,722 | 12,800 | 33,752 | 20,952 |
| 31 - ROGER LUDLOWE MS | 123,493 | 120,541 | 137,214 | 15,622 | 121,592 | 139,854 | 12,800 | 32,893 | 20,093 |
| 32 - TOMLINSON MS | 95,353 | 90,042 | 106,434 | 9,936 | 96,498 | 107,743 | 12,800 | 31,896 | 19,096 |
| 41 - FFLD LUDLOWE H.S. | 628,425 | 614,226 | 705,375 | 61,716 | 643,659 | 741,702 | 32,000 | 60,910 | 28,910 |
| 43 - FFLD WARDE H.S. | 639,540 | 615,961 | 708,708 | 68,216 | 640,492 | 711,399 | 32,000 | 65,240 | 33,240 |
| 50 - WALTER FITZGERALD CAMPUS | 19,781 | 16,015 | 12,276 | 1,645 | 10,631 | 12,250 | 1,800 | 6,378 | 4,578 |
| Total Schools Allocations | \$ 2,167,603 | \$ 2,093,692 | \$ 2,410,266 | \$ 205,102 | \$ 2,205,164 | \$ 2,419,864 | \$ 169,100 | \$ 320,712 | \$ 156,652 |

| School Per Pupil Allocation History | | 2017-2018 | | | | 2018-2019 | | 2019-2020 | | 2017-2018 | | |
|---|----------------------------|--|-------|----------------------------|-------|---|-------|------------------------------|----------|---------------------------|---------------------------------|------------------|
| 2017-2018 Projected Enrollment / 2017-2018 Actual Enrollment* | 2017-2018 Budget Per Pupil | 2017-2018 Actual** Per Pupil (Actual Enrollment) | | 2018-2019 Budget Per Pupil | | 2018-2019 Projected Per Pupil (Actual Enrollment) | | 2019-2020 Proposed Per Pupil | | Additional STEAM Supplies | Additional Instruction Supplies | |
| | | Elementary | \$135 | \$152 | \$137 | \$130 | \$137 | \$130 | \$137 | \$137 | \$74,806 | \$74,121 |
| Middle School | \$162 | \$145 | \$163 | \$149 | \$163 | \$149 | \$163 | \$163 | \$12,360 | \$12,360 | \$60,141 | |
| High School | \$475/\$420* | \$414 | \$481 | \$425 | \$481 | \$425 | \$481 | \$481 | \$20,649 | \$20,649 | \$62,150 | |
| WFC | \$396 | \$517 | \$396 | \$443 | \$396 | \$443 | \$396 | \$396 | \$74,806 | \$107,130 | \$4,578 | |
| Total Additional Spending at School Level | | | | | | | | | | \$74,806 | \$107,130 | \$338,588 |

*Per Pupil Allocation based on actual enrollment

**Includes Additional STEAM and Instruction Supplies

Jeff Peterson

66. One quick question on Obj 501, Capital Outlay: has there been an analysis of lease v buy for the \$45K lift in question?

No. We rent one 5-6 times a year now at a cost of \$954.34 each time and we feel if we owned our own piece of equipment we could do alot more with it.

67. Instructional Services pp30-31:

Object 303: Pupil Personnel Services: Is the contractual increase for Audiology consults?

Pupil Personnel Services includes a projected increase in our contracted audiological services through CES of \$12,500. Additionally this area includes projected increases in our contracted services through Rehab Associates in the areas of occupational and physical therapy of \$51,325 and \$22,562 respectively. An increase of \$40,000 in consultation services through the Center for Children with Special needs (CCSN) to address the complex needs of students in our CLC programs is also projected.

68. Object 409: Student Activity Expenses

I assume this sports element of this category represents equipment, uniforms, and such (does it also include transportation to meets?). The Warde and Ludlowe amounts are notable increases in a category that's been fairly stable for several years. Can you provide any color for the bump?

Yes, the sports account encompasses the costs mentioned, including transportation. The increases are due to increases in the cost of officials, transportation, and security/fire personnel for large crowds.

69. Supplies/Texts/Materials pp 38-39:

Object 400: Supplies, Books, and Materials, Do the school amounts represent individual principal/staff requests?

Yes

70. Object 401: Instructional Supplies/Materials, I'm sure this is a noisy category, but I have to ask: what is the 10000% increase in FCS (line 56172)? It seems a huge number for a line that's been very small in recent years.

The total amount of funding in this area, \$12,718, is for the purchase of an online textbook for the child development classes in the high schools. The current text was published in 2006 and is no longer relevant and contains errors.

71. Object 415: Other Supplies/Materials

I can understand why Chromebook cases are classified this way, but it's tricky divorced from the actual Chromebook proposal. I assume this number is mostly to cover (ha!) the new Chromebook purchases for incoming grades 6 & 7? What's the cost per unit? Are we assuming this year's 8th graders are going to take their cases to high school? Has there been an ongoing cost for broken cases/replacements?

- I assume this number is mostly to cover (ha!) the new Chromebook purchases for incoming grades 6 & 7? Yes, the cases budgeted are for the incoming Grade 6 and 7 Chromebooks
- What's the cost per unit? The cases are \$23.50 each
- Are we assuming this year's 8th graders are going to take their cases to high school?
- 8th graders have not yet been allocated Chromebooks. This year's current 7th graders will take their cases to 8th grade.
- Has there been an ongoing cost for broken cases/replacements?
- There has not been an ongoing cost for replacement covers or cases. 100 cases in addition to the original order was placed in the fall for each middle schools to cover the "spares" that are circulated from the libraries.

