

Reading Public Schools
Rationale for FY18 Budget Discussion Items

Background

The Town of Reading is currently considering a 7.5 million dollar override ballot question which will be voted on by the community on October 18th. As part of these discussions, the Reading School Committee and Reading Public Schools Administration have been reviewing budget scenarios given the current revenue projections for FY18 (.7% increase for municipal and school operating budgets if \$2,000,000 of free cash is used and a -.3% increase for municipal and school operating budgets if no free cash is used). In addition, for over a year, there have been discussions with the Reading Public School Community on the educational needs for the school district that are aligned with the challenges that the school district is currently facing and the goals of the school district. Like many other communities in the state, the Reading Public Schools is facing these challenges:

1. Retaining and Attracting Staff
2. Developing well-balanced and prepared students for college, career, and life
3. Supporting teachers and administrators as we transition to more rigorous standards and curriculum
4. Continuing to improve our special education services and in district programs
5. Identifying long term space needs to address program changes
6. Remaining comparable and competitive with other towns and school districts

This document gives a rationale regarding resources in the FY18 budget to support challenges 1-4 and 6. Challenge 5, *identifying the long term space needs to address program changes*, is not included in the FY18 budget discussion, but will need to be addressed in the next few years. Below is some further information regarding each of these challenges:

1. Retaining and Attracting Staff

Over the last three fiscal years, the Reading Public Schools has had to make \$1,792,813 in personnel and non-personnel reductions/offset adjustments to level service budgets. In the FY17 budget alone, there is a reduction of 7.3 positions (6.3 teachers) as part of an overall \$650,000 reduction from a level service budget. This reduction in personnel will lead to higher class sizes in Grades 3 and 5 at Killam, the elimination of the High School Freshman Advisory Program, and reduced course sections in all departments at Reading Memorial High School. In addition, when reviewing the salary schedules of 30 comparable communities that our Municipal and school department uses for budgetary purposes, Reading is in the bottom half for teacher salaries and compensation. The lack of additional resources in clerical and mid-level supervisory support has led to an increased workload for our teachers and administrators in an era of increased expectations and accountability for education. This combination has led to an increase in staff leaving the district for other communities over the last few years for higher wages and benefits and decreased workload. Moreover, it has been more difficult to attract teachers to come to Reading. This past school year alone, four teachers who were offered positions in Reading declined our offer to teach in other districts for higher wages and benefits.

To support this challenge, we have seen a steady increase in the number of teachers who have resigned in the school district since 2010 (See Appendix, Table 1). During our exit interview process, teachers are indicating that they are leaving for a variety of reasons, including family situations, relocation, advancement in their career, and working closer to their home. However, we are also seeing an increase in teachers leaving because of the workload/demands of the position and the compensation/benefits we offer. Anecdotally, we have seen teachers resign from the Reading Public Schools and receive a 6-8% increase in pay and benefits for a similar position in another school district. We have also experienced situations where perspective candidates have

been offered positions in our school district and have declined to take an offer in another district for higher wages and benefits.

It is critical that our district remain competitive in salaries, benefits, and working conditions with other districts. Each time a teacher leaves the district, there is not only a financial and administrative cost to recruit, train and mentor the new teacher, but more importantly, there is a negative cultural impact to a school, classroom, and students.

2. Developing well balanced and prepared students for college, career, and life

States and school districts across the country are at various stages of updating their math, literacy, and science curriculum, improving their instructional practices, and developing an assessment system that identifies what students are truly learning. Our students are learning more rigorous and challenging curriculum and our teachers are working extremely hard to stay current in the type of classroom instruction that addresses today's student.

