

**GMRSD Turn-Around Plan: Budget Update
November 1, 2008**

Submitted to

**The Gill-Montague Regional School Committee
and
The Department of Elementary and Secondary Education**

by

Kenneth Rocke, Superintendent of Schools

Table of Contents

I. Budget Update	pp. 3-5
<hr/>	
A. How much of the Turn Around Plan has been implemented to date?	
B. How much money does the district have in reserve?	
C. Do we really need a 4% budget increase for FY09?	
D. Given the District's 4% budget, what is the assessment increase for Montague?	
E. Given the District's 4% budget, what is the assessment increase for Gill?	
II. Funding Strategies	pp. 6-8
<hr/>	
A. Should reserves be used to fund the budget 'gap'?	
B. What can be done about the unintended consequences of School Choice policy?	
III. District update (from prior 7.31.08 TAP update)	pp. 9-10
<hr/>	
A. Overview	
B. Elementary schools configuration	
C. Budget	
D. Educational initiatives	
E. Next steps	
IV. District Goals (charts updated for this report)	pp. 11-15
<hr/>	
A. Resolve elementary configuration question	
B. Reorganize central office and educational administrative staffing	
C. Create an educationally sound and fiscally sustainable budget for FY09 and beyond	
D. Restore and improve elementary educational programs and services	
E. Restore middle school and high school programs and services	

I. Budget Update

How much of the Turn Around Plan has been implemented to date?

Although we have made great progress in restoring educational services to students, we have also made significant reductions in both the goals and the timeline of our Turn Around Plan, in response to the fiscal situation of our member towns.

Key staffing components implemented to date include: restoration of full-time principals and nurses in each school; addition of an 8th grade reading specialist at the middle school; addition of a 6th grade classroom teacher at the middle school; addition of a .5 FTE district-wide ELL teacher; restoration of the 3rd administrative position in the middle school / high school; restoration of a 6th grade teacher to Gill Elementary School; addition of a .5 FTE nurse-leader (grant funded); and addition of an elementary math coach (grant funded, this year only).

These improvements have been made possible through a combination of our entry into the GIC insurance plan, our consolidation of elementary education into three buildings, and significant reorganization of both administrative and educational staffing, particularly in the special education department.

There is, however, much left undone. A partial list would surely include: a school-to-work transitions counselor for the high school; a middle school guidance counselor; a middle school math specialist; an elementary computer technology teacher; a district-wide computer technology coach; and additional reading specialists for the elementary schools.

At risk in the current budget crisis is not only our ability to sustain these educational improvements, but also our ability to design and implement new programs designed to improve student learning, to increase student motivation, and to attract and retain students in the regional educational marketplace that is the school choice arena.

The bottom line: we have made a very good beginning at restoring and sustaining the educational programs and services our students need to be successful in their learning. Future progress will be dependent not only upon the quality of our planning and the skills and commitment of our teachers and staff, but also upon our ability to maintain adequate funding for all of our schools and programs.

How much money does the district have in reserve?

As a result of our entry into the GIC, the G-M district has, for the first time in many years, fiscal reserves adequate enough to help fund the budget 'gap' for both FY09 and FY10. However, since these are 'one-time funds', if further significant economies of operation or increases in revenue streams are not achieved over the course of the next two or three years, these reserve funds will soon be exhausted. In addition, if the budget 'gap' (between what we need and what our towns are able or willing to provide) is too large in FY09 or FY10, educational improvements we have made to date will be at risk.

We have submitted both our end-of-year report and our estimate of Excess and Deficiency for FY09, and are waiting for certification of the latter by the DOR. We estimate that our E&D balance will be in the range of 3% to 5% of our operating budget for FY09.

In addition, it appears that we will receive a significant 'rebate' from the dissolution of our prior self-insured health insurance group. Although we will not know for sure until all 'run-out' health insurance costs are tabulated, and until a final fiscal audit is performed, preliminary estimates are in the range of \$150,000 to \$400,000. The superintendent's recommendation is to use these funds to establish a

district Educational Stabilization Fund, to be used to bridge the FY10 budget gap, and/or to offset expected yearly increases in GIC health insurance costs of 6% to 8%.

We have also been able to retain \$250,000 in our Special Education Circuit Breaker revolving fund. Since our annual out-of-district SPED costs are well over the one million dollar mark, and since the circuit breaker extraordinary relief fund does not apply until qualifying district SPED CB expenses increase by more than 25% over the prior fiscal year, this revolving fund balance is the key to maintaining some measure of budgetary predictability in a district marked by considerable SPED cost volatility.