72. Other Purchased Services pp 36-37 Object 321: Professional Development

- For clarity: am I correct that the “Professional Growth Tuition” line represents the district’s reimbursement for staff tuition/conference/workshop expenses? [Yes.](#)
- There are a lot of line increases in this section, presumably for the program implementations you mention. If you could address the types of expenses that go into such an effort, it would be useful color. [In Instructional Services there is a total requested increase of \\$75,508. The majority of this increase request is in Language Arts. Additional funding in Language Arts is requested for a program audit of our Readers’ Workshop model in K-5 which will use Burr Elementary School as a case study \(\\$30,000\), coaching support for our LAS team at elementary and middle schools \(\\$16,000\), professional development to support our dual language programs K-12 \(\\$12,000\). Also, we are seeking \\$10,000 to support implementation of the new science curriculum in elementary. Finally we are encouraging teachers in the elective areas to explore additional programmatic options and each department is seeking additional funds for conferences and workshops related to this initiative.](#)
- \$8K for “bus routing software training” seems excessive. How many people need to receive this training? [Training is needed for two different modules of software. The transportation staff, and certain central office staff need further training in routing regular buses, sped buses, integration with IC, and retrieving data. In addition, an initial rollout was done exclusively for submitting and tracking sports trips, but has the potential to include field trips. The initial rollout for trips was intentionally confined to a small group, but if expanded to field trips, requires additional training across the district.](#)

73. Contracted Services pp 32-33

Object 305: Professional/Technical Services

- Am I correct in assuming you’re earmarking \$50K for technical support for the BoE’s scheduled facility discussions? [Yes. There are technical consulting services for enrollment and facilities study to help us with new enrollment projections, facilities capacities, racial imbalance, and other district goals.](#)
- It feels extremely premature to think about \$100K for a bid for the discussed AC upgrade project. Unless there are developments of which I’m unaware, this is not much more than an idea at this point. If the argument is that this sort of move is necessary to give us a grip about the scale/cost of a potential project, I get it; but assuming we spend this money and do not move ahead, would the information be valuable in any way? Also: wouldn’t this be the sort of expense bundled into a capital request? [Yes. This work will be very important and will help us understand what is needed for each school building and more importantly what the majority of the work will entail as well as provide us with good cost estimates. We are anticipating that the final design documents and estimates will be compiled for us to make a Capital Project Request to the town bodies.](#)

74. Object 325 Personnel/Recruitment Expenses

Have you found this amount sufficient? Are having difficulties with recruitment that could be at least partially attributed to insufficient recruitment spending?

[Yes, it has been sufficient for recruitment of teachers. We have not had difficulty recruiting with the exception of hard to fill positions like Physics, and even those, we have found great candidates. The funds can be utilized to advertise in a broader market if necessary, like *Education Week*.](#)

75. Object 501: Capital Outlay. Mostly out of curiosity, what capital investment is Music Education making (\$714, line #58250)? Why are all the capital amounts budgeted for the individual buildings static from year to year? Isn't this something that should be reevaluated regularly? [Capital has always been budgeted with a standard allocation by level \(elementary, middle, and high school\). The amounts were cut back in 05-06 and 06-07, mostly restored in 08-09, but cut back further in 09-10 and 10-11. They increased minimally in 11-12, and maintained contract through 14-15. In 15-16 they were increased mostly at the elementary level, and have remained constant since that time. There are some funds budgeted at the district level for extraordinary needs. For instance, in elementary, most Learning Commons have the same needs in terms of chairs, and other capital items. Capital](#)

does not change much depending upon the size of a school. Cafeteria tables cost the same for all schools, so when a replacement is needed it is the same regardless of the student enrollment.

76. A comment, relative to line #58599, the establishment of the theft/loss account: This is a new expense of \$25K, but is listed as a 0% increase. I don't know what the accounting standard is here but this type of presentation (which is used elsewhere in the book) is misleading. I might prefer a notation in the "% Change" column for new expenses/new line items. [This is for theft or damage during an unforeseen event.](#)

77. Object 503: Technology (referencing pp 152-3)

Re Annual Refresh: Are we replacing fewer of these devices due to the establishment of broad Chromebook use? Recall this was a question raised by the BoF at the top of the school year. [At the secondary schools we are not replacing student devices that were previously shared in generic spaces, such as writing or multipurpose labs and carts of laptops or tablets. We will continue to replace specialty labs, stationary and mobile, such as CAD and digital arts, which require more robust software and processors that a Chromebook is incapable of providing.](#)

78. Re Elementary Wireless: Has there really been an "explosion" of wireless devices by *PK-5 students* since 2014? We're not, for instance, expanding individual Chromebook use to these grades. Otherwise, where are these extra devices coming from--are we talking about curriculum devices, or increased staff usage? [There has been a slow but steady increase of the use of wireless, mobile devices used in the cart distribution format at the 11 elementary schools, as well as a movement by teachers to a mobile format, typically a laptop rather than the traditional desktop.](#)

79. And is this different than the two-year IT switch project bundled in our capital non-recurring requests? If it's the same type of technology, why is it being budgeted as a current expense rather than a capital one? [Yes this is different technology. The switch project enables the wireless access points to function.](#)

80. Re Acquisition of Technology: I'm having trouble with the numbers in this section. There are 1,516 projected incoming 6th and 7th graders (those who would need new Chromebooks), and multiplying that by the \$203 per-unit cost we get \$307,748. This assumes we are NOT repurposing the Chromebooks returned by graduating seniors. The 2-Jan enrollment data shows 788 seniors between Warde and Ludlowe...if we assume we're getting 788 CBs back, then we only have to purchase 728 new ones (for \$147,784 at the \$203 unit price). If this is the correct scenario, are we really paying \$302,643 for the "additional resources" (Wacom tablets, restaurant screens, and Holland Hill infrastructure)? [The budget for the student Chromebooks is for 1600 for grades 6 and 7. The current 7th graders will take their devices to 8th grade. It is assumed the incoming 9th graders will receive the outgoing 12th graders devices. The numbers are similar. There is no allocation for Chromebooks for the high schools in the budget as a result.](#)

[The calculation for the middle school students represents the projected 1516 students plus and additional 84, \(divided across all three sites\), to increase the number of spares available in the libraries for check out when needed to provide equipment to students if their unit needs to be repaired.](#)

The \$203 price ended as of the first of the year. The budgeted price is \$225 per unit.

The amount of \$450,427, as shown on page 152 represents the following:

- \$360,000 for 1600 Chromebooks for grades 6 and 7 students.
- \$36,000 for Chromebooks for grades 6 and 8 teachers.
- \$7,227 for display systems for the high schools
- \$35,000 for infrastructure and projection systems for Holland Hill's addition.
- \$12,200 for Wacom drawing tablets for the high school art department.

