

AGENDA
SCHOOL BOARD OF SANTA ROSA COUNTY
WORKSHOP
February 26, 2019-9:00 AM

Items for Review and Discussion

A. Staffing Plan Development and Instructional Schedules

For a complete word for word transcript, please see the video @ <http://santarosacountysdfl.swagit.com/play/02262019-635>
(Select the meeting date on the calendar)

The following Board members were present: Mrs. Carol Boston, Chairman, Mr. Buddy Hinote, Vice-Chairman, Mrs. Jennifer Granse, Mrs. Linda Sanborn, and Mrs. Wei Ueberschaer. Also present was Timothy S. Wyrosdick, Superintendent of Schools and Secretary.

The Chairman called the workshop to order and Superintendent Wyrosdick led us in the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag and in a moment of silence.

The Superintendent opened the workshop by explaining how we got to where we are today. Over the last several months he has met with each Board member individually to discuss ideas and areas of interest. This workshop provides an opportunity to discuss together a huge topic. It's important that the staff hear which direction the Board wants to take regarding development of instructional schedules, how we plan to do that and a timeline. We won't decide that today but at the end of the meeting he would like to hear some consensus on how to move forward in planning for the 2019-20 or 2020-21 school years.

We focus our discussion today on three targeted questions.

- How do we add instructional time to our schedule? We're in the middle of an audit which has revealed that we are short on instructional time.

- How much instructional time do we add?

- What parameters should we consider when adding instructional time to our day?

The Superintendent continued that he has requested each Assistant Superintendent to take a portion of the workshop today. We understand that there will be many questions. He pointed out that in the last eleven years every decision we've made has been based on economics - unfortunately. Superintendent Wyrosdick added that he has the utmost faith in his staff and the information they provide.

Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum and Instruction Bill Emerson was the first presenter. Mr. Emerson noted that in a traditional sense we can use 300 minutes of instruction per day for 180 days. This equals 900 hours which is the requirement. When we have days that are shy of 300 minutes this affects the required total.

He reviewed a schedule history from 1987 to the present which showed a decreasing amount of daily instructional time. The next slide showed student performance history based on school grades. Mrs. Sanborn questioned the number of schools shown; it appears that we may have missed the primary schools. The history shows that our school grades have declined some though we do not have any "D" or "F" schools.

Superintendent Wyrosdick asked a rhetorical question - can you equate instructional time to test scores? He noted there are many anomalies outside of the test itself; there are many pieces that make up a school grade. We try to focus on proficiency and growth.

Mrs. Boston stated "there are far too many variables to make a direct correlation."

Assistant Superintendent Bill Emerson pointed out that we are showing an upward trend in graduation rate; our graduation rate is above the state average.

Mr. Hinote pointed out that while we are above the state average the gap between our graduation rate and the state average is growing closer.

Mr. Emerson continued by showing the two different graduation requirements (or pathways to a diploma). The traditional diploma requires 24 credits while the ACCEL diploma requires 18 credits.

When the 18-credit ACCEL graduation option was introduced it was to benefit students who wanted to move through high school quickly so they could continue on to college. It has been used more frequently by students who may be struggling and find it easier to meet the requirements of the 18-credit option. We have used it to benefit those students when possible.

Superintendent Wyrosdick asked Mr. Emerson to walk us through the "concordant score." For those students who can't meet state assessment graduation requirements, there are other options such as passing the ACT or SAT (in the right areas). For concordant score purposes only, the ACT or SAT may be taken untimed. The previously used PERT test was easier to pass since it was a much quicker assessment.

Mrs. Ueberschaer inquired about the cost of the ACT and SAT; Mr. Weeks

responded that the District covers specific levels and schools may cover others at their discretion.

The next slide showed planning period history. We currently have a six-period traditional schedule for middle and high schools with teachers teaching six periods a day and a common planning period before or after school. Elementary teachers plan during special area time (art, music, P.E.).

Mr. Emerson moved on to elementary instructional time starting with 2008-09 when the three-tier bus system was introduced - elementary instructional time was reduced to six hours and thirty minutes. When state requirements for P.E. and recess changed in 2008-09 elementary instructional time was reduced again. When the six-period day began in 2011-12, the elementary day was further reduced to six hours and six minutes. We now have 286 minutes each day for content instruction plus thirty minutes of P.E. for 316 total instructional minutes per day; the state requirement is a minimum of 300 minutes per day.

Superintendent Wyrosdick noted that a recent audit shows that we are not in compliance with the required number of minutes per day; he will be recommending that we add minutes per day and possibly adding full days to our calendar.

