



Brigid Nease, Superintendent

Michelle Baker, Director of Finance/Operations

Sheila Soule, Director of Curriculum

Donarae Dawson, Director of Student Support Services

## Harwood Unified Union School District Redesign Superintendent Nease's Perspective December 12, 2017

---

### **Act: 46:**

Three years ago, the Vermont Legislature passed Act 46 to address rising per pupil costs within Vermont's educational system and to expand opportunities by creating more efficient governance. As most people are aware, on July 1, 2017 the Harwood Union Unified School District (HUUSD), with one unified board of directors, became fully operational. Under Act 46, voters in our six towns passed the approval of this merger by 80-90 percent depending on the town. A single board of directors replaced the previous operating structure of seven boards, one from each of the six towns comprising the Washington West Supervisory Union, and the WWSU Board. The new unified board was charged with operating all seven campuses PreK-12 and the central office by developing one single budget and a common tax contribution from all six towns, which would only vary after applying each town's common level of appraisal.

The guideposts for operation are loosely defined in the Articles of Agreement approved by the voters by Australian ballot in June 2016. Also, the preliminary goals of the HUUSD are stated throughout the Study Committee Report. All of these documents can be found on the [wwsu.org](http://wwsu.org) website under the Act 46 tab.

### **Here are the five primary goals approved by our voters:**

Goal #1: The proposed union school district will provide substantial equity in the quality and variety of educational opportunities.

Goal #2: The proposed union school district will lead students to achieve or exceed the State's Education Quality Standards, adopted as rules by the State Board of Education at the direction of the General Assembly.

Goal #3: The proposed union school district will maximize operational efficiencies through increased flexibility to manage, share, and transfer resources, with a goal of increasing the district-level ratio of students to full-time equivalent staff.

Goal #4: The proposed union school district will promote transparency and accountability.

Goal #5: The proposed union school district will deliver education at a cost that parents, voters, and taxpayers value.

## **The Vermont Statewide Situation:**

The state of Vermont maintains an educational funding formula that is reliant on property taxes (approximately 33% from the general fund/state revenues, 26% homestead property tax, and 41% non-residential property tax), although a high percentage of Vermonters qualify for income sensitivity, where their contribution is tied to income rather than property. The funding formula is of course complicated but for the purposes of this paper, one needs only to think of it as a single checking account from which all checks to operate all schools in the state are drawn. Therefore, our property taxes are determined by what every community in the state spends on its schools.

As a state, we continue to struggle with affordability. Many of the variables contributing to that struggle are not in the control of our local communities and school boards. Affordable housing, sustainable employment, development of new businesses, and attracting young adults to our beautiful green mountain state are some key contributing factors. Therefore, these pressures/factors and their solutions are largely out of our control through local school budgeting. We are faced with cost containment measures imposed upon our schools year after year, for many years now, regardless of which Party is in control in Montpelier. This continues to result in spending penalties and one-size-fits all solutions for education funding based on targets that are largely voluntary.

My position remains that we have a serious statewide problem and that requires a serious statewide solution. You can only change what you can control, and our local board cannot control the school spending of towns throughout the rest of Vermont, any more than it can change the economic development model of the state or the school funding formula in effect.

We have experienced years of freezing our spending or extremely low spending increases, while watching other towns continue to spend and invest in their schools. Our taxpayers, under this funding formula, are forced to support the spending of all those other towns. In many ways, we fell farther behind especially in areas like building maintenance, creating reserve funds, adding new programs and/or co-curricular experiences to attract families to our schools, and the like. Instead, we were forced to hold on tight to preserve what we already had, making cuts along the way and cost shifting where possible. This approach provides nothing more than a band aid. As enrollment continues to decline throughout the state and in our own SU at 1-2% a year, the cost of hanging on becomes greater.

## **Here are some Vermont facts to consider when analyzing the challenges we face ahead:**

- Vermont's population growth has remained flat this decade.
- Vermont is ranked the 2<sup>nd</sup> oldest state in the nation (26% decline in ages 25-39 since 1990).
- Vermont lost population three of the last four years (2012-2016).
- From 2015-2016, Vermont's population decreased by 1,494, or .24%. This is second in the country, only topped by West Virginia.
- From 2015-2016, Vermont's poverty rate increased by 1.7%, the largest increase and only statistically significant increase in the nation. At the same time, the nationwide population increased by 0.7% and the poverty rate declined by 0.7%.
- Only 24% of VT households have school age children.
- Student enrollment has declined since 1997- losing about 1% a year. A decline of 20% in the last 20 years.
- VT, when compared to the other New England states, has the second highest expenditure per pupil (\$18,320) and the third lowest median income (\$59,494).
- Vermont has the highest Staff-Student Ratios in the Nation at about 4.67 to 1.
- Between 2013 and 2015, Vermont's median household income decreased by 10%.

