

**FAIRBANKS NORTH STAR BOROUGH SCHOOL DISTRICT
BOARD OF EDUCATION**

March 7, 2016

**Work Session: 2016-17 Budget Work,
Including the Citizen Budget Review Committee (CBRC) Report**

6:00 p.m.

Board Room
Administrative Center
520 Fifth Avenue

AGENDA

1. Call to Order

- 2. OUR MISSION:** *Our mission is to provide an excellent, equitable education in a safe, supportive environment so all students will succeed and contribute to a diverse and changing society.*

3. Roll Call

Heidi Haas, President
Lisa Gentry, Vice President
Allyson Lambert, Treasurer
Michael O'Brien, Clerk
Wendy Dominique, Member
Sue Hull, Member
Sean Rice, Member
Kobe Rizk, Student Representative
Richard Cole, Base Representative
Sean Williams, Post Representative

4. 2016-17 Proposed Budget Work

- **CBRC Report**

5. Board Comments/Announcements

6. Adjournment

Executive Session: The board reserves the right to enter into executive session on any agenda item as and to the extent allowed for in State law. Executive sessions will be entered into by motion for the following subjects as permitted by law: (1) matters the immediate knowledge of which would clearly have an adverse effect upon the finances of the District; (2) subjects that tend to prejudice the reputation and character of any person, provided that the person may request a public discussion; (3) matters which by law, municipal charter, or ordinance are required to be confidential; (4) matters involving consideration of government records that by law are not subject to public disclosure. Motions to go into executive session should specify the subject of the proposed executive session without defeating the purpose of addressing the subject in private. Reference: AS 44.62.310 and Board Policy 264, D.

Work Sessions are an opportunity to study and review, in-depth, matters that may be too lengthy for a regular or special meeting. No action may be taken at a work session. All work sessions, special, and regular meetings are open to the public.

This page left
intentionally blank.

FAIRBANKS NORTH STAR BOROUGH SCHOOL DISTRICT (FNSBSD)
BOARD OF EDUCATION

Citizens' Budget Review Committee (CBRC)

Report to the Board of Education for the 2016-2017 Proposed Budget

March 2016

This year marks the thirty-second year of citizen participation in the Fairbanks North Star Borough School District budget review process.

The Citizens' Budget Review Committee consisted of two School Board Members, Allyson Lambert, Chair, and Heidi Haas. The following committee members wish to express their appreciation for the opportunity to comment directly to the Board of Education:

Citizen Members:

Joe Hayes
Noelle Hohnecker
Tammy Dauma
Christopher Dean
(vacant)
Charlotte Larue
Becky Williams
Dawson Mann

Appointed by:

Wendy Dominique
Colonel Richard Cole
Colonel Sean Williams
Lisa Gentry
Sean Rice
Michael O'Brien
Sue Hull
Regional Student Council Representative

The committee has a wide range of experience. Becky Williams and Tammy Dauma returned to complete their fourth year; Noelle Hohnecker and Christopher Dean completed their second year and Dawson Mann, Charlotte Larue and Joe Hayes served their first year on the committee.

The 2016-2017 CBRC met six (6) times during the months of October and November 2015, prior to the development of the 2016-17 proposed budget, in order to offer suggestions for the superintendent and district administration to consider during the budget development cycle for the upcoming school year. These meetings resulted in a schedule of priorities that were presented to the school board on November 16th. This CBRC reconvened in February, 2016, for another 4 meetings to evaluate the administration's proposed budget for 2016-2017, to include assessing the reasonableness of the revenue level assumptions, and to examine the level of expenditures planned for the upcoming school year across all operating fund program areas.

This report presents some specific recommendations with regard to the administrations FY 2016-2017 proposed budget, developed over the course of the additional four CBRC meetings held during the month of February, 2016.

Revenue Assumptions & Suggestions

Revenue assumptions comprise an essential component of CBRC review. District administration makes an educated estimate each year as to how much revenue will materialize for next year's operations. Anticipated program expenditures are then matched against the level of projected revenues in order to present a balanced budget.

At this stage of the budget development process, due to the timing of local assembly and state legislative appropriation actions, the true revenue picture is never 100% certain. The range of possible revenue scenarios can fluctuate by millions of dollars.

