

Budget Summary

On October 5, the School Committee voted the FY12 budget guidelines and requested that the Superintendent present a level-service budget. For purposes of clarification, a level-service budget is defined as the funds necessary to replicate the current level of services provided and to meet all legal requirements, including current collective bargaining requirements and special education laws. The recommended level-service budget for 2011-2012 requires an additional \$3,158,634, which is an increase of 4.56% over the FY11 appropriation at the spring Town Meeting. This budget is based on the assumption that the loss of federal ARRA stimulus funds (\$1,060,370) will be replaced by \$586,572 from the new one-time federal "Jobs" grant, the use of \$250,000 from the Avalon trust fund, and \$138,000 from the LABBB credit. If these additional funds were not available, the level-service budget would increase by \$4,156,251, which is an increase of 6.0%

	FY11 FTE	FY11 STM Budget	FY12 FTE	FY12 Level Serv EST	FTE Adj	\$ CHANGE	% CHANGE
Salary & Wages w/benefits	881.00	\$ 57,727,988	886.99	\$ 60,882,595	5.98	\$ 3,154,607	
Expenses		\$ 11,515,538		\$ 12,517,182		\$ 1,001,644	
Total 1100 Lexington Public Schools	881.00	\$ 69,243,526	886.99	\$ 73,399,777	5.98	\$ 4,156,251	6.00%
Offsets Applied							
				SFSF	\$	37,654	
				Ed Jobs	\$	548,918	
				LABBB	\$	138,000	
				AVALON	\$	250,000	
				Medicaid	\$	23,045	
				Total Offsets	\$	997,617	
Level Service Budget Request				\$		72,402,160	\$ 3,158,634 4.56%

The increase in the school budget is driven by five key factors:

1. Special Education Mandates:

The cost of special education continues to be a key factor in the development of the school district budget. The major influences on special education costs include:

- a. Out-of-district tuition expenses – The overall increase of the district’s tuition obligation is projected to increase by 14.12% or \$802,686.
- b. Staffing needs – The following positions or changes in job classifications are needed: Student Support Instructors for the Fiske Intensive Learning Program (ILP), the reclassification of Instructional Assistants to Special Class Teaching Assistants in the Hastings Intensive Learning Program in order to address increased behavioral needs of students, and a Student Services Data Specialist to manage required student and services data.

2. Personnel Salaries:

The FY 12 budget includes funds for all negotiated salary and step increases for all bargaining units. The FY 12 personnel budget is based on current personnel, as of October 15, plus any known vacancies. It is assumed that all teachers on a leave of absence will return next fall.

3. Reduction in State and Federal Title Grants:

In FY12, we are projecting a 15% reduction in the Title 1 grant. Title IIA (aid for improving educator quality) is expected to decline by 2%, Title III (aid for limited English proficient students is expected to remain the same next year. The Full Day Kindergarten Grant is expected to be reduced by 10%. We are assuming the METCO grant will be level-funded after substantial reductions during the past three years.

4. Elimination in the Federal Stimulus Program, Also Known as ARRA:

Two years ago, the federal government passed the American Reinvestment Recovery Act (ARRA) to protect school districts from massive budget cuts for two years. Lexington was allocated \$818,090 for FY 10 and \$818,090 for FY 11. The elimination of the ARRA federal grant in FY 12 will mean the loss of \$1,060,370 (\$818,090 plus \$242,280 rolled over from last year). This loss will be partially offset in FY 12 by using a new, one-time federal grant passed last year, commonly known as the Education Jobs program. Since our "Jobs" grant of \$548,918 was not used in FY 11, these funds are available to be used in FY 12. The difference in the two federal grant programs will mean a shortfall of \$511,452 in FY 12.

The plan to transition from expiring federal funds is as follows:

FY 12 (To make up for the loss of \$1,060,370 in ARRA funds):

New federal jobs grant	\$548,918
New SFSF federal grant	\$ 37,654
Medicaid funds	\$23,045 Due to our hiring of a dedicated staff person, we have been able to stabilize our reimbursement at about \$200,000 per year.
Use of Avalon funds	\$250,000 (We anticipate the maximum of \$750,000 will be in the account by June 2011)
Use of LABBB credit	<u>\$138,000</u> (The total credit is approximately \$580,000)
Total	<u>\$997,617</u>

FY 13

Use of Avalon funds	\$250,000
Use of LABBB credit	<u>\$250,000 (leaving approximately \$190,000 at the end of FY 13)</u>
Total	<u>\$500,000</u>

FY 14 (At the end of FY 14, the funds will be exhausted)

Use of Avalon funds	<u>\$250,000</u> (At the end of FY 14, the fund will be exhausted)
Use of LABBB credit	<u>\$TBD</u>
Total	<u>\$500,000</u>

5. Decrease in Regular Education Transportation Revenue:

In FY 11, there was a substantial shift in the make up of riders, but the overall ridership remained relatively constant. Our eligible riders increased by 60 partially due to the rising number of students at Avalon going to Bridge (\$33,000 in lost revenue). The number of paying riders is 160 less than projected for the budget year (\$88,000 in lost revenue). The net result is an additional \$115,000 added to the FY11 budget. The level of financial assistance increased from 150 riders in FY09 to 185 for FY10 and FY11. Family Cap riders increased from 3 in FY09 to approximately 80 in FY11. The combination of these two fee reduction elements of our program results in a range of \$25,000 to \$75,000 in lost revenue. Due to these changes, the regular education transportation budget has been increased by \$183,049 (33.75%). In the FY12 budget the operating budget subsidy for fee riders has risen to \$246,331.