81. And related to that, why are we budgeting for tech infrastructure in the HH addition when the renovation is still ongoing? Shouldn't this fall under that funding apparatus? [The town building projects do not cover the actual](#)

hardware nor wiring for classroom audio visual systems, nor network hardware. The funds here are for additional switches and classroom equipment necessary to meet district standard allocations in the classrooms.

82. I'm not sure I understand why you would need 28% more CBs than students in a cart-based model (1977/1541). I get that we would need some replacement stock, but this is also the case under the individual model. It just seems like a LOT more. The "Cart Model" assumes that each classroom will have enough Chromebooks in the cart for the classroom to be used at full or maximum capacity. For example, the maximum capacity of students in a section of English 11 is 27 students. The actual number of students may vary from 18 to 27 depending on student schedules. Because one must insure each student has a Chromebook available to them in the cart, allocations are based on the highest possible number of students allowed. the course, and the timing of the section. By allocating to the actual number of students rather than that full capacity of the classroom, the required number of devices drops.

83. Also, the projection from FLHS 2019-20 appears to be 1,532, not 1,541 (see p122)
The projection of 1532 is lower than the current actual of October 1, 2018, at 1541.

Jessica Gerber

TARGETED ENHANCEMENTS

84. Page 5

Could you please clarify what “strengthen the examination of student work protocols for consistency across the district” entails?

[Please see the response to question #143.](#)

85. Regarding “continued focus on interventions for PK-12” – could you please touch briefly on how these interventions have been working so far, and what changes, if any, you are planning on making in the coming year?

Interventions at the elementary level continue to improve at all schools. We need to address schools that are not yet at best performance as well as continue to invest in ongoing training for all staff. Work at the middle and high schools continues as we are improving meeting protocols, data use, and staff responsiveness. What we still must address at these levels is embedded time for interventions and potentially staffing supports.

The general and special education departments are working together on these improvements and we will increase efforts next year to bring the staff from both departments together for ongoing training and continued collaboration.

| Kindergarten-STAR Early Literacy | FPS | | |
|---|-------|--------------|--------|
| | Fall | Early Winter | Change |
| Number of Students | 595 | 588 | |
| Meeting (99th - 40th Percentile) | 70.8% | 80.4% | +9.7% |
| On Watch (39th - 25th Percentile) | 16.5% | 12.8% | -3.7% |
| Intervention (24th - 10th Percentile) | 8.7% | 4.3% | -4.5% |
| Urgent Intervention (Below 10th Percentile) | 4.0% | 2.6% | -1.5% |
| 1st Grade | FPS | | |
| | Fall | Early Winter | Change |
| Number of Students | 629 | 634 | +5 |
| Meeting (99th - 40th Percentile) | 76.0% | 88.2% | +12.2% |
| On Watch (39th - 25th Percentile) | 10.7% | 6.5% | -4.2% |
| Intervention (24th - 10th Percentile) | 10.0% | 4.3% | -5.8% |
| Urgent Intervention (Below 10th Percentile) | 3.3% | 1.1% | -2.2% |

STAR Reading:

| 1st Grade | FPS | | |
|---|-------|--------------|--------|
| | Fall | Early Winter | Change |
| Number of Students | 538 | 612 | +74 |
| % Exceeding + Meeting | 62.5% | 71.1% | +8.6% |
| Exceeding (99th - 81st Percentile) | 37.5% | 45.1% | +7.6% |
| Meeting (80th - 55th Percentile) | 24.9% | 26.0% | +1.1% |
| On Watch (54th - 36th Percentile) | 17.8% | 12.9% | -4.9% |
| Intervention (35th - 16th Percentile) | 8.0% | 12.4% | +4.4% |
| Urgent Intervention (Below 16th Percentile) | 11.7% | 3.6% | -8.1% |
| 2nd Grade | FPS | | |
| | Fall | Early Winter | Change |
| Number of Students | 673 | 675 | +2 |
| % Exceeding + Meeting | 57.8% | 71.7% | +13.9% |
| Exceeding (99th - 81st Percentile) | 27.5% | 37.9% | +10.4% |
| Meeting (80th - 55th Percentile) | 30.3% | 33.8% | +3.5% |
| On Watch (54th - 36th Percentile) | 18.9% | 14.4% | -4.5% |
| Intervention (35th - 16th Percentile) | 13.8% | 9.6% | -4.2% |
| Urgent Intervention (Below 16th Percentile) | 9.5% | 4.3% | -5.2% |

STAR Math:

| 1st Grade | FPS | | |
|---|-------|--------------|--------|
| | Fall | Early Winter | Change |
| Number of Students | 624 | 632 | +8 |
| % Exceeding + Meeting | 68.8% | 83.4% | +14.6% |
| Exceeding (99th - 81st Percentile) | 38.0% | 49.5% | +11.5% |
| Meeting (80th - 55th Percentile) | 30.8% | 33.9% | +3.1% |
| On Watch (54th - 36th Percentile) | 14.6% | 9.3% | -5.2% |
| Intervention (35th - 16th Percentile) | 10.7% | 4.9% | -5.8% |
| Urgent Intervention (Below 16th Percentile) | 5.9% | 2.4% | -3.6% |
| 2nd Grade | FPS | | |
| | Fall | Early Winter | Change |
| Number of Students | 679 | 669 | -10 |
| % Exceeding + Meeting | 58.2% | 75.0% | +16.9% |
| Exceeding (99th - 81st Percentile) | 29.2% | 47.4% | +18.2% |
| Meeting (80th - 55th Percentile) | 29.0% | 27.7% | -1.4% |
| On Watch (54th - 36th Percentile) | 19.4% | 12.6% | -6.9% |
| Intervention (35th - 16th Percentile) | 15.6% | 8.2% | -7.4% |
| Urgent Intervention (Below 16th Percentile) | 6.8% | 4.2% | -2.6% |

86. Page 6

Could you please give a brief update as to how data teams are being utilized now, and what changes if any you are planning on making in the coming year?