Revenue projections that are either too high or too low create an unstable environment which ultimately negatively impacts our students. The committee was concerned about making revenue recommendations that were both reasonable and defensible.

The administration's projected operating fund revenues anticipate an increase of approximately \$3.5m based on a slight increase in projected enrollment and an increase of \$50.00 to the Base Student Allocation (BSA) set forth in the Governor's proposed budget, (from the current level of \$5,880 to \$5,930).

The financial crisis facing the state makes it difficult for this committee to imagine this \$50 increase will remain in place until the end of this legislative session. However, we understand why both the Governor and district administration included this increase in their proposed budgets: legislative action in prior years provided for it, and the Governor included it – thus, it's not an unreasonable starting point for the first district administration's proposal. Nonetheless, provisions should be made in the event anticipated revenues fail to materialize, a topic to be addressed later in this report.

The FY16-17 proposed budget includes a status quo local contribution amount of \$55.3m. Again, the committee feels this is not an unreasonable expectation, for the FNSB Assembly has historically been very supportive of the district. It remains to be seen what financial impact the crisis facing the state will have on local communities, **but the committee again would like to suggest the district request the Borough Assembly waive the \$800,000 annual lapsing of fund balance in support of the district's operating budget for fiscal year 2016-17.**

As recommended last year, the committee again recommends that district administration continue to work with the Borough to amend code language that permanently addresses the lapse of school district funds. We are hopeful that a compromise can be reached that meets everyone's needs. While the committee appreciates the Borough Assembly's commitment to maintain school facilities, current language ultimately reduces critical operational dollars in the classroom and does not take into account unique situations regarding categorical funding and foundation funding offsets. The committee believes that current language discourages prudent saving of year end funds and the re-allocation of those funds in support of classrooms in the next budget year.

Depending upon what happens at the state level, this committee may further recommend the Board request additional local contribution amounts from the FNSB Assembly, in order to avoid significant degradation to the local community educational program. The committee understands, conceivably, there is room in the foundation formula for the local community to contribute close to an additional \$9m more towards education, before hitting the 100% threshold of the formula. The committee also understands other local governments already contribute 100% of what is allowed by the foundation formula.

CBRC Proposed Budget Changes Regardless of Funding:

The CBRC strongly supports the ongoing efforts of the Board and administration to maintain class size as this impacts the majority of students and lends to greater achievement. Long discussions were had on how to maintain and/or decrease current class sizes.

Our number one priority is to maintain or improve class sizes, especially in the lower grade (Grades 1-4) levels. Low class sizes have the greatest potential for the maximum effect on increasing student achievement. Therefore:

The committee recommends the Board re-evaluate class sizes across all grade levels, with the specific goal of decreasing PTR in grades 1 – 4. In other words, consider increasing class size targets at certain higher grade levels, in order to find the funds necessary to lower the class size targets in grades 1 – 4, ultimately resulting in a “net zero dollar impact” to the total budget.

The CBRC makes the following recommendations and would like to point out that these items are not listed in any particular order:

- Increase support for underperforming students at non-Title I schools.
- Empower school principals to allocate their staff to best fit the needs of their local school community.
- Restructure the Special Education Department in order to provide one full-time Extended Learning Program (ELP) teacher to each elementary school. The ELP is part of the Special Education Department and has not had an increase in years.
- Continue to support student enrichment through art, music and activities.

CBRC Proposed Budget Changes in the event of decreased funding:

Due to the uncertainty associated with the projected revenue level, the committee recommends the following adjustments:

- Decrease the proposed budgets by 2.5% in the following departments
 - Technology
- Decrease the proposed budgets by 5% in the following departments:
 - Administrative Services
 - Human Resources
 - Special Education, through restructuring
 - Instruction and Supervision

- Decrease the proposed budgets by 10% in the following departments
 - Board of Education
 - Travel

- Increase efficiencies throughout the district. For example,
 - Renegotiate officiating contracts
 - Renegotiating Ice contracts/facility agreements
 - Manage Overtime expenses-look for more efficient work schedule structure

Sustaining a variety of educational programs is also of serious concern.

Additional Comments to the School Board:

The CBRC held many conversations that we felt were important to the overall operations of our district. Although as a committee we believe the administration has done a good job at utilizing staff, programs and funds, we believe that continual evaluations of each program or department are crucial to the student and financial success of our district.