K-12 Curriculum, Instruction, and Professional Development Summary

The Office of Curriculum, Instruction, and Professional Development supports, organizes, and manages high quality educational programs for Lexington students in over twelve programs and serves the district's 630 FTEs PK-12 administrators and teachers. This office's FY12 goals include the continuation of the district's curriculum review process, continuation of data analysis, and building a data culture to inform curriculum and instruction designed to increase academic excellence and student achievement that is explicitly linked to district goals. We continue our commitment to building professional learning communities among our teachers and our use of common formative assessments to assist our work in closing the achievement gap and advancing overall student achievement. The inclusion of a second district-wide goal focused on the concurrent development of pro-social skills is included as a significant part of the district's instructional mission. If student stress and their social, emotional, and organizational preparedness to learn are in anyway challenged or compromised, students' academic success can suffer, as well. The two goals must walk "hand in hand" in order to ensure overall student success. Consequently, the Office of Curriculum, Instruction, and Professional Development is hard at work with district administrators and program leaders to bolster the fundamental building blocks that will bring many complex and complicated elements together in a seamlessly aligned cycle that continuously addresses the four basic, yet essential questions educators need to answer on a regular and on-going basis:

1. What do we want all students to know and be able to do? (Curriculum)
2. How do we teach so that all students can learn? (Instruction)
3. How will we know if students have learned what we have taught? (Assessment)
4. What will we do if they have NOT learned it OR if they already know it? (Interventions and Extensions)

Educational research has emphatically proven that a strongly embedded and on-going Professional Development (P.D.) program plays a key role in assuring that teaching and learning goals are met. This research and our everyday practice continue to demonstrate that a strong professional development program is, in fact, a critical component of highly effective schools and the advancement of student achievement. A strong professional development program that addresses the complexities of pedagogy is firmly grounded in "day-to-day teaching practice and is designed to enhance teachers' content specific instructional practices with the intent of improving learning" (Darling-Hammond and McLaughlin, 1995).

The Lexington Public Schools has historically demonstrated a longstanding commitment to professional development for its faculty and administrators, yet declining budgets over the course of several years caused a serious decrease in the amount of time and money that could be dedicated to this endeavor. The district has never undervalued the importance of P.D. in enhancing the growth of its professional staff and the consequent advancement of student learning; however, declining funds in this account over the past decade have not allowed the district to pursue professional development activities to the degree and extent we would have preferred.

Thanks to the availability of ARRA (American Reinvestment and Recovery Act – *stimulus money*) dollars in FY10 and FY11, the district has been enabled to redirect, renew, and invigorate its focus on this well-needed and long awaited opportunity to advance our P.D. efforts. We are proud to announce that we have been able to make tremendous strides in our work in this area. A strong, in-depth series of optional, after-school offerings were provided in the spring, summer, and fall of 2010 with another round scheduled for the spring of 2011. Over forty-three (43) courses and workshops, focused on differentiated instruction, best practices, Response to Intervention (RTI), technology integration, and advancing 21st century literacies, and more, have been provided "in-district" for a total of 522 teachers during this 18-month period. Additionally, a total of 395 administrators and faculty have been able to participate in out-of-district courses (both in-state and out-of-state) with educational experts and colleagues from around the country. As a result, our staff has been able to bring back what they have learned to their school, their PLCs, and the district at large. Required training to

provide content specific information to teachers in the areas of mathematics and literacy skills has taken place during the course of the school day on designated dates.

Not only has our success in the area of Professional Development been acclaimed by our district's faculty via their end-of-course evaluation forms, but national recognition has come our way, as well. In the November issue of "Education Week," a profile of the district's P.D. work was showcased. The article attests to the importance of our local efforts and its relative uniqueness in the country as we work to become a "learning system" – one that fosters teacher learning beyond the individual school and classroom level (Dr. Paul B. Ash, 2010). We are indeed one of the only districts in the nation that has committed itself to the systemic and synergized importance of this work.

However, the work is never done. The momentum must be sustained. There must be continuity and consistency, not only in the mission and vision, but also in our collective effort. The needs of teachers "new" to Lexington, as well as the needs of our experienced, veteran teachers must be continuously addressed. From "Better Beginnings" and mentor coaching for our new teachers to the changing and advanced needs of our experienced teachers . . . we must cover all the bases, both in our required and optional programs. Our Professional Development Committee continues to respond to the expressed needs of teachers through course feedback loops and surveys. The committee continues to design and structure offerings that synthesize the goals of the district focused on improving student performance at every level with a specific concentration on reducing the achievement gap. A great deal of time and attention are required to organize the many aspects and details of a consolidated P.D. "system." Multiple components must be considered and addressed . . . from beginning teachers to veteran teachers, from content to pedagogy, from in-district to out-of-district activities, from registrations to cancellations. Through a re-alignment of funds in the current budget, a part-time P.D. liaison position will take the place of a retired administrator who has served in the capacity of chairperson in helping to coordinate and lead this effort forward.

The overall essence of this systemic P.D. program is centered on increasing our collaborative efforts, as educators, through the application of principles inherent in Professional Learning Communities, through targeted and specific training in the development and identification of tiered intervention instructional models and strategies, collecting data to inform individual student instruction, integrating expanding technologies as educational tools in each classroom, encouraging increased interdisciplinary curricular goals, and much more.

In the area of curriculum development, a committee of teachers, administrators, and community members continues with Year 2 of the K-12 English Language Arts (ELA) Curriculum Review/Program Evaluation Process. The work in this programmatic area is addressing the alignment of the Lexington Public Schools' ELA curriculum with the Common Core Standards recently adopted by the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. The district has invested in a web based tool called *Atlas Rubicon* which is being used to upload the priority standards for each grade level, along with the suggested instructional strategies that should accompany the teaching of these standards and the list of accompanying resources, activities, and materials that can be used to support success in this area.

The commitment to this ambitious curriculum renewal cycle will ensure that the Lexington Public Schools' curriculum is always aligned to state and national academic standards in a timely way, while at the same time ensure that we are offering the very best programs to our students.

To date, the curriculum review cycle has been completed in three programmatic areas: Mathematics, Physical Education/Wellness, and Science/Engineering and Technology. Revisions in the mathematics documents will have to be considered in the near future as a result of the State's adoption of the national Common Core Standards. This work will be scheduled to begin in the summer of 2011. It should be duly noted that the new Common Core standards significantly emphasize the importance of higher order thinking skills in each program area. These skills are highlighted as essential to success in post high school programs and student career paths.