More than ever before data teams are focusing on specific actions to increase full group and individual student performance. Data for this work comes from both district benchmarks as well as class assignments. Teachers use the student work protocols to help sort student needs. We will continue to improve the use of data to inform planning and individualizing instruction to student needs. It has been very good work this year, steady progress of which everyone can be proud.

87. Regarding Elementary Program Facilitators – could you please give an update as to how this position is working so far this year? And re: continued professional development for EPF’s – could you explain what types of PD they have been getting and will be getting?

EPF work has focused heavily on supporting the Special Education process, thus enabling principals to have more time to focus on the needs of students and staff. PD for the EPF’s have focused on everything from running PPT’s and the protocols of which to follow along with support on Special Education Law. We plan to continue support to help them prepare schools for the upcoming State testing along with further updates on testing protocols and IEP protocols to help all to meet the needs of each school.

The EPF’s meet monthly and have a defined agenda for 1 ½ hours. Our elementary principals have found the EPF positions to be everything FPS designed them to be and more.

88. Regarding “opportunities for enhanced teacher leadership” – could you please provide examples of these opportunities?

There is a group of elementary teachers who in grade level groups are designing interdisciplinary assessments as models for district wide use.

There is another group of elementary teachers who are working to build cross-curricular units in an effort to improve student understanding of concepts and skills and reduce time demands.

There is one more elementary group integrating inquiry-based instruction into their classrooms using an action research format.

We are offering a teacher designed professional learning session on February 14 for 6-12 teachers. Teachers will design PD sessions for their peers

Our curriculum liaisons are meeting bi-monthly to address curriculum and program issues. They will receive training in protocols and other leadership skills in coming months.

SRBI and PLC teams across all levels offer opportunities for teachers to set agendas, seek out professional learning needs, and collaborate to address instructional needs.

89. Regarding “define and enhance planning time for elementary schools” – how will this look for a teacher’s weekly schedule? Will there any impact on teachers’ time with their students in the classroom?

The STEAM period will be used as an additional preparation period for K-5 teachers. This will allow principals to schedule grade level meetings once per week as well as provide all teachers with individualized planning time each day. This reduces classroom teacher contact time with students 45 minutes per cycle. It is already happening in 3-5 and will be added in K-2 in 19-20.

90. IMPACT – how has that been working this year?: Our high school IMPACT program currently services forty-six of our students at FLHS, FWHS and WFC. Without the level of support provided to students in the IMPACT program the district would struggle to provide students with the intensive services they require in order to succeed within the Fairfield Public Schools.

91. CLC-S in MS – how many students will be part of this program and what will the staffing look like? Regarding the CLC-S at Riverfield – how is that working out? The middle school CLC-S will service up to eight students with significant social and emotional needs. The projected staffing for this programs includes a 1.0 FTE special education teacher along with a 1.0 FTE licensed clinical social worker. Program staff also includes the support of 3.0 FTE paraprofessionals. Middle School CLC-S students will have access to daily DBT groups and weekly individual support with a licensed clinical social worker.

The CLC-S at Riverfield continues to address the needs of elementary students with significant social and emotional needs who otherwise would not be able to be programmed for within the Fairfield Public Schools. The CLC-S at Riverfield and Riverfield School will be participating in training and implementation of DBT during the 2019-20 school year. The program is working extremely well. The students in the program were at other FPS school sites in 2017-2018 so there is a baseline to compare student success to this year.

92. Will there eventually be a need for a CLC-S at the high schools? Our high school IMPACT program is our in-district program that addresses the needs of students with significant social and emotional needs.

93. What will introducing DBT at the CLC-S at Riverfield entail? There is a required one to two day implementation training with the administration, school psychologist, school social worker, and CLC-S social worker with our DBT consultant from Cognitive Behavioral Consultants (CBC) followed by an introduction to DBT meeting with parents. Once the implementation training has been completed the core team will develop appropriate groups and begin implementation. There is also weekly consultation meetings with team members and bi-weekly consultations with our consultant from CBC to review processes and students.

Page 7

94. Could you provide a description of how the staffing for the ECC program will look now with the movement of the Burr program to Stratfield and the additional classes added at Stratfield? Is there a breakdown available of how these changes realize \$250,000 in savings?

The existing PK programs and para's are being reallocated to ECC sections. In the past, ECC sections were added while the general education PK remained. Your savings comes from collapsing the general education sections and utilizing those existing funded positions to fill the need for ECC.

On page 119 (Line 1117) Preschool can be seen to eliminate \$252,606 and those positions are now allocated on page 112 to ECC/Pre-School. In addition, the paras will be moved to ECC from Stratfield and Burr General Education now that we know where the 2nd site will be housed and those cost avoidance will also be attributed to the change.

INSTRUCTIONAL SERVICES

95. Page 31

Is there any specific reason for the increase in regular and SPED homebound instruction? There has been an increase in the number of students, both general education and special education, hospitalized with significant mental health challenges that require homebound tutoring until able to return to school.

96. What does the additional day of consultation services at the ECC entail? With the projected need for a second CLC at the ECC for the 2019-20 school year the additional consultation includes one day per week of support by a Board Certified Behavior Analyst (BCBA) through the Center for Children with

Special Needs (CCSN). This BCBA will consult with the CLC teacher on the development of student programs and data collection and analysis procedures. Ongoing training in the implementation of ABA learning principals will also be provided by this BCBA to all CLC staff.

97. The percent increases for Instructional Services and Pupil Personnel Services was much higher last year than this year – why is that? For Instructional Services is it primarily because of the decrease in curriculum development for 19-20?

Yes, a decrease in curriculum development is the driver of this change.

SUPPLIES/TEXTS/MATERIALS

98. Page 39

Why is the implementation of K-8 NGSS so much less than the previous year?

This is because of a reduction in the request for texts and materials at the secondary level due to the unavailability of quality resources as well as the understanding that the best available texts may be those we develop together as a district. Also, Open online resources have increased and there is a tremendous amount of high quality material available for access.

99. What is the cost of the Chromebook cases?

The cases are \$23.50 each. The 2019-2020 budget allocates \$37,600 for Chromebook cases. (1600 Chromebooks for Grade 6 and Grade 8).

OTHER PURCHASED SERVICES

100. Page 37

Professional development/curriculum writing – could you please break out the costs of the different programs?