- Vermont's four year CPI average is 1.13%. School labor contracts are rising at approximately 3.0% and health insurance costs increasing 10% or higher. (*attachment #1 VSBA/VSA Recommendations for Cost Containment*)
- Each day on average, there are 6 fewer workers in our workforce, 3 fewer students in our K-12 schools, and one baby born exposed to opiates. The Governor refers to this as the 6-3-1.

### **The Challenges Ahead:**

As we develop our FY 19 HUUSD School budget, we are faced with the conditions statewide noted above. Our Act 46 merger brought several incentives to our district including but not limited to a 5 year tax rate reduction of 10,8,6,4,and 2 cents. For FY 19 we will apply the 8 cent reduction. However, the state support to schools will be reduced by an amount greater than the incentive before we even make any adjustments to our local budgets. The department of taxes reports that the FY 2019 rate of growth anticipated in school spending across the state is 3.52%. Without some action by the legislature, the homestead property tax will be set 9.4 cents higher from \$1.50 to \$1.594 and the non-residential rate from \$1.535 to \$1.629. (*attachment #2 Governor Scott Letter to Education Leaders*)(*attachment #3 Letter Commissioner of Taxes*)

On November 15, 2017 Governor Scott sent a letter to education leaders urging districts to limit their growth per pupil spending to 2.5%. The tax commissioner's letter states that if no districts exceed the 2.5% per-pupil spending growth in their budgets, the average increase in property taxes could be at least 3 cents lower than what is presented.

In my opinion, while I understand this one-size fits all, non-mandated partial solution has appeal, it will not come to fruition. Simply put, some school boards will cut and reduce programs and defer maintenance, while others spend and grow. Boards and administrators will continue to "hang on to what they have" while absorbing labor and health care cost increases in excess of the 2.5% target. Once again, a statewide problem needs a statewide solution, not a voluntary do it if you can approach. That way of thinking continues to exacerbate the inequities of opportunities and quality for students and the cost to taxpayers across our state.

### **Cost Containment Recommendations from the state level:**

The Governor's approach supports a Cradle to Career perspective with increased investments in child care, preschool, higher education, and innovative vocational programs as a way to draw families to our state. He believes we should strive to have Vermont known as the Education Destination. He calls for the consolidation of grades and schools wherever possible to respond to the declining enrollment and to lower per pupil expenditures. He is not the first to do so. We have been discussing the serious impact of declining student enrollment and the affordability of our schools for well over two decades, regardless of the makeup of the Administration and Legislature.

At the same time, we are hearing loud calls for reducing K-12 spending further. Year after year, boards are faced with spending penalties of one kind or another and end of the legislative session decisions that often appear desperate. We have continued down this path since the 1990's and yet, we still cannot contain spending and sustain affordable, equitable, high-performing schools throughout our state. One of the primary components of the solution offered by those in Montpelier is to control student to staff ratios. (*attachment #4 Memo Secretary of Education: Managing Staff Attrition*)

### **Consider the following:**

- Over the past 20 years, consistent with trends across the North East and rural states, our student population has shrunk by 20%.

- According to the Agency of Education (AOE) based on national statistics, Vermont’s small schools are “micro systems”. In several cases, the entire student body could fit in a neighboring school 5-10 minutes away on a paved road, without incurring additional cost, and still maintain student-to-teacher ratios that are less than half the national average. As schools and class sizes shrink, per pupil costs increase and offerings and opportunities to students decrease.
- According to the National Center for Educational Statistics, Vermont has had the lowest student-to-teacher ratio for all fifty states and the territories for the last four available years of data.
- The data indicate that we currently employ about one adult for every four children served. Without focus and change in this area, we could soon end up employing one adult for every three children.
- While Vermonters love micro classrooms and low ratios, they are a very expensive way to educate our children. Educational research typically defines a “small class” as being fewer than 20 students. In Vermont, our classes are half as big as what other states consider small.
- No research supports the notion that staffing ratios as small as ours lead to better outcomes. Our results are not proportional to our investment.
- Review of our local and state assessment scores, along with the percentage of students in need of learning plans, does not directly correlate smaller class sizes to more successful student outcomes.
- In Vermont communities large enough to scale for size, most maintain class sizes of approximately 20 students K-3, 20-25 in grades 4-6 and 25-28 in grades 7 and 8.