With the recent hiring of a K-5 Social Studies Coordinator, the district is ready to begin a fifth curriculum review cycle in the FY12 academic year in the area of Social Studies. This work is scheduled to begin in the summer of 2011.

The curriculum office has established a Report Card Committee whose charge it is to research and design a standards-based K-5 report card that will replace the current elementary reporting instrument. The goal of this work is to provide a reporting tool to parents and students that will more accurately communicate student achievement and progress with a target year for implementation in 2012.

Since there was an unexpected increase of 165 K-5 students this past year, the budget includes two unallocated teachers that will be allocated next year in whatever schools have the greatest enrollment pressures.

K-12 Student Services Summary

The cost of special education continues to be a key factor in the development of the school district budget. The major influences on special education costs include:

- a. Increases in out-of-district tuition: The tuition account is projected to increase by approximately 8.63%, net of all state and federal offsets (\$694,200). However, due to the reduction in ARRA funds for FY 12, the district will experience a 14.12% increase. The tuition line item includes a 1.69% increase for private special education schools, an increase for private schools that have requested program reconstruction or extraordinary relief, and a 4% increase for collaborative tuitions.
- b. Decreases in State circuit breaker reimbursements:
The State "Circuit Breaker" law partially reimburses school districts for out-of-district special education placements that cost four times the foundation budget (\$38,636 per student for FY10). In FY 12, we are projecting a 40% reimbursement rate and expect to receive \$1,402,149 based on November 2010 eligible students.

In FY 10, the State reduced funding for the Circuit Breaker reimbursement program. The special education reimbursement rate was reduced from 72% to 40%. The Lexington Public Schools lost \$600,000. In FY 12, we project that the reimbursement rate will remain at 40%.

- c. Decreases in contracted services for specialized service delivery to students:
The contracted services line item has been decreased this year.

Previously, the district contracted for physical therapy services. This year, the district hired a full-time physical therapist at a savings of approximately \$2,000 to \$5,000. In addition, the district contracted for BCBA and ABA services for a middle school student. By employing an additional Student Support Instructor in lieu of contracting for these services, the district will save approximately \$7,400.

During the FY'10 school year, the district contracted for Augmentative Communication services in lieu of contracting for those services as in the past. The district projected to pay approximately \$68,000 for 10 hours per week of service. The district was experiencing a growing need in this area for in-district and out-of-district students. The district was able to hire a full-time Augmentative Communication Specialist at a savings of \$10,500 to meet the current needs.

- d. Special Transportation Costs
The transition of all transportation services to the Business Office is complete. This includes all general education, special education, METCO, and homeless students.

We are continuing to work with the LABBB/EDCO Transportation Network to cost share out-of-district students with surrounding towns. This collaborative effort was the result of a successful pilot program with Arlington, Belmont, Watertown, and Burlington. Waltham will be joining us next year. We hope to keep our special education transportation costs stable.

- e. Staffing changes: Additional staff are needed in the Fiske and high school Intensive Learning Programs (ILP) due to a projected increase in enrollments. Three Student Support Instructors are needed to support students moving up from the preschool and students moving in to the Fiske ILP. The budget does not take into account any move-ins during the school year. The high school ILP requires an additional ILP teacher due to an increase in enrollment. Six students are scheduled to enter the ILP from the 8th grade. One student is graduating. The additional five students will impact general education classes in that they need to be supported by a special education teacher. These students require an appropriate teacher/student ratio that allows for all necessary services outlined in their IEP and ensures a free and appropriate public education (FAPE) and effective progress to be made. In addition, without the addition of this teacher, the current ILP teachers will be teaching more classes than is contractually allowed.

The proposed budget also includes a Student Support Instructor for a middle school student who has been receiving school and home services through IAs and outside contractors. By converting the IA to Student Support Instructor, all services can be provided without contracting with independent contractors. This will save the district approximately \$7,400.

The Student Services Department is seeking to reorganize its administrative support structure. The student services department has experienced significant growth in capacity and complexity over the last four years. Programs have expanded or been developed. Currently, the two K-8 Supervisors are the only supervisors without secretaries. This creates a difficult hardship as they spend an inordinate amount of time completing secretarial tasks. These two supervisors have the majority of the students on IEPs, oversee four schools each, and their staff and programs have increased and/or expanded requiring additional time for staff supervision and program oversight. The FY 12 budget proposes elimination of the IEP secretary and creation of one secretary for K-8 Student Services at no additional cost. A second secretary is included in the supplemental budget.

The budget also includes a Student Services Data Specialist. As recommended in the DMC report, accurate IEP data is critical for compliance with state and federal regulations, monitoring of student services and staffing, and state reporting which has a significant financial impact. It is recommended that this position be funded by eliminating the contract with SEMS Tracker (\$17,000) and using \$38,000 from the LABBB credit. The department intends to use the X2 IEP program included in the current X2 Student Information System instead of the SEMS Tracker IEP software program. It is anticipated that with the creation of this position, diligent scrutiny and data management will result in increased circuit breaker and Medicaid claims sufficient to fund this position in future years.

The budget includes a change in the Hastings ILP staffing from Instructional Assistants to Special Class Assistants. The Hastings ILP program has changed as the students' profiles now include significant behavior issues and emotional concerns in addition to communication and academic needs. The children's co-morbidity and the attendant behavioral issues have not been well served. The students require support staff personnel with specialized training in order to succeed in the integrated model. This plan is to change the job category for all of the Instructional Assistants serving the ILP students at Hastings to Special Class Teaching Assistants. Some district-wide programs that service students with complex needs that include challenging behaviors have typically employed Special Class Assistants in lieu of Instructional Assistants. The skill set and job responsibilities required by Special Class Assistants differ from those of Instructional Assistants. The funding would enable the ILP program to be staffed with Special Class Teaching

Assistants with greater responsibilities than instructional assistants, CPI certification, and embedded specialized training during the school year to meet the needs of this student population. The Hastings ILP program currently has thirty students. Over the past two years, the district has added three ILP students each year, after the budget process has been concluded. There are fifteen assistants and one Student Support Instructor (SSI) with the ILP program this year. The plan is to eliminate the current fifteen instructional assistant positions and one SSI position and create sixteen special class assistants in FY 12.