The Professional Development section (page 82) is more than PD/Curriculum Writing. The largest drivers in that category are the following:

\$228,557 Professional Growth Tuition for Staff

\$ 68,730 Technology Training, most notably for bus software

\$178,793 PD for District

See Pg. 150 Inquiry Academy, School Improvement, Assessment Literacy, August Advance, HR training, CES workshops, Evaluation assistance, teacher evaluation...

101. Is \$30,000 a significant increase for professional growth tuition?

The budget was increased based on the shortfall in this account since 15-16.

102. Could you please explain what the bus routing software training entails?

See response above.

103. Postage – last year there was a slight decline in postage costs; this year's decrease is much larger. Is there any specific reason behind this? See response provided to another question. In general the district is using less postage due to electronic messaging.

104. Printing/copying – last year there was a 7% increase from the year before – is there any specific reason for the anticipated decrease for 19-20?

\$4,200 of the decrease is in the high school printing accounts as budgeted by the headmasters. The remaining decrease is a reflection of reduced dependency on paper copies. Although lease costs increased, these multi-functional devices are being used more and more for scanning to file rather than paper copies.

TUITION

105. Page 35

Is there any explanation for the decrease in magnet school enrollment? I apologize if I missed it, but I couldn't find a breakdown of the number of students at each magnet school. If it's not in the book could you please provide it?

FPS has been enhancing the quality of programming for high school and it is likely that the enhancements are encouraging some students to stay in the district at high school level. One of our elementary schools also added additional spaces for before and after care and that could be helping families from that elementary not require a magnet option to gain a longer school day.

| <u>School</u> | <u># Students</u> |
|------------------------------|-------------------|
| AgriScience | 9 |
| Aquaculture | 112 |
| Six to Six | 16 |
| Regional Center for the Arts | 16 |
| Discovery | 6 |
| <u>Fairchild Wheeler</u> | <u>24</u> |
| TOTAL | 183 |

106. For SPED tuition – overall, the number of outplacements has decreased by two students, apparently due to an increase in settlements-unilateral placements from 28 students to 39 (based on info on page 151).

The number of projected PPT outplacements projected in the 2019-20 budget has decreased by nine students from the number of PPT outplacements projected for the 2018-19 budget. There is also two less DCF outplacements projected in the 2019-20 proposed budget from the proposed 2018-19 budget.

There is a projected increase in unilateral placements/settlement agreements from thirty to thirty-nine between the proposed 2018-19 and 2019-20 budgets.

107. It looks like there is also an increase in the tuition for the unilateral placements from \$1,937,466 to \$2,881,385, which is an almost \$1 million increase from last year. Is this increase an anomaly? Or perhaps a trend?

See response above. With ongoing development of in-district programs for students with disabilities and strengthening of the District's SRBI processes the number of settlement agreements should not continue to rise. The actual projected cost increase in settlement agreements projected in the 2019-20 proposed budget from the 2018-19 budget is \$559,228 when factoring in the \$384,691 cost listed under the Settlements-Legal Placements line on the projected out of district student tuition chart on page 152 of the current 2018-19 BOE budget book.

108. Would it be possible to get a breakout of the outplacement costs per student?

Examples of outplacement costs:

| Out Placement School | Approximate Annual Tuition Per Student |
|------------------------------|--|
| CES | \$60,000 |
| Hope Academy | \$85,000 |
| Grove School | \$140,000 |
| Cedarhurst | \$63,000 |
| St. Vincent's Special Needs | \$103,000 |
| Meliora Academy | \$130,000 - \$170,000 |
| Giant Steps | \$140,000 |
| SPIRE | \$96,000 |
| Pinnacle | \$72,000 |
| IPPI | \$120,000 |
| Wellspring | \$160,000 |
| American School for the Deaf | \$98,000 |
| Boys and Girls Village | \$92,000 |
| Westport Day School | \$77,000 |
| Milestones | \$125,000 |
| Glenholme School at Devereux | \$132,000 |
| Adelbrook | \$85,000 |
| Futures Inc. | \$90,000 |
| Eagle Hill-Greenwich | \$68,000 |

109. Knowing the amount of work that has gone into programs bringing outplaced students back or keeping students here from being outplaced, do we think that these programs are working?

Yes. This is evidenced by the number of students that have returned to district as well as the number of students who are able to be programmed for in-district due to the existence of our CLC programs, our CLC-S program and our high school IMPACT program.

110. Do you have any sense as to how many students would be outplaced without them?

Conservatively speaking it is likely that approximately sixteen students currently enrolled in our high school IMPACT program and our elementary CLC-S program would need to be placed out of district in order to be provided an appropriate program. Additionally, the district would likely struggle in its ability to program for other students who require the intensive support provided to them in these in-district programs. Our current average outplacement cost is \$114,000. Sixteen more students could likely cost \$1,824,000 in tuition alone. This does not account for students who would need outplacement due to lack of program availability.

CONTRACTED SERVICES

111. Page 33

\$50,000 will be going to Milone & MacBroom for 19-20 – how much work would that cover? Would that be enough for them to come up with a full redistricting plan if that is the decision the Board makes?

There are technical consulting services for enrollment and facilities study to help us with new enrollment projections, facilities capacities, racial imbalance, and other district goals.; Yes.

112. When you mention the slight decline in costs based on a competitive bid in 2017 are you referencing the athletic trainers? Because it looks like they actually are slightly more this year, but maybe I am misunderstanding...

Sorry, the explanation is poorly worded. The \$51,500 budgeted for the athletic trainer for 19-20, is less than the \$53,571 budgeted in 17-18 prior to awarding the contract. There is a contractual increase of 5% over the 18-19 budget and actual.

CAPITAL

113. Page 43

When you mention the cost of equipment lost through theft and or damage, do you have a specific amount you are looking at? Yes. We go by previous years for a history and we look at the situations occurring and then budget accordingly.

114. The elementary school wireless upgrade – here it says that it wasn't done because of lack of funding, but I thought that it was always planned on being done in 19-20?

You are correct. That sentence is an error. On page 153, (Replacement and Upgrade of the Wireless Network Hardware at all eleven elementary schools support additional capacity) is the correct proposal.