**About the HUUSD:**

Each and every year during budget season, a full presentation is made regarding student enrollment. Confusion occurs in reporting because we have three types of calculations that are used: the actual number of students on Oct. 1 each year in our classrooms; the average daily membership (ADM) reported to the state for funding, which is a two year average; and equalized pupils, another enrollment metric that weights students by categories such as poverty, grade level, language learners, etc. for the purposes of calculating state supported funding to the schools. Full reports on student enrollment can be found on our wwsu.org website (we have not yet converted to huusd.org).

**For the purpose of this paper, consider the following:**

These numbers were taken from the November 15, 2017 budget presentation by Michelle Baker, CFO (*attachments # 5 and 6*) HUUSD Student Enrollment Information Presented 11/15/17). Enrollment of actual students in our buildings (including tuition students) comparing 10/1/2009 to 10/1/2017 actuals, and finally 2018 estimates are:

Fayston:	112/81/81
Moretown:	120/106/106
Waitsfield:	154/112/112
Warren:	148/135/127
Thatcher:	343/369/367
Crossett:	283/274/283
Harwood Middle:	148/143/134
Harwood High:	632/501/511
HUMS/HUHS:	780/644/645

As you can see, from 2009 to 2017, HUMS/HUHS declined by 135 students or roughly the size of a 5/6, 7/8, or 9<sup>th</sup> grade team.

Our high school students attend the regional technical career center in Barre. In 2009, the center had total enrollment of 237, 156 in 2017 and projects 130 in 2018. How will they continue to provide a comprehensive, robust experience for students on this pathway?

**HUUSD Building capacities as per the AOE are as follows:**

Fayston:	140
Moretown:	225
Waitsfield:	185
Warren:	191
Thatcher:	480
Crossett:	400
HUMS/HUHS:	862

*(attachment #7 HUUSD Building Capacity: A preliminary Look by Director of Facilities, Ray Daigle)*

**Other Data: Our Current FY 18 Staffing:**

Consider the information in the attached appendix. You will find the at-a-glance summary data of our current FY 2018 staffing, K-12 enrollment, free lunch/poverty count, and the percentage of students on learning plans requiring supports outside of those provided by the regular classroom teacher.

In 2017, we employed 370.03 staff in our SU schools; 374.82 in 2018, and projected 376.61 in 2019. Even though our enrollment has declined, we continue to employ more staff. This is a result of not being able to increase class sizes in the core regular classrooms, the need for additional intervention services for students struggling, due to the increase number of students on learning plans, the increased needs in preschool - which is now mandated - and the addition of world language staff in TBPS, where there was no program at all, and an increase in CBMS so that their program is equivalent with HUMS.

We are currently in the thick of budget season for FY 2019. This year we have utilized a “One Budget Budget” process. The Act 46 merger has brought some early savings. The FY 2019 budget was reduced by almost \$131,000 in operating expenses, which is better than the 100K yearly estimated in the Act 46 Study Committee projections.

The entire administrative team has been meeting 3-4 times a month for several hours at a time carefully studying the needs, staffing, and past practices of all 7 campuses. Collectively, we have recommended to the board a first run of budget expenditures that reduces staff to adjust for class sizes that are too small, but that also adds staff in different categories to provide equity in all the SU schools in the areas of Pre K, World Language instruction, and Intervention services for students that need more academic support beyond Tier I instruction in the classroom. The net cost effect of the changes recommended will result in a staffing increase overall net of about .3 FTE, after factoring in the additional revenue received to offset the additional 1.7 FTE needed to expand PreK.

As of the time of this writing, we do not have tax rates calculated based on our initial budget proposal. Our timeline, depending on when we receive the needed calculations from the state, is to see those early cost projections by 12/20/17, then work to refine and finalize a board approved budget by 1/17/17 to take to the voters in March.

**What the HUUSD Can Accomplish Through Redesign:**

Our education system is a powerful tool for recruiting more working-age families to our communities. For nearly two decades we have heard the calls from our taxpayers for property tax relief. We have continued down a path in our SU, now District, responding to the affordability agenda by making reductions where we can,

while continuing to operate our 7 schools to achieve solid outcomes academically and socially for our students, and we recently merged our SU into one District. Sadly, what we have done is not enough.