In the short term, our budgetary reserves give us some measure of protection from potential cuts in either local funding or state Chapter 70 aid. However, these reserves will be quickly exhausted if both local and state funding are not maintained at a level adequate to fund our educational needs.

Do we really need a 4% budget increase for FY09?

We have had to absorb significant reductions in key grant funds in FY09: our Reading First grant (\$89,000) has been eliminated; our Title I grant funds have been reduced by \$45,000; and we've been asked to find funding for our School Resource Officer for the last part of this fiscal year (a position entirely grant funded in prior years). We have thus seen a total reduction of over \$175,000 in key grants for FY09. All of the activities supported by these grants (reading support, class size reduction, security for the middle school and high school) are essential to operating safe and effective schools, and we have built these positions and programs into our 4% budget.

We are anticipating a net additional loss in FY09 of at least \$125,000 through increased numbers of students choosing to choice-out of our district. This loss must also be funded within our 4% budget. We may see further revenue losses due to increased charter school tuition costs, but will not see the new numbers until the 2nd quarter cherry sheets are issued.

These two factors alone account for almost half of the budget increase in our 4% budget. If we factored these increases out, our 4% budget would be close to just a 2% overall increase.

Budget proposals presented at District Meeting called for a reduction in our school budget of over \$700,000. Although everyone who has looked closely at our proposed FY09 budget has acknowledged that 'we need what we are asking for', no one has made a serious suggestion on just how we might reduce our budget by \$700,000 without causing serious harm to our schools.

The concern on the district side is not that we have asked for too much, but that, in an attempt to meet our towns half-way, we've reduced our budget request too much.

Given the District's 4% budget, what is the increase in assessment for the Town of Montague?

It has been said that the 4% budget proposed by the school committee at the recent District Meeting would require the use of \$300,000 in reserves by the Town of Montague.

The actual increase in assessment for Montague for this proposed budget is \$233,66. The \$300,000 figure cited is based on an artificial starting point – the so-called .9% budget proposed by the finance committee. Since that proposal actually reduces the amount given to the schools for FY09, an artificially large budget 'gap' is created.

The percent increase in Montague's assessment in the 4% budget proposal is just 3.3%. Coincidentally, this is the same as the percent increase of the total town operating budget for FY09 (the number cited at District Meeting).

The statement also implies that the 'structural imbalance' in the town budget is caused entirely by the school budget. The town's operating budget increased by at least 3.3% this year. Why reduce the amount of money allocated to the schools, while providing budget increases (3% to 5%) to town departments?

It would be far more accurate to say that it would take \$300,000 of reserves to bridge the total gap in the budget for the Town of Montague. Each part of the town's services has a role in creating the budget 'gap'.

Given the District's 4% budget, what is the increase in assessment for the Town of Gill?

As a result of a shift in the percentages of students attending G-M schools from our two towns, a 4% district operating budget increase and a 4% district assessment increase has resulted in a 7.9% assessment increase for the Town of Gill. This translates to an increase in their assessment 'bill' of an additional \$51,247, over and above the 4% increase they might have expected and planned for.

The Town of Gill has already approved (at their Town Meeting) an assessment increase for GMRSD of \$61,624, an increase over FY08 of over 4.7%. The gap between what Gill has already approved at Town Meeting and the assessment generated by the GMRSD's 4% budget is \$41,773.

If this budget gap could be bridged by an additional infusion of funding from the state level, designated to be used for the GMRSD assessment, Gill would be free to focus its attention on the rest of the town budget.

II. Funding Strategies

Should reserves be used to bridge the budget 'gap'?

The argument has been made that neither district nor town reserve funds should be used to fund the budget gap in FY09 or FY10 because, if we do, in another year or two we'll be back in the same situation again. The assumption here is that neither the school district nor the town has been able to make significant changes in cost efficiency.

On the contrary, the GMRSD has implemented at least three very significant changes in operation to achieve positive changes in cost efficiency: joining the Group Insurance Commission health insurance plan; consolidating elementary education at Sheffield, Gill, and Hillcrest elementary schools; and assuming direct operational control of the therapeutic classrooms programs.

GMRSD has demonstrated significant capacity for positive organizational change. We have improved educational services and reduced the cost of those services at the same time.

Prior to gaining entry into the GIC, double-digit annual increases in health insurance costs created level-service budget increases in the 6% to 8% range. Each year, the district was faced with the choice of either implementing a budget increasing at a rate significantly higher than the inflation rate, or finding significant cuts in educational programs and services in order to present a budget to our member towns in line with the inflation rate (4% to 5%).