Elementary K-5 Summary

In FY 12, the K-5 enrollment is projected to increase by eight students (2830 students in FY11 and no change in students for FY 12). Currently, there are 131 classrooms in the six K-5 schools.

Classroom teachers provide instruction in the core academic areas and are supported by experts and specialists in the fields of art, music, physical education, and library/media. Specialists provide developmentally appropriate instruction, and this instruction is interdisciplinary in nature whenever possible. Literacy and mathematics intervention specialists at each building work with all students, as well as at-risk students to provide assistance with their literacy and numeracy skills. Additionally, the K-5 specialists assist teachers with model lessons, lesson planning, and professional development. The K-5 Literacy and Math Department Heads and specialists work with administrators and teachers in program planning for cognitively gifted students to assure these students have appropriate programs in both reading and math.

Funds are allocated in department budgets to support ongoing programs that support ongoing, planned assessment to inform instruction, provide supplemental materials for comprehensive programs that are aligned with the Massachusetts State Curriculum Frameworks, and provide teachers with professional development in current instructional methodologies.

The overall school expense budgets for the elementary schools were based on a per pupil expenditure of approximately \$54.00 per student, which is unchanged from FY11. The principals then reallocated their school's allotment to the various needs within their building.

Per pupil allocations for level service are applied in the following manner:

Elementary School Expense Budget (general education budget only) Level Fund Per Pupil at \$54.00 and Budget Allocation adjusted by # of students as of official October 1, 2010 enrollment													
Line Number	Roll Up	Location	FY10	# of Students	Per Pupil Allocation	FY11	# of Students	Per Pupil Allocation	Change	FY12	# of Students	Per Pupil Allocation	Change
1	Bowman		\$25,704	476	\$ 54.00	\$26,082	483	\$ 54.00	\$ 378.00	\$28,674	531	\$ 54.00	\$2,592
2	Bridge		\$23,274	431	\$ 54.00	\$27,000	500	\$ 54.00	\$ 3,726.00	\$27,972	518	\$ 54.00	\$ 972.00
3	Estabrook		\$22,032	408	\$ 54.00	\$23,706	439	\$ 54.00	\$ 1,674.00	\$24,300	450	\$ 54.00	\$ 594.00
4	Fiske		\$26,892	498	\$ 54.00	\$23,652	438	\$ 54.00	\$ (3,240.00)	\$25,488	472	\$ 54.00	\$ 1,836.00
5	Harrington		\$21,978	407	\$ 54.00	\$21,168	392	\$ 54.00	\$ (810.00)	\$24,948	462	\$ 54.00	\$ 3,780.00
6	Hastings		\$21,924	406	\$ 54.00	\$22,842	423	\$ 54.00	\$ 918.00	\$23,922	443	\$ 54.00	\$ 1,080.00
			\$ 141,804	2,626	\$ 54.00	\$ 144,450	2,675	\$ 54.00	\$ 2,646.00	\$155,304	2,876	\$ 54.00	\$ 10,854.00
10	K-5 Literacy		\$87,096	2,626	\$ 33.17	\$88,721	2,675	\$ 33.17	\$ 1,625.17	\$95,388	2,876	\$ 33.17	\$ 6,666.51
11	K-5 Math		\$63,876	2,626	\$ 24.32	\$65,068	2,675	\$ 24.32	\$ 1,191.90	\$69,957	2,876	\$ 24.32	\$ 4,889.24
12	K-5 Science		\$29,718	2,626	\$ 11.32	\$30,272	2,675	\$ 11.32	\$ 554.52	\$32,547	2,876	\$ 11.32	\$ 2,274.67
13	K-5 Social Studies		\$24,336	2,626	\$ 9.27	\$24,791	2,675	\$ 9.27	\$ 454.11	\$26,653	2,876	\$ 9.27	\$ 1,862.77
			\$ 205,026	2,626	\$ 78.08	\$ 208,852	2,675	\$ 78.08	\$ 3,825.70	\$ 224,545	2,876	\$ 78.08	\$ 15,693.19
	Elementary Total		\$ 346,830	2,626	\$ 132.08	\$ 353,302	2,675	\$ 132.08	\$ 6,471.70	\$ 379,849	2,876	\$ 132.08	\$ 26,547.19
			-1.14%	-2.70%		1.87%	1.87%			7.51%	7.51%		

Middle School Summary

The FY12 budget recommendation for the Middle Schools is driven by the following consideration:

The overall school expense budgets for the middle schools were based on a per pupil expenditure of approximately \$131.61 per student. The principals then reallocated their school's allotment to the various department needs within their building. In FY 12, Clarke's enrollment is projected to increase by 51 students. Diamond's enrollment is projected to increase by 28 students. If additional staffing is needed due to increased enrollment, the unallocated staffing set aside in the K-5 budget, if not needed, could be transferred to the middle school(s).

	Clarke Projected FY11	Clarke Actual FY11	Diamond Projected FY11	Diamond Actual FY11	TOTAL Actual FY11	Clarke Projected FY12	Diamond Projected FY12	TOTAL Projected FY12 ¹
Grade 6	247	261	257	252	513	292	255	547
Grade 7	256	264	269	266	530	266	257	523
Grade 8	234	243	224	229	472	261	263	524
Total	737	768	750	747	1515	819	775	1594

The Middle School experience is unique. With its team approach to teaching, our staff members work together to make the learning experience a positive one for all of our students. Each team strives to get to know each student and his/her unique learning and emotional needs and works hard to address these needs.