At the time of this writing, we are nearly complete with the renovations at the Warren School, a 2.55 million dollar investment, with approximately another 380K invested due to problems, damage, and insurance claims. Our other facilities, with the exception of Harwood Union, are in very good shape. Harwood has been analyzing its needs and considering a bond project for many years, and seriously over the past five. The HUHS Board hired architects to develop a plan for renovation. All of this was put on hold until decisions about Act 46 and merger were concluded. It is time to return to this very important project and the serious needs of one of our buildings that dates back to the 1960's. I will not get into the specific needs in this writing. That can wait until the HUUSD Board determines a new overall direction.

From January 2018 on, the HUUSD Board, administration, and communities will be studying the possibilities, pros and cons, of redesigning the delivery model of education in our 6 communities. We will be seriously engaging our communities on this very important topic.

As the Superintendent of Schools in the WWSU/HUUSD since July 1, 2009, I have learned a lot about the intimate workings of each of our schools. I remain passionate and protective of our schools and students, while being keenly aware of the affordability challenges ahead. How can we continue to maintain great schools that are affordable to our taxpayers? How can we not only provide holistic, transformative, current opportunities for our students, but also attract students on tuition and new families to our six towns? How can we protect the property values of our taxpayers? What can and should we do to stop the erosion of our program/school quality given the economic challenges we collectively face in Vermont?

I felt it was important to write this position paper because I believe I owe it to students present and future, as well as all our taxpayers, to tell you what I think after 8 years on the job. I am well aware that these types of redesign big picture changes have pros and cons, and will likely be met with fiercely opposing viewpoints. However, I am hoping that these thoughts and recommendations act as a catalyst to engage our communities in tough but robust civil dialogue, which can lead the HUUSD towards the development of a long term plan to achieve excellence, while maintaining affordability, sustainability, effectiveness, efficiency, equity and balance. This will serve to replace the one year at a time "survival" budgeting we are forced to engage in as a result of Vermont's financial landscape.

**I respectfully submit the following for consideration by all stakeholders:**

- Our choice is to sit back and let the financial situation in this state and the one check book approach to education funding force us to be reactive, play defense, continue to struggle to make cuts, and hold on for dear life, or take control of what we can. It is always important in life to know when things are bigger than you and to identify what you actually have control over.
- The Act 46 merger has given us the full ability to share. It has broadened our definition of community and has brought serious increased capacity to us, as long as we are not frozen by fear. We will be stronger as an integrated whole rather than the sum of our isolated parts.
- We need to accept that as in most of Vermont, our schools are getting too small, where the lack of economies of scale and the laws of supply and demand do not work in our favor. Our current delivery model is not sustainable. The peer group for our students in our existing configuration is too small, both academically and socially.
- We need to redesign ourselves to not only better meet the needs of our students and provide greater affordability to our taxpayers, but to draw families to our six towns to attend any of our schools and graduate from Harwood. In order to do this, we need to stand out, compete, and offer what others don't, stand for important things, and provide more not less to students and the community at large.

For these reasons I propose merging students beyond our bricks and mortar by combining grades. We can substantially expand student peer groups (socially, emotionally and academically), increase academic offerings, co-curricular activities, and adult offerings at our schools, while making our schools more affordable and sustainable. In order to do this, it appears to me that the only way out of this “State” mess is to isolate and insulate ourselves from the challenges and variables in cost containment that we have no control over by making structural changes in our organization that we do have control over. That being said, we do not have a perfectly clean slate from which to begin. We must work with the assets that we have, compromising along the way, and possibly spending some money up front to save money later.