As has been widely noted and documented in great detail, state Chapter 70 aid has remained fairly flat over the past several years (increasing at a rate less than 1%). This decline in the percentage of state aid relative to the local contribution has exacerbated the difficulty of funding adequate education budgets.

Our actions in the past year have done a great deal to ameliorate this situation. Our proposed budget this year is in line with the inflation rate, in line with increases in neighboring districts, and in line with budgetary increases our towns are granting to their own departments (roads, police, fire, etc.). Because we have been able to bring health insurance costs under control, we can anticipate level-services budgets that remain in the 4% range.

Using a moderate amount of reserves from both the town side and the district side to fund the FY09 budget gap (and the anticipated FY10 budget gap) will free the school district to aggressively explore further cost-saving efficiencies. Developing educational collaborations with neighboring districts has the potential to further improve educational services while simultaneously reducing costs, but such efforts require significant investments of time and leadership capacity. We need to ensure our district of level-services budgets for the next few years, so that we can work to find the efficiencies of service that both the state and our member towns are asking of us.

Given this situation, the use of reserves to temporarily bridge the budget gap is not only warranted, but would be an excellent investment for all concerned. This is exactly the kind of situation where reserves should be used: to buy time while holding all parties harmless, so that better solutions can be worked out.

What can be done about the unintended consequences of School Choice policy?

The unintended effects of state educational policy regarding School Choice and Charter School funding threaten to undermine any gains achieved by our school district through joining the GIC, consolidating elementary schools, assuming control of special programs, and so on.

Our unofficial rough estimate of new school choice net losses for FY09 is a further exodus of 25 students to other districts. If accurate (we won't know for sure until the 2nd quarter 'cherry sheets' are

issued by the DESE), this represents a further loss of \$125,000 for FY09. This estimate does not include possible additional revenue losses through charter school tuition costs.

Had we not engaged in a fairly aggressive informational campaign to recruit new choice students this year, the financial damage to our district would have been far worse.

The additional revenue lost to school choice for FY09 must be added to the baseline data for FY08 to get a true picture of the magnitude of the problem: FY08 net choice lost revenue amounted to \$440,882. This became the official state estimate for the choice net revenue offset for FY09. If we add our estimate of \$125,000 in additional lost revenue, the total is \$565,882 for FY09. It is worth noting that this net 'loss' is deducted directly from Chapter 70 revenues sent to our district, and amounts to a serious reduction of state aid.

Although it is true that each student who chooses out to another district is one less student that the home district must educate, the incremental cost savings of having one less student to educate does not come close to the \$5,000 deducted from the sending district's state aid. As enrollment declines in small districts, further student losses erode the district's economies of scale, i.e. the core costs of administration, utilities and so on are borne by a smaller 'base' of students. In effect, an acceleration of students choicing out of small districts compromises that district's ability to provide quality educational services to the remaining students.

A policy designed to promote positive educational competition thus erodes the competitive position of fiscally fragile districts. School districts that have been struggling mightily just to **keep up** with their neighboring districts are thus required to **catch up**, to bridge an ever-widening gap between educational needs and available resources.

It has been suggested that a study be done to determine why students are choicing out of districts such as Gill-Montague. This is surely a good idea. Those of us working within the district, who genuinely feel that our schools are delivering high-quality education with somewhat limited resources, tend to think that at least three factors are driving students to choice-out to other districts:

1. Neighboring districts (Pioneer, Frontier, Amherst) have not see the kind of staffing and program cuts that GMRSD has endured over the course of the past several years. Parents and students, we think, have opted to choice into districts with greater educational resources (more art, music, foreign language instruction, and so on).
2. Neighboring districts have tended, in recent years, to settle their budgets early (in May, or June) and in a positive way. The annual budget battles between GMRSD and our member towns promote a climate of uncertainty, which surely affects the choices of concerned parents and students.
3. The consolidation of elementary schools at Sheffield and Gill, and the consequent closing of Montague Center School, has undoubtedly produced a number of new choice-outs.

We'd like to suggest that a legislative or regulatory mechanism be created to limit the fiscal damage done to districts such as ours caused by accelerating school choice and charter tuition losses. Perhaps 'Commissioner's Districts' could be held harmless for increases in choice and charter losses.