All school districts are experiencing student challenges that did not exist 10 years ago. Students are facing a greater degree of peer pressure, social media, and societal pressures, at a time when they are expected to achieve at a higher level. These pressures on our students have led to an increased number of students who are being diagnosed with anxiety and depression which has led to an increased number of students who have been hospitalized. In the 2015 administration of the Youth Risk Behavior Survey (YRBS), we are seeing trends where 29% of RMHS students are feeling sad or hopeless two weeks in a row (up 7% from 2005), 22% of RMHS purposely injured themselves without the intention of killing themselves (up 5% from 2005) and 17% of RMHS students have seriously considered suicide (up 6% from 2005). These pressures can also lead to an increase in risky behaviors such as drug and alcohol use, including the use of Opioids and other illegal substances. In addition, we are having a growing population of students who are struggling academically. To help address these needs, the Reading Public Schools has been putting into place different levels of supports and programs for students based on need. However, additional staffing is needed to provide those academic and social/emotional supports. If we are able to proactively address these challenges when a child is first struggling, it will help the student and potentially avoid more expensive interventions and supports (i.e. special education) at a later date.

One of the areas that we are not addressing adequately is health education. Unlike other school districts, the Reading Public Schools does not have a comprehensive health education program in Grades K-12. Currently, there are 10 lessons of health education per year in Grades 3-8, and semester courses in Grades 9 and 11. A Grade 7 middle school health education course was eliminated due to budget reductions in 2013. A middle school health education program would focus on prevention and educate students on making good healthy decisions, improve peer relations, and understand how to live a healthy and productive lifestyle. It is important for students to have this foundation before reaching high school.

Finally, anecdotally, we are beginning to hear from some families that their children are not being accepted into their top college choices. When we have researched this concern, we are hearing that our students do not have access to as many Advanced Placement Courses as other school districts. Reading Memorial High School has one the lowest number of available Advanced Placement Courses in the region. In addition, we do not have the types of elective courses available to our high school students that allow them to explore and go more into depth areas that will prepare them better for their college interests. The availability of Advanced Placement Courses and elective opportunities is a critical component in making students more competitive when they are applying to colleges and Universities and to better prepare them for their future choices. Additional staffing is needed to provide these courses.

3. Supporting teachers and administrators as we transition to more rigorous standards and curriculum

Giving teachers and administrators the time, support, and professional training is essential so that they are able to address the needs of today's students. As part of this support, it is important to maintain and update our current levels of technology hardware, training, and infrastructure so that teachers have the instructional tools in the classroom. Moreover, we need to continue to provide professional development time for teachers to learn new curriculum, update instructional practices, and have time to collaborate with each other so that there is consistency in learning experiences across all schools.

One area that is critical, but is currently a challenge in our district is the amount of administrative and supervisory support that is available for staff. In Table 2 in the appendix, there is a breakdown of the number of staff that are supervised by an administrator in a school. On average, our building level administrators supervise and evaluate 47 staff at each of our schools. This ratio is much higher than our comparable communities and is a cause for concern because it does not allow our administrators to adequately help support teachers and other staff while managing the day to day operations of the school. Essentially, because of the lack of administrative support, Principals are forced to focus more on the day to day operations of the school and spend less time on continually improving the school. Ultimately, this affects student learning and success.

Most comparable school districts have these additional supports in the form of elementary assistant principals, curriculum coordinators, and curriculum directors. In FY14, which is the latest figures that we have from the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE), Reading is ranked 26th out of 30 comparable communities in per pupil expenditures for District and School Instructional Leadership (see Table 3 in the appendix). One of the school districts that was ranked below us, North Andover, recently added two K-12 curriculum coordinator positions, which will most likely rank them above us in a future ranking. In addition to providing supervision, these positions focus on curriculum coordination so that students in every classroom across the school district are receiving the same learning experiences by grade and subject area. In an era of increased accountability and expectations, school districts are recognizing the importance of these positions and the impact that they can have on students.

4. Continuing to improve our special education services and programs

In 2015, the Reading Public Schools had Walker Associates conduct a complete evaluation of our special education programs and services in the school district. As part of that report, there was a finding of increased administrative turnover and workload for the Director of Student Services and Team Chairs. The Director of Student Services currently oversees all of the Age 3-22 special education programs and services, special education transportation, English Language Learner services, Health Services, and Social Emotional Learning coordination. Additional support is needed in this area so that the Director's focus can be on improving special education programs and services throughout the school district. By strengthening our in district special education programs, we will be able to educate more of our special education students in district instead of enrolling them in out of district placements. This has both a fiscal benefit for the community and an educational benefit for students as it will allow students to stay in their local school district with their peers in a more inclusive setting. For example, a student who is in the Compass Program (in district program for students with severe autism) will cost \$52,000 less per year than an out of district private special education program and \$17,000 less per year than a public collaborative program that service the same disability (see Appendix Tables 4 and 5). By strengthening our in district special education programs, the savings that results from those investments can ultimately be used for all students in the district.

