



TONA 2020 Agenda  
March 18, 2014

Groups will have a break out session and begin working on their reports. All completed reports will be submitted to [jnewton@tona.wnyric.org](mailto:jnewton@tona.wnyric.org). If you do not finish your report this evening, then please set up another subcommittee meeting, so you can complete your group project.

1. Program - This group will look at the 2010 facilities report and develop a one page, bullet list of the potential program for a pre k - 5 building. They will also discuss new state requirements that can be interwoven into the program. (Carrie Oliver, Mary Beth Scullion, Bob Starr, Brian Misliwy)
2. Staffing - This group will look at enrollment projections as well as staffing in all bargaining units to see if reductions or savings can be made if the district went to one campus. (Lisa Drmacich, Amy Edgerton, Claudia Panaro, Maureen Zarcone, John McKenna, Paul Maziarz)
3. PRO'S - This group will list advantages of one elementary campus. They will create a one page, bullet list. The 2010 report can be used as well as other resources.. (James Newton, Nancy Grosskopf, Brad Halgash, Larry Badgley, Rita Zirnheld)
4. Finance - This group will look at the financial impact of the project on the community. They will also exam what is needed to make the project tax rate neutral for the taxpayers in the City of Tonawanda. (Richard Hitzges, Alyssa Russell, Brian Opalinski, Diane Misner, Donald Riemer, Dennis Smilinich)

# **A Review of Collaborative Options for Functions and Facilities**

City of Tonawanda &  
Tonawanda City School District

**January, 2009**

While much of the maintenance team's responsibilities are outdoors, it will also address basic non-electrical facility repairs at City facilities, including floors, walls, heaters and minor roof leaks. The City has a contract with Tonawanda-based BCS (Building Controls & Services Inc.) to handle HVAC maintenance and service in its facilities. During 2006 and 2007, the City paid BCS approximately \$100,000 for this service.

One complication of the current bifurcated approach is that there are occasional "grey lines" between responsibilities of custodial and maintenance staff, and inconsistency regarding where responsibilities begin and end. One example illustrates the point: Custodial staff responsibilities are limited to basic cleaning work, while maintenance staff focuses on larger facility and grounds issues. However, at City Hall, custodial staff is responsible for lawn and shoveling work, which are functions carried out by the maintenance team at all other City facilities.

## Conclusions

1. Current service level is adequate to the City's needs.
2. The system is administered out of two different departments, despite the functional similarity between custodial and maintenance services.
3. There is occasional confusion over custodian vs. maintenance responsibilities, even among some City officials.

## What Exists in the School District

The District's maintenance function involves an team assigned to each building, along with a districtwide staff of maintenance personnel that "floats" to facilities on an as needed basis. School principals generally give high marks to the quality of the custodial and maintenance operation.

## Overview

The District's maintenance function is administered by the Director of School Facilities and Operations and structured around individual facilities. Each facility has its own maintenance staff, with personnel numbers driven primarily by building size. The five school facilities have an engineer supervising a team of custodians and cleaners. The High School/Middle School also has a head custodian, given the size of the operation. In addition, the District has a general mechanical/electrical staff that services more specialized needs across District facilities.

**Table 6:**  
District Maintenance Staff  
(Source: TCSD)

Facility	Title	Number of Personnel
Fletcher	Engineer	1
	Custodian	1
	Cleaners	2
Riverview	Engineer	1
	Custodian	1
	Cleaners	2
Mullen	Engineer	1
	Custodian	1
	Cleaners	2
Highland	Engineer	1
	Custodian	1
	Cleaners	2
High/Middle	Engineer	1
	Head Custodian	1
	Custodian	6
	Cleaners	8
Central	Custodian	1
	Cleaners	1
Not Assigned	Maintenance	4
	Mechanic/Electrician	1
<b>Total</b>		<b>39</b>

Individual facilities are maintained by stationary engineers, custodians and cleaners. Staff have a fairly streamlined understanding of the differentiation, much of which is attributed to title descriptions contained in labor contracts.

Engineers are licensed by the state to perform general maintenance on boilers; they will also generally maintain major mechanical equipment related to their facility's operations. The supervising engineer is always present when the building is open, oversees the work of the custodian and cleaning staff, and handles administrative duties such as ordering supplies for the facility. Engineers also carry out lawn mowing, snow shoveling, plumbing and basic boiler responsibilities at each building. To the extent that major boiler repairs are required, the District maintains a private vendor contract.

