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FY’18 Budget Choices by the Numbers

Improvement budget - $906,234 (including $150,000 stabilization but no money to fund OPEB)

Level Service Budget - $403,950

Budget Version 1.0 - $0

Budget Version 2.0 - $105,908

Budget Version 3.0 - $53,856 (Potential)

Total Change from Improvement budget to Version 3.0 $1,469,948
Impact of Reducing Budget by School/Area

Current Littleville/Chester Class Sizes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LITTLEVILLE</th>
<th>ENROLLMENT</th>
<th>CHESTER</th>
<th>ENROLLMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PreK: 24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>PreK: 20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K: 25/25</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>K: 21</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gr 1: 21/22</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>Gr 1: 12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gr 2: 20/21</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>Gr 2: 20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gr 3: 18/20/19</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>Gr 3: 19</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gr 4: 15/15/15</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Gr 4: 12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gr 5: 25/25</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Gr 5: 21</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Impact of Reducing Budget by School/Area

Elementary Impacts:

❖ Littleville has lost 3 teaching positions over the past three years, a half-time reading specialist and a half-time school adjustment counselor. This loss of our core classroom teachers has created a constant cycle of teachers having to change grade levels each year to accommodate student enrollment. This is challenging because teachers need to change all their materials and learn a new curriculum. We have implemented several looping groups to ease the impact on both staff and students.

❖ In Chester, losing a teacher would mean creating a multi-age classroom with upwards of 30 students in the classroom.

❖ Cutting a “specials” teacher (PE/Health, Art, Music, STEM) would have an impact on both elementary schools because they already split their time between both buildings. We would not be able to meet the contractual prep-times of the teacher contract. It would also be extremely unfortunate to not be able to offer our students exposure to the Arts. Our new STEM program has been very successful in creating a strong focus on science and math that is benefiting our students greatly as evidenced in our preliminary STE MCAS scores. To lose this would weaken our curriculum.

❖ At the elementary level we cannot eliminate a special education teacher and still be in compliance with our IEPs. Without our substantially separate programs we would be sending students out of district in order to meet their needs.
### Impact of Reducing Budget by School/Area

#### Current MS/HS Enrollment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MIDDLE SCHOOL ENROLLMENT</th>
<th>HIGH SCHOOL ENROLLMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gr. 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gr. 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gr. 7</td>
<td>Gr. 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gr. 8</td>
<td>Gr. 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Gr. 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>199</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Impact of Reducing Budget by School/Area

**Middle School Specials**
- Other than a part-time culture/language position, all specials teachers in the middle school are shared with the high school, so a loss in this realm would affect both. Current shared positions provide:
  - Jazz & Concert Band and lessons
  - Show and Concert Choir
  - Visual and digital arts courses
  - Welding/metals tech.
  - P.E (required at each grade by law)/Health (required in 7th grade by School Comm. policy)/Wellness

**Middle School Core**
- Loss of 1 core teacher in middle school
  - Loss of teaming (core of MS model)
  - Class sizes jump to 22-25 (vs. 16-17)
    - This would restrict flexible grouping for academic & socio-emotional needs
Impact of Reducing Budget by School/Area

High School Specials
- Other than a part-time health position, the following are provided by “non-core” positions:
  - Visual and digital arts
  - Wood Tech. (this teacher also teaches mult. sections of a core Sci.)
  - Spanish I-IV (2 years required by colleges/universities; 4 years recommended for 4 year schools)
  - P.E. (required by law)

High School Core
- Loss of core teacher in most departments would necessitate more than one of the following:
  - Elimination of AP courses
  - Merging of honors & college prep sections
  - Loss of integrated/remedial courses (math & ELA) or more of them taught by special education teachers (not best practice)
  - Offering fewer sections causing more schedule conflicts (meaning fewer students would get the courses they want or need for college and careers)
- Maintaining as much of the Program of Studies as possible following additional a cut at the high school could necessitate:
  - Renegotiating teacher contracts related to:
    - number of preps
    - prep time
    - Online learning catalog
  - Changing to a 6-period schedule (would also lead to more schedule conflicts)
Impact of Reducing Budget by School/Area

2017-2018 Special Education Budget Impact Information

❖ At the elementary level we cannot eliminate a special education teacher and still be in compliance with our IEPs. Without our substantially separate programs we would be sending students out of district in order to meet their needs.

❖ At the middle/high school, reducing a special education position would necessitate:
  ➢ Grouping more/all students with IEP support in one class (not best practice)
  ➢ Increased schedule conflicts for IEP students (due to consolidated groupings)
  ➢ Loss of integrated/remedial courses currently taught by special education teachers in high school
  ➢ Eliminating flexible grouping for academic & socio-emotional needs
  ➢ Loss of special education support in classes not specifically required by IEPs (which would lead to more being written into IEPs, thus forcing the issue in future years)
## Budget Version 3.0 Assessments (Adopted 9.13.17)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Town</th>
<th>FY’18</th>
<th>Change $ FY’17</th>
<th>Change %</th>
<th>Per Student Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blandford</td>
<td>$1,523,430</td>
<td>($62,816)</td>
<td>-3.96%</td>
<td>$13,482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chester</td>
<td>$1,492,633</td>
<td>$1,179</td>
<td>0.08%</td>
<td>$9,951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huntington</td>
<td>$2,616,658</td>
<td>$118,257</td>
<td>4.73%</td>
<td>$9,837</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middlefield</td>
<td>$476,645</td>
<td>($38,366)</td>
<td>-7.45%</td>
<td>$13,240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montgomery</td>
<td>$907,537</td>
<td>($22,519)</td>
<td>-2.42%</td>
<td>$12,265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russell</td>
<td>$2,219,215</td>
<td>$171,987</td>
<td>8.40%</td>
<td>$8,343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$9,236,118</td>
<td>$167,722</td>
<td>1.85%</td>
<td>$10,251</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Draft FY18 Budget

Only changes from Version 2.0 are updating line items, moving central office staff to handle day security and allocating that money to afternoon/evening security.

Total reduction under this scenario would be $53,856

Total budget amount would be $16,035,958 (.63% increase over FY ‘17)