Grade 6-8 Department Chairs assess, align, coordinate, and develop curriculum during department meetings and during Middle School Curriculum Council meetings. They identify appropriate instructional materials and issues that arise relevant to the middle school experience. They assist teachers in using curriculum documents and materials to provide high quality instruction to students. All middle school teachers work together to identify and discuss ways to help individual students explore and make connections in the curriculum. They serve as partners with parents to communicate about homework, schedules, parent conferences, and progress reports.

Middle School Staffing Changes:

1. The five department chair positions at Clarke and five department chairs at Diamond (English, mathematics, foreign languages, social studies, and science) will be replaced with five department head positions for both schools. The change to a department head structure will allow the new administrators to supervise and evaluate the teachers in each department. Currently, the department chairs are responsible for each department's budget and leading the department; however, the schools do not have evaluators who are licensed in the subject areas. In addition, the department chair structure for each school does not vest in one person the responsibility for curriculum continuity and expectations between schools. Recent curriculum reviews have shown that some significant curriculum differences have developed between schools and that one supervisor per department for both schools is needed. The reorganization will not increase the amount of administrative time during the school year. Currently, there are ten department chairs with a total of ten periods for leadership. With the new department head structure, there will be five department heads that will be released two periods per day for supervisor/evaluation responsibilities. It is anticipated that each department head will work an additional eight days per year. The cost of the additional days is almost the same as the

¹ <http://ips.lexingtonma.org/Current/EnrollmentPresentation5JAN10.pdf>

cost of the department chair stipends, which will be eliminated. The final workload and salaries are subject to negotiations with the LEA.

- Other staffing changes are noted in a K-12 summary sheet included with this executive summary.

Per Pupil Allocations for level service are applied in the following manner:

Middle School Expense Budget (general education budget only) Level Fund Per Pupil at Current Enrollment and Budget Allocations adjusted by # of students as of official October 1, 2010 enrollment													
Line Number	Roll Up	Location	FY10	# of Students	Per Pupil Allocation	FY11	# of Students	Per Pupil Allocation	Change	FY12	# of Students	Per Pupil Allocation	Change
7	Clarke		\$23,590	752	\$ 31.37	\$23,622	753	\$ 31.37	\$ 31.37	\$23,967	764	\$ 31.37	\$ 345.07
8	Diamond		\$23,778	758	\$ 31.37	\$22,994	733	\$ 31.37	\$ (784.25)	\$23,277	742	\$ 31.37	\$ 282.33
			\$ 47,369	\$ 1,510	\$ 31.37	\$ 46,616	1,486	\$ 31.37	\$ (752.88)	\$ 47,243	1,506	\$ 31.37	\$ 627.40
14	6-8 Eng/Lang Arts	Clarke	\$15,742	752	\$ 20.93	\$15,763	753	\$ 20.93	\$ 20.93	\$15,993	764	\$ 20.93	\$ 230.27
		Diamond	\$15,868	758	\$ 20.93	\$15,344	733	\$ 20.93	\$ (523.33)	\$15,533	742	\$ 20.93	\$ 188.40
			\$ 31,609	1510	\$ 20.93	\$ 31,107	1486	\$ 20.93	\$ (502.40)	\$ 31,526	1506	\$ 20.93	\$ 418.67
16	6-8 Foreign Language	Clarke	\$13,566	752	\$ 18.04	\$13,584	753	\$ 18.04	\$ 18.04	\$13,783	764	\$ 18.04	\$ 198.44
		Diamond	\$13,674	758	\$ 18.04	\$13,223	733	\$ 18.04	\$ (451.00)	\$13,386	742	\$ 18.04	\$ 162.36
			\$ 27,240	1510	\$ 18.04	\$ 26,807	1486	\$ 18.04	\$ (432.96)	\$ 27,168	1506	\$ 18.04	\$ 360.80
17	6-8 Math	Clarke	\$12,581	752	\$ 16.73	\$12,598	753	\$ 16.73	\$ 16.73	\$12,782	764	\$ 16.73	\$ 184.03
		Diamond	\$12,681	758	\$ 16.73	\$12,263	733	\$ 16.73	\$ (418.25)	\$12,414	742	\$ 16.73	\$ 150.57
			\$ 25,263	1510	\$ 16.73	\$ 24,861	1486	\$ 16.73	\$ (401.52)	\$ 25,196	1506	\$ 16.73	\$ 334.60
18	6-8 Science	Clarke	\$18,575	752	\$ 24.70	\$18,599	753	\$ 24.70	\$ 24.70	\$25,973	764	\$ 34.00	\$ 7,373.96
		Diamond	\$18,723	758	\$ 24.70	\$18,105	733	\$ 24.70	\$ (617.50)	\$25,225	742	\$ 34.00	\$ 7,120.04
			\$ 37,297	1510	\$ 24.70	\$ 36,704	1486	\$ 24.70	\$ (592.80)	\$ 51,199	1506	\$ 34.00	\$ 14,494.00
19	6-8 Social Studies	Clarke	\$10,631	752	\$ 14.14	\$10,645	753	\$ 14.14	\$ 14.14	\$10,800	764	\$ 14.14	\$ 155.50
		Diamond	\$10,716	758	\$ 14.14	\$10,362	733	\$ 14.14	\$ (353.41)	\$10,489	742	\$ 14.14	\$ 127.23
			\$ 21,346	1510	\$ 14.14	\$ 21,007	1486	\$ 14.14	\$ (339.28)	\$ 21,290	1506	\$ 14.14	\$ 282.73
20	6-8 Info Tech/Business	Clarke	\$4,287	752	\$ 5.70	\$4,292	753	\$ 5.70	\$ 5.70	\$4,355	764	\$ 5.70	\$ 62.70
		Diamond	\$4,321	758	\$ 5.70	\$4,178	733	\$ 5.70	\$ (142.50)	\$4,230	742	\$ 5.70	\$ 51.30
			\$ 8,607	1510	\$ 5.70	\$ 8,470	1486	\$ 5.70	\$ (136.80)	\$ 8,585	1506	\$ 5.70	\$ 114.00
			\$ 198,732	1510	\$ 131.61	\$ 195,573	1486	\$ 131.61	\$ (3,158.65)	\$ 212,205	1506	\$ 140.91	\$ 16,632.21
													\$ -
		Clarke	\$ 98,971	752	\$ 131.61	\$ 99,103	753	\$ 131.61	\$ 131.61	\$ 107,653	764	\$ 140.91	\$ 8,549.97
		Diamond	\$ 99,761	758	\$ 131.61	\$ 96,471	733	\$ 131.61	\$ (3,290.26)	\$ 104,553	742	\$ 140.91	\$ 8,082.24
			\$ 198,732	1510	\$ 131.61	\$ 195,573	1486	\$ 131.61	\$ (3,158.65)	\$ 212,205	1506	\$ 140.91	\$ 16,632.21
			0.60%	0.60%		-1.59%	-1.59%			8.50%	1.35%		