5. Identifying long term space needs to address program changes (Not addressed in FY18 Budget)

The Reading Public Schools has had space constraints over the last several years due to programmatic changes and additions in special education, full day kindergarten, preschool and other program offerings. In addition to the special education program needs described above, there has been a growing demand for full day kindergarten and preschool. In the 2016-17 school year, 75% of our kindergarten students will be in tuition-

based full day kindergarten. According to the Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, in the 2015-16 school year, 93% of all kindergarten students in Massachusetts public schools were enrolled in full day kindergarten. In addition, 78% of all Massachusetts School Districts now have tuition free full day kindergarten and that percent is increasing annually. Our space needs were partially addressed with the addition of six modular classrooms last year at the elementary level. These modular classrooms will provide much needed classroom space for at least 10-15 years. Unfortunately, the space needs continue to grow as we continue to strengthen our in district special education programs and more families are choosing full day kindergarten.

In addition, Killam Elementary School, which was built in 1969, is beginning to show its wear and tear and will need work done in the next five to ten years. Recently, The Town of Reading Water Department conducted water testing for lead in all of our schools. The lead in water test results have indicated that over 80% of the faucets at Killam are showing above lead levels in water of 15 parts per billion or greater. This is due to plumbing fixtures and pipes that contain high lead content. The only long term solution to solving the high lead content is to completely replace all of the plumbing in the building. In addition, Killam is the only school building in the district that has not had a renovation or new construction. It is anticipated that this could be a possible option to add additional classroom space in the district to accommodate these programmatic changes. A feasibility study in the next few years may provide sufficient information on how to move forward in this challenge.

6. Remaining comparable and competitive with other towns and school districts

Addressing each of the above challenges (1-5) will keep our school district comparable and competitive with area towns and school districts. As mentioned in Challenges 1 and 3, we need to become more comparable in salary, working conditions, and benefits to be able to retain and attract teachers and administrators. In addition, we need to keep our programs, curriculum, and learning experiences strong so that we can provide opportunities and options for our families so that they will send their children to the Reading Public Schools.

Resources Needed to Address Challenges and Structural Deficit

On August 16th, the Board of Selectmen voted to place a \$7,500,000 override question on the October 18th ballot. If the override is successful, it is anticipated that an additional \$2,960,000 will be allocated to the FY18 School Department Budget. The chart below lists the resources needed to address the challenges described above (See Table 6 in the appendix for more detail) with the additional override funding. This is not a wish list; rather, these are resources that are common in our comparable towns and school districts and was developed in a year-long discussion with staff and the community on the goals and priorities of the Reading Public Schools. It is well recognized that our staff is a dedicated and hard-working group that prides itself in doing what is in the best interest of our students. The resources below will support our teachers and administrators, continue to improve our schools, keep them comparable with area school districts and provide the necessary support for our students.

Resources Needed to Address Challenges and Structural Deficit

Area	Funding Needed
1. Structural Deficit (.7% Budget Increase in FY18)	\$2,000,000
2. Salary Adjustments	\$360,000
3. Middle School Health Education	\$140,000
4. High School Program Improvement	\$110,000
5. Additional Supports for Struggling Students (Tutors, BCBA)	\$107,000
6. Maintain School Transformation Grant Funded Positions-Grant Funded through FY19 (Data Analyst/Coach, Administrator for Social Emotional Learning)	0
7. Curriculum Supervision Leadership	\$195,000
8. Special Education Leadership	\$48,000
TOTAL	\$2,960,000

Below is further explanation for these needed resources and how each specifically addresses the targeted challenges for our community:

1. **Structural Deficit (\$2,000,000)**
(Addresses Challenges 1-6)

The structural deficit will have a significant impact on all of the challenges described above if we are not able to address it. Based on the Town Manager's projections for FY18, both the Municipal and School Department will be facing a .7% increase in the operational budgets. For the school department, this will result in a \$2,000,000 difference between a level service budget and the funding that is available (see Table 7 in appendix). The level service budget is designed to provide the same level of service that we are providing during the 2016-17 school year and includes an average cost of living adjustment/contractual increases, projected increases in special education tuition/transportation and regular day transportation, the Year 2 implementation of the Science Curriculum (\$150,000), and a decrease in the athletic and full day kindergarten revolving accounts to account for changes in revenue and expenses in those programs.

