

DRAFT MINUTES

**Greenfield Public Schools
Budget, Finance, & Negotiations**

Date: 5/2/2016

Time: 4-6 pm

Location: Davis St.

Attendees:

Members: Hollins 4:05 arrive

Admin:

**Donna Woodcock (DW) (5:15 departure), Karen Patenaud (KP) (5:15 departure),
Howie Barber (HB) (5:35 departure), Jordana Harper (JH) (5:20 departure)**

Supporting Documents Received:

Last meeting minutes

GHS Daily Block Schedule

Draft MOU from High School

Call to order:

4:11

Agenda Items:

1. Public Comment--none

2. GHS Block Schedule Proposal Update: Discussion follows up April presentation to school committee by the GHS Leadership Team. Need to pursue “tweaking” negotiated details in the 2016-2019 Teacher Contract, Article V: *Teacher Work Year–Teacher Work Day, Sect B.1. a.*

“Each high school teacher will have a daily professional period equal to the length of a regular class period provided that school is in session for a full day and the normal student schedule is being followed.”

Currently, the 7-period day has 45 minute periods so each teacher has a 45-minute planning period. With 90-minute periods Monday through Thursday and short periods on Friday, how will Article V, B.1.a. be implemented?

Other details.

1. Period 5 is a shorter period currently and also with the proposed change. For approx. 5 teachers there will be a difference period 5. (covered under V.B.c.)
2. Each teacher has a 30-minute duty free lunch (Article V, B,1.b).
3. Each teacher has a duty assignment, approx. 30 minutes currently.

At least six (6) different ideas are shared for implementing Article V, B.1.a:

- 1) “Each teacher will have daily planning for at least 56 minutes.”

Adding one 30-minute duty time daily will equal one new 90-minute period.

- Concern about changing current negotiated apportionment of time for teaching vs planning $56 \times 5 = 280$ min/week vs. current $45 \times 5 = 225$ min/week; 56 min/day $\times 5$ days adds nearly an hour more of planning time/week vs. 2 min more teaching time.
 - Fridays has a different schedule and the 56 min would not fit.
 - Concern to keep integrity of currently-negotiated contract provisions.
- 2) "Each teacher will have 56 minutes of planning Monday through Thursday but not Friday.
- 56×4 days (M-TH) = 224 min/week so this matches the current contract.
 - Will teachers agree to longer planning periods $4 \times$ week but no planning period on Friday?
- 3) "Each teacher will have 90 minutes of planning $2 \times$ week and 30 - 45 /min on Friday."
- Article V, B.1.a mentions "*daily professional period equal to the length of a regular class period*" and with block scheduling the "regular class period" is 90 minutes so this would match.
 - Teachers might like the longer 90 -minute planning period to be able to plan for 2 days.
 - Teachers might not like 90 -minute planning periods $2 \times$ week.
 - If teachers have to differentiate instruction, would the every other day longer planning periods allow for daily individualizing?
 - Friday is still an issue.
 - Would not have to change the contract—just reinterpret for new length of "regular class period."
- 4) "Each teacher will have 56 minutes for planning Monday through Thursday and 30 minutes on Friday."
- Gives teachers more planning time than in current 2016 - 2019 contract (254 (new) vs 225 (current contract)).
 - What happens if the school district reverts back to the 7 -period day and the whole contract is changed to 254 minutes/week planning. Then what?
- 5) Keep current contract wording but add a phrase that the first year of the 2016 - 2019 contract will be a pilot year for modified block scheduling.
- Gives a year to work out what might be lots of small details in how this will work.
 - Teachers probably will not want to make the change with all the training required if it looks like just one pilot year. GHS wants to make the change for the full three-year period of the 2016 - 2019 contract.
 - Can't tell result in one year. Would need 3 years to judge if there is a benefit to learning.
- 6) Keep current contract wording for the 7 -period schedule, adding a phrase to to clarify something like: "When GHS has a 7 -period day schedule, each teacher will have..." and add a new statement that clarifies the block

scheduling option: "When GHS uses modified block scheduling, each teacher will have...."

- Fixes the problem of changing the whole scheduling portion of the contract so that if there is a different decision in some future year, the current arrangement will still be there to use without having to renegotiate what is already in place.

At the end of the discussion, idea #6 seemed the best using the 4 days with longer blocks of planning and Fridays with a shorter block for planning.

Other issues discussed related to the modified block schedule proposal.

1. Q: How receptive are the teachers?

A: Faculty meeting will be voting after seeing MOU and sample schedule. People seem quite favorable. GHS has wanted this for a long time.

2. Q: Training?

A: Yes, teaching for 90-minute blocks of time requires different planning and management skills than teaching for 45-minute blocks of time. We'll need some best-practice training. Will be possible.

3.. Q: Will the schedule change affect any other contracted employees?

A: No.

4.. Q: Special Education...the IEPs are written in a way that will need amending?

A: Yes...approximately 50-60 IEPs will need amending. This is possible but requires a meeting in each instance. IEP reviews take place at the end of the year, usually, so it is possible to complete the amendments. Services would not be changed but the wording of when provided would change. Doesn't interfere with services.

5.. Q: Is there a clear benefit to students with the schedule change?

A: Yes... Extra time to support differentiation, intervention, Restorative practice, build community, college prep, data analysis, focusing on ddms, student growth and learning. DW--believes NEASC's final report will suggest more labs and project learning which is difficult to do in 7 period schedule.

6. Q: Are there any teachers at GHS whose particular assignment will not fit into the new modified block scheduling?

A: No.

7. Q: How many teachers are affected by the 5th period's different time period?

A: About 5.

Discussion summary:

KP to rewrite and send to Jordana and sbcte for review in time for teacher review and vote, adding a sentence for option #6 for modified block scheduling—4 days with 56 minutes of planning and 30 minutes on Friday. Leaving current provision in contract for a 7-period day.

JH-supports sense of urgency. PD to start asap. KP notes some speakers and leadership team already thinking about PD needs, etc.

NT-Teachers are voting on wording? ~~Who is offering this up?~~ Which party to the contract is making the proposal to the other party?

JH- If SC agrees, will present to GEA as tentative MOU to GEA. If majority teacher support.

Discussion on history and proper order of events and who should propose. DW notes the study group and leadership team and teacher involvement in drafting initial language with the MOU. NT-supports new block scheduling. Notes the feeling rushed and that things are out of order. NT suggests the proposal should come through the GEA rather than from the District. SH agrees, proposal is coming from the teachers.

3. FY17 Budget Discussion:

Goal is identifying potential cuts to recommend to sc

Staffing: Are numbers of elementary teachers currently planned in budget needed based on current understanding of elementary enrollment? HB general enrollment data is under evaluation. Says enrollment is back up to 1700. SH requests enrollment report from enrollment office. HB- Gathering data on classes and enrollment. Want to be able to give complete enrollment report.

Following comments about enrollment and AP courses, SH- expresses support for HS electives and not a reduction in electives.

Transportation: HB-Currently compiling listing of potential transportation cuts and reductions. Not saying recommends, but is looking at all factors and policy. Discussion on transport/Capital \$70,000. And potential impact. HB clarification on what is contracted, what is not. Two quotes for one new bus are \$82-83,000. Reviewed one used bus. ~~Now reviewing what is available for used.~~ Notes maintenance and projected repair costs. ~~notes just signed warrants.~~ SH Notes bills in April warrant for extra contracted transport that could have been covered by a GPS big bus. Field Trips, etc. Had asked to have copies to show committee. Asks for an estimate on this reduction. SH guesses 35-50g/year.

Teacher Assistants: Working with Adam on para information.

AN- recalls previous conversation of potential savings for purchase of bus of approx 10,000. SH clarifies there was approx. \$10,000 reduction for transportation coordinator. HB- notes that all would be speculation at this point. Notes operation costs, extra staff, etc. Operational cost min. 35,000, but, could

be higher. Also notes benefits. Notes cost to city. AN- Request a more specific estimate in report that is to come.

HB- possibility of transportation rerouting, notes policy of 1.5 miles 5 and below, and 2m for older. Could drop two routes. Is reviewing this now. Notes school choice and “waving” trans. right. Notes that MSA as choice option and potential to cut to and see option here. NT-Clarification: Question--best way to reduce trans is reducing the transportation offering but keeping within the policy we have? How many would this impact? This is the biggest recommendation for reduction in transportation? NT and SH have concerns about this recommendation.

HB- suggests possible areas of reduction include transportation, sped para reduction, but not reduce staff (teachers).

SH/HB-Lists other reductions identified: extra days for secretaries (needs to be negotiated) \$8g, transportation routes \$153,000, sped about \$30g, Davis custodian (\$12k—HB says already out of budget). HB- Expresses desire to preserve staff and not reduce electives, focus on increase student enrollment.

SH- Notes choice out transport routes that involve other districts busing out GPS students from inside Greenfield. NT- asks about history of bus route issue. SH- recalls sc asking Pioneer not to come and pick, also hazardous conditions if more start driving kids, etc. Notes organizing traffic, police intervention. Farther kids walk, more cars. Concern for safety and weather and proper dress, etc. Regarding proposal to save \$153,000 by making more students walk, NT-Notes potential backlash. SH- doesn't want to make it harder for kids to come to school. Notes climate and current problems at elementary schools with parent cars.

Discussion of other options. Common drop off points?

SH-suggests holding off new positions added to budget, e.g. Building Monitor at prek (\$20,000), notes possible options for funding a nurse leader other than .5 additional nurse budgeted at \$17,000 (-\$10,000), etc.

Sum of potential reductions from today's discussion:

| | | |
|---|----------|----------------------------|
| Hold off add'l sect days | 8,000 | |
| Modify add'l nurse coord plan | \$10,000 | |
| Hold off new bldg. monitor, Prek | \$20,000 | |
| Reduction of 2 teacher aides | \$30,000 | |
| Modify transp coordination | \$10,000 | \$8,000? |
| Modify transp budget to allow for 1 or 2 Medium to full-size buses | \$? | \$10,000 to \$50,000 |
| | | Route changes = \$153,000? |

Dept of Public Health conversation:

AN- Brief report from Public Health Dept. (Nicole Zabko). Community Nursing project is currently being planned as a mobile clinic to serve particular housing areas. The project is considered a “special project”, through the Mayor’s office. Praise and support expressed for current GPS nursing team, and good communication between the departments. Does not support reducing GPS nurses. Suggests addition of floater position.

SH- some history on public nurse. Original idea with city was having more home support outreach at prek which is entry point for many children.

SH- does not want to alarm community about the transportation issue. Suggests speaking with our transportation contractor for possible ways to reduce costs.

Discussion on cost centers. NT notes desire for more knowledge on cost centers.

Goals or Committee Recommendations:

Next regular meeting can continue with providing feedback to Superintendent on potential reductions.

Forthcoming materials for June 6 meeting:

Enrollment information. Actual enrollment report requested.

Summary of suggested changes to Transportation including explicit estimate of budget implication of bus purchase options.

Next Meeting:

May 9, 3:30-6:30 Negotiation Units C and A

Regular meeting:

June 6, 4pm

Adjournment time:

6:13pm