High School Summary

For FY11, the high school enrollment is projected to decrease from 1981 students to 1945 students, which is a decrease of fifty students. The FY11 budget was based on an enrollment of 1,981 students. The overall school expense budget for the high school was based on a per pupil expenditure of approximately \$175.58 per student.

Grade	FY11 Projected	FY11 Actual	FY12 Projected
9	499	484	453
10	498	514	479
11	497	505	514
12	487	492	495
TOTAL	1981	1995	1945

High School Staffing Changes:

Staffing changes are noted in a K-12 summary sheet included with this executive summary.

Per Pupil Allocations for level service are applied in the following manner:

High School Expense Budget (general education budget only) Level Fund Per Pupil at Current Enrollment and Budget Allocations adjusted by # of students as of official October 1, 2010 enrollment													
Line Number	Roll Up	Location	FY10	# of Students	Per Pupil Allocation	FY11	# of Students	Per Pupil Allocation	Change	FY12	# of Students	Per Pupil Allocation	Change
9	Lexington High School		\$128,090	1980	\$ 64.69	\$127,443	1970	\$ 64.69	\$ (646.92)	\$128,413	1985	\$ 64.69	\$ 970.38
21	Eng/Lang Arts		\$ 28,634	1980	\$ 14.46	\$28,489	1970	\$ 14.46	\$ (144.62)	\$28,706	1985	\$ 14.46	\$ 216.92
22	Foreign Language		\$ 34,909	1980	\$ 17.63	\$34,733	1970	\$ 17.63	\$ (176.31)	\$34,997	1985	\$ 17.63	\$ 264.46
23	Math		\$ 23,690	1980	\$ 11.96	\$23,570	1970	\$ 11.96	\$ (119.65)	\$23,750	1985	\$ 11.96	\$ 179.47
24	Science		\$ 85,453	1980	\$ 43.16	\$85,021	1970	\$ 43.16	\$ (431.58)	\$85,669	1985	\$ 43.16	\$ 647.37
25	Social Studies		\$ 35,535	1980	\$ 17.95	\$35,356	1970	\$ 17.95	\$ (179.47)	\$35,625	1985	\$ 17.95	\$ 269.20
26	competitive Speech		\$ 4,120	1980	\$ 2.08	\$4,099	1970	\$ 2.08	\$ (20.81)	\$4,130	1985	\$ 2.08	\$ 31.21
27	Info Tech/Business		\$ -	1980	\$ -	\$0	1970	\$ -	\$ -	\$0	1985	\$ -	\$ -
28	Guidance		\$ 7,210	1980	\$ 3.64	\$7,174	1970	\$ 3.64	\$ (36.41)	\$7,228	1985	\$ 3.64	\$ 54.62
			\$ 347,641	1980	\$ 175.58	\$ 345,885	1970	\$ 175.58	\$ (1,755.76)	\$ 348,519	1985	\$ 175.58	\$ 2,633.64
			3.05%	66.25%		-0.51%	-0.51%			0.76%	0.76%		

Personnel

Personnel costs (exclusive of benefits) make up 84% of the school budget. The FY12 Salaries and Wages budget for the school department are based on staffing levels in the FY11 Annual Town Meeting School Committee request. During the school year, the FTE allocation levels were modified to reflect program needs of the district. Position changes are discussed and highlighted for the reader in the program area budgets. The net staffing increase for the proposed FY12 budget is 5.98 positions.