Custodians and cleaners perform all cleaning responsibilities and maintain the general décor of each facility. This includes sweeping, mopping, washing walls/lockers, dusting and emptying trash. It is important to note that cleaner staff generally perform "lighter" work not requiring climbing or lifting. Further, cleaners perform no work on grounds outside of District facilities. Their responsibilities are strictly inside. Custodians, by contrast, will perform heavier tasks both inside and outside the facility.



The remaining maintenance workers not assigned to a specific facility act essentially as “floats” from building to building as needed. In so doing, they will perform lawn maintenance, furniture moving and storage responsibilities, as well as help with snow removal in the winter months. It is important to note that much as the City’s grounds responsibilities extend to park areas, the District also has large swaths of lawn to maintain at some of its buildings—the High School/Middle School, Riverview and Fletcher, in particular.

**Table 7:**  
School District Maintenance Costs  
(Source: TCSD 2008-09 Budget)

Category	Item	Total Cost
Custodial Services	Support Staff Salaries	\$1,127,602
Custodial Services	Equipment	\$8,810
Custodial Services	Contractual Expenses	\$132,545
Bldgs & Grounds	Supplies and Materials	\$106,550
Operation & Maintenance	Support Staff Salaries*	\$247,084
Operation & Maintenance	Equipment	\$9,000
Operation & Maintenance	Contractual Expenses	\$142,894
Operation & Maintenance	Supplies and Materials	\$55,000
<b>Total</b>		<b>\$1,829,485</b>

\* Includes Director of Facilities

Each school building stores its own supplies. For the most part, custodial and cleaning supplies are purchased off of a standard list. The District’s facilities director has established a standard purchase list for common items, off of which engineers order specific quantities for the year. Engineers and custodians retain some discretion to request specific, non-standard items through the facilities director, but by and large supplies and equipment have been standardized over the past several years. Any capital equipment required—such as lawn mowers or floor scrubbers—must be requested through the facilities director.

In addition to maintaining school facilities and adjacent grounds, the District also maintains Clint Small Stadium. As it is detached from a school facility, the stadium presents unique maintenance and cost challenges. One maintenance staff member is essentially assigned year-round to the facility, and its overall maintenance costs (including salaries) are estimated at \$70-75,000. As a stand-alone facility, the stadium is not eligible for state aid that is otherwise available for certain operating and capital costs in District facilities. More importantly, officials note the stadium’s capital needs—such as bleachers and turf—are significant.

## Conclusions

1. Current service level appears adequate to the District’s needs.

2. A further centralization of the purchasing process can capitalize on economies of scale for common maintenance supplies and equipment, where available. The District has spent approximately two years standardizing its bid list to reduce separate purchasing. It has also created a central warehouse at Central School to further reduce overstocking and ensure shorter lead times for critical supply needs. Notwithstanding these efforts, custodial staff believe the purchasing process could be further streamlined by eliminating what is seen as unnecessary building-level discretion to use specific cleaning products—for example, Murphy’s Oil Soap.
3. While the District’s capital equipment portfolio is generally sufficient to meet everyday needs, it lacks larger pieces of equipment (*e.g.* dump trucks, paving equipment, plows) that the City has for specialized jobs. For example, the District contracted out nearly \$12,000 in 2007 for parking lot striping and paving.
4. Stand-alone football stadium property presents unique challenges and exempts facility from state aid reimbursements.

## Opportunities for Shared Services

As noted, there is already a degree of grounds maintenance sharing in place between the City and District. Certain District programming utilizes City-maintained ball fields, and the City’s Recreation Department uses District-tended soccer fields. Further, there is occasional equipment sharing between the City and District grounds crews. The City and School District also contract to share a fueling station and salt storage facility. And recognizing the capital equipment resource advantage the City has over the District, the City’s Public Works Department provides occasional snow clearing of the “island” areas inside District bus loops. This ensures District students can safely navigate parking lots and entrances without having to deal with “blind spots” caused by snow buildup.

Beyond the existing sharing arrangements, there do not appear significant additional “cost savers” through City/District collaboration on maintenance. Though certain officials suggested having the District take over responsibility for City facility maintenance, based on CGR’s review the savings potential of such a change appears limited at best.