Mr. Emerson began discussing middle and high school instructional time which showed a gradual reduction due to several factors: three-tier implementation, school dismissal before 4:00 P.M., and implementation of the six-period day. Other considerations include lost time for lunch, class pass time, and ITV time.

Mrs. Ueberschaer asked if there is a minimum number of minutes that we would be comfortable with. Superintendent Wyrosdick responded that the minimum number is the required 300 minutes per day. He continued that there is further reduction when you remove the required lunch and recess time from the elementary day; adding minutes to the elementary day will require adjustment to the other grade levels.

Mrs. Ueberschaer reworded her question - "what is the goal minute number?"

Mr. Emerson responded that he wants us to have enough minutes that when we experience a snow or storm day we are not being squeezed to make it up. He added that he would love to see all of our minutes added back; he would like thirty minutes.

Superintendent Wyrosdick cautioned that extending the high school day after 4:00 presents other concerns. Mrs. Sanborn noted that this would affect bus schedules and adding thirty minutes would place them just shy of 4:00.

The Superintendent pointed out that adding minutes to the instructional day will also affect the planning period which is negotiated. He continued that we

haven't delved into the seven-period day but we can if the Board would like to. Mrs. Sanborn sought clarification regarding the seven-period day; this could necessitate taking minutes away from other classes. Mr. Emerson responded that there is a cost associated with going to the seven-period day.

(Break)

Superintendent Wyrosdick gave opening comments on Staffing Projections for 2019-20 before Assistant Superintendent for Human Resources Conni Camley came forward. He noted that changing the staffing plan will impact instructional delivery, staffing ratio quotas (which will impact financials), and teacher planning time.

The Superintendent spoke of how the staffing plan has changed - it used to be one page. A school site administrator received their staffing plan and built a master schedule. This is more complex now especially in the area of Exceptional Student Education.

We are not in a position to add everything back that we had before the recession but we try to look at that every year and keep it in mind to work on down the road. We try to move the staffing plan in that direction - we want to meet instructional needs and operational needs while balancing it with what we can afford.

Mrs. Camley came forward to provide an overview of the staffing instructional personnel process which begins in January. This is very complicated and time intensive. Assistant Superintendent Bill Emerson works with his Directors and special area Coordinators using articulation of feeder schools, FTE projections, and past student enrollment trends. Exceptional Student Education projections are developed by ESE Director Debbie Anderson using projections provided by her staff based on school, program, and need.

Mrs. Camley continued that we want to provide the information to school site administrators by April so they can begin looking at what teachers they want to recommend back and who will be placed on hold (they may be out of field or have not met the requirements of the GK test). Another consideration is the transfer period which is negotiated and takes place in early May. Schools are also developing master schedules and looking at the possibility of hiring out of field.

The next slide showed the core class size requirements by grade level.

The average salary and benefits of all instructional staff is \$61,299.74; the average salary and benefits of newly hired instructional staff for 2018-19 is \$50,837.62 (this was used for staffing cost calculations). Mrs. Camley pointed out that this is the number she uses for projections since it is not realistic to expect that we will hire all beginning teachers with zero years of experience

(\$45,564 - salary and benefits). We have hired 278 teachers this year.

Mrs. Sanborn asked what is included in the benefits; Mrs. Camley responded that health care, Florida Retirement System, and Social Security are included.

Staffing for elementary schools is calculated by dividing the student population by the core class size requirement for the grade level. This gives you the total number of teachers. You then add ESE instructional staff based on ESE formulas and IEPs; plus instructional support as prescribed by the district staffing plan (librarian, guidance, intervention, P.E., music/art) which gives you the total instructional staff for the school. Projected instructional personnel for elementary staffing for 18/19 was 1016; for 19/20 it is 1027.8. (Increase of 11.8 X \$50,837.62 = \$599,883.92)

Increase in staffing may not always be due to an increase in student population but the type of student we are serving. Mrs. Camley also noted that the numbers do not include any increase that may be negotiated.

Mrs. Sanborn asked if we an idea how many senior instructional employees may be leaving. Mrs. Camley responded the only way to project is to look at how many are scheduled to exit DROP. However, the Board recently approved allowing instructional employees to extend DROP by up to three years. We currently have eleven instructional employees scheduled to exit DROP this year. We've had three indicate interest in extending their DROP.

Projected instructional personnel/cost for staffing middle schools varies by the student population served as well as the type of class (core or elective). The student population is divided by the appropriate number (based on student and class type) and then multiplied by the appropriate number depending on class type (core or elective). The total number of class periods is then divided by six (number of periods a teacher teaches) which is the number of teachers. Then ESE instructional staff is added in (based on ESE formulas and IEPs) as well as instructional support as prescribed by the district staffing plan giving the total instructional staff.