**Therefore, I propose the following:**

1. We embrace the Governor’s platform of Cradle to Career and reconfigure our buildings to provide resources, programs, and delivery models to encompass birth through adulthood.
2. In my opinion, given our small sized schools, one of the best things we can do for our students academically, emotionally and socially, is to better align their experiences by removing transitional barriers that exist naturally because they are physically separated among six buildings by moving them together into one cohort beginning in grade 5.
3. All 5/6 students from the valley schools (127) would move to Crossett Brook (148) (total 275), along with grade 4 (74) from Thatcher (combined student total = 349). All 7/8 CBMS (135) students would move to HUMS (134) (total middle 269). We would create a 5-8 integrated middle school environment between the 2 campuses with all the students integrated. Research indicates that the “sweet spot” for school size producing the highest levels of achievement with the greatest affordability are a) 300-400 elementary students; b) 400-600 middle level students; and c) 600-900 high school students. A combined all HUUSD 7-12 grades at Harwood with present enrollment would be about 780.
4. Merging these grades together will not only be better for students, it will provide more opportunities to reduce duplicate spending in materials, supplies, services and many other areas now spent across 6 buildings.
5. Enough students in a cohort over a period of years, with cost shifting and savings, should give us the opportunities to provide and/or explore the provision of a robust 5-8 band, chorus, drama, robotics, gymnastics, dance and other clubs. We should bring debate, civics and cultural clubs to our 9-12 graders. Many more possibilities exist and can come to fruition by spending our money differently, using existing campuses and other prior investments differently, and by incensing the Harwood bond to accomplish much more than just the same old much needed renovations.
6. This would allow all HUUSD students in grades 5-12 to remain together as one cohort from grade 5 through grade 12. Staffing would be more geared to 5-8 and 9-12, where then the high school teachers can be freed up from teaching middle school classes making more offerings available to 9-12 grade students, and middle school students will all be instructed using a common middle school philosophy. The teaching staff would work and learn in departments with several expert team members.
7. Administrators would be assigned differently. One of the ongoing complaints about HUMS middle school over the years has been the ownership by and assignment of administrators providing focused middle level leadership.
8. The bus ride would be longer for some students by 7-10 minutes. I believe that, while not desirable, this is manageable and worth it given the additional opportunities these students could realize.

9. By bringing grade 4 over to Crossett (which developmentally works well as a stand-alone and pre-requisite grade to grade 5), four classrooms would free up at TBPS, which continues to experience increasing enrollment. This would allow for PreK expansion (approximately 50 of the 120 Pre K students are able to be served onsite at the present time) and increased enrollment. If this component was not acceptable, other space options could be explored and evaluated including a small addition or modular units to gain more space at this farther end of the district.
10. Enrollment projections continue to indicate decline, especially in the valley schools over the next several years. Using the estimates for FY 2018, K-12 students in the buildings, approximately 127 5/6 grade valley students would move to CBMS, roughly the same size as the 7/8 team from CBMS that would move to HUMS. That would leave approximately 299 K-4 students in the 4 valley sites; 58 K, 117 grades 1/ 2, 124 grades 3/4. Collectively, those 4 sites have a capacity of about 741. Many possibilities could exist here and would warrant further significant research and community dialogue.
11. One plan could be operating 2 of the 4 schools in the valley as PreK-4 buildings with approximately 130-150 students in each building. By combining students into two school buildings, grade groups of students would be large enough so that class sizes of 17-20 (the Vermont recommended standard) could be achievable. Multiage classrooms could be replaced with looping classrooms, where all students remain in single grades, a 3<sup>rd</sup> grade for example, but remain with the same teacher for two years. This is considered best practice today because the reading, writing, and math standards and programs are very grade specific, as are the NCLB (No Child Left Behind) and now ESSA (Every Student Succeeds Act which replaced NCLB). This would eliminate the need for a second teacher to join a classroom of multiage 1/ 2 so that we have two separate teachers teaching the graded curriculum. Looping is preferred if you have enough students at each grade level across Vermont and is currently the model at Thatcher Brook.
12. Two of the schools in the valley could be re-purposed. Some Pre K classes could occur in one of these two sites. We could create a robust pre-vocational program in one of the valley schools (something that has been much needed for many years in Vermont). Students now cannot access vocational programs until well into 10th grade. These programs would be available to our students and students from neighboring schools on tuition (a revenue stream) beginning in grade 7.
13. We could repurpose the other valley school to run our own Behavioral Intervention Program and Services model, which I strongly believe would be better for students and far more cost effective for the district than the consulting contracts we currently utilize. This area of need continues to grow and remains one of the biggest cost drivers in not only our SU/District but throughout the state. If we could find enough space for this program in one of the other six buildings, then we could consider a post-secondary satellite program, a private or independent school, or other desirable use for that school that could generate revenue instead. In the event that enrollment increases, the funding formula changes, or other unanticipated factors surface, the 4 buildings in the valley could be readjusted accordingly.
14. If enough space can be found, I would move the central offices into a school. However, many districts have built their own central office building, and we could too on the property at Harwood. That facility could have been paid for many times over if WWSU had built years ago, as 35K in rent could be reinvested back into the system. Having a central office at Harwood could also provide some added support potentially for evening programming and other events.
15. The added space, along with space freed up in the valley schools, would allow for the expansion of the Children's Room and initiatives like that focused on supporting families birth to 3 years of age; not providing care or programs for this age child, but allowing for space within the school buildings for them to operate. I was very interested to learn after attending a Children's Room meeting how many

young families felt that this one program seriously influenced their decision to move to Waterbury/Duxbury.