While not significant cost savers, CGR believes there are several opportunities to improve the current maintenance function. As noted in the previous section, CGR recommends the City and School District aggregate their currently separate bid/contract for heating, ventilation and air conditioning work. Further, CGR recommends the City and District consider how even a portion of District waste could be incorporated into



## Conclusions

1. At an annual cost of \$20,000 in computer equipment and \$5,500 in tech support stipend, the function is relatively inexpensive.
2. The City's tech support net is largely informal, staffed exclusively by one person whose primary responsibilities are in another department.
3. With technical support responsibilities vested in one person, the City has no backup. In this individual's absence, the City's technical vulnerability is raised. Further, the possible retirement of the computer administrator in the next 5-to-10 years will force a "change point" on the City, as there does not appear to be sufficient in-house expertise to continue the current informal approach.
4. The City lacks a formalized, proactive capital replacement program, seeking rather to replace equipment as needed when it breaks. At the same time, certain offices are struggling with outdated, obsolete machines and seek better and more modern equipment.
5. The City would benefit greatly from a formalization of its technical support function and improved technical expertise. Further, the building inspector that currently handles network administration already faces substantial workload in his primary function.
6. The decentralized nature of procurement and leasing, especially in terms of copier machines, may be sacrificing some economy of scale that could be realized through better purchasing coordination across departments.

## What Exists in the School District

The School District maintains an expansive technical infrastructure serving classrooms and staff. In addition to its own IT staff, the District contracts with the Board of Cooperative Educational Services for a dedicated IT person to assist in network administration, tech support and hardware/software maintenance.

## Overview

The School District's computer network and related hardware are considerably more expansive than the City's. There are approximately 1,200 stationary computers districtwide, with an additional 440 computers deployed in school buildings on mobile laptop carts that move from classroom to classroom. Each teacher has a desktop computer in his/her

classroom, and all schools have at least one laptop cart. Many classrooms also have TV monitors with capability to show computer video and central video feeds. All end-users in the District work off the Windows XP operating system.

The District's extensive server network is located entirely at the High School and fed by fiber optic cable. There are more than a dozen file, application, Novell and email servers combined. There is a Novell server for the High School / Middle School; a Novell server for the District office; a consolidated Novell server for the elementary schools; elementary and High School library (*i.e.* card catalog and inventory) servers; a district-wide building controls server for heating, ventilation and air conditioning; an email server; application servers for specific programs such as LabVolt and Read180; a bus transportation software server; a dynamic host configuration protocol (DHCP) server; and servers for antivirus, email and the District's telephones. All servers and mainline infrastructure related to phones, Internet and email were migrated to the High School during the last major capital project.

As noted, the District's lines are fiber optic cable. The phone system was installed—and is maintained—by IP Logic; fiber for the phone system is through Choice One. The Central School building on Clinton Street—much of which is leased space—is on the network but on a separate phone system.

The extensive nature of its network and sheer number of users demand the District have a formal technology support operation. Presently, two individuals provide full-time tech support, both network administration and end-user support for individual computers. One is an employee of the District, and the other is an employee of the Erie I Board of Cooperative Educational Services (BOCES). The District contracts directly with BOCES for this position and related technical training at an annual cost of approximately \$260,000. In the 2008-09 District budget, an additional 0.4 full-time equivalent has been added to the tech support operation. District officials note that current technology staffing levels are insufficient to meet ongoing purchases, and options to add staff are under discussion.

The technology support office is located at the High School along with the technology infrastructure hub. Tech support staff are “on call” and will deploy to other buildings within the District as needed, but their home base is at the High School. The number of support calls can become overwhelming at times with turnaround time as high as two days, but the demand for assistance at the end-user level is generally met without noticeable delay. Support staff report that the majority of their work is at the “micro level,” addressing individual computer problems, printer issues, end-user hardware and wireless connectivity, as opposed to major



2008 level of \$22.17 per thousand, school tax rate of \$24.10 and county tax rate of \$7.88; and annual AV growth of 3 percent from a current level of \$129,000. It should be noted that the calculations assess only property tax revenue generated from development of the site; no consideration is given to additional costs that might be borne from adding to the City's population (*e.g.* additional school-aged children attending Tonawanda schools), nor to infrastructure issues that might need to be addressed for any proposed redevelopment of the site.