Our projected middle school instructional personnel staffing shows an increase for 19/20 of nine. Once the core class size requirement is met you add ESE instructional staff (based on ESE formulas and IEPs) and instructional staff as prescribed by district staffing plan which gives you the total number of instructional staff for the school.

The next slide showed middle school staffing cost increase based on the different schedules. Our 19/20 increase based on a 6/6 period day and an increase of nine instructional employees would be \$457,538.58. A 5/6 period day with an increase of 62 instructional employees showed an increase of \$3,151,932.44. A 6/7 period day would increase by 38 employees at a projected cost of \$1,931,829.56.

High school staffing is based on core class size requirements as well as the population served and the type of class (core or elective). The total number of class periods is divided by six (number of periods a teacher teaches) to get the number of teachers. ESE instructional staff is added in based on ESE formulas and IEPs as well as instructional support as prescribed by the district staffing plan.

Projected high school staffing for 19/20 based on a 6/6 period shows an increase of 9 instructional employees at a cost increase of \$457,538.58; a 5/6 period day staffing shows an increase of 73 instructional staff with a cost increase of \$3,711,146.26; and a 6/7 period day staffing with an instructional staff increase of 50 shows an increase of \$2,541,881.

In summary, 2019/20 projected additional cost for instructional personnel is as follows: 6/6 period day - 29.8 additional instructional employees = 29.8 X \$50,837.62 = \$1,514,961.08; 5/6 period day - 146.8 additional instructional employees X \$50,837.62 = \$6,688,795.20; 6/7 period day - 99.8 additional instructional employees X \$50,837.62 = \$5,073,594.48.

Additional factors to be considered:

- The risk cost for property and casualty insurance increases; total payroll cost is one of the factors in our premium calculation.*
- Additional cost due to the increased number of drug screenings*
- Substitute costs have increased; the current average number of days per teacher requiring a substitute is twelve. Using this average number the sub cost for 6/6 period day is projected at \$35,295.12; a 5/6 period day is projected at \$173,869.92; and a 6/7 period day is projected at \$118,203.12.*
- Need for qualified/certified instructional personnel - additional cost*
- We currently have 88 instructional personnel serving out of field.*
- Required items to be negotiated (planning period, etc.)*

Mrs. Camley noted that we currently have twelve instructional vacancies (eight are ESE related).

The next slide addressed retention among instructional employees. We have added mentor teachers to assist with the PDCP (Alt Cert Program); we currently have 100 instructors in the program and anticipate growth. We provide on-going tutorial sessions for the GK test (math and reading) and have added district determination of subject area expertise which allows the district to designate instructors as "in-field" for reporting purposes.

We are pursuing several proposals in the area of recruitment including a conditional contract to student teachers who receive a positive recommendation from the supervising teacher and principal; and a possible

employment incentive for a critical shortage area. We are posting jobs to People Admin through SchoolLink to national job/employment boards and providing recruitment information to colleges of education within a 300 mile radius.

Superintendent Wyrosdick pointed out that we are not doing the recruitment fair this year; 93% of the employees hired from the recruitment fair last year were local people. Mrs. Camley shared that many of our potential hires want to live in the south end but there is not available affordable housing at the south end (of the county). Superintendent Wyrosdick commented that the recruitment fair has brought an awareness of Santa Rosa County to surrounding areas.

Another piece that is adding to the teacher shortage is the difficulty in obtaining alternative certification; it's a three-year process.

Mr. Hinote asked Mrs. Camley if "distance learning" might be part of the solution to the teacher shortage problem. Mrs. Camley responded that this is being explored but there are issues with this, too, particularly if it's a core class. Mr. Emerson talked about the "teacher of record" in 3270 which generated a discussion on 3270. This is an antiquated system but will cost millions to replace.

Mrs. Sanborn asked about the classes that have "push-in" teachers; we have two certified teachers in those classes; it appears that we may have "extra" teachers in those classes. Is there a way to rearrange the ESE model so that push-ins are not involved in so many classes?

Mrs. Camley responded that much of this is driven by IEP requirements as well as certifications held by the teacher in that classroom. If the teacher has the required subject area certification and ESE certification this meets the requirement for the classroom. Mrs. Sanborn stated that when she was a teacher she had many ESE students in her classroom and did not hold ESE certification.

Mrs. Camley pointed out that a scheduling workshop is held to aid administrators in scheduling efficiently. For example, if ESE students can be assigned to a smaller number of classrooms we can utilize our push-in teachers in those classrooms resulting in fewer push-in teachers being needed. Mrs. Sanborn asked about the possibility of offering a financial incentive to teachers to add ESE to their certificate so that there would be fewer out of field. Mrs. Camley stated this is being looked at; it is a negotiated item.