TYPE	LINE No	ROLL UP	FY11 FTE	FY11 ATM	FY11 STM Revised Budget	FY12 FTE	FY12 Level Serv EST	FTE CHANGE	\$ CHANGE	% Change
SALARIES & WAGES	1	UNIT A - LEA	625.60	\$ 44,459,507	\$ 43,973,549	618.36	\$ 46,286,599	(7.24)	\$ 2,313,049	5.26%
	2	UNIT A - STIPENDS		\$ 369,506	\$ 444,506		\$ 460,174	-	\$ 15,668	3.52%
	3	UNIT A - COACHES		\$ 513,605	\$ 513,605		\$ 493,201		\$ (20,404)	-3.97%
	4	LESA - SECRETARIES	70.36	\$ 2,603,315	\$ 2,585,343	68.50	\$ 2,587,506	(1.86)	\$ 2,163	0.08%
	5	NON-UNION DISTRICT SUPPORT/MGRS	15.00	\$ 958,071	\$ 1,188,320	16.50	\$ 1,166,877	1.50	\$ (21,443)	-1.80%
	7	UNIT C - INSTR ASST.	87.34	\$ 2,592,382	\$ 2,592,382	75.28	\$ 2,169,458	(12.05)	\$ (422,924)	-16.31%
	7.2	UNIT C - STUDENT SUPPORT INSTRUCTORS	21.23	\$ 489,432	\$ 561,539	25.76	\$ 1,066,892	4.53	\$ 505,354	89.99%
	7.1	NON-UNION PARAPROFESSIONALS	4.55	\$ 189,215	\$ 189,215	1.90	\$ 130,329	(2.65)	\$ (58,886)	-31.12%
	8	ABA/BCBA INSTRUCTORS	3.41	\$ 549,037	\$ 225,091	2.90	\$ 268,366	(0.51)	\$ 43,275	19.23%
	9	OT ASSISTANTS	3.00	\$ 153,510	\$ 153,510	3.00	\$ 144,064	-	\$ (9,447)	-6.15%
	10	SPECIAL CLASS AIDES	11.01	\$ 410,797	\$ 410,797	22.90	\$ 750,326	11.89	\$ 339,529	82.65%
	13	TECHNOLOGY UNIT	5.00	\$ 232,584	\$ 454,053	12.00	\$ 529,332	7.00	\$ 75,279	16.58%
	13.1	TECHNOLOGY NON-BARGAINING			\$ -		\$ -		\$ -	
	13.2	TECHNOLOGY ADMINISTRATION			\$ -		\$ -		\$ -	
	14	CENTRAL ADMINISTRATORS	6.50	\$ 919,372	\$ 919,372	6.50	\$ 970,734	-	\$ 51,362	5.59%
	15	PRINCIPALS	9.00	\$ 1,130,847	\$ 1,130,847	9.00	\$ 1,141,053	-	\$ 10,206	0.90%
	16	ALA - ASST PRINC/SUPERVISORS	19.00	\$ 1,892,552	\$ 2,283,246	24.38	\$ 2,460,729	5.38	\$ 177,483	7.77%
	17	NURSE SUBS		\$ 10,000	\$ 10,000		\$ 15,000		\$ 5,000	50.00%
		TEACHER SUBSTITUTES		\$ 443,396	\$ 443,396		\$ 569,086		\$ 125,690	28.35%
	18	SECRETARY SUBSTITUTES		\$ 50,000	\$ 50,000		\$ 50,000		\$ -	0.00%
	PARAPROFESSIONAL SUBSTITUTES		\$ 35,000	\$ 35,000		\$ 35,000		\$ -	0.00%	
20	SICK LEAVE BUY BACK			\$ -		\$ -		\$ -		
	Sal Dif & Benefits Transfer \$500 Settlement		\$ (500,000)	\$ (457,100)		\$ (500,000)		\$ (42,900)	9.39%	
TOWN	SHARED EXPENSES		\$ 46,753	\$ 21,315		\$ 87,869		\$ 66,554	312.24%	
SALARIES & WAGES Total			881.00	\$ 57,548,883	\$ 57,727,988	886.99	\$ 60,882,595	5.98	\$ 3,154,607	5.46%

Overall Recommended Change in Staffing From FY11 to FY12

Newly identified positions for the district are as follows.

Line No	Bargaining Unit	Job Title	New Positions	
1	LEA	Classroom Teacher	New Classroom Teachers	2.00
		Dept Chair	Converted to Dept Heads	(2.50)
		Dept Head	Converted From Dept Chair	2.50
		ELL Teacher	ELL Teacher for Enrollment	1.00
		Foreign Lang Teacher	LHS Mandarin Teacher	0.20
		Guidance	Fiske	0.10
		ILP Teacher	LHS ILP Teacher	1.00
		Music Teacher	LHS	0.10
		Reading Sp	Fiske Literacy	(0.10)
		Spec Educ Teacher	Bowman	(0.10)
4	LESA 12MTH	Admin Asst Dir Ss	Admin Asst Conversion St. Serv.	1.00
		Secy. Student Services	Admin Asst Conversion St. Serv.	(1.00)
		Secretary	Medicaid Revenue Secy.	0.49
7	LEXED	Sped IA	Convert to Special Class Aides	(11.57)
7	LEXED	SSI	Additions Due to Enrollment (Clarke/Fiske)	3.61
8	ABA TUTORS	ABA	Conversion to SSIs	(0.76)
		BCBA	New Position	0.25
10	CLASS AIDE	Class Aide	Conversion of IAs	11.90
16	ALA UNION	Asst Principal	Conversion to ALA Asst Principal	0.10
		Coordinator	Coordinator of Guidance	1.00
		Dir Guidance	Director of Guidance	(1.00)
		Positions Eliminated During FY11		(2.24)
			Total	5.98

Expenses by Program

The School Department shows all financial reports in a program budget format. The line numbers below represent curriculum, instruction, services, and general expenses for operating the Pre-K through Grade 12 school system. More detail for each line item is available under each program expense budget.