16. We could expand our success sponsoring programs like MECA and WASP that provide child care in our buildings for a fee before, during, and afterschool, as well as during the summer. Our experience tells us that this is what families today really need. This could be expanded to provide HUUSD Vacation Camps during February and April breaks, when parents have great difficulty finding child care. MECA continues to have a waiting list. We believe that this service to kids and families has helped Moretown increase enrollment some, while putting the brakes on the decline they were experiencing. These programs can also enroll students from other towns outside the SU for a fee, if enough space is available.
17. We could develop a Community School at Harwood that would create a new revenue stream. It would operate after school and in the evenings, offering courses in technology, adult basic education, etc., and classes in yoga, the arts, and whatever the community desires and identifies. How wonderful could it be to have the schools utilized differently in the community, where reasonable, for all ages and taxpayers? This is done successfully elsewhere in the state. The CVU district is one example.
18. The HUUSD could create another revenue stream by providing a state-of-the-art integrated summer program for our students and others on tuition, focused on wellness and outdoor activities in our beautiful valley, advanced learning academic studies, and academic recovery supports.

### **It's Time to Define a Process and Next Steps:**

We all know that change, let alone significant change, is very difficult. Human beings naturally like to hang on tight to what is familiar and works well. Change can threaten our identities. But what happens when, due to circumstances outside our control, what is familiar and works well becomes threatened and unsustainable? What happens if instead of looking at this situation as dooms day, we force ourselves to turn it into opportunity; to harness our capacity, embrace our unity, and dare to reinvent ourselves for our students and taxpayers to serve them well into the future?

It is not that who we have been isn't great. It is that our state has changed, including the way that Vermont public schools can remain affordable while still maintaining quality. That demands that we change too. James Baldwin said, "Not everything that is faced can be changed, but nothing can be changed until it is faced".

I am telling myself that this is a time for courageous leadership, and I hope this position paper is received that way in our six communities, even by those who may strongly disagree with these recommendations. I respectfully ask that you do not shoot the messenger (my family still needs me). I urge you to develop a board and community process, begin the work, have the tough conversations, consider all the possibilities, and decide on a plan. Create your own destiny in our/your six towns. When tackling the statewide affordability challenges, play offense not defense when possible. Advocate for additional financial incentives in the form of tax rate reductions, hold harmless conditions, and construction aid to schools for merged Act 46 districts that can accomplish real structural, sustainable change. The fundamental question needs to be, if not this, then what is the alternative solution?

If in the end, you choose to do nothing and keep things the way they are, we can all say that we studied and considered the pros and cons, completed the hard work, and decided not to make significant change. Only then will the taxpayers have gotten what they voted for through the Act 46 merger when the Vermont Legislature passed it to address rising per pupil costs within Vermont's educational system and to expand opportunities by creating more efficient governance.

This position paper and attachments can be found on the homepage of our website at [wwsu.org](http://wwsu.org). A dedicated email address, [redesign@wwsu.org](mailto:redesign@wwsu.org) has been established there to collect feedback and comment from the community at large. As the process gets defined and the study work moves forward, all the documents will be kept on the website under a dedicated tab, labeled Redesign, just as our Act 46 work was.

# APPENDIX

## HUUSD Comparative Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Teacher Staffing Schedule Elementary Schools at November 2017 (FY2018)