Mrs. Boston asked about the likelihood of staffing for the 6/7 schedule. Mrs. Camley responded that it is unlikely that we could staff for this schedule. Mrs. Sanborn requested clarification; are we saying that it's impossible? Superintendent Wyrosdick responded that nothing is impossible. Mrs. Sanborn asked if it would be more easily accomplished by waiting one year. Mrs.

Camley said that because of the trend in colleges of education she could not respond to the question; alternative certification teachers also have to complete the Beginning Teacher Program.

Mike Thorpe, Director of Instructional Technology, came forward to talk about the Alternative Certification Program. Mr. Thorpe explained that the candidates are required to complete weekly activities with the mentor teachers and must also pass the General Knowledge exam within the first year. There are approximately 22 courses that they must complete within the first three years; the courses vary in length from 30-60 hours.

(Break)

Joey Harrell, Assistant Superintendent for Administrative Services, began the next part of the workshop by providing transportation information. We have 14,090 funded riders and 3,264 unfunded riders who live within a 2-mile radius. Our total daily ridership is 17,354 and our current Average Bus Occupancy (ABO) is 72.8. ABO is a key part of the FEFP funding formula; a higher number shows greater efficiency and we receive more funding as a reward. If we add students and the ABO goes down to 55% (estimated ABO for 2 Tier) we will experience a loss of approximately \$200,000 in state funding. Mr. Harrell pointed out that Transportation is funded at approximately half of what it actually costs state-wide; our district cost is approximately \$5 million.

The next slide showed proposed schedules; if we stay with a 3-tier bus schedule there will be little to no financial impact. If we go to a 2-tier system, based on the current contract, the estimated increased cost to the district would be \$3.3 million. (The cost of one additional bus is projected at \$52,086 per year; the addition of sixty buses is \$3,125,160. The estimated decrease in state funding (ABO) equals \$200,000.

Mrs. Boston asked about the likelihood of staffing the additional bus drivers. It does not appear that we could since we are currently short on bench drivers.

Assistant Superintendent for Finance Susan McCole came to the podium next to discuss our Financial Condition Ratio. Our current FCR is 6.27; at the end of 2018-19 it was over 8. The decrease has been due to the loss of FTE as well as employee raises. Ms. McCole noted that every \$1.9 million spent equates to a 1% drop in FCR; additional personnel costs alone would bring our FCR down to approximately 3.7.

Superintendent Wyrosdick added that we have some known expenses coming up; all of our information systems are so antiquated; this must be fixed before we see serious effects such as people not being paid on time/correctly; leave not calculated correctly; retirement benefits not calculated correctly; vendors not being appropriately remunerated. The problem is two-fold; we can't hire programmers at the salary we currently have. The program that we currently

use does not have a manual and the employees who are proficient in that program are either retired or approaching retirement. This must be addressed quickly. We also have medical/insurance and textbook issues approaching.

Superintendent Wyrosdick stated that "you eat an elephant one bite at a time." Let's try to break it down and do what we can do. Today we want to share with you what we do know; there are also unknowns. "Decision time for 19/20 is here." The Superintendent said that he will agenda an item at the March 12 Board meeting requesting a consensus opinion from the Board on where to go/direction. The Superintendent will bring a staffing plan in April for the Board's approval; unless he hears differently from the Board he will continue to move forward with the 6/6 schedule. We must address the need for additional minutes in the schedule at all grade levels. We will begin working with our principals on their staffing/schedules in April.

The Superintendent concluded that we need to open the meeting to a Public Forum. The Chairman opened the floor for the Public Forum and asked if anyone would like to address the Board. There was no response; the forum was closed.

Mrs. Sanborn stated that she would like to see the District return to a 6/7 schedule for the purpose of increased instructional time and to benefit teachers. She continued that a 6/6 schedule is tough (she has taught 6/6). She feels that for reasons of survival, teachers put a video on at the end of class or have "free time." She feels that we can't go to a 6/7 schedule for the 19/20 school year but need to make a commitment for the 20/21 school year.

Mrs. Ueberschaer agreed that it would be difficult to implement a 6/7 schedule for the 19/20 school year but stated that she would like a commitment that we will move to the 6/7 schedule in 20/21.

Mr. Hinote stated that "we all would like to go to a 6/7 schedule but there are too many variables to make a commitment for the following year." We don't know what will transpire in the coming year.

Mrs. Ueberschaer pointed out that the projected increase in students (508) could produce over \$2 million. "There's never going to be an ideal time to do it." She feels that it needs to be a priority for our students and teachers.