Since the School Department has been making reductions in personnel and non-personnel areas for the last three years, the budget reductions from this structural deficit would primarily be in personnel and result in the elimination of several teacher, support staff, and administrator positions, leading to increases in class sizes and a reduction in program offerings and courses across the district. The scope of the reductions are explained further in the next section, *What happens if the override is not approved.*

2. **Salary Adjustments (\$360,000)**
(Addresses Challenges 1 and 6)

The funding allotted will be used for contractual union and non-union salary increases to help make Reading's salary scales more comparable to its like peer communities. It is important that we continue to retain and attract the best teachers and administrators for our schools. When there is turnover in a school district, there is a cost associated, both financially and culturally, to hire, train, and support the new teacher or administrator. FY17 is the final year of a three collective bargaining agreement for all five bargaining units.

3. **Middle School Health Education (\$140,000)**
(Addresses challenges 2 and 6)

This funding will provide staffing for dedicated health education classes at the middle school level in grades to be determined. These will most likely be semester long courses. 1.5 FTE will be allocated to Parker Middle School and 1.0 FTE will be allocated to Coolidge Middle School. A middle school health education program would focus on prevention and educate students on making good healthy decisions, improve peer relations, and understand how to live a healthy and productive lifestyle. With the ongoing community dialogue about opioid use and other harmful substances, addressing this challenge is not only a school priority, but a community priority.

4. **High School Program Improvement (\$110,000)**
(Addresses challenges 2 and 6)

This funding will add 2.0 FTE teachers at Reading Memorial High School and will restore some of the RMHS teacher reductions from the FY17 budget, while providing adequate staffing to increase the number of AP and elective courses across departments. These additional resources will help ensure that students have access to a greater number of Advanced Placement and elective courses, as well as, improve their college acceptance process and help prepare them for the next steps in their post high school career.

5. **Additional supports for struggling students (\$107,000)**
(Addresses challenges 2 and 6)

This funding will potentially provide the following academic and social emotional support for students.

- **4.0 FTE Academic Tutors** where two will be assigned at the High School and one at each middle school. These tutors will provide academic support for struggling students during designated intervention blocks. Currently, our middle schools and the high school do not have staffing available to provide this support.
- **.5 FTE Board Certified Behavior Analyst or equivalent** who will be assigned at the elementary level to provide social emotional support for students and provide coaching to teachers on how to address behavior issues in the classroom. Currently, our elementary schools do not have any district level support in this critical area.

For students that are struggling academically and/or need additional behavioral support in the classroom these positions are critical to support student learning. They can also proactively address academic and social emotional issues before they potentially could become more long term issues that require greater resources (i.e. special education).

6. **School Transformation Grant Funded Positions (\$0)**
(Addresses challenges 2 and 6)

Two years ago, the Reading Public Schools received a five year, 1.25 million dollar, Federally Funded School Transformation Grant which is currently providing funding to implement Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS) in Grades PreK-12. The grant, which has three years remaining, provides funding for training, professional development, stipends, and two critical positions, the Administrator for Social Emotional Learning and a Data Analyst/Coach. The Administrator for Social Emotional Learning (\$90,000) oversees the implementation of all behavioral health and social emotional learning in the school district. The data analyst/coach (\$70,000) compiles academic, behavioral, and social emotional data for each school and the district and works with staff to help them use the data to support student learning. This position allows us to take the enormous amount of data that is collected by our district, interpret it, and design interventions that will support students. The position also assists teachers and administrators understand that data is more than just test scores and it provides a forum for us as educators to ask and investigate questions about students, how we teach, and how students learn. Some possible questions that a data analyst/coach could help staff answer include:

- How do student outcomes differ by demographics, programs, and schools?
- To what extent have specific programs, interventions, and services improved outcomes?
- What are the characteristics of students who are succeeding and of those who do not?
- Where are we making the most progress in closing achievement gaps?
- How do student grades correlate with state assessment results and other measures?

More and more school districts in our region are realizing the benefit of these positions and through the grant, we have begun to see the potential of how this type of position can help us effectively use the available resources to help students improve and grow.

These positions are funded until FY19. At that time, the funding from the last year of the science curriculum implementation will be available to fund these positions.

7. **Curriculum Supervision Leadership (\$195,000)**
(Addresses challenges 3, 4, and 6)

This funding provides funding for curriculum supervision leadership at the elementary level and a restructuring of curriculum supervision leadership at the secondary level. There are different models that are used in school districts. Here is a possible breakdown of the curriculum supervision model:

- 2.0 FTE PreK-8 Curriculum Coordinators (STEM and Humanities)
- Restructure RMHS Curriculum Leadership to provide evaluative responsibilities

These leadership positions, which are common in our comparable school districts, would be able to fill a void and provide more supervisory and curriculum leadership in all subject areas. In addition, these positions would share supervision and evaluation responsibilities with building principals, oversee the development and refinement of common assessments, work with teachers to update curriculum maps and pacing charts and participate in ongoing outreach to the community in curriculum areas. More importantly, by establishing these roles, there will be a greater level of focus on improving teaching and learning in our district, which will lead to more successful students.

8. **Special Education Leadership (\$48,000)**
(Addresses Challenges 1 and 4)

This funding provides for a .5 FTE Assistant Director of Student Services to help support the special education, special education transportation, English Language Learners services, and Health services in the school district. Currently, the Director of Student Services oversees these areas and all of the special education programs and services. The investment in this leadership position will help improve our special education in district programs, which will help keep more of our students who require these services in our school district, where appropriate.

What Happens if the Override Is Not Approved

The Town of Reading is currently considering a 7.5 million dollar override ballot question which will be voted on by the community on October 18th. In the first year of the override funding, the town would allocate \$2,960,000 to the school department and \$1,540,000 to the municipal budget. The amount allocated to the school department will rectify the identified 2 million dollar structural deficit in next year's school department budget—and will restore or address several other high priority areas which the district has been unable to effectively address due to budget reductions over the last few years. If the override does not pass, approximately \$2,000,000 would need to be reduced from the FY18 school department budget. Below is an overview of the impact that such reductions would have on the Reading Public Schools.

Since the school department has been making personnel and non-personnel reductions for the last three years, the majority of the reductions would be personnel in order to total 2 million dollars. Some non-personnel expenses (perhaps 10-15% of the total reductions) could be made as a one-time cut for FY18 only; however, many of these would most likely need to be restored the following year. Without the input of the entire budget process that we go through each year with the community, staff, and School Committee, it would of course not be appropriate to determine specific positions or programs that would be impacted. On the next page is a potential list in general terms of the types of cuts that would be necessary to reach a total of \$2,000,000 in reductions to the FY18 budget (including approximately 30-35 FTE in personnel or 5% of total staff in the district). It should be noted that while the below table does not attempt to quantify the specific impact on student outcomes, such large reductions on any school system may also impact students in ways that are not easily projected. Based on current financial and enrollment information, the below examples would total approximately \$2,000,000 in budget reductions for next year.

