

# School Committee



## Fiscal Year 2012 Annual Town Meeting Budget Request

As voted: February 15, 2011

<http://lps.lexingtonma.org/businessandfinance.html>

# Budget Summary

## Table of Contents

<b>BUDGET SUMMARY .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<i>K-12 Curriculum, Instruction, and Professional Development Summary.....</i>	<i>3</i>
<i>K-12 Student Services Summary.....</i>	<i>5</i>
<i>Elementary K-5 Summary .....</i>	<i>10</i>
<i>Middle School Summary.....</i>	<i>12</i>
<i>High School Summary.....</i>	<i>14</i>





## 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. On February 15, the School Committee voted the recommended level-service budget for 2011-2012 of \$73,144,866, which requires an additional \$3,901,360. The request represents an increase of 5.63% over the FY11 appropriation. The FY12 budget is based on the assumption that the loss of federal ARRA stimulus funds (\$1,060,370) will be replaced by the following:

- \$586,572 from the new one-time federal “EdJobs” grant and “SFSF” (State Fiscal Stabilization Funds);
- The use of one-third or \$250,000 from the Avalon Bay Education Mitigation Fund;
- \$138,000 from the LABBB credit;
- Revisions to the General Fund revenue estimate for the school departments’ Medicaid Reimbursement Claims, and to one-time modifications to the town’s revenue sharing model;
- Unallocated revenue of \$285,000 was voted during budget deliberations at Financial Summit IV to be used to support the program deficit; and
- The school department will assume all costs for unemployment insurance over the FY12 appropriation should additional funds be required to support terminated school department employees that are unknown at this time.

Appropriation Summary	FY 2009 Actual	FY 2010 Restated	FY 2011 Requested	FY2012 Requested	Dollar Increase	Percent Increase
Compensation	\$ 53,418,882	\$ 54,440,050	\$ 58,026,383	\$ 60,636,052	\$ 2,609,669	4.50%
Expenses	\$ 10,667,348	\$ 10,577,386	\$ 11,217,143	\$ 12,508,833	\$ 1,291,690	11.52%
<b>Total 1100 Lexington Public Schools</b>	<b>\$ 64,086,230</b>	<b>\$ 65,017,437</b>	<b>\$ 69,243,526</b>	<b>\$ 73,144,885</b>	<b>\$ 3,901,359</b>	<b>5.63%</b>

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 11.69% or \$664,686.
  - 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.
  - c. Special Education Transportation – due to our regional collaboration with area towns, the district is experiencing a leveling off from three years of progressive savings. The regionalization of these services saved at least \$400,000 over the last three years of participation. The regional group is currently out to bid for a new five year contract. The regional group of public schools (Arlington, Belmont, Burlington, Lexington, and Watertown) is being joined this year by Waltham Public Schools.
  
- 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, program elimination, or identified program needs due to enrollment. It is assumed that all teachers on a leave of absence will return next fall. The district is adding net of 3.59 FTEs. The additional staff and the shifts in allocation of staff within the proposed budget address the changing needs of the district.



**Lexington Public Schools**

**2012 School Committee Budget as voted February 15, 2011**

- 3) Reduction in State and Federal Title Grants: In FY12, the school department is 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. Once the grant awards are known, any reduction in funding will result in reduction in staffing.
- 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 FY10). 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 "EdJobs" grant of \$548,918 and SFSF grant of \$37,654 was not used in FY 11, these funds are available to be used 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 Reimbursement Revenue	\$39,479	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. This will be used in three increments.
Use of LABBB credit	<u>\$138,000</u>	The total credit is approximately \$580,000
<b>Total</b>	<b><i>\$1,014,051</i></b>	

**FY 13**

Use of Avalon funds	\$250,000	Second of three increments
Use of LABBB credit	<u>\$250,000</u>	leaving approximately \$190,000 at the end of FY 13
<b>Total</b>	<b><i>\$500,000</i></b>	

**FY 14**

Use of Avalon funds	\$250,000	Last increment. At the end of FY 14, the fund will be exhausted
Program Reductions or New Revenue	\$ 60,000	
Use of LABBB credit	<u>\$190,000</u>	
<b>Total</b>	<b><i>\$500,000</i></b>	At the end of FY 14, the funds will be exhausted

- 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 the above variations resulted in a request to increase the subsidy to the regular education transportation program.