Grades Served	Fayston	Moretown	Waitsfield	Warren	Thatcher Brook
	Elementary	Elementary	Elementary	Elementary	PS
	PK-6	PK-6	PK-6	PK-6	PK-4
Pre-Kindergarten Teacher	0.60	0.96	0.94	1.50	1.60
Elementary Classroom Teacher (K to 6) or (K-4 at TB)	6.00	7.00	7.00	8.00	21.00
Physical Education Teacher	0.40	0.40	0.40	0.50	1.35
Art Teacher	0.35	0.40	0.40	0.40	1.00
Music Teacher	0.40	0.40	0.60	0.40	1.00
World Language Teacher (French)	0.40	0.40	0.40	0.40	-
Library Media Specialist	0.40	0.80	0.50	1.00	1.00
Technology Integration Teacher	0.30	-	0.50	-	-
Health Education Teacher	0.05	0.10	0.10	0.05	0.25
School Nurse	0.50	0.50	1.00	0.50	1.00
Guidance Counselor	0.40	0.40	0.60	0.40	1.00
Home School Coordinator	-	-	-	0.20	1.0 thru WCMH
Behavior Specialist	-	-	-	-	0.60
Interventionists/some funded with SCW CFG Funds	1.00	-	-	0.50	4.00
English Language Learner Teacher (1.0 FTE for entire SU)	-	-	-	-	-
Special Education Teacher	1.00	1.50	1.00	2.60	3.40
EEE Teacher	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.60
Speech Teacher	0.60	1.00	1.00	1.00	2.40
MTSS Coordinator	0.10	0.10	-	-	-
<b>Total Teachers</b>	<b>12.75</b>	<b>14.21</b>	<b>14.69</b>	<b>17.70</b>	<b>40.20</b>
Principal/School Administrator	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	2.00
K+ Total Student Enrollment 10-1-2017	81.00	106.00	112.00	135.00	369.00
Student to Classroom Teacher Ratio - (K to 6 or K to 4)	13.50	15.14	16.00	16.88	17.57
<u>Other Data</u>					
Title I Eligible	No	No	No	Yes	Yes
2016-2017 Free/Reduced %*	16.22%	13.33%	20.71%	32.80%	22.61%
7/1/2017 SpEd Child count	19	14	15	31	37
7/1/17 Students on 504 Plans	5	5	8	3	12
Students on EST Plans per Building Admins	2	10	12	12	43
% Students on Plans to Enrollment	32.10%	27.36%	31.25%	34.07%	24.93%

HUUSD Comparative Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) **Teacher** Staffing Schedule Secondary Schools at November 2017 (FY2018)

	Crossett Brook		HUHS MS/HS
	Grades Served	MS 5-8	7-12
Secondary Classroom Teacher (Grade 5 to 6)		7.30	*
Secondary Classroom Teacher (Grades 7 to 8)		8.00	8.00
Secondary Classroom Teacher (Grades 9 to 12)			28.00
Sustainability		1.00	-
Physical Education Teacher		2.00	2.50
Art Teacher		1.00	3.00
Music Teacher		2.00	3.00
World Language Teacher <i>CB currently offers Spanish</i>		1.00	5.60
Library Media Specialist		1.00	1.00
Technology Education Teacher (Stem)		1.00	2.00
Technology Integration Teacher		-	-
Health Education Teacher		0.20	0.50
School Nurse		1.00	1.50
Guidance Counselor		1.00	3.50
Home School Coordinator	1.0 thru WCMH		-
Behavior Specialist		-	-
Student Assistance Consultant		-	0.60
Interventionists/some funded with SCW CFG Funds		2.00	3.00
Vocational Education		-	1.50
Drivers Education		-	1.00
English Language Learner Teacher (1.0 FTE for entire SU)		-	-
Special Education Teacher/.EEE Teacher		5.00	11.55
Speech Teacher		1.00	1.50
PLP Coordinator			0.50
MTSS Coordinator		-	-
<b>Total Teachers</b>		<b>34.50</b>	<b>78.25</b>
Principal/School Administrator		2.00	3.00
Director of Student Services & Director of Student Management			2.00
<b>Total Student Enrollment 10-1-2017</b>		<b>274.00</b>	<b>644.00</b>
<b>Student to All Teacher Ratio</b>		<b>7.94</b>	<b>8.23</b>
<b>Student to Classroom Teacher Ratio - (5 to 8 CB or 7 to 12 HU)</b>		<b>17.91</b>	<b>80.50</b>
<b><u>Other Data</u></b>			
Title I Eligible		Yes	Yes
2016-2017 Free/Reduced %*		24.36%	24.96%
7/1/2017 SpEd Child count		58	90
7/1/17 Students on 504 Plans		15	89
Students on EST Plans per Building Admins		16	7
% Students on Plans to Enrollment		32.48%	28.91%
<b>*Includes English, Math Science &amp; Social Studies grade 7-12</b>			
	CBMS 7-8	HUHS 7-8	HUHS 9-12
7-12 English	2.00	2.00	6.00
7-12 Math	2.00	2.00	7.00
7-12 Social Studies	2.00	2.00	6.00
7-12 Science	2.00	2.00	6.00
HUHS HUB English			1.00
HUHS HCLC English			1.00
HUHS HCLC Science			1.00
Secondary Classroom Teacher (7 to 12)	8.00	8.00	28.00
Student Enrollment on 10/1/2017	135.00	143.00	501.00
Student to Classroom Teacher Ratio - (7 to 8 and 9 to 12)	16.88	17.88	18.50

**HUUSD Comparative Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Support Staff Schedule Secondary Schools at November 2017 (FY2018)**

	Fayston	Moretown	Waitsfield	Warren	Thatcher Brook	Crossett Brook	HUMS/HS	Central Office and Operations
Instructional Assistant (Eligible & Ineligible)	4.11	5.50	5.78	7.57	12.80	14.70	15.00	
Intensive Specialist Assistant							1.00	
OG Instructional Asst						1.00	1.00	
Hall Monitor							1.00	
On Staff Substitute								
Student Support Specialist					2.00		2.00	
Library Assistant			0.07	0.20	1.00		1.00	
Nursing Assistant								
Planning Room Coordinator						1.00		
Learning Room Coordinator								
Athletic and Activities Director							1.00	
Athletic Trainer							1.00	
System Administrator								1.00
Network Manager					0.50	0.50		
Technology Coordinator in Education							1.00	
Technology Coordinator	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.50	0.50	1.00	
Technology Assistant					0.50	0.50	1.00	
Director of Maintenance and Grounds								1.00
Maintenance Director	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	
Buildings and Grounds Maintenance Worker							1.00	
Custodian	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.50	3.00	3.00	5.00	
Registrar/College Planning Coordinator							1.00	
Secretary Receptionist					1.00	1.00	1.00	
Administrative Assltant	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	3.00	2.60
Food Service Director	1.00	-	-	1.00	0.50	0.50	1.00	
Food Service Cook	-	-	-	-		1.00	-	
Sous Chef							1.00	
Food Service Worker	1.00	-	-	1.00	1.93	0.86	5.00	
Superintendent								1.00
Director of Student Support Services								1.00
Director of Curriculum and Assessment								1.00
Director of Finance & Operations								1.00
Project Coordinator								1.00
Accountant								2.00
Payroll & Benefits Coordinator								1.00
Accounts Payable Clerk								0.80
Medicaid Clerk								0.60
<b>Total Support Staff</b>	<b>8.86</b>	<b>8.25</b>	<b>8.60</b>	<b>12.52</b>	<b>25.73</b>	<b>26.56</b>	<b>45.00</b>	<b>14.00</b>

HUUSD Summary at November 2017 (FY2018)

	Teachers (All Categories)	School & SU Administrators	Instructional Support	Maintenance Support	Technology Support	Food Service	Administrative Support	Athletic Support	Total All Staff-Nov 2017	Total All Staff-Nov 2016
Fayston Elementary	12.75	1.00	4.11	1.50	0.25	2.00	1.00	-	22.61	23.48
Moretown Elementary	14.21	1.00	5.50	1.50	0.25	-	1.00	-	23.46	21.49
Waitsfield Elementary	14.69	1.00	5.85	1.50	0.25	-	1.00	-	24.29	23.15
Warren Elementary	17.70	1.00	7.77	1.50	0.25	2.00	1.00	-	31.22	31.21
Thatcher Brook Primary	40.20	2.00	15.80	4.00	1.50	2.43	2.00	-	67.93	66.74
Crossett Brook Middle	34.50	2.00	16.70	4.00	1.50	2.36	2.00	-	63.06	63.58
HU Middle/High School	78.25	5.00	21.00	7.00	3.00	7.00	5.00	2.00	128.25	126.00
Central Support	-	4.00	-	1.00	1.00	-	8.00	-	14.00	14.40
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>212.30</b>	<b>17.00</b>	<b>76.73</b>	<b>22.00</b>	<b>8.00</b>	<b>15.79</b>	<b>21.00</b>	<b>2.00</b>	<b>374.82</b>	<b>370.03</b>

**Proposed For FY2019**

Classroom Teachers	(2.40)									
Intervention Teachers	3.00									
Reduction of .20 FTE MTSS Coord	(0.20)									
Instructional Assistants			(3.01)							
World Language Proposal	2.40									
PreKindergarten Proposal	0.50		1.20				(0.60)			
Data Manager					1.00					
Library-Media Tech Integration	0.20									
Guidance	0.20									
Nurse .50 FTE? - TBD										
Return to HU Co-Principal Model	0.50						(1.00)			
<b>Net Change in FTE FY2019 from Present</b>	<b>216.50</b>	<b>17.00</b>	<b>74.92</b>	<b>22.00</b>	<b>9.00</b>	<b>15.79</b>	<b>19.40</b>	<b>2.00</b>	<b>376.61</b>	