Impact to School Department Budget if Override is Not Approved

Level	Reduction	Impact Information
Elementary School	4-5 FTE Classroom Teachers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Classroom Teacher reductions at this level for second year in a row Increase in average class sizes, with some classrooms increasing up to 26 students in Grades K-2 and 28 students in Grades 3-5 (Based on current enrollment projections) Would not be able to conform to School Committee class sizes guidelines established in 2005.
Elementary School	12-13 FTE Support Staff	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Elimination of non-mandated classroom personnel or support staff. Level of support currently being provided to both teachers and students would be significantly decreased.
Middle School	10-11 FTE Classroom Teachers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increase in class sizes Elimination of programs and/or course offerings Would cause a change in the middle school interdisciplinary model and impact vertical course opportunities/pathways as students enter high school
High School	3-4 FTE Classroom Teachers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Classroom teacher reductions at this level for second year in a row Increase in class sizes Elimination of specific programs and/or courses (for instance AP offerings and/or electives). Impact on current RMHS Graduation requirements Reduced course access for some students due to scheduling limitations and/or number of course sections Potential negative impact on some students' college acceptances
District	1-2 FTE District	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reduced support for administrators, teachers, and families Further increase the workload of the building principals and school-level staff
All levels	Curriculum funding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Impact on continuing implementation of the Science curriculum and alignment with the recently updated Massachusetts Curriculum Framework for Science & Technology/Engineering Years 2 and 3 of Science/Engineering implementation will depend on Finance Committee and Town Meeting's support of Free Cash allocation
All levels	Building per pupil budgets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reduction of materials and supplies for classrooms and teachers.
All levels	Professional development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Less training for teachers and a delay in professional development plans for instructional practices aligned with new curriculum.
All levels	Technology	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Delayed replacement of computers and less availability of technology for students in Grades K-12

Long Term Challenges

The resource needs described above address many immediate challenges that our school district is facing. There are, however, some long term challenges that cannot be addressed in the FY18 budget and will need to be addressed in the next few years.

1. Full Day Kindergarten

There is growing research on the positive impact that full day kindergarten has on the academic and social emotional wellbeing of students. Full day kindergarten in Reading is tuition based and is one of the highest in the Commonwealth at \$4200/year. As described under Challenge #5, in the 2016-17 school year, 75% of our kindergarten students will be in tuition-based full day kindergarten. More and more communities in Massachusetts are transitioning to tuition free full day kindergarten for all students. According to the Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, in the 2015-16 school year, 93% of all kindergarten students in Massachusetts public schools were enrolled in full day kindergarten. In addition, 78% of all Massachusetts School Districts now have tuition-free full day kindergarten and that percent is increasing annually.

To transition to tuition-free full day kindergarten will necessitate additional resources (approximately \$1,000,000/year) and additional space.

2. Space Needs and Killam Elementary School

As described in Challenges #4 and #5, the Reading Public Schools is experiencing instructional and classroom space constraints over the last several years due to programmatic changes and increased enrollment in special education programs, full day kindergarten, and preschool. Our space needs were partially addressed with the addition of six modular classrooms last year at the elementary level. These modular classrooms will provide much needed classroom space for at least 10-15 years. Unfortunately, the space needs continue to grow as we continue to strengthen our in district special education programs, more families are choosing full day kindergarten, and we have a waiting list for students to enter the RISE preschool.

One possible solution is to address the infrastructure needs and add classroom space to Killam Elementary School. Killam, which was built in 1969, is beginning to show its wear and tear and will need work done in the next five to ten years. Killam is the only school building in the district that has not had a renovation or new construction. It is anticipated that this could be a possible option to add additional classroom space in the district to accommodate these programmatic changes. A feasibility study in the next few years may provide sufficient information on how to move forward in this challenge.

Conclusion

Our community has been very supportive of our schools through their investment of time and funding and we appreciate that support. Unfortunately, the projected revenue forecasts indicate that the FY18 budget will result in reductions for both Municipal Government and schools. We realize that the revenues for Reading will always be limited when compared to other districts. This is why the focus of our conversations for the last year with the Community have emphasized the minimum resources needed to get the maximum benefits for our students. The resources presented in this document address the real challenges that our district is facing and do not focus on a wish list of additional programs and staff. We have seen firsthand the commitment that our community has made to education over the last several years because our citizens value the importance of education and the role that it needs to play in a community. There is no question that a major indicator of the *quality of life* for everyone in a community can be measured by the quality of its schools and by a community's commitment to its children. In this way, the quality of a school district affects *every single person* in a community, and the Town of Reading is no exception. The information in this

document was developed with a significant amount of input from our Community and reflects the goals and values that are embedded in our town and schools.

We welcome your questions and comments regarding the information presented in this document. Please do not hesitate to contact the Reading Public Schools at 781-944-5800.