Jennifer Leeper

115. What were the PPE Ranks for Fairfield in CT for years between 2000-2008 vs Fairfield's PPE Rank between 2009-2018? Please see page 1 in the budget book. See far right column.

116. Who plans/coordinates/implements/oversees PD?

Professional development is overseen by the administrators. Principals plan for buildings, curriculum liaisons and program directors for the curriculum departments, and the Executive Directors and Chief Academic Officer coordinate district-wide or level professional learning. There is also coordinated planning among departments and principals which is occurring more frequently than in the past.

117. Could you provide more information about the Mind Up program?

See Question #2.

118. What happened from 2010-11 to 2011-12 that caused the ECC to nearly double?

Perhaps this is a results of the relatively low tuition charged for nondisabled peers to participate in the preschool program

119. Could we regionalize the instruction of expelled students (Public Act 16-147)?

Yes, CES is looking at that for the region superintendents right now. However, we are so close in proximity to CES that we utilize their services for our students right now. The good news is that in Fairfield we do not have high volumes of expulsions.

120. Could you describe the 10% give back in a little more detail? Is it up to principals to determine where their 10% comes from? Do we anticipate this having any significant impact on any of the schools' budgets or ability to appropriately fund programs?

This is standard management practice when school districts are faced with budgetary challenges. Since most of the budget is fixed costs (insurance, gas, heating, salaries) there is little to reduce. In Fairfield we utilize school site budgeting for allocations so principals control where they want to reduce the 10%. At the end of the year, if the gap was closed and other items come in under budget the funds are given back to the principals to utilize.

This will have no impact on the ability to fund programs.

121. What won't we be doing in regards to NGSS because of the \$400,000 they are giving to cover the deficit?

Nothing. This money was for textbooks, so we are utilizing and finding other resources since high quality materials are not available in the market.

122. Contracted services- Summary Objective 309- Security Services/Expenses, is this line item \$0 because all of these improvements were made in 2018-19? Were there any additional recommendations from the Police Department?

This funding provides adequate coverage for our routine safety and security expenses (walkie-talkie replacements, cell phones, special duty police, video cameras...) Page 32 in the Budget.

123. Is there any cost associated with the Review of the math curriculum this year?

We do not anticipate any costs with the math review this year. This will be addressed in existing meetings.

124. I noticed that there is no revenue line for Advertising. Did I miss it? Could you explain?

No, until we actually begin to generate revenue we do not want to count on revenue which may not eventuate. If we know more before the BOE Budget book prints, we will add that line in on page 17 "Other Sources."

125. What's the major driver for the increase in the Instructional SVCS Program Assessment (page 70, item 52091)?

This is related to the addition and expansion of the STAMP assessment for World Languages. Please see above.

126. What's the major driver for the increase in the Health/PE supplies and materials?

Health - We are hoping to add First Aid training for all freshmen students and a life support certification class for a class of seniors as an elective.

PE - this is primarily to ensure program equity at all the elementary schools. This process began last year.

Each department has also budgeted funds for curriculum revisions.

Phil Dwyer

127. Pgs. 5 -7: Cost of expanding the ECC by four classrooms?

\$ 250,000 offset from eliminating 2 general education pre-school classrooms for net cost of \$91,000 Teacher, 2 Para's at \$56,000 each = \$203,000

128. Pgs. 38-39 – In category 404 you say the \$ 25,000 reduction is offset by an increase in ECC supplies elsewhere in the budget. Where is that found? [At the bottom of page 91 and at the top of page 93 of the budget book is the requested increase in supplies and materials for the ECC.](#)

129. Pgs. 34-35 – How does this .42% increase relate to the \$ 420,442 “cost reduction” highlighted in the power point presentation?

[The powerpoint is solely *gross special education tuition* projected for 2018-2019 which has gone down.](#)

[2018-2019 Gross Projected Special Education Tuition \\$9,371,880 \(page 152 18-19 budget book\)](#)

[2019-2020 Projected Gross Special Education Tuition \\$8,969,438 \(Lower by \\$402,442 page 151 \)](#)

[This is the actual tuition paid for students outside of our FPS schools.](#)

[While the “tuition line” has a slight increase of \\$25,040 it’s because all of our excess cost is now applied on the tuition line to make it easier to track our costs. Our overall special education costs are not increasing to the rate at which is usual, and the excess cost is expected to go down in relation to those reduced expenses.](#)

130. Pgs. 32 – 33 – If the board chooses NOT to pursue the bidding process for air conditioning, due to the real likelihood of getting capital funding for these projects, and thus the bids will be out of date....is this a possible area of savings?

[Yes, this could be taken out of the budget for savings. The study is to determine where air conditioning would need to be installed, where we would need additional upgrades in wiring, and determine a basic project cost for all of our school sites. For clarification, the funding is not to bid the project.](#)

131. Pgs. 42-43 – Does the purchase of an interior boom, produce any offsetting costs for outside vendors when we have to purchase a service requiring a boom, and/or rent that equipment ourselves?

[Yes. The maintenance department currently rents interior boom lifts when we have several work orders involving our in-house staff requiring the use of an interior boom lift. Annually we rent one 5-6 times at a cost of \\$ 954.35 each time. We also feel that if we had one in-house we could do more with it.](#)

Jennifer Maxon-Kennelly

From the presentation itself:

132. The presentation referenced the 15% who are now identified as getting F/Rlunch, vs. the 8% of last year. Just to be clear....that increase is due to more students being identified by virtue of the Medicaid work, NOT that we have that many more students who qualify? Secondly, as the increased identification resulted in any cost savings for SPED costs, due to our applying for funds?

Currently the district has received \$33,132 in Medicaid reimbursement from July 2018 - December 2018. As the percentage of parental consents increase it is expected that monthly reimbursements will rise as well.

133. To what (I forget if you said) is attributed the \$402K reduction in SPED tuition?

There are fewer students projected to be out placed during the 2019-20 school year. As the district expands its in-district programming options the special education department is working with families to maintain student programming within the Fairfield Public Schools.