**Table 11:**  
Property Tax Impact Over 20 Years  
Adding Four Residential Units on Current City Hall Site  
(Source: CGR Calculations)

Year	City	Schools	County	Total	Cumulative Impact
1	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
2	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
3	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
4	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
5	\$12,876	\$13,996	\$4,576	\$31,448	\$31,448
6	\$13,262	\$14,416	\$4,714	\$32,392	\$63,840
7	\$13,660	\$14,849	\$4,855	\$33,363	\$97,204
8	\$14,069	\$15,294	\$5,001	\$34,364	\$131,568
9	\$14,491	\$15,753	\$5,151	\$35,395	\$166,963
10	\$14,926	\$16,226	\$5,305	\$36,457	\$203,420
15	\$17,304	\$18,810	\$6,150	\$42,264	\$402,783
20	\$20,060	\$21,806	\$7,130	\$48,995	\$633,899

*Net present value of City/School property tax impact only  
@ 1% = \$475,831, @ 4% = \$329,012*

Redevelopment of the City Hall site into four residential parcels would produce more than \$600,000 in cumulative property tax revenues over twenty years. The vast majority—over \$540,000—would accrue to the City and School District, with the remainder paid to Erie County. On an annual basis, the additional revenue is worth roughly 0.14 percent of the City's tax levy and 0.13 percent of the District's levy. To the extent the site can accommodate additional residential development, each unit beyond the four assumed in this analysis would increase the twenty-year cumulative total by approximately \$160,000. Similarly, to the extent that assessments rise at 5 percent rather than the 3 percent assumed in the analysis, the cumulative total would increase by \$170,000.

## Creating a Single Elementary “Campus”

One opportunity mentioned repeatedly in CGR's interviews and in previous long-range planning dialogue involves development of a single elementary campus. The concept is consistent with the Long-Range Plan

developed for the District by the Western New York Educational Service Council (WNYESC) in February 2005, and an updated Long-Range Facility Plan produced by Erie I BOCES in April 2008.

Of course, the District has made a substantial investment in the operation of four separate elementary schools. Since the “Tonawanda 2000” initiative, elementary capital upgrades have totaled \$9.4 million for all four elementary schools. Those investments notwithstanding, there is acknowledgment that reorganizing the elementary capital portfolio could produce certain staffing and operational efficiencies. A March 2007 staffing study prepared for the District by WNYESC concluded that “continuing to operate four elementary schools is, from a staffing/cost perspective, inefficient. Two or even a single elementary school, perhaps with a K-2 and 3-5 structure, would lead to reductions in staff without affecting class size ceilings.”

The District already has a living, breathing example of school consolidation. Its High School/Middle School complex combines 6<sup>th</sup> through 12<sup>th</sup> graders in a single facility, enabling certain operational savings that would otherwise be unavailable. The example has proven the District can successfully maintain class sizes and service levels in a single campus, without sacrificing quality.

### ***Cost of an Elementary Campus***

(Costs associated with this option would not necessarily be borne entirely by local taxpayers, due to the availability of state building aid and the expected creation of a capital reserve fund within the District. For more information, see the **Note** on p 38.)

As noted in the 2008 Long-Range Facility Plan, “the school district at present does not have any separate potential site or sites for new schools. However, Fletcher Elementary and Riverview Elementary have adjacent land available for building expansion or new buildings.” As a result, this analysis is based on the assumption that the District would convert an existing elementary school into the consolidated campus, rather than acquiring additional land and building a brand new facility.

While the actual site selected does not necessarily impact the following cost analysis, there are natural benefits to locating at the current Fletcher site. The availability of District property on which to expand the current facility, and the ability of the District to consolidate its facilities portfolio in a single part of the City (across from the High School/Middle School) are primary benefits of the Fletcher site.

The project team estimated the construction costs of a new combined elementary campus at the current Fletcher Elementary site. Estimates



were developed in two parts: First, for rehabilitation to the existing Fletcher facility which would be required for additional build-out, and second, for new construction adding onto the existing Fletcher facility.

Space assumptions were based on accommodating approximately 925 students—roughly 102.5 percent of the current elementary enrollment—plus staff. While certain existing facilities at Fletcher will likely not be suitable to serve the enlarged population, this approach does not anticipate the creation of specific nodes or buildings for distinguishable populations or groups. Rather, it envisions a single large school complex where shared elements can serve the whole population. For example:

- **Gymnasium:** The gym at Fletcher would be too small. One additional gymnasium/locker complex of approximately 2,800 square feet is included in the calculation. The result is two gymnasiums in one complex, versus the current arrangement of four gymnasiums across four schools.
- **Auditorium:** The auditorium at Fletcher would be too small. A new auditorium with capacity of approximately 1,040 would be able to serve full school events. The existing Fletcher auditorium could be retained for smaller events, rehearsals and practices. The result is one large and one small auditorium, vs. the current arrangement of four small auditoriums across four schools.
- **Music and Art:** Instrumental and vocal music programs are likely to grow in proportion to the size of the school, and the spaces in Fletcher, as now configured, are insufficient to handle that capacity. The same logic applies to art instruction. As such, the calculation assumes one additional music suite and one additional art classroom.
- **Cafeteria:** The cafeteria at Fletcher would be too small. Assuming that a single kitchen and food storage area is desirable, a new (or enlarged) cafeteria would be required. The existing cafeteria may be reused for special purposes, such as staff meetings or special programming, or it may be retrofit for educational use.
- **Special Services:** It is likely that space for special services at Fletcher would be insufficient. The calculation assumes an additional 1,100 square feet to support the following special services: Math Intervention, Reading, Resource Room, Speech/Language, Psychologist and Nurse.
- **School Administration:** Administration space at Fletcher would be too small. The calculation assumes an additional 1,000 square feet for the following purposes: Principal, Administrative Assistant, Secretary, Conference Room, Copy Room and Faculty Work/Lunch Room.

Of course, the option exists to demolish Fletcher and design the new complex from scratch. This would eliminate awkward small spaces and



provide a more efficient building—approximately 147,200 square feet—that is less costly to heat and maintain.

**Table 12:**  
Capital Costs for Single Elementary Campus  
(Source: Lewis Childs Architect)

Item	Lower Bound	Upper Bound
<b>Option 1: Demolish and Build</b>		
<b>New Facility</b> (Full elementary population, DNI demolition/asbestos costs)	\$26,700,000	\$32,700,000
<b>Option 2: Augment Existing</b>		
<b>Fletcher Facility</b>		
Rehabilitate Fletcher	\$1,600,000	\$2,300,000
Replacement Spaces (1-for-1)	\$13,800,000	\$16,900,000
Augmented Spaces	\$1,700,000	\$2,100,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$17,100,000</b>	<b>\$21,300,000</b>

Any alternative use of Highland Elementary would, of course, result in the loss of its swimming pool for school purposes. If the District opted to incorporate a pool into an augmented Fletcher facility as part of an elementary campus, the cost is projected to be \$775,000 to \$1,000,000. This is based on the assumption of a 25-meter x 5 lane pool with 3-foot shallow end and deep end for diving, with a 1-meter diving board. The cost projection assumes a 2,250 square foot pre-engineered structure with exterior finishes matching the new construction, and use of the same locker rooms that serve the gymnasium. The building would have moisture resistant interior finishes.

### ***Operational Savings from a Single Campus***

To what extent has the High School/Middle School structure enabled staffing efficiencies? In general, the student:staff ratios for non-teaching staff in the High School/Middle School are considerably better than the elementary schools. This is understandable, since stand-alone elementary schools require their own administrative and operational staff overhead. But it is illustrative of what staffing savings could be realized through a similar consolidated facility for grades PK-5. For example, the student:staff ratio for principals and clerical staff is 48 percent better at the High School/Middle School. It is nearly 300 percent more efficient for nurses and librarians, 200 percent more efficient for music instructors, and more than 100 percent more efficient for physical education teachers.

Using student:staff ratios for administrative personnel—and sf:staff ratios for maintenance/operations personnel—CGR derived the potential staff

savings that could be derived from a consolidated elementary facility. In so doing, CGR determined staffing ratios for each elementary facility and compared the average to current ratios in the High School/Middle School. Staffing ratios were determined *only* for non-grade teaching personnel, under the assumption that the District would choose to maintain current student:teacher ratios for those instructional staff in a new facility. If the District and community were inclined to revisit current student:teacher ratios, certain teaching staff efficiencies could be realized. The 2007 staffing study prepared by WNYESC suggested that closing even one elementary school could enable “2-3 teaching positions, as well as one principal’s position and some support staff positions.” That efficiency could be furthered by shifting to the single elementary campus concept.