Appendix

Table 1-Number of Teachers who have resigned, excluding retirements and non-renewals (2010-2016)

School Year	Number of Teachers who have resigned, excluding retirements and non-renewals for performance
2010-11	15
2011-12	17
2012-13	18
2013-14	24
2014-15	23
2015-16 (As of September 6 th)	19
Grand Total	116

Table 2-Number of Staff Supervised per Administrator by School

	Barrows	Birch Meadow	Joshua Eaton	Killam	Wood End	Coolidge	Parker	RMHS
Teachers	32	37	37	36	29	47	55	103
Paraducators	15	24	17	16	22	17	12	12
Secretary	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	5
Total	48	62	55	53	52	65	68	120
Number of Administrators	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	3.25
Staff Per Administrator	48	62	55	53	52	33	34	37

Table 3-Ranking of Reading Public Schools in Per Pupil Expenditure for District and School Instructional Leadership and overall per pupil expenditure (FY14)

TOTAL EXPENDITURES
Function

District	Total FTE Memb	Total Expenditures	Expenditure Per Pupil	Ranking
LEXINGTON	6,697.90	\$117,184,669	\$17,496	2
BURLINGTON	3,643.00	\$64,482,442	\$17,700	1
STONEHAM	2,487.00	\$36,102,626	\$14,517	9
BEDFORD	2,632.20	\$45,341,398	\$17,226	3
MILTON	3,993.20	\$53,904,488	\$13,499	15
CONCORD	2,212.00	\$36,402,152	\$16,457	5
WALPOLE	4,049.20	\$54,668,292	\$13,501	14
ANDOVER	6,263.20	\$95,109,234	\$15,185	6
LYNNFIELD	2,218.70	\$29,836,098	\$13,448	16
DANVERS	3,763.20	\$51,274,125	\$13,625	12
DEDHAM	2,854.70	\$48,261,857	\$16,906	4
MELROSE	3,978.60	\$47,405,266	\$11,915	26
WAKEFIELD	3,451.60	\$44,770,094	\$12,971	18
NATICK	5,440.30	\$73,714,556	\$13,550	13
BELMONT	4,271.80	\$54,675,498	\$12,799	20
MARSHFIELD	4,477.00	\$53,484,499	\$11,947	25
WESTBOROUGH	3,637.60	\$53,604,611	\$14,736	7
WILMINGTON	3,590.70	\$52,653,828	\$14,664	8
CHELMSFORD	5,314.60	\$66,094,948	\$12,436	23
MANSFIELD	4,487.10	\$57,600,786	\$12,837	19
NORTH READING	2,640.20	\$35,090,938	\$13,291	17
HINGHAM	4,279.40	\$49,965,020	\$11,676	30
SHREWSBURY	6,283.60	\$74,586,282	\$11,870	28
WINCHESTER	4,494.60	\$56,536,546	\$12,579	21
EASTON	3,890.80	\$46,541,937	\$11,962	24
READING	4,458.40	\$52,641,725	\$11,807	29
CANTON	3,317.50	\$47,410,063	\$14,291	10
WESTFORD	5,216.60	\$65,359,243	\$12,529	22
TEWKSBURY	3,905.60	\$53,774,092	\$13,768	11
NORTH ANDOVER	4,886.20	\$58,094,147	\$11,889	27

Total Expenditures Curriculum Directors, Dept Heads, School Leadership (2110, 2120, 2210 & 2220)		
Total Expenditures	Expenditure Per Pupil	Ranking
\$8,854,397	\$1,342	1
\$4,162,413	\$1,174	2
\$2,049,539	\$888	3
\$2,236,291	\$883	4
\$3,325,635	\$848	5
\$1,791,232	\$826	6
\$3,267,597	\$820	7
\$5,056,389	\$820	8
\$1,747,174	\$796	9
\$2,798,982	\$769	10
\$2,088,054	\$760	11
\$2,732,830	\$744	12
\$2,456,835	\$738	13
\$3,745,829	\$711	14
\$2,973,774	\$710	15
\$3,056,984	\$700	16
\$2,503,665	\$698	17
\$2,433,130	\$693	18
\$3,469,026	\$685	19
\$2,911,870	\$679	20
\$1,753,830	\$676	21
\$2,795,072	\$664	22
\$3,810,515	\$643	23
\$2,782,322	\$629	24
\$2,357,181	\$617	25
\$2,555,142	\$582	26
\$1,875,322	\$580	27
\$2,977,630	\$579	28
\$2,104,344	\$566	29
\$2,190,484	\$457	30