We believe that special consideration should be given to districts such as Gill-Montague, that have taken action to consolidate elementary schools in the face of declining enrollments. It is painful enough to close beloved elementary schools in small towns; to suffer losses of state aid as a consequence seems to undercut both our attempts to save precious educational dollars, and the DESE's and Legislature's positions promoting increased consolidation and regionalization of schools and districts. What lessons will other districts learn from our situation, if our attempts to consolidate to save money result in further losses of state aid for the district?

III. District update (from previous 7/31/08 report)

Overview

The Gill-Montague Regional School District is continuing to make significant progress on all fronts, despite a challenging fiscal situation.

The re-configuration of elementary schools and classrooms has enabled the district to better serve the educational needs of our students. We have moved from four elementary schools with significant staffing gaps to three elementary schools that will be appropriately staffed in all essential programs.

Joining the GIC for health insurance has enabled the district to propose a 5.18% budget that begins to restore needed educational services and programs. Our budget has been rejected twice by our member towns, a 'Commissioner's budget' of approximately 4% has been set, and a district meeting for citizens of our region has been set for September 17th. We remain hopeful that our towns and school committee will be able to agree on a budget that allows us to move ahead educationally without causing undue fiscal distress to our towns.

Our district leadership team has been strengthened considerably. We have hired dynamic educational leaders in each of our schools, and have increased our central office capacity to oversee elementary education, special education, and special programs.

Elementary schools configuration

Each of our elementary schools has undergone significant change in the past few months: Montague Center School is closed; Hillcrest Elementary transformed to a pre-K and Kindergarten school, Sheffield expanded to incorporate eight new classrooms, and Gill expanded by the addition of a stand-alone sixth grade and an additional kindergarten class. Each elementary school will have a full-time principal and a full-time nurse.

Consolidation of schools and classrooms has allowed us to re-assign existing positions to better serve the needs of students: one SPED position has been changed to a pre-K-5 Team Leader / School Psychologist position, and another to an Adjustment Counselor position for Sheffield. In addition, we have established a Special Education Resources Suite at Sheffield, to serve a number of children who were at Gill and Hillcrest.

Budget

Net gains from joining the GIC program are allowing the district to survive, and to make modest improvements in staffing. We have been able to move our Reading Specialist position from the Reading First grant (ended) to our general fund, ensuring sustainability of this important position. We have also been able to absorb a reduction in our Title I funds of about \$45,000 through GIC gains. In addition, we are in the process of re-vamping our Title II grant, to enable us to engage in professional development for teachers that is more comprehensive and suited to the educational initiatives we've undertaken.

We are adding a Reading Specialist at the middle school, to ensure that each student receives appropriate reading instruction, we're adding a 6th grade classroom teacher to keep class sizes manageable, and are fully funding the Secondary Assistant Principal position, to assist our ms/hs administrative team with student discipline and teacher evaluation.

With state funding essentially flat, and our towns struggling to keep up with double-digit assessment increases, all of this has been made possible this year only through our entry into the GIC program. In

that sense, these are one-time gains, and further economies and cost-effective strategies will have to be found if we hope to keep improving education.

Educational initiatives

Despite these gains, significant needs remain. Funding has yet to be found for many items in our greatly-reduced revised Turn-Around Plan, including computer technology teachers for the elementary schools, a math specialist for the middle school, a career counselor for the high school, an additional math/science teacher for the high school and sustainable funding for all of our educational initiatives.

Next steps

The school committee is engaged in strategic planning at several levels: a Sheffield Building Committee has been established to discuss next steps for the elementary schools re-configuration; they have established a sub-committee on Strategic Planning, which is developing a strategic educational vision and plan to guide future school committee decision-making; and there is an on-going collaboration with our member towns regarding the development of a five-year sustainable budget plan.

Both the school committee and the administration are hopeful that we will continue to find ways of improving education while finding additional cost-efficiencies.

What follows in this document are updated charts showing the specific objectives and status of our Turn-Around Plan.

We appreciate the time and attention that the DESE has devoted to our situation, and trust that you will find that we have made significant progress in the last year.