## **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 21<sup>st</sup> 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:

Program Changes for FY12:

- 1) Increases in out-of-district tuition: The tuition obligation is projected to increase by approximately 7.41%. However, due to the reduction in ARRA funds for FY 12, the district will experience an 11.69% increase, net of all state and federal offsets (\$664,686). 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.
- 2) State circuit breaker reimbursements:
  - a. 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.
  - b. The governor's FY12 budget request projects a 60-70% reimbursement rate. The actual rate will not be known until two events occur,
    - i. The legislature approves the governor's budget recommendation, and
    - ii. The DESE determines the actual rate, based on reimbursement claims submitted by all districts in July and apportions the legislatively approved budget for the program to all school district.
- 3) Decreases in contracted services for specialized service delivery to students:
  - a. The contracted services line item has been decreased this year.
  - b. 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.



- c. 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.
- 4) Special Transportation Costs
- a. The transition of all transportation services to the Business Office is complete. This includes all general education, special education, METCO, and homeless students.
  - b. 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.
- 5) 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 8<sup>th</sup> 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.

K-12 Student Services Program:

1. Administrative Assistant Support: This request includes increasing one high school 10-month secretaries (1.0 FTE) to 11 months positions (0.92 FTE). The two additional months are needed to support summer services, new students moving in to the district, processing of Individual Education Programs (IEPs), and new and changing out-of-district placements.

In order to provide adequate secretarial support to two K-8 student services administrators and the K-12 Coordinator of English Language Learners, the recommendation is to restructure all three secretarial positions in the student services department (2.5 FTE) and create four other positions (3.25 FTE). The plan calls for hiring one clerical secretary who will provide basic services to five administrators (1 FTE) (PreK-12 Director, the two K-8 supervisors, Out-of-District Coordinator, and the K-12 Coordinator of English Language Learners). The duties will include answering the phone, photocopying, making appointments, handling mail, and basic correspondence. The other three positions include one administrative secretary to be shared between the PreK-12 Director (.50 12 month) and one K-8 supervisor (.46 FTE or 11 month), one part-time administrative secretary to be shared between the other the ELL Coordinator (.23 FTE or 11 month) and the Out-of-District Coordinator (.46 FTE or 11 month), and one part-time administrative secretary supporting the second K-8 supervisor (.46 FTE or 11 month). This model will permit the allocation of needed secretarial support to three of the five administrators, which currently have little or no access to these services.

The Student Services Department has experienced significant growth in capacity and complexity over the last four years. Programs and services have expanded or developed. In addition, in the effort to become more efficient and effective, positions such as the Assistive Technology Specialist, Augmentative Communication Specialist, and Board Certified Behavior Analysts were created in-district. The services from these positions were formerly funded through independent contractors at a





significantly higher rate. The district was able to benefit financially and from improved and increased services.

Similarly, the Financial Secretary position was replaced by a Finance and Operations Manager. This position was created to develop systems and manage student services accounts including, but not limited to, out of district tuitions, contracted services and contracts.

In FY 11, Evaluation Team Leader positions were replaced by Evaluation Team Supervisors. These positions were elevated to provide added responsibility and authority to the special education evaluation process. The above illustrate some of the ways in which the Student Services Department has expanded in scope and complexity. As a result a re-organization in administrative support is necessary. The administrative support is not currently commensurate with the growth and complexity of the department. Therefore, this request is to reorganize the administrative support of the department.

2. **Student Services Data Specialist:** 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.

K-8 Student Services Program:

1. **Student Support Instructor:** 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.
2. **Special Class Assistants:** 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.