Table 4-Cost Analysis of Students In district vs. Out of District for students diagnosed with severe autism

Program	Per Student Cost (FY16)	Transportation (FY16)	Total for FY16	Per Student Cost For 12 Years (Assuming 3% Increase/Year)	Transportation Cost for 12 Years (Assuming 3% Increase/Year)	Total Cost for 12 Years
Compass (Birch Meadow, Coolidge, High School)	\$31,229	\$1,400	\$32,629	\$443,209	\$19,869	\$463,078
Private Day-Melmark	\$81,784	\$10,800	\$92,584	\$1,160,687	\$153,274	\$1,313,961
SEEM-Public Collaborative	\$38,800	\$10,800	\$49,600	\$550,651	\$153,274	\$703,925

Table 5-Cost Analysis of Students Indistrict vs. Out of District for students with Learning Language Disability

Program	Per Student Cost (FY16)	In district Transportation (FY16)	Total for FY16	Per Student Cost For 7 Years (Assuming 3% Increase/Year)	Transportation Cost for 7 Years (Assuming 3% Increase/Year)	Total Cost for 7 Years
Bridge Program (Eaton, Parker, RMHS)	\$17,472	\$1,400	\$18,872	\$133,882	\$10,727	\$144,610
Private Day-Landmark	\$48,440	\$10,800	\$59,240	\$371,170	\$82,755	\$453,924
SEEM-Public Collaborative	\$38,800	\$10,800	\$49,600	\$297,304	\$82,755	\$380,058

Table 6-Resources Needed to Address Challenges and Structural Deficit and How they Align to District Goals

Area	Funding Needed	Addresses Challenge(s)	District Goals
1. Structural Deficit (.7% Budget Increase in FY18)	\$2,000,000	1,2,3,4,5,6	4
2. Salary Adjustments	\$360,000	1,6	4
3. Middle School Health Education	\$140,000	2,6	3
4. High School Program Improvement	\$110,000	2,6	1
5. Additional Supports for Struggling Students (Tutors, BCBA)	\$107,000	2,6	3
6. Maintain School Transformation Grant Funded Positions-Grant Funded through FY19 (Data Analyst/Coach, Administrator for Social Emotional Learning)	\$ 0	2,6	3
7. Curriculum Supervision Leadership	\$195,000	3,4,6	1,2
8. Special Education Leadership	\$48,000	1,4	1,2
TOTAL	\$2,960,000		

Challenges

1. Retaining and Attracting Staff
2. Developing well balanced and prepared students for college, career, and life
3. Supporting teachers and administrators as we transition to more rigorous standards and curriculum
4. Continuing to improve our special education services and in district programs
5. Identifying long term space needs to address program changes
6. Remaining comparable and competitive with area schools

District Goals and Priorities

1. **Student Learning**- Improve curriculum and instruction, student support, and assessment
2. **Professional Practice**- Increase the professional learning of all staff and develop teacher leadership
3. **Student Support, Wellness, and Safety**-Strengthen social/emotional and behavioral health
4. **Resources and Space**-Address time, space, and program needs for continuous district improvement
5. **Communication**-Improve communication across the district, with families and the Reading community

Table 7-Projected Budget Shortfall from Level Service Budget for .7% Scenario and -.3% Scenario

FY17 Superintendent Recommended Budget	\$40,697,666	\$40,697,666
Estimated Increase for FY18 Budget	.70%	-.30%
Dollar amount of FY18 Budget Increase	\$284,884	\$-122,093
Estimated Operating Budget for FY18	\$40,982,550	\$40,575,573
Estimated Projected Expenses for FY18 (Increase due to increases in COLA, Special Education Tuition and Transportation, Regular Day Transportation, Decrease in some offsets, Year 2 of Science Curriculum Implementation)	42,932,633	\$42,932,633
Estimated FY18 Budget Shortfall	(\$1,950,083)	(\$2,357,060)