The following table shows positions reviewed by CGR where staffing ratios in the elementary schools were below those of the High School/Middle School:

**Table 13:**  
Current Staffing Ratios, Elementaries and HS/MS  
*(Source: TCSD Organizational Charts; CGR Calculations)*

Position	Students:Staff (Elementary Avg)	Students:Staff (HS/MS)
Principal	215	319
Secretary	215	319
Nurse	215	638
Music	215	425
Librarian	215	638
Phys Ed	220	250

  

Position	Sq Feet:Staff (Elementary Avg)	Sq Feet:Staff (HS/MS)
Engineer	49,188	265,650
Cleaner	24,594	33,206

The following table shows the efficiency savings realizable through a consolidated elementary facility that adopted the High School/Middle School staffing ratios for these positions:

**Table 14:**  
Annual Efficiency Savings at Consolidated Elementary Facility  
(Source: CGR Calculations)

Positions	FTE Reduction	Salary Savings	Benefit Savings	Total Savings
Principal	1.3	\$112,333	\$39,317	\$151,649
Secretary	1.3	\$44,330	\$15,516	\$59,846
Nurse	2.7	\$80,107	\$28,037	\$108,144
Music	2.0	\$116,582	\$40,804	\$157,386
Librarian	2.7	\$137,520	\$48,132	\$185,653
Phys Ed	0.5	\$27,539	\$9,639	\$37,178
Engineer	3.3	\$131,650	\$46,077	\$177,727
Cleaner	2.4	\$51,266	\$17,943	\$69,209
<b>Total</b>		<b>\$701,328</b>	<b>\$245,465</b>	<b>\$946,793</b>

Cumulative 15-Year Savings @ 3% annual salary and 5% annual benefit growth \$18,340,721

*Note 1: Benefit savings calculated as 35% of salary savings*

*Note 2: Analysis includes partial positions*

In addition to potential staff efficiencies, a consolidated elementary campus has the potential to impact a variety of other cost centers, including shipping/receiving and pupil transportation. A point-of-service transportation analysis would have to be conducted to quantify the cost/savings impact of moving pupils to and from any consolidated elementary campus.

### ***Enriched Educational Opportunity***

More to the point of enriching educational opportunity, there are natural synergies to be gained from locating a consolidated elementary campus at the current Fletcher site. During the course of CGR's interviews, multiple officials noted the benefits gained from having an elementary facility across the street from the High School/Middle School. One official even referred to the relationship as a "learning laboratory," an example being middle school and high school students writing and reading their own literary works to Fletcher Elementary students. More synergistic opportunities like this would be enabled through an elementary campus at the Fletcher site and a formal partnership between the two schools.

### ***Fiscal Impact of Redeveloping Elementary Schools***

The question of existing facility re-use will accompany any proposal to create a single elementary campus. One idea suggested to CGR during the



course of our interviews is considered in a later section—retrofitting Highland Elementary as a community center, which might enable further facility savings to accrue to the City through a consolidation of the Kohler and Senior Center facilities.

For the purposes of this section and to inform discussions on the productive reuse value of the existing elementary locations, CGR completed a fiscal impact analysis that assumes the facilities at Mullen and Riverview redeveloped as residential property. CGR has applied this assumption for two reasons: First, both school buildings are in a residential area, therefore making residential redevelopment a natural for any reuse plan; and second, CGR was repeatedly told by stakeholders that the City of Tonawanda’s residential real estate market would benefit greatly from additional property inventory and new units.

### ***Redeveloping Mullen Elementary***

Since 2004, there have been ninety-four residential property transactions with sale prices over \$35,000 in the neighborhood immediately surrounding Mullen Elementary. For the purposes of this analysis, CGR defined that area as bounded by Delaware Street on the west, Cranbrook on the east, Canton on the south and Walter on the north, and including all or portions of the following streets: Amsterdam, Walter, Maldiner, Delaware Street, Canton, Dekalb, Ilion, Mullen, Syracuse, Utica and Linwood.

The vast majority of those transactions have involved single-family residential units (94 percent), with the remainder being two-family units. Though sale prices have ranged as high as the \$150,000s, the median sale price was approximately \$81,400.

The Mullen Elementary site is 4.8 acres. Based on the sizes of properties sold since 2004, the typical residential parcel in the neighborhood appears to be roughly 55 feet x 120 feet, or 0.15 acres. In other words, the existing Mullen site would appear large enough to accommodate approximately 25 residential parcels of the same size and density as the surrounding neighborhood.

Given the absence of new residential developments of this type in recent years in the City, there are not reliable benchmark data to suggest a likely absorption rate of new houses. The following analysis assumes three new residential units per year, beginning in year 3—allowing time for site clearing and preparation—until full build-out. All units are assumed fully taxable.