The committee strongly agrees that class size is the priority despite funding -uncertainty.

The committee understands that additional areas may not be addressed prior to this budget cycle but would like to encourage additional evaluations be made before the next budget cycle.

Closing comments:

The CBRC operates on an on-going basis. We will continue to perform a thorough review of district efforts to achieve student success as well as management and operational efficiencies. Our goal is to provide more specific recommendations for the Board's consideration during future budget cycles and validate the effective use of taxpayer resources needed to maintain the high level of service and dedication to our students. With the adoption of the Strategic plan, the committee is eager to assist the administration and board in laying the framework for this longer term plan that will lessen the burden/impact as we move forward.

The CBRC is hopeful that, with community support and advocacy, the funding level for education in the Governor's Proposed Budget will be supported by the legislature and the Borough will fund at status quo level. Additionally, we are hopeful that the Borough will once again waive the lapse funds

The CBRC would like to thank the administration and staff for their support and assistance throughout our budget discussions. The CBRC thanks the Board of Education and the Administration for allowing its members to contribute to the upcoming budget formation prior to its issuance.

Thank you for your time in reading this committee report. We hope you will find the recommendations useful.

Respectfully Submitted,

For the members of the 2016-2017 Citizens' Budget Review Committee

Board of Education FY15-16 Approved-Revised Budget Adjustments

Presented by Program

<u>Classroom Instruction</u>	<u>FTE</u>	<u>2015-16 Adjustment</u>	<u>% Change 2014-15</u>
	(21.5)	(\$2,635,950)	
Enrollment	(11.5)		-1.11%
Reduction	(10.0)		-1.17%
<u>Elementary Response to Intervention (RTI)</u>	(0.5)	(265,284.0)	-13.42%
<u>Student Activities</u>	0.0	(\$241,292)	-8.47%
<u>Administrative Center/Districtwide Instruction</u>	(4.5)	(\$3,854,127)	-9.68%
<u>Charter Schools</u>	1.0	(\$301,315)	-3.79%
<u>Human Resources Department</u>	4.0	\$68,848	3.82%
<u>Non-Departmental</u>	0.0	(\$100,000)	-23.40%
<u>Special Education Instruction</u>	(1.4)	(\$224,259)	-0.54%
<u>Student Support Services</u>	(16.5)	(\$1,121,541)	-3.36%
TOTAL BUDGET ADJUSTMENT	(39.4)	(8,674,920)	-3.53%

Overview of 2016-17 Proposed Budget Adjustments

<u>Personnel</u>	<u>Position</u>	<u>FTE</u>		
Elementary	SP Teacher - Regular Ed (Due to Increase Enrollment)	6.00	\$	672,552
Middle School	SP Teacher - Regular Ed (Due to Increase Enrollment)	2.50	\$	280,230
Jr/Sr High School	SP Teacher -Regular Ed (Due to Increase Enrollment)	0.50	\$	56,046
Senior High	SP Teacher - Regular Ed (Due to Increase Enrollment)	1.00	\$	112,092
	Teacher (Prior Year FTE True Up to detail)	0.50	\$	-
Facilities Management	Roving Custodian (Prior Year FTE True Up and grade corrections)	1.00	\$	(53,317)
	Weekend Coverage – Building Rentals	4.00	\$	271,416
	Project & Grounds Manager	-1.00	\$	(159,329)
Human Resources	SP Assistant Benefit Specialist - ADAAA/FMLA	1.00	\$	96,445
Instruction & Supervision	RTI Teacher - Transition Facilitator	-6.00	\$	(672,552)
Personalized Learning	Behavior Intervention Aid - SMART	-1.00	\$	(49,154)
	Teacher – SMART	0.50	\$	56,046
	SP Teacher – eLearning Labs	5.00	\$	560,460
	Teacher – Golden Heart Academy (Decrease Enrollment)	-1.00	\$	(112,092)
Special Education	Crisis Prevention Intervention (CPI) Trainer (HB44)	1.00	\$	50,657
Teaching, Learning & Prof Dev	SP Instructional Technology Teacher	-2.00	\$	(224,184)
Technology	SP Network Manager	1.00	\$	106,275
	SP School Technology Specialist	6.00	\$	436,530
			Personnel Adjustments	<u>19.00</u>
				<u>\$ 1,428,121</u>
 <u>Non-Personnel</u>				
Districtwide Benefits	Increase Health Insurance contribution rate by 2%		\$	2,000,000
Personalized Learning	Reduction due to online classes subscription		\$	(175,000)
Special Education	Increase Purchased Services for CPI Training (HB44) Year 1 of 2		\$	226,000
Facilities Management	Utility Reduction		\$	(290,000)
Non-Departmental	Transfer to Student Transportation Fund		\$	1,500,000
			Non-Personnel Adjustments	<u>\$ 3,261,000</u>
			OVERALL ADJUSTMENT	<u>\$ 4,689,121</u>

* Note -Attributed to Strategic Plan

<i>Less Transfer to Student Transportation Fund</i>	\$	(1,500,000)
<i>Less Increase Health Insurance contribution rate by 2%</i>	\$	(2,000,000)
<i>Less cost of 10 certified FTE Due to Increase Enrollment</i>	\$	(1,120,920)
<i>Clarification of all other changes result from reallocation of resources</i>	\$	68,201

Adjustments to 2016-17 Proposed Budget

Salary & Benefit Obligations

(\$2,270,000)

Presented by Program

		FTE		
<u>Response to Intervention (RTI)</u>	RTI Assistants vacancies	(2.0)	\$	(87,420)
<u>Special Education</u>	Eliminate Crisis Prevention Intervention (CPI) Trainer (HB44)	(1.0)	\$	(50,657)
	Decrease Purchased Services for CPI Training (HB44) Year 1 of 2		\$	(226,000)
	Teacher - Mentor	(1.0)	\$	(112,000)
<u>Administrative Center</u>	Eliminate VOIP upgrade equipment		\$	(128,000)
<u>Facilities Management Department</u>	Utility adjustment		\$	(483,374)
<u>Charter Schools</u>	Reduce funding level		\$	(100,000)
<u>District Wide</u>	Reduce non-personnel 10%		\$	(1,100,000)
		(4.0)	\$	(2,287,451)
			\$	(2,287,451)

<i>Program</i>	<i>Reduction</i>	
	<u>FTE</u>	<u>Overall</u>
<i>Instruction</i>		
<i>Student Support Services</i>		
<i>RTI -K-8 Interventions</i>	(2.0)	-9.52%
<i>Special Education</i>	(2.0)	-0.52%
<i>Facilities Management</i>		
<i>Administrative Center</i>		
<i>Student Activities</i>		

Reductions to 2016-17 Proposed Budget

Level 1 Reduction -\$50 to BSA (\$5930- \$50 = \$5880)

(\$1,043,501)

Presented by Program

		<u>FTE</u>		
<u>Response to Intervention (RTI)</u>	RTI Coordinator - Cut to 10 months		\$	(13,450)
<u>Student Activities</u>	Eliminate Elementary SAS & SDA		\$	(206,620)
	Reduce MS/Jr. High Activities - 40% Reduction to SAS & SDA		\$	(100,364)
	HS Activities: Outsource hockey, swim, xc skiing, cheer, wrestling, gymnastics		\$	(260,000)
	Federal Programs student travel		\$	(20,385)
			<hr/>	<hr/>
			\$	(587,369)
<u>Student Support Services</u>	Eliminate Teen Option program	(3.0)	\$	(140,450)
	Prevention Intervention Specialist - Hutchison	(1.0)	\$	(73,150)
	Safe & Healthy Students Coordinator - Cut to 10 months		\$	(16,282)
		<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
		(4.0)	\$	(229,882)
<u>Teaching, Learning & Prof Dev</u>	Reduce Curriculum Materials		\$	(213,000)
	Personnel Adjustments			
		<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
		(4.0)	\$	(1,043,701)
			<hr/>	<hr/>
			\$	(1,043,701)

<i>Program</i>	<i>Cumulative</i>	
	<u>FTE</u>	<u>Overall</u>
<i>Instruction</i>		
<i>Student Support Services</i>	(4.0)	-4.66%
<i>RTI -K-8 Interventions</i>	(2.0)	-9.52%
<i>Special Education</i>	(2.0)	-0.52%
<i>Facilities Management</i>		
<i>Administrative Center</i>		
<i>Student Activities</i>		

Reductions to 2016-17 Proposed Budget

Level 2 Reduction -5% to FY16 BSA (\$5586)

(\$8,970,316)

Presented by Program

	FTE	
<u>Instruction</u>		
Class Size Adjustment K +0.0 to 22.5	0.0	\$ -
Class Size Adjustment 1-3 +0.5 to 24.5	(4.0)	\$ (448,368)
Class Size Adjustment 4-6 +0.5 to 26.5	(4.0)	\$ (448,368)
Class Size Adjustment 7-8 +1.0 to 27.5	(3.5)	\$ (392,322)
Class Size Adjustment 9-12 +2.5 to 31.0	(11.5)	\$ (1,289,058)
Teacher - Barnette Supplemental (reduce 50%)	(1.0)	\$ (112,000)
Teacher - Career & Technical Education - CTE	(1.0)	\$ (112,000)
Teacher - Elementary 4th Grade Instrumental	(2.0)	\$ (224,000)
Teacher - DW Art (1 coordinator remains)	(3.0)	\$ (336,000)
	(30.0)	\$ (3,362,116)
<u>Response to Intervention (RTI)</u>		
RTI Assistants	(18.0)	\$ (786,780)
<u>Student Activities</u>		
Reduce High School Activities - 10% Reduction to SAS & SDA		\$ (105,000)
<u>Administrative Center</u>		
Reduce Communications Coordinator	(0.5)	\$ (59,210)
Reduce Grants/Policy Coordinator	(0.5)	\$ (62,970)
Assistant Accounting Clerk	(1.0)	\$ (69,000)
Purchasing Clerk	(1.0)	\$ (85,000)
Technology Engineer	(1.0)	\$ (106,000)
Eliminate hard drives for teacher laptops (would not be repurposed to students)		\$ (110,000)
	(4.0)	\$ (492,180)
<u>Teaching, Learning & Prof Dev</u>		
Reduce Curriculum Materials		\$ (250,000)
MAP Testing grades (reduce from grades 3-10 to 5,7,9 only)		\$ (110,000)
		\$ (360,000)
<u>Facilities Management Department</u>		
Carpenter	(1.0)	\$ (112,200)
Electronic Technician	(1.0)	\$ (112,200)
Wire Crew - term position	(1.0)	\$ (40,000)
	(3.0)	\$ (264,400)
<u>Charter Schools</u>		
Reduce funding level		\$ (575,000)
<u>Human Resources (HR) Department</u>		
Benefits Assistant	(1.0)	\$ (96,450)
<u>Special Education</u>		
Secretary	(1.0)	\$ (49,500)
Teacher - Mentor	(1.0)	\$ (112,000)
	(2.0)	\$ (161,500)
<u>Student Support Services</u>		
School Technology Specialists	(6.0)	\$ (557,300)
Reduce Library Assistants (4MS, 3HS - WV, LA, NP)	(7.0)	\$ (370,000)
Eliminate SMART Program	(4.0)	\$ (306,148)
Secretary - Barnette Supplemental (reduce 50%)	(0.5)	\$ (58,510)
Swimming Aide (RYN)	(1.0)	\$ (55,600)
Reduce Extended contracts for counselors & librarians		\$ (75,000)
Department Heads		\$ (250,000)
	(18.5)	\$ (1,724,558.0)
Level 2 Reductions	(76.5)	\$ (7,927,984)
Level 1 Reductions	(4.0)	\$ (1,043,701)
Proposed Budget Adjustment	(4.0)	(84.5)
	(84.5)	\$ (8,971,685)

<i>Program</i>	<i>Cumulative FTE</i>	<i>Overall</i>
<i>Instruction</i>	<i>(30.0)</i>	<i>-3.22%</i>
<i>Student Support Services</i>	<i>(22.5)</i>	<i>-26.19%</i>
<i>RTI -K-8 Interventions</i>	<i>(20.0)</i>	<i>-95.24%</i>
<i>Special Education</i>	<i>(4.0)</i>	<i>-1.05%</i>
<i>Facilities Management</i>	<i>(3.0)</i>	<i>-1.71%</i>
<i>Administrative Center</i>	<i>(5.0)</i>	<i>-5.29%</i>
<i>Student Activities</i>		<i>0.00%</i>

Reductions to 2016-17 Proposed Budget

Level 3 Reduction -10% to FY16 BSA (\$5292)

(\$16,376,483)

Revised 3-3-16

Presented by Program

	FTE		
<u>Instruction</u>			
Class Size Adjustment K +0.0 to 22.5	0.0	\$	-
Class Size Adjustment 1-3 +1.0 to 25.0	(4.0)	\$	(448,368)
Class Size Adjustment 4-6 +1.5 to 27.5	(4.0)	\$	(448,368)
Class Size Adjustment 7-8 +2.5 to 29.0	(4.5)	\$	(504,414)
Class Size Adjustment 9-12 +3.0 to 31.5	(2.5)	\$	(280,230)
Teacher - Career & Technical Education - CTE	(1.0)	\$	(112,000)
Teacher - Elementary 5th & 6th Grade Instrumental	(8.5)	\$	(952,000)
Teacher - eLearning Labs	(5.0)	\$	(560,000)
	(29.5)	\$	(3,305,380)
<u>Response to Intervention (RTI)</u>			
RTI Coordinator	(1.0)	\$	(68,000)
RTI Non-Personnel		\$	(175,000)
Eliminate AIMS Web K-2		\$	(22,380)
	(1.0)	\$	(265,380)
<u>Student Activities</u>			
Eliminate MS/Jr. High SAS & SDA		\$	(150,546)
Activities Coordinators (1 remaining DW Coordinator)	(2.5)	\$	(280,000)
	(2.5)	\$	(430,546)
<u>Administrative Center</u>			
Eliminate Communications Coordinator	(0.5)	\$	(59,210)
Warehouse Person I	(1.0)	\$	(81,870)
AP/Fixed Asset Accountant	(1.0)	\$	(124,800)
ITT-Instructional Technology Teachers (1 remaining for inst design)	(2.0)	\$	(224,000)
Director of Personalized Learning	(1.0)	\$	(169,400)
Director of Business Services	(1.0)	\$	(160,800)
Computer Technician	(1.0)	\$	(96,465)
Technology Admin Secretary	(1.0)	\$	(86,700)
	(8.5)	\$	(1,003,245)
<u>Charter Schools</u>			
Reduce funding level		\$	(100,000)
<u>Teaching, Learning & Prof Dev</u>			
Reduce Curriculum Materials		\$	(215,000)
<u>Facilities Management Department</u>			
12 Month Custodians	(2.0)	\$	(135,708)
<u>Human Resources (HR) Department</u>			
Sr Human Resource Assistant I	(1.0)	\$	(82,400)
<u>Special Education</u>			
Program Cuts TBD		\$	(500,000)
<u>Student Support Services</u>			
Behavior Aides	(18.0)	\$	(884,790)
Prevention Intervention Specialists (3HS - WV, LA, NP)	(3.0)	\$	(219,440)
Assistant Principal (RSMS)	(1.0)	\$	(142,125)
eLearning Labs Chromebooks		\$	(53,660)
ELL Secretary - Cut to 10 months		\$	(7,000)
ELL Equipment		\$	(9,500)
	(22.0)	\$	(1,316,515.0)
Level 3 Reductions	(66.5)	\$	(7,254,174)
Level 2 Reductions	(76.5)	\$	(7,927,984)
Level 1 Reductions	(4.0)	\$	(1,043,701)
Proposed Budget Adjustment	(4.0)	\$	-
	(151.0)	\$	(16,225,859)
	\$	(16,225,859)	

Program	Cumulative FTE	Overall
Instruction	(59.5)	-6.39%
Student Support Services	(44.5)	-51.80%
RTI -K-8 Interventions	(21.0)	-100.00%
Special Education	(4.0)	-1.05%
Facilities Management	(5.0)	-2.84%
Administrative Center	(14.5)	-15.34%
Student Activities	(2.5)	-71.43%

CSR Summary of Research

Assumptions About Class Size Reduction

- Higher morale and less teacher stress
- Reduced teacher workloads
- More individualized attention for students
- Increased student and teacher interaction/ communication
- Higher levels of student participation
- More time on task or greater opportunity to learn
- Lower student retention rates
- Increased parent and teacher interaction/communication

Summary of Findings

While individual studies have not offered conclusive evidence, the entire range of studies suggests a number of general conclusions about the effects of smaller classes on student performance:

- Small classes in the primary grades offer particular academic and behavioral advantages to minority and low-income students whose gains increase the longer they are exposed to smaller classes
- Academic gains from small classes in the primary grades are larger when class size is reduced to **fewer than 15** students
- The greatest effects recorded were for class size **reductions of 7-8 students per class**
- When making modifications to class size, small increments are unlikely to lead to substantial shifts in student achievement patterns. Changes in the average class size – modifying class loads by one or two students in a given direction – do not seem to lead to significant improvements or detriments to student achievement in most analyses of class size manipulations.
- Academic gains from small classes in the primary grades are retained when students return to standard-size classes in the upper grades and the gains continue through middle school and high school
- Evidence of academic improvement from smaller classes in middle school and high school has been inconclusive
- Any changes in class size policies should be accompanied by steps to maintain or improve teacher quality

Evidence-Based Alternatives to CSR

What the studies don't agree on is whether or not CSR is more or less effective than other strategies. Other evidence-based reforms with potentially equal or greater impact on student outcomes than CSR include:

- Allowing some students to arrive an hour early and others to remain an hour later to enable small group instruction
- One-to-one or small group tutoring on a "pull out" basis
- Early childhood programs involving developmental child care and established preschool models
- Whole school reform programs such as Success for All and Accelerated Schools
- Improvements to teacher quality
- Restructure of teacher preparation programs

Recommendations

Carefully weigh the efficacy of a class-size-reduction policy against other potential uses of funds. Lower class size may or may not prove the more cost-effective policy overall. If possible, class size reduction should be targeted toward the populations for which it is known to work best. The academic effects seem to be largest when introduced in the earliest grades, and for students from less advantaged family backgrounds. **They may also be largest in classrooms of teachers who are less well prepared and effective in the classroom.**

- Prioritize smaller class sizes for the populations that have been shown to reap the most benefits: early grades and low-income minority student.
- Focus CSR on **low-achieving schools**.
- Allow class size **flexibility** to accommodate the different needs of each school so that class size is lower for low income students and higher for more affluent students.
- **Allow smaller classes for beginning teachers and larger classes for experienced teachers.**
- Focus on establishing smaller classes in **kindergarten and first grade**.

HR Staffing Comparison Chart

Organization	HR Staff	Benefited employees	Non-benefited employees	Total number employees	Processing Stats <i>(availability of stats varied; most sites reported either FY14 or FY15; some were only able to provide current caseload numbers; some don't track at all)</i>			Additional comments	HR staff to employees ratio
					FMLA	ADAAA	Vacancies		
FNSBSD	18 (17.5 FTE)	1930	1102	3032	151	32	496	Student discipline = 0.25 FTE - 0.5 FTE depending on caseload (student discipline is not an HR function, but currently housed in HR)	168
University of Alaska Fairbanks	22	2192	1941	4133	120	17	Current open = 27	UAF/UAA/UAS campuses are supported by nine HR staff from UA statewide	188
Fairbanks Memorial Hospital	10	1255	89	1344	N/A	N/A	43	FMH said they cannot share FMLA/ADAAA stats	134
Kinross - Fort Knox Gold Mine	5	670	(Uses temp agencies)	670	N/A	N/A	Current open = 12		134
Doyon Limited	24	1783	90	1873	N/A	N/A	507	Company is broken out into four companies and a service center, each with its own HR staff	78
Anchorage SD	35	5817	568	6385	720	64	1972		182
Juneau SD	5	714	78	792	49	4	539		158
Mat-Su BSD ^{1,2,3}	8	2348	1508	3856	75	N/A	709		482
Kenai Peninsula BSD	7	1210	126	1336	82	22	420		191
									Average: 175
									Industry Standard: 100
		¹ Some functions, to include benefits and FMLA, are handled by MatSu's payroll department, which has a staff of 6 (not included in MatSu's HR staffing of 8)							
		² HR staff count does not include EEO officer who also handles ADAAA.							
		³ MatSu count does not include receptionist							