134. Can you explain more regarding the “21 requests for new staff”?

| | | |
|-------------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| HS Health 1.0 | ELL .6 | SLP .4 |
| HS Art .4 | SW .6 | Elem Rdg Resource .5 |
| Spec Ed 2.0 | SRBI 3.0 | K-2 WL 1.9 |
| Para 3.0 | MS Gifted .6 | MS Eval Team 3.0 |
| Ed Trainer 2.0 | MS Math Resource 3.0 | Custodial 2.0 |
| Instructional Coach 1.0 | MS Rdg Resource. 2.0 | Systems Engineer 1.0 |
| Social Workers .5 | Tech Ed .7 | Receptionist .5 |
| Music .2 | Hybrid Learning 3.2 | |
| School Psych 1.0 | World Lang .4 | |

34.5 FTE in Total

135. Can you explain more (if appropriate) regarding the \$470K of K-8 Entrance Security?

Yes. The plan was to hire security guards for every school entrance location K-12. Similar to what we have at the High Schools that exists now.

136. Regarding “Innovative Learning Year Two”....has there been a decision made yet regarding what will happen with the Chromebooks in the summer?

No decision has been made yet.

As we prepare to buy more for the other two middle school grades, I assume we still have enough “extras” to cover for summer damage, if they take them home, and from the course of this school year?

Yes, there is a small allocation for 84 additional devices that can be used in addition to current spring, should it be needed.

137. The presentation referenced “Additional Enhancements.” Could staff be prepared to speak to the value of our investment in DBT, Mind Up, IMPACT, and our move away from ESS? We will try to arrange for staff to be present to speak to this question.

138. You reference the SPED audit, which I see has resulted in the evaluation teams, which I fully support. What SAVINGS resulted from the audit? Cost savings will be realized over time as we continually refine our evaluation and special education eligibility determination and programming processes along with improving efficiencies across the district with our PPT processes.

From the book:

139. Thank you for including page 4. Interesting information, on a topic we always reference at some point (what are the “attorney issues” that we share?) [Insurance, Facilities, Risk Management](#).

140. P. 5 references that “Innovative Learning became the norm at our high schools and Grade 7.” I assume this is a reference to the Chromebook roll out. [Yes](#).

141. Can you speak more to specifically how this is proving to a worthwhile investment for both our student and staff? Educationally and financially?

[Please see question #23](#).

142. What is the specific nature of the PD that is being offered to maximize the use of the Chromebooks? [We have provided some professional development in the use of the Chromebooks and the applications of the Google suite. Most of the professional learning in this area occurs when teachers are sharing student work and discussing methods and strategies to achieve results. It is integrated into discussions on instruction and learning and has a greater impact as the application is discussed in relationship to the instructional targets.](#)

143. “Strengthen the examination of student work protocols...” what does this mean and what does this “look like”?

[Below is a sample of one of the protocols we use -](#)

Purpose: [To identify most effective instructional strategies based upon student growth, engage in discourse about teaching decisions and planning, and to maximize student learning outcomes.](#)

[Pre-meeting preparation:](#)

- [1. PLT agrees upon an indicator within the Academic Expectation rubric related to Communication or Collaboration.](#)
- [2. Teachers individually create and implement a lesson that assesses the achievement of the indicator.](#)
- [3. Teachers collect and individually review their own students’ samples.](#)
- [4. Quickly sort the work samples into three batches based on levels of understanding or sophistication of work related to task expectations \(high, medium, low\).](#)
- [5. Select one piece of work from each batch and create a packet for each member of the group. For example, if a PLT has four members, four separate packets of student samples \(1 high, 1 medium, 1 low\) are brought.](#)

[In PLTs:](#)

- [1. Determine which PLT member will share student samples first. This person will be know as the presenter. This person provides a description of the task and what instructional strategies were used \(~5 minutes\).](#)
- [2. The presenter distributes a packet of student samples to each member.](#)
- [3. The “readers” take a few minutes to read the sample work while the presenter only speaks to answer clarifying questions \(~10 minutes\).](#)
- [4. The readers identify the patterns or trends found in the student work samples and share with the PLT. The first presenter remains silent but takes notes on what other members say about instructional strategies. Suggested questions to answer:
 - \[a. Did the students achieve the objective?\]\(#\)
 - \[b. How much growth does the sample work exhibit? \\(~times will vary\\)\]\(#\)](#)
- [5. After hearing from the team, the presenter reflects on what the PLT shared and leads the team \(~ 3 minutes\).](#)

Switch roles - select a new presenter. Repeat steps 1-5 until each PLT member shares student work. This may take multiple PLT sessions.

6. Identify the most effective instructional strategy amongst the group based on apparent growth of student learning.
7. Determine how PLT members could teach a future lesson using the group-selected, most-effective instructional strategy. Suggested questions to answer:
 - a. What instructional changes will we make to increase student learning growth?
 - b. How will we know that instructional changes are successful?

After Looking at Student Work: Find your slide on this [PLT 18-19 Showcase](#) Google Slides presentation and prepare a slide that will be shared in December with FWHS staff about the most effective strategy.

144. "Continued focus on [SRBI]"....can you speak more to what have we done that's been a successful investment of time and money....what has been tried and found not to work what is new for the coming school year as a focus of time and money in SRBI?

We have worked concurrently at all levels on several improvement strands of SRBI

- Improving the use of data - there is a team of administrators working with our IT staff to create a PK-12 data interface that will improve student data readiness and decision-making
- Improving the SRBI process - staff at all levels are working to improve meeting efficiency by completing information requests ahead of the actual meeting and moving the meeting agendas to decision-making
- Looking at Student Work protocols - work in this area brings the focus of the process to the desired end - did students achieve what was expected of them? Why or why not? As a result of the student learning what are the next instructional targets and supports for students
- Administrator professional learning - looking at how to support our coaches in the best manner so they can best support teachers. What are their roles and responsibilities? Are we giving them adequate time to coach? How do we improve coaching itself?

145. P. 6 what are the opportunities that you reference for "enhanced teacher leadership"? What are the educational and budget impacts of this?

The explanation is provided above. Budget impacts are primarily seen in any substitutes that are required to cover teacher absences.

146. The CLC-S cohort at Tomlinson....so like at Riverfield, students for whom this is deemed a necessary intervention will be districted to TMS, regardless of elem. School? **Yes**

147 P. 7 any reason Burr isn't mentioned as a preK site?

Yes, in 2018-2019 Burr is not an ECC site for PK. It is a general education PK.

***Instructional Services

148. Regarding the schedule on p. 148-9, minor point, but why is social studies broken out; can't it be combined under a single heading?

That is an error on our part. They can be combined.

149. I don't understand the extent of the drop in curriculum development....I had expected we would be seeing significant work in Health especially given the new grad. Requirements. And why isn't PE listed on p. 150 at all?

The primary driver for the decrease in curriculum development is the comparatively small size of the departments making curriculum revisions and are use of school year professional learning time, not summers, to build the professional learning. **PE does not need an increase in funding to accomplish goals.**

150. P. 31/71, can you explain more regarding the nature of the consultation services increase? And this is solely connected to the ECC? Consultation services includes services provided by the staff from the Center for Children (CCSN) with Special needs who oversee all of our CLC programs and train all ed trainers and CLC paraprofessional staff. This area also includes consultants from Cognitive Behavioral Consultants (CBC) who oversee implementation of DBT throughout middle schools and high schools. Additionally this area includes psychiatric and clinical psychological consultation support as part of our high school IMPACT program and districtwide psychiatric consultations and evaluations recommended through the PPT process. The increase is primarily due to the addition of one day per week of consultation through CCSN.

151. P. 31/70, can you explain more the nature of the increase in the program assessments?
This is the change in funding source, and the increased use of the STAMP assessments, as answered above

152. p . 112 - why such a sizable increase in professional devel. Costs?
This is answered in Mr. Dwyer's questions. The primary driver is an increase of funding to support 6-12 English/Language Arts.

153. P. 112/113 - why such sizable DECREASE in Instructional Materials?

Student enrollment has declined in elementary (per student allocations) and there is no major core area focus this year.

154. P. 113, line 307 - explanation of increase? See page 32 in the Budget – (307), Outside Contractors.

***Supplies/Texts/Materials

155. P. 92, line 56172 -- I have never seen a percentage increase like that before! So just wondering why? (it canNOT be frosting!)

It is for an online textbook for Child Development. The last text was purchased in 2006.

156. P. 92, how such a significant decrease in psych testing material? There was some unencumbered funds from last year's budget that was used to purchase materials that otherwise would have been budgeted for in the 2019-20 budget proposal.

*** Contracted Services

157. P. 83, 325, why are we needing to maintain an almost \$7,000 increase in recruitment?

Yes, this is needed for hard-to-fill positions and recruitment fairs.

Trisha Pytko

Responses to Questions for 1-15-2019 Budget Review

158. Page 7- Please explain how there is a \$250,000 savings for the ECC sections. I am curious because we just had a special education audit.

The savings results from the BOE decision to reprogram the two General Education PK classrooms. Otherwise, we would be paying for 12 classrooms for preschool next year instead of 10.

(additional teachers and paras)

159. Page 8- what is the "Collaborative"?

The website for the TEAMS mentoring.

160. Page 8- Any insight into how the state has justified cutting a 1/2 of the per pupil cost for special education services. Are there savings or other grants?

They have not cut cost at this time. The reduction in excess cost is directly related to a reduction in expenses. If we spend less, we get less reimbursement.

161. Page 9-Universal Preschool- What would be the cost for an additional 22 classrooms? Do we have space in our current facilities to add 22 classrooms?

No, we do not have space for 22 additional classrooms without leaving no space for additional sections and unique spaces like special education resource.

A very cursory estimate would be:

Teacher \$90,000

Para \$40,000

Classroom Set Up \$25,000

\$155,000 per classroom x 22 classrooms = \$3,410,000 First Year

**Space would have an additional cost

162. Page 10- Are we currently training any staff for Dyslexia? How many? which schools? Do we have any staff already trained?

We are currently in the third and final year of Wilson Training with special education and some LAS staff in being completed in this cohort. There are a total of 30 staff being trained right now

We have trained up 100 people across the district.

163. Page 11- ECS funding- do we have any indications from the state on whether we will received this funding this year?

Currently, in Hartford it is expected that the ECS funding will be received. However, it is early.

164. Page 16- How did we qualify for \$2,827 for Bilingual Education? Were there certain requirements which would help keep any programs in FPS?

This is based on the number of EL students who speak the same language in one building (McKinley).

165. Page 24- Will you provide a breakdown of the 10.9 FTE staff that were added this current school year 2018-2019?

This was provided in the Quarterly Report on September 30, 2018.

5.9 Teachers (2.0 Elem, 1.9 Sped, 1.0 Tech Integration, 1.025 General Ed HS Sections)

4.7 FTE – Special Education Paras

166. Page 35 Will you explain the decrease in SPED tuition?

We have brought students back from out placements and our programs are assisting FPS in keeping students in district. On page 151 you can see the gross projected tuition, and there is a note at the bottom of the page noting a reduction of \$402,442 for 1029-2020 (Actual Tuition). On page 35 this is the tuition line including all magnet schools, and we apply all excess cost to this line. We have a reduction in special education excess cost due to reducing expenses.

167. Page 37- 319 Reduction in Conference and Travel for staff and SPED. However, in pages 80-82, and 103 - 115, some schools have 100% + increase in travel/conference- please explain the difference.

This is determined by the principal and directors based on their needs. They determine which categories within their budgets need their site based or departmental funding. For instance, if the principal wants to send a group of teachers to a particular conference he/she may increase that line item for the following year.

168. Page 40- Please explain all of the increases in utilities. I am sure some people may be confused why there is an increase in electricity when we installed solar panels and solar car ports.

Refer to pages 169 and 170.

On page 169 you will see that solar is expected to save \$199,412 in 2019-2020. The budget would have been increased by that amount if the solar did not exist. On page 170 you can see four years of electric and heat. The distribution costs on electric and heat have risen dramatically causing increased utilities. Also, electric has Holland Hill and Sherman usage factored in since they will have air conditioning and mechanical means of fresh air next year which increases utilities.