Goal A: Resolve elementary configuration question

Status: can accomplish with FY09 budget plan

Objectives:

- Establish broad grade-span configuration for all district elementary schools
- Consolidate educational resources at Sheffield
- Free district leadership to focus on educational and fiscal issues
- Re-establish leadership credibility in eyes of community and towns

Goal A: Resolve the elementary configuration question in order to realize fiscal efficiencies that will free up resources to support the district's educational needs.		Status
A.	Change processes by which: a) school buildings are closed; and b) grade levels are transferred.	
1	Amend regional agreement to lower threshold for closing a school from 8/9 at school committee level, to a 2/3 school committee vote followed by majority votes in each town.	approved by DSC and towns: approved by DESE
2	Amend district policy to raise threshold for transferring grade-levels from building to building within a member town from simple majority to 2/3 majority, in order to reduce likelihood of subsequent reversal of vote.	approved by school committee
B.	Initiate a plan to consolidate elementary education in Town of Montague at Sheffield Elementary.	
1	Move all 1st & 2nd grade students from Hillcrest to Sheffield, to establish broad grade-span configuration	done
2	Perform architectural study to determine costs of making 'old' side of Sheffield Elementary fully accessible	preliminary cost estimates done
3	Perform architectural study to determine costs of making 'old' side of Sheffield Elementary appropriate for pre-K and K	
C.	Create a process and a plan to determine future of Montague Center School	
1	Plan for possible transfer of MC grades 1-3 to Sheffield and K to Hillcrest	done
2	Implement process to determine viability of MC plans	done
3	Review plans according to set timeline, school committee makes final decisions	done
4	Implement plan to move MC grades 1-3 to Sheffield, K to Hillcrest for Sept. 2008	done
D.	Create staffing plan and budget for consolidated Sheffield for SY08-09	
1	design and staff behavioral and special education consolidated programs	done
2	consolidate classrooms	done
3	modify building as needed to accommodate new students and programs	done

Goal B: Reorganize central office and educational administrative staffing

Status: can accomplish with FY09 budget plan (GIC gains)

Objectives

- Provide significantly increased central office capacity to design, implement and monitor curriculum development, professional development, and new program development.
- Increase district capacity to provide effective supervision and evaluation of teachers in all district schools.
- Increase district capacity to engage in long-term strategic planning, focusing on leadership, educational achievement, and fiscal sustainability.
- Improve district ability to manage data, technology and train staff
- Stabilize district leadership team and retain highly qualified district administrators
- Provide full-time principals at each school

Goal B: Reorganize central office and educational administrative staffing in order to increase capacity to provide effective management, supervision and oversight of educational improvement		Status
A.	Plan educational administrative staffing for SY08-09	
1	Hire superintendent for FY09	done
2	Determine administrative staffing plan for SY08-09	done
3	Hire Director of Elementary Education	done
4	Hire principal for consolidated Sheffield Elementary	done
5	Hire principal for Hillcrest Early Childhood Center	done
6	Expand principal position at Gill from .5 to 1.0 FTE: hire	done
7	Hire Director of Student Services and Special Education	done
8	Review administrative needs of PPS and SPED	in progress
9	Add grant-funded .5 nurse/leader position	done
10	Explore need for SPED district-wide team leader	done
11	Hire all administrative staff for MS/HS	done
B.	Re-do all administrative contracts	
1	Write job descriptions for new / changed positions	in progress
2	Perform county-wide compensation survey	done
3	Determine cost of indexing admin salaries to county average	done
4	Negotiate contracts indexed to county average	done
C.	Add central office capacity to manage data, technology and IT training of staff	
1	Determine optimal central office staffing for IT	reviewing staffing and data management
2	Write job descriptions for new / changed positions	
3	Negotiate contracts / hire new as needed	

Goal C: Create an educationally sound and fiscally sustainable budget for FY09 and beyond

Status: in progress

Objectives:

- Find cost economies for FY09 budget and beyond
- Work with member towns to forecast sustainability of future budgets
- Identify strategies for increasing school revenue streams

Goal C: Create an educationally sound and fiscally sustainable budget for FY09 and beyond		Status
A. Create room in FY09 budget for restoration of educational programs and services		
1	Join GIC to reduce health insurance costs	done
2	Regain lost economies-of-scale through elementary school building consolidation	done
3	Negotiate teachers' contracts within budget parameters	on-going
4	Reduce out-of-district SPED costs through increased monitoring	on-going
5	Explore possible collaboration with neighboring districts on special programs for middle and high school students	on-going
6	Promote school choice options within the GMRSD district, to limit overall losses	done
B. Develop inflation index-linked budget for FY09		
1	Calculate GIC gains, changes in revenue streams, estimate E & D balance	done
2	Determine net savings available for restoration of educational programs and services	done
3	Develop 4% budget that limits town assessment increase to 4%	done
C. Work with member towns to develop 5-year fiscal sustainability plan for district and towns		
1	Secure funding for study, determine scope, hire consultant	done
2	Review study, conclusions and recommendations	in progress
C. Develop and implement a two-year budget plan (district, towns, and state)		
1	Use proceeds from dissolution of Franklin County Health Insurance Group to establish District Stabilization Fund	proposed
2	Use re-certified E&D balance to bridge FY09 budget gap	recommended
3	Use Foundation Reserve Funds to reduce assessments, improve education	in process
4	Develop a budget plan for FY09 and FY10 that restores educational services	in process
5	Secure commitment of towns to equitable funding for schools (in comparison to other town services and programs)	recommended
6	Secure commitment of state to hold district harmless for school choice losses in FY09 & FY10	proposed
7	Secure commitment of state to increase overall state aid	proposed