TYPE	LINE No	ROLL UP	FY11 ATM	FY11 STM Revised Budget	FY12 Level Serv EST	\$ CHANGE	% Change
1000	48	ADMINISTRATION	\$ 350,316	\$ 350,316	\$ 376,566	\$ 26,250	7.49%
1000	46	LEGAL SERVICES	\$ 208,000	\$ 208,000	\$ 218,000	\$ 10,000	4.81%
2000	29	K-12 CURRICULUM	\$ 434,066	\$ 634,461	\$ 645,988	\$ 11,527	1.82%
2000	30	K-12 LIBRARY/MEDIA	\$ 155,014	\$ 155,014	\$ 160,981	\$ 5,967	3.85%
2000	31	TECHNOLOGY	\$ 242,281	\$ 340,281	\$ 340,281	\$ -	0.00%
2000	32	ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS	\$ 10,325	\$ 10,325	\$ 10,723	\$ 398	3.85%
2000	33	K-12 PE/WELLNESS	\$ 56,789	\$ 56,789	\$ 58,975	\$ 2,186	3.85%
2000	34	K-12 VISUAL ARTS	\$ 73,277	\$ 73,277	\$ 75,059	\$ 1,782	2.43%
2000	35	K-12 PERFORMING ARTS	\$ 77,439	\$ 77,439	\$ 80,420	\$ 2,981	3.85%
2000	40.4	K-12 STUDENT SERVICES	\$ 156,531	\$ 156,531	\$ 194,202	\$ 37,671	24.07%
2000	40.4	K-12 GUIDANCE	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	-
2000	43	SPECIAL EDUCATION CONSULTANTS	\$ 592,530	\$ 592,530	\$ 560,000	\$ (32,530)	-5.49%
2000	39	PSYCHOLOGIST (Combined with Student Services lines by Level)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	-
2000	37	EARLY CHILDHOOD PROGRAM	\$ 65,875	\$ 65,875	\$ 65,875	\$ -	0.00%
2000	40.1	K-5 STUDENT SERVICES	\$ 30,050	\$ 30,050	\$ 32,308	\$ 2,258	7.51%
2000	40.1	K-5 GUIDANCE	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	-
2000	40.2	6-8 Student Services	\$ 75,183	\$ 75,183	\$ 75,434	\$ 251	0.33%
2000	40.2	6-8 GUIDANCE	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	-
2000	40.3	9-12 Student Services	\$ 29,272	\$ 29,272	\$ 29,332	\$ 60	0.20%
2000	45	PRINT CENTER	\$ 278,100	\$ 278,100	\$ 278,100	\$ -	0.00%
2000	47	TEACHER SUBSTITUTES	\$ 111,000	\$ 111,000	\$ -	\$ (111,000)	-100.00%
2000	58	PRIOR YEAR EXPENSES	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	-
2000	1	BOWMAN	\$ 26,082	\$ 26,082	\$ 28,674	\$ 2,592	9.94%
2000	2	BRIDGE	\$ 24,300	\$ 24,300	\$ 27,972	\$ 3,672	15.11%
2000	3	ESTABROOK	\$ 23,706	\$ 42,306	\$ 24,300	\$ (18,006)	-42.56%
2000	4	FISKE	\$ 31,352	\$ 31,352	\$ 25,488	\$ (5,864)	-18.70%
2000	5	HARRINGTON	\$ 21,168	\$ 21,168	\$ 24,948	\$ 3,780	17.86%
2000	6	HASTINGS	\$ 22,842	\$ 22,842	\$ 23,922	\$ 1,080	4.73%
2000	10	K-5 LITERACY	\$ 88,725	\$ 88,725	\$ 95,388	\$ 6,663	7.51%
2000	11	K-5 MATH	\$ 65,071	\$ 65,071	\$ 69,957	\$ 4,886	7.51%
2000	12	K-5 SCIENCE	\$ 30,274	\$ 30,274	\$ 32,547	\$ 2,273	7.51%
2000	13	K-5 SOCIAL STUDIES	\$ 24,792	\$ 24,792	\$ 26,653	\$ 1,861	7.51%
2000	7	CLARKE	\$ 23,624	\$ 23,624	\$ 23,967	\$ 343	1.45%
2000	8	DIAMOND	\$ 22,997	\$ 22,997	\$ 23,277	\$ 280	1.22%
2000	14	6-8 ENG/LANG ARTS	\$ 31,108	\$ 31,108	\$ 31,526	\$ 418	1.34%
2000	16	6-8 FOREIGN LANGUAGE	\$ 26,807	\$ 26,807	\$ 27,168	\$ 361	1.35%
2000	17	6-8 MATH	\$ 24,861	\$ 24,861	\$ 25,196	\$ 335	1.35%
2000	18	6-8 SCIENCE	\$ 41,254	\$ 41,254	\$ 56,512	\$ 15,258	36.99%
2000	19	6-8 SOCIAL STUDIES	\$ 24,927	\$ 24,927	\$ 24,561	\$ (366)	-1.47%
2000	20	6-8 INFO TECH/BUSINESS (Distributed to 6-8 Science and 6-8 Soc	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	-
2000	9	LHS	\$ 127,443	\$ 127,443	\$ 128,413	\$ 970	0.76%
2000	21	9-12 ENG/LANG ARTS	\$ 28,489	\$ 28,489	\$ 28,706	\$ 217	0.76%
2000	22	9-12 FOREIGN LANGUAGE	\$ 34,733	\$ 34,733	\$ 34,997	\$ 264	0.76%
2000	23	9-12 MATH	\$ 23,571	\$ 23,571	\$ 23,750	\$ 179	0.76%
2000	24	9-12 SCIENCE	\$ 85,022	\$ 85,022	\$ 85,669	\$ 647	0.76%
2000	25	9-12 SOCIAL STUDIES	\$ 34,871	\$ 34,871	\$ 35,625	\$ 754	2.16%
2000	26	9-12 COMPETITIVE SPEECH	\$ 4,099	\$ 4,099	\$ 4,130	\$ 31	0.75%
2000	27	9-12 POLICY DEBATE (Combined with Line #26)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	-
2000	28	9-12 GUIDANCE	\$ 7,174	\$ 7,174	\$ 7,228	\$ 54	0.75%
3000	36	ATHLETICS	\$ 111,820	\$ 111,820	\$ 116,124	\$ 4,304	3.85%
3000	38	HEALTH SERVICES	\$ 12,626	\$ 12,626	\$ 13,112	\$ 486	3.85%
3000	42	TRANSPORTATION SPECIAL EDUCATION	\$ 970,000	\$ 970,000	\$ 999,100	\$ 29,100	3.00%
3000	44	TRANSPORTATION	\$ 542,415	\$ 542,415	\$ 725,464	\$ 183,049	33.75%
4000	56	TELEPHONE/Cell Phone/Pagers	\$ 30,725	\$ 30,725	\$ 32,261	\$ 1,536	5.00%
7000	59	REVOLVING FUND PROGRAMS	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	-
9000	41	TUITION * Net Circuit Breaker Offset	\$ 5,685,617	\$ 5,685,617	\$ 6,488,303	\$ 802,686	14.12%
			\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	-
EXPENSES Total			\$ 11,198,543	\$ 11,515,538	\$ 12,517,182	\$ 1,001,644	8.70%
Grand Total			\$ 68,747,426	\$ 69,243,526	\$ 73,399,777	\$ 4,156,251	6.00%

Changes in specific line items are highlighted in the program section of the budget document.