9-12 Student Services Program:



1. Alpha Lead Clinician, (0.20 FTE): The first quarter of ALPHA (A Learning Place for Hospitalized Adolescents) at Lexington High was busier than anticipated and set the stage for an active year of students transitioning back and forth from hospitals. From the beginning of the school year until the end of the quarter (November 15, 2010), school counselors completed pre-referrals for ALPHA services for nine students. Of the nine students, five were actively receiving ALPHA services, two declined the service at re-entry, one had not been discharged by the end of the quarter, and the remaining one was not successful at re-entry and chose to not return to LHS. These successes and challenges in re-integrating students during the first quarter has helped to sculpt the way in which the service is presented to students and families, methods in assisting students in transition, and has helped the administration more clearly identify the needs of the program in terms of staffing. At present, ALPHA is staffed by one Lead Clinician (.8 FTE), a 1.0 Case Manager (.5 borrowed from Student Services) and a 24-hour/week Special Class Assistant (also part of the Student Services budget). Previous documents identified the Lead Clinician position as a Student Intervention Clinical Coordinator, and the Special Class Assistant as an Academic Intervention Coordinator. After the first quarter, it has become clear that increasing resources to allow for a 1.0 Lead Clinician and a 1.0 Special Class Assistant would more effectively meet the needs of the students and would increase the effectiveness of the program.
2. Alpha Special Class Teaching Assistant (Class Aide), (0.25 FTE): It appears that of all the services available through ALPHA, having a consistent person to receive academic support from has been the one of most value. At present, the SCA is responsible for monitoring attendance of the students, homework completion as well as makeup work completion, and facilitating any additional resources a student might need to re-integrate to their regular schedule within an 8 week time frame. Given the goals that the ALPHA service has of transitioning students within this limited time, each block that he/she is able to spend servicing students improves our successes and expedites students through the process. Increasing the Special Class Teaching Assistant position to 1.0 will provide ALPHA with the opportunity to potentially add responsibilities to the role (i.e. case management) and will also provide students with a more consistent support. Given the nature of the students mental health needs, this constancy is integral to effectively returning to LHS.

K-12 Guidance Program:

1. Conversion to a K-12 Guidance Director from two lead positions (9-12 Guidance, and K-8 Guidance)
  2. Prevention Specialist (0.50 FTE): Due to the current workload/responsibilities of the K-12 .5 FTE Prevention Specialist position, it is requested that current 0.5 FTE position be increased to full-time. There has been a significant increase in parent and school requests around drug and alcohol issues at both the middle and high school levels.
- 6) Changes in Expenses:
- a. Equipment (\$37,600): Each year the district experiences additional requests for FM systems or sound field systems that are unanticipated for hearing impaired students who either move into Lexington or who require updated systems. For FY'12 the request is for two systems to cover move-ins and two systems that are in line to be replaced for existing students.
  - b. In FY'11 a full time physical therapist was hired. This position was filled by an independent contractor previously who supplied her own equipment. The physical therapy equipment needs include:
    - Foam wedges to replace torn wedges at Harrington
    - Two Rifton chairs for two physically disabled students who have outgrown their current chairs.
    - Adaptive pedals, waist coats for bikes
  - c. There are currently five students who will require augmentative communication devices. One of these students has recently been given an outside evaluation and is in the process of an inside evaluation. Preliminary recommendations require the use of devices ranging from \$2,000 to



**Lexington Public Schools**

*2012 School Committee Budget as voted February 15, 2011*

---

\$8,500 for this one student. It is anticipated that the remaining four students will also require devices in order to communicate effectively, participate in school and for the district to comply with their IEP needs. This request is for two devices.

- d. It is anticipated that a visually impaired student at Bridge will be in need of some Braille equipment as well as a special desk lamp In addition the Vision specialist is in need of testing equipment/materials



## Elementary K-5 Summary

In FY 12, the K-5 enrollment is projected to increase by eight students (2876 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 using the final October 1 information submitted to the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education:

Elementary School Expense Budget <i>(general education budget only)</i> 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
			<b>\$ 141,804</b>	<b>2,626</b>	<b>\$ 54.00</b>	<b>\$ 144,450</b>	<b>2,675</b>	<b>\$ 54.00</b>	<b>\$ 2,646.00</b>	<b>\$155,304</b>	<b>2,876</b>	<b>\$ 54.00</b>	<b>\$ 10,854.00</b>
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
			<b>\$ 205,026</b>	<b>2,626</b>	<b>\$ 78.08</b>	<b>\$ 208,852</b>	<b>2,675</b>	<b>\$ 78.08</b>	<b>\$ 3,825.70</b>	<b>\$ 224,545</b>	<b>2,876</b>	<b>\$ 78.08</b>	<b>\$ 15,693.19</b>
<b>Elementary Total</b>			<b>\$ 346,830</b>	<b>2,626</b>	<b>\$ 132.08</b>	<b>\$ 353,302</b>	<b>2,675</b>	<b>\$ 132.08</b>	<b>\$ 6,471.70</b>	<b>\$ 379,849</b>	<b>2,876</b>	<b>\$ 132.08</b>	<b>\$ 26,547.19</b>
			-1.14%	-2.70%		1.87%	1.87%			7.51%	7.51%		

### Program Changes for FY12:

- 1) 5<sup>th</sup> Grade Overnight Field Trip (All Six K-5 Schools): In order to ensure that all students with special needs will be able to attend the Grade 5 Alton Jones program (or its equivalent), \$1,000 per school is needed to hire extra staff. Listed below are two representative explanations.

All fifth graders participate and all classroom teachers travel with the students to Rhode Island for two days and a night of community building and learning activities. Included is a system wide program for intensive students with profiles on the autism spectrum (ILP) and our students in



## **Lexington Public Schools**

*2012 School Committee Budget as voted February 15, 2011*

---

Developmental Learning Program (DLP). These students require intensive 1:1 support throughout their day as well as supervision of a BCBA. In order to provide FAPE: a Free and Appropriate Public Education, the ILP students must have access to any school sponsored event. The ILP students require additional personnel in order to access this trip. The students and staff leave school at 7:00AM one day and return at 4:30 the next. The special education staff members are with our ILP students all day, evening and over night. If the children wake up at 5:00, the staff members get up with the students. This request is to provide funding for the paraprofessionals who make it possible for our students to attend. Each school requested funds for the assistants until the evening activities end at 9:00PM on the first day and from 7:00AM-4:30 PM on the second day. The BCBA would work the same hours. The total would be an additional 8 hours of work on the week of the trip.

- 2) System-wide School Support Personnel (0.50 Net FTE): The current staffing level does not provide sufficient coverage for safely overseeing recess and lunch periods and cannot safely provide coverage during indoor recesses. In addition, elementary schools also lack sufficient coverage for classroom teachers during special education meeting times, and as a result have to pay additionally to pull special education assistants to cover classrooms. This lack costs the system in substitutes and impacts students on IEPs who would be serviced by the impacted IAs.



## 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 <sup>1</sup>
Grade 6	247	260	257	252	513	292	255	547
Grade 7	256	262	269	262	530	266	257	523
Grade 8	234	242	224	228	472	261	263	524
<b>Total</b>	<b>737</b>	<b>764</b>	<b>750</b>	<b>742</b>	<b>1515</b>	<b>819</b>	<b>775</b>	<b>1594</b>

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

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



**Lexington Public Schools**

**2012 School Committee Budget as voted February 15, 2011**

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 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 using the final October 1 information submitted to the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education:

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
			<b>\$ 47,369</b>	<b>1,510</b>	<b>\$ 31.37</b>	<b>\$ 46,616</b>	<b>1,486</b>	<b>\$ 31.37</b>	<b>\$ (752.88)</b>	<b>\$ 47,243</b>	<b>1,506</b>	<b>\$ 31.37</b>	<b>\$ 627.40</b>
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
			<b>\$ 31,609</b>	<b>1,510</b>	<b>\$ 20.93</b>	<b>\$ 31,107</b>	<b>1,486</b>	<b>\$ 20.93</b>	<b>\$ (502.40)</b>	<b>\$ 31,526</b>	<b>1,506</b>	<b>\$ 20.93</b>	<b>\$ 418.67</b>
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
			<b>\$ 27,240</b>	<b>1,510</b>	<b>\$ 18.04</b>	<b>\$ 26,807</b>	<b>1,486</b>	<b>\$ 18.04</b>	<b>\$ (432.96)</b>	<b>\$ 27,168</b>	<b>1,506</b>	<b>\$ 18.04</b>	<b>\$ 360.80</b>
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
			<b>\$ 25,263</b>	<b>1,510</b>	<b>\$ 16.73</b>	<b>\$ 24,861</b>	<b>1,486</b>	<b>\$ 16.73</b>	<b>\$ (401.52)</b>	<b>\$ 25,196</b>	<b>1,506</b>	<b>\$ 16.73</b>	<b>\$ 334.60</b>
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
			<b>\$ 37,297</b>	<b>1,510</b>	<b>\$ 24.70</b>	<b>\$ 36,704</b>	<b>1,486</b>	<b>\$ 24.70</b>	<b>\$ (592.80)</b>	<b>\$ 51,199</b>	<b>1,506</b>	<b>\$ 34.00</b>	<b>\$ 14,494.00</b>
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
			<b>\$ 21,346</b>	<b>1,510</b>	<b>\$ 14.14</b>	<b>\$ 21,007</b>	<b>1,486</b>	<b>\$ 14.14</b>	<b>\$ (339.28)</b>	<b>\$ 21,290</b>	<b>1,506</b>	<b>\$ 14.14</b>	<b>\$ 282.73</b>
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
			<b>\$ 8,607</b>	<b>1,510</b>	<b>\$ 5.70</b>	<b>\$ 8,470</b>	<b>1,486</b>	<b>\$ 5.70</b>	<b>\$ (136.80)</b>	<b>\$ 8,585</b>	<b>1,506</b>	<b>\$ 5.70</b>	<b>\$ 114.00</b>
			<b>\$ 198,732</b>	<b>1,510</b>	<b>\$ 131.61</b>	<b>\$ 195,573</b>	<b>1,486</b>	<b>\$ 131.61</b>	<b>\$ (3,158.65)</b>	<b>\$ 212,205</b>	<b>1,506</b>	<b>\$ 140.91</b>	<b>\$ 16,632.21</b>
													\$ -
		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
			<b>\$ 198,732</b>	<b>1,510</b>	<b>\$ 131.61</b>	<b>\$ 195,573</b>	<b>1,486</b>	<b>\$ 131.61</b>	<b>\$ (3,158.65)</b>	<b>\$ 212,205</b>	<b>1,506</b>	<b>\$ 140.91</b>	<b>\$ 16,632.21</b>
			<b>0.60%</b>	<b>0.60%</b>		<b>-1.59%</b>	<b>-1.59%</b>			<b>8.50%</b>	<b>1.35%</b>		



## 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	482	453
10	498	512	479
11	497	501	514
12	487	490	495
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>1981</b>	<b>1985</b>	<b>1945</b>

### High School Staffing Changes:

- 1) Staffing changes are noted in a K-12 summary sheet included with this executive summary.
- 2) Data Coordinator (0.60 FTE): Rather than hire a .75 secretary, the revised recommendation is to hire an expert on working with the district's student information system X2, specifically as it relates to high school needs: student scheduling, student grades and grading system, transcripts, and attendance tracking.
  - Coordinates all procedures associated with scheduling, report card and progress report entry and distribution (monitors teacher completion of tasks including teacher verification and correct printouts)
  - Makes grades permanent (historical) and handles all corrections to permanent grades after grading window is closed
  - With assistance from administrative support staff, monitors accuracy of new student contact information and updates existing contact information
  - Exports information (lists) needed by High School administrators in an appropriate format
  - Monitors setup, protocols, and parent and student issues with High School Family Portal
  - Monitors student attendance verification process for class attendance entries

Per Pupil Allocations for level service are applied in the following manner using the final October 1 information submitted to the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education:

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
			<b>\$ 347,641</b>	<b>1980</b>	<b>\$ 175.58</b>	<b>\$ 345,885</b>	<b>1970</b>	<b>\$ 175.58</b>	<b>\$ (1,755.76)</b>	<b>\$ 348,519</b>	<b>1985</b>	<b>\$ 175.58</b>	<b>\$ 2,633.64</b>
			3.05%	66.25%		-0.51%	-0.51%			0.76%	0.76%		