Goal D: Restore and improve elementary educational programs and services

Status: Restoration of key positions and initiatives will be dependent upon funding

Objectives:

- Provide sufficient social and emotional support to students to overcome obstacles to learning
- Provide sufficient academic support to students to enable them to achieve their potential
- Provide appropriate academic coaching to teachers to increase their ability to help students improve understanding of core academic subjects
- Extend Responsive Classroom model to all elementary classrooms and schools
- Establish Math Expressions as core math curriculum
- Maintain and expand reading and literacy initiatives
- Explore Expanded Learning Time models
- Map and align elementary curriculum
- Provide computer technology learning experiences to elementary students

Goal D: Restore and improve elementary educational programs and services		Status
A. Restore elementary educational programs and services		
1	Increase .5 Gill nurse position to FT	done
2	Add 6th grade teacher and class to Gill Elementary	done
3	Shift Reading Specialist position from Reading First Grant to general operating budget (grant elimination)	done
4	Shift Title I teaching position from Title I grant to general operating budget (grant reduction)	done
5	Purchase new computer labs for elementaries	done
6	Hire additional .5 ELL teacher	done (.25 FTE, shared with ms/hs)
7	Hire elementary adjustment counselor	done (SPED teaching position re-assigned)
8	Hire school psychologist / team leader, for testing, diagnostic and clinical intervention services to preK/K and 1-5 students	done (SPED teaching position re-assigned)
9	Hire math coach for Math Expressions curriculum	done (Title II grant & DESE assistance grant)
10	Hire computer technology teacher for elementaries; train teachers in Galileo	no funding at present
B. Improve elementary education		
1	Extend Responsive Classroom model to all elementary classrooms and schools	all initiatives in progress and will continue in FY09, with existing funding (general fund and Title II)
2	Establish Math Expressions as core math curriculum	
3	Maintain and expand reading and literacy initiatives	
4	Map and align elementary curriculum, identify power standards, translate into student-friendly language	
5	Explore Expanded Learning Time models	on hold

Goal E: Restore middle school and high school programs and services

Status: Curriculum initiatives will continue with FY09 budget; additional positions and professional development dependent upon funding

Objectives:

- Provide academic support to students
- Provide social and emotional support to students to overcome obstacles to learning
- Provide appropriate academic coaching to teachers
- Extend the 9th Grade Academy concept to 10th Grade
- Establish programs that will encourage and enable students to stay in school until graduation
- Extend Developmental Designs model to middle school classrooms
- Maintain and expand reading and literacy initiatives
- Explore Expanded Learning Time models
- Map and align middle school and high school curriculum

Goal E: Restore and improve secondary programs and services			Status
A. Restore middle school and high school educational programs and services			
1	Add .5 ELL teacher		done (.25 FTE, share with elem)
2	Provide MS/HS summer school programs		planning for next year
3	Add 9th and 10th grade team leaders		in process
4	Add afternoon/evening receptionist security position for building safety		in process
5	Add middle school reading specialist		done
6	Assume funding responsibility for hs.ms School Resource Officer		in process
7	Add middle school guidance counselor		on hold: no funding at present
8	Continue to fund peer mediation coordinator (50% grant funded)		
9	Add middle school math specialist		
10	Add math/science instructor at high school		
11	Add high school career / guidance / transitions counselor		
B. Improve secondary education			
1	Continue to train teachers in curriculum mapping and standards-based assessments		all initiatives in progress and will continue in FY09, with existing funding (general fund and Title II)
2	Continue to train staff in Developmental Designs model		
3	Maintain and expand Reconnecting Youth drop-out prevention program		
4	Continue Sedita Literacy Initiative for MS and HS staff		
5	Train teachers in use of Galileo software to improve continuous assessment & remediation		
6	Explore expansion of 9th Grade Academy to 10th Grade		
7	Explore Collins Writing Program for middle school		
8	Explore Expanded Teaching & Learning Time initiative		on hold