For the purposes of this analysis, a flat City homestead tax rate at the 2008 level of \$22.17 per thousand, school tax rate of \$24.10 and county tax rate of \$7.88; and annual AV growth of 3 percent are assumed.

**Table 15:**  
Property Tax Impact Over 20 Years  
Residential Redevelopment of Mullen Elementary  
(Source: CGR Calculations)

Year	City	Schools	County	Total	Cumulative Impact
1	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
2	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
3	\$5,744	\$6,244	\$2,041	\$14,029	\$14,029
4	\$11,832	\$12,862	\$4,205	\$28,899	\$42,928
5	\$18,280	\$19,872	\$6,497	\$44,649	\$87,577
6	\$25,105	\$27,290	\$8,923	\$61,318	\$148,896
7	\$32,322	\$35,136	\$11,489	\$78,947	\$227,843
8	\$39,951	\$43,428	\$14,200	\$97,579	\$325,422
9	\$48,007	\$52,187	\$17,063	\$117,257	\$442,679
10	\$56,511	\$61,431	\$20,086	\$138,029	\$580,708
15	\$65,512	\$71,215	\$23,285	\$160,013	\$1,335,505
20	\$75,947	\$82,558	\$26,994	\$185,499	\$2,210,521

*Net present value of City/School property tax impact only  
@ 1% = \$1,650,519, @ 4% = \$1,122,624*

### **Redeveloping Riverview Elementary**

Since 2004, there have been thirty-two residential property transactions with sale prices over \$35,000 in the neighborhood immediately surrounding Riverview Elementary. For the purposes of this analysis, CGR defined that area as bounded by Brookside Terrace on the west, Rogers on the east, Wadsworth Court on the south and Mitchell on the north, and including all or portions of the following streets: Brookside Terrace, Brookside Terrace West, Taylor, Wadsworth Court, Wadsworth, Hamilton, Bellinger, Karen, Baker, Plymouth, Mitchell, Hackett and Rogers.

All of the transactions occurring in that area over the past four years have involved single-family residential units. Sale prices have ranged as high as \$160,000, with a median sale value of \$90,500.

The Riverview site is 8.0 acres in size, making it the second-largest elementary school parcel in the District (following Fletcher). Based on the size of the properties sold since 2004, the typical residential parcel in the neighborhood appears to be 60 feet x 120 feet, or 0.16 acres. In other words, the existing Riverview site would appear large enough to accommodate approximately 40 residential parcels of the same size and density as the surrounding neighborhood.



**Table 16:**  
**Property Tax Impact Over 20 Years**  
 Residential Redevelopment of Riverview Elementary  
 (Source: CGR Calculations)

Year	City	Schools	County	Total	Cumulative Impact
1	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
2	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
3	\$6,386	\$6,942	\$2,270	\$15,597	\$15,597
4	\$13,155	\$14,300	\$4,676	\$32,130	\$47,727
5	\$20,324	\$22,093	\$7,224	\$49,641	\$97,368
6	\$27,911	\$30,341	\$9,921	\$68,173	\$165,541
7	\$35,936	\$39,064	\$12,773	\$87,773	\$253,314
8	\$44,417	\$48,283	\$15,787	\$108,488	\$361,802
9	\$53,374	\$58,021	\$18,971	\$130,366	\$492,168
10	\$62,829	\$68,299	\$22,332	\$153,459	\$645,627
15	\$118,359	\$128,662	\$42,069	\$289,090	\$1,805,697
20	\$140,728	\$152,979	\$50,020	\$343,728	\$3,427,093

*Net present value of City/School property tax impact only  
 @ 1% = \$2,537,355, @ 4% = \$1,681,799*

## Closing One Elementary School

### Operational Savings

Much as a single elementary campus would enable certain efficiencies, shifting from four elementary schools to three would provide for efficiency opportunities. The existence of four elementary schools forces the District to support certain built-in “overhead” costs, such as a principal, nurse and maintenance staff at each facility. Reducing the number of elementary facilities by one would chip away at some of that overhead cost.

In calculating the potential staffing efficiencies from closing a single elementary school, CGR did not select a specific school. Rather, the staffing ratios are based on the average of current student:staff and sf:staff ratios of all four elementary schools. As such, were the District to pursue the closure of one elementary school, final savings figures would need to be refined based on exact enrollment and square footage.

Average enrollment across the four elementary schools is 215. The closure of one school would therefore result in a shift of 215 students to the other three elementaries. Assuming those students were equally distributed across the remaining schools, average elementary enrollment would increase to approximately 287 (*i.e.* 215 students ÷ 3 schools = approx 72 students per remaining school). As with the staffing analysis presented in the preceding section, ratios were determined *only* for non-grade teaching personnel under the assumption that current student:teacher



ratios would be maintained. In other words, the closure of one elementary school would result in the shift of existing teaching staff to the remaining schools.

The largest efficiency of shifting from four elementary schools to three involves administrative and maintenance staff. CGR estimates that one full-time equivalent position could be eliminated in each of the following areas:

- Principal
- Secretary
- Nurse
- Music
- Librarian
- Engineer
- Custodian

In addition, two FTE cleaners could be eliminated. The elimination of these nine positions would produce an estimated \$516,000 in potential annual salary and benefit savings for the District. The cumulative 15-year savings at an annual salary growth of 3 percent and benefit growth of 5 percent would be \$9,999,355.

Beyond direct staffing efficiencies, the District would realize some savings in utilities and capital maintenance. Capital maintenance savings are difficult to accurately estimate, and would be different depending on which facility were to close. As for utilities, the four elementary schools spent an average of \$65,000 each on combined natural gas and electricity in 2007-08. Closure of a single school would save at least that amount on an annual basis.

## ***Fiscal Impact of Redeveloping Elementary Schools***

Depending upon which elementary school was closed, there would be a potential fiscal impact from the sale and redevelopment of that property.

### ***Redeveloping Mullen Elementary***

(See Previous Section)

### ***Redeveloping Riverview Elementary***

(See Previous Section)

### ***Redeveloping Fletcher Elementary***

Since 2004, there have been thirty-three residential property transactions with sale prices over \$35,000 in the neighborhood immediately

surrounding Fletcher Elementary. For the purposes of this analysis, CGR defined that areas as bounded by Rogers Avenue on the west, Wheeler on the east, Morgan on the north and Schuler on the south, and including all or portions of the following streets: Fletcher, Hinds, Proy, Moyle, Wheeler, Morgan and Gibson.

The vast majority of those transactions have involved single-family residential units (94 percent), with the remainder being multi-family units. Sale prices have ranged as high as the \$130,000s; the median sale price was \$83,000.

The Fletcher Elementary site is 9.7 acres. Based on the sizes of properties sold since 2004, the typical residential parcel in this neighborhood appears to be roughly 60 feet x 130 feet, or 0.18 acres. The existing Fletcher site therefore appears large enough to accommodate approximately 50 residential parcels of the same size and density as the surrounding neighborhood. For this analysis, the same absorption and tax rate assumptions are used as in the previous section.

**Table 17:**  
Property Tax Impact Over 20 Years  
Residential Redevelopment of Fletcher Elementary  
(Source: CGR Calculations)

Year	City	Schools	County	Total	Cumulative Impact
1	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
2	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
3	\$5,857	\$6,366	\$2,082	\$14,304	\$14,304
4	\$12,064	\$13,115	\$4,288	\$29,467	\$43,772
5	\$18,640	\$20,262	\$6,625	\$45,527	\$89,299
6	\$25,598	\$27,827	\$9,099	\$62,524	\$151,822
7	\$32,958	\$35,827	\$11,714	\$80,499	\$232,321
8	\$40,736	\$44,282	\$14,479	\$99,497	\$331,818
9	\$48,951	\$53,212	\$17,399	\$119,562	\$451,380
10	\$57,622	\$62,639	\$20,481	\$140,742	\$592,122
15	\$108,550	\$118,000	\$38,582	\$265,132	\$1,656,053
20	\$161,332	\$175,377	\$57,343	\$394,052	\$3,407,900

*Net present value of City/School property tax impact only  
@ 1% = \$2,515,061, @ 4% = \$1,651,454*

## Converting Elementary School to a Community Center

The concept of converting an elementary school to a community center for residents of Tonawanda combines several elements heard by the project team during interviews and the public meeting. First, the community lacks a community center. Second, it was suggested that Highland Elementary could be an attractive facility to retrofit because it houses an

**TONAWANDA CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT  
FACILITIES TASK FORCE RECOMMENDATION  
TO  
THE BOARD OF EDUCATION  
JANUARY, 2010**

**MEMBERSHIP:**

Augustine Beyer, Sue D'Angelo, Nancy Grosskopf, Joyce Hogenkamp, Dawn Holler, Kevin Kazmierczak, Todd Lachat, Renee Marciniