

Superintendent Recommendation	Estimated Cost Savings		Futures Planning Committee Input (percent support for items and considerations for changes to recommendation)		DRAFT
	Low Rate	High Rate	Quantitative Support (yes or no)	Qualitative Considerations – items to consider from individual committee members. Points do not illustrate consensus from committee but attempt to capture items the committee members would like considered when presenting the final recommendation. (SEE BACKSIDE FOR MORE CONSIDERATIONS)	
Increase HS staffing ratio to 30 students	\$3,250,000	\$5,005,000	52% Yes 48% No 33 responses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider classroom size when making this change; High School rooms were built for 27 students, moving to 30 students would create challenges Consider at the HS a ratio of 25-28; the proposed 30 is too high Consider removing or lessening the impact of these items; increasing class ratios will increase stress/workload on teachers Consider implementing a “minimum” class size requirement Consider room space; there must be enough tables/chairs for students 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do not consider a MS staffing ratio increase if a building will be repurposed and 2nd plan time is eliminated Consider implementing staff ratios for electives only – not core classes Consider the increase to 30 students at elementary level, if that is already there, MS and HS should also increase class ratios Consider establishing a class minimum of 10-12 students for class to be offered
Increase MS staffing ratio to 28 students			52% Yes 48% No 33 responses		
Negotiated Item: Eliminate MS 2 nd Plan Time	\$1,300,000	\$1,300,000	67% Yes 33% No 33 responses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider as a negotiated item; LEA must also agree to see cost savings Consider the current inequity that MS teachers have with 2nd Plan time Consider implementing this item if the MS staff ratio is NOT increased Consider implementing this item if a MS is NOT repurposed Consider implementing in 2024/25 – do not implement in 2023/24 Consider the increase of teacher stress that may occur with eliminating item 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider tying this item with the 4-day school week; do NOT implement if the student calendar remains the same (5-day school week) Do not consider this item; teachers value 2nd plan time for students with IEPs Consider this item through a student equity lens – students with IEPs and/or behavioral issues will be impacted greater than other students
Reduction in District Administration	\$127,662 per position	\$127,662 per position	69% Yes 31% No 32 responses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider additional cuts (2-3 positions) in central administration Consider consolidating building administration between buildings Consider tying all staffing to student enrollment (central admin) Consider implementing in 2023/24 school year Consider amount of support needed for buildings; district administration is already spread too thin in the district 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do not consider cutting over 1 position of district administration Consider a tiered salary reduction to administration (10%, or variation of KU Model) Consider a roll-back salary increase to administration (2020-2023 or 2020-2022) Consider evaluating the extra benefits district administration receive Consider eliminating learning coaches in this area Consider administration not receiving a pay increase from the budget reductions
Transition to a 4-Day Student School Week, 5-day Staff Work Week	\$700,000	\$700,000	47% Yes 53% No 32 responses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do not consider for 2023/24 implementation; more research needed to determine impact on student learning outcomes Consider implementing for MS/HS and maintain 5-day week for ES Consider shifting early release to Friday in High School only Consider if implementing, needs to be for ALL students in the district 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider how this will affect paras and kitchen staff Consider this as a tool for staff retention to implement in year 2 Consider negative and positive public input on this item Consider the currently limited childcare and the expanded need for it if a 4-day school week is implemented
Negotiated Item: Reallocate payment to 403(b)	\$1,260,000	\$1,260,000	76% Yes 24% No 33 Responses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider as a negotiated item; LEA must also agree to see cost savings Consider providing other incentives for opting out of health insurance Consider the benefit of providing money upfront to staff/faculty and providing them with the choice 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider implementing in 2023/24 school year Consider offering part-time, non-classified positions to save on benefits Consider how this may impact staff retention issue (low pay and no salary movement)
Savings in Solar Power and/or Renewable Energy	Unknown Savings		87% Yes 13% No 31 Responses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Further investigation needed in practical cost savings of solar energy Consider adopting an energy saving guideline (see USD437) Consider as an item in a long-range plan, not in this budget reduction plan Consider establishing solar planes before roof replacement 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider feasibility of this item; the funds that could be potentially generated do not contribute to our #1 goal (staff salaries) Consider how the district would pay the upfront cost and if it still contributes to enough savings to warrant those costs
Close 1 st Elementary School	\$300,000	\$400,000	84% Yes 16% No 32 Responses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider paired grade centers (K-2, 3-5) instead of school closures Consider K-8 education model Consider adopting formal procedure when reducing building inventory Consider school catchments for smaller schools (create 4-section buildings) Consider a minimum of 12 months notice before closing any buildings to integrate a plan and support students/staff in the transition Consider ways to shape this positively as an opportunity for the district 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> When considering which building(s) are selected, consider other factors beyond numbers (transportation challenges, equity, student safety, staff impact, class size, multi-age) Consider others way to achieve this monetary savings – look to energy efficiency, allowing/marketing LVS, selling ESC, repurposing Kennedy, etc. Consider closing a 3rd elementary school Consider phasing the closing of two Elementary schools (23/24 1st school, 24/25 2nd school) Do not consider schools in lower SES neighborhoods
Close 2 nd Elementary School	\$300,000	\$400,000	76% Yes 24% No 33 Responses		
Repurpose 1 Middle School	\$325,000	\$325,000	84% Yes 16% No 32 Responses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider repurposing as a district-wide magnet school Consider LMCMS as an Art-Based education and language school Do not consider for 2023/24 school year Consider the savings; if we repurpose as a magnet school, the savings will change; The main savings will come from moving the ESC to a vacated MS and selling the ESC Consider repurposing LMCMS as a K-8 school to serve district-wide 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do not consider sending all students from LMCMS to BMMS without increases in staff; BMMS already has challenges with culture and adding students to the building without adequate support is not good Consider repurposing as an Alternative secondary school for students needing further intervention Consider this item with a long-term re-boundary analysis to ensure financial viability and benefits to students in this implementation
Grand Total:	\$7,562,662	\$9,517,662	<p>Note: 1 Quantitative support illustrates total committee support for items from polling questions asked at the final committee meeting. Each question was asked in the same format “I support [inset item]. Yes or No.” Members were told to answer “Yes” if the support the item implemented any time in the future. In the qualitative considerations there is the opportunity to specify when the item should be implemented. 34 members were in attendance at Meeting #9. Some chose not to submit answer to questions.</p> <p>Note 2: Qualitative considerations illustrate what the committee would like noted in reference to each item. They DO NOT illustrate a consensus opinion on each item. Many bullet points contradict other points and convey the differing viewpoints of individual committee members. Bullet points were condensed and summarized from after reviewing all committee member thoughts. The same note may have been notated on multiple handouts, but it will be listed once on this sheet. The recommendation asks board members to consider ALL qualitative feedback equally. Page two includes more qualitative considerations that are not tied the current budget items.</p>		

Other Considerations from Futures Planning Committee (not linked to current items in recommendation):

Facility Considerations:

- Consider relocating ESC to a repurposed facility (Kennedy) and selling current ESC
- Consider including the selling of non-school offices to increase capital costs
- Consider allowing LVS to function as both virtual school, and support for homeschool kids
- Consider the impacts on training and admin workspace if selling ESC
- Consider restructure in the virtual school to be housed under an existing administration
- Consider building flagship elementary school in East Lawrence (pending Panasonic growth)
- Consider changes in the MS systems – more support needed for middle school students and staff
- Consider consolidating New York and the Early childhood Center under one administration
- Consider use of Kennedy building – could this be sold or repurposed
- Consider renovating a closed building to a day care – individual day care providers could rent classrooms to work from
- Consider adding Pre-K to elementary schools to better utilize buildings and sell Pre-K facilities
- Consider expanding Montessori offerings
- Consider closing building 110; currently operating costs estimated of \$226K (FPC member)
- Consider shifting art electives to a designated school
- Consider reviewing the 4-section elementary model and the cost of Montessori

Staff/Student Retention Avenues:

- Consider a new recruitment strategy for students
- Consider allowing employees that do no work 40 hours to shift tasks under other roles to achieve 40 hours and receive benefits in the district
- Consider 10% pay reduction in <\$120K income; this could be restored as enrollment increases in the future
- Consider offering other staff benefits for staying year-to-year
- Consider ways to ensure federal funding follows the student
- Consider ways to grow enrollment to prevent this position 5-10 years out
- Consider staff retention boost if we add support to staff and create easier classrooms

Elective Class Offering Consideration:

- Consider charging a fee for certain electives that are higher cost to the district
- Consider keeping as many electives as possible at high schools (nest AP classes, fall or spring only class options)
- Consider hiring “adjunct” facility for electives
- Consider conducting a review of course catalog to streamline class offerings
- Consider offering different electives at each HS
- Consider collecting input from HS students before reducing electives

Implementation of Items:

- Consider thoughtfully staggering implementation of items to ensure a better long-term plan for the district
- Consider a full-scale boundary analysis for elementary and middle school attendance areas in conjunction with potential school closures
- Consider the timeline of this plan and what items could be phased in over years; there are challenges to implementing items for administration, staff, and students by next year

Board Process/Objectives/Committee Process:

- Consider the impact on quality of education and teacher working conditions a \$9 million cut will do; a pay-raise may not be worth it the serious impacts it will cause
- Consider the importance of timeline and well vetted implemented plans – Not all of the items need to be year 1; a long-term solution is a better choice
- Consider committee concern with process and decision-making process; many feel as if this was a multiple-choice test with administration providing the choice rather than a cooperative, solution seeking work
- Consider the root of this problem – will the cuts presented address the larger issue?

Misc.:

- Consider increasing fees for parking passes and extra-curricular sports
- Consider removing multi-age classrooms and the elementary staffing ratios set in 2021/22
- Consider restructure (cuts) in learning coaches and curriculum specialists
- Consider adjusting transportation requirements for elementary schools in lieu of school closures
- Consider pairing secondary building administration with a lower enrolling elementary school (example: LHS and Woodlawn Elementary)