Mr. Hinote agreed that our teachers are tired; twelve absences per year is indicative of that. We need to be thinking about the possibility of changing (to a 6/7 schedule) but there are too many variables that may occur. What is the legislature going to do; there is tremendous cost involved in implementation of a 6/7 schedule - what is our FCR? Mr. Hinote stated that he had thought we should take the money set aside (\$3 million) and use it for the 6/7 schedule. This might get us by for one year; where will the funding come from after that?

Mrs. Ueberschaer stated that by the end of this school year we will know what the base student allocation and categoricals will be. We can plan ahead for 20/21 knowing that we still have \$3 million dollars to use the first year. As long as growth is happening we will have revenue.

Mrs. Sanborn shared that she is not looking for an absolute definitive commitment that we will implement the 6/7 the following school year (20/21); but instead of having the discussion next March she would like to have it in August of this year. Mrs. Sanborn added that she appreciates the Superintendent's comment that "anything is possible" but maybe not feasible. She repeated that she would like this discussion to begin in August for the following year.

Mrs. Granse stated that she agrees with looking at this in the early fall; she noted that she ran for office because of the 6/6 schedule; she feels that no one is more eager to return to a 6/7 than she.

Mrs. Sanborn added that she feels the 6/6 schedule is adding to our retention concerns; many teachers are looking for a way out.

Mr. Hinote stated that he feels we are all in agreement that something needs to occur; the commitment piece is what's troubling him. He continued that moving to a 6/7 schedule could affect teachers' raises in the future. When he talks with teachers most of them would prefer a raise over moving to a 6/7 schedule.

Mrs. Sanborn responded that she doesn't agree with that; she has talked with teachers who say that going to a 6/7 would be comparable to receiving a raise.

Mrs. Boston talked about her personal experience with her own children; one had 6/7 and one had the 6/6 schedule. She agreed that it would be good to return to the 6/7 schedule. However, we must look at the large scope impact of this; not just the big picture but the long term effects. We're estimating what the FCR will be next year - but what about after that? If we implement this schedule and then have to begin cutting back after a year or two; we need to evaluate all of this very carefully.

Mr. Hinote spoke of the \$2.1 million we spend on subs. Since we've gone to contracted subs has there been an increase in the number of teacher absences? Superintendent Wyrosdick responded that we are looking at different models of professional development for next year. Board members asked for clarification on the twelve day average absence per year per teacher; is professional development part of this? It is not. Mrs. Boston stated that when she was a sub she worked many times for instructional employees who were choosing to take a vacation during the school year.

Mrs. Ueberschaer asked about the contracting of programmer positions; do we have an idea of what that cost will be. The Superintendent responded that the

cost will be huge; we can't do all of that at one time; it will need to be implemented over a 2-3 year period.

Mrs. Sanborn asked if there are areas in the budget that can be cut. Superintendent Wyrosdick responded that there are areas that can be cut. The Board passes a budget every year; if the Board asks the Superintendent to eliminate a specific expense it can be done. For example, STEAM Innovate, the 2-mile bus radius; it's a matter of what the Board wants to establish as a priority.

Mrs. Sanborn suggested that we may - at a later meeting - establish moving to a 6/7 schedule as a priority. Then review budget items that could be cut if we have set the 6/7 as a priority. If we don't set it as a priority, we won't ever get to it.

Mrs. Boston pointed out that the Board committed to that as a priority when we set the \$3 million aside.

Superintendent Wyrosdick stated that the \$3 million was set aside for two reasons. It was an overage in FTE and an unexpected windfall, we knew (the 6/7 schedule) would be a recurring expense.

The Superintendent continued that he feels the Board is saying they would like a list of potential cuts that could be implemented in order to move to a 6/7 period schedule.

Mrs. Boston asked Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum and Instruction Bill Emerson what he is hearing or seeing from students and parents regarding what they are not receiving in the 6/6 schedule to enable them to be successful after high school. Mr. Emerson responded that as an educator, he feels the more we can give our students the greater the benefit. But in the polls he has done, the results are about 50/50 to move back to the 6/7 period day. Mr. Emerson shared that as a parent, his girls are examples of students who did not need any more than a 6-period day. Discussions regarding sunrise/sunset and other after hours offerings have not been well received at school sites. Mr. Emerson stated that he has not had one parent call and ask about adding periods to the school day. Another consideration is that many students will not want to take the additional class; they may opt for the 18-credit graduation option instead.

Superintendent Wyrosdick concluded that the staff will go back and take a look at the budget to see what could be eliminated in order to move to a 6/7 period day.

There being no further business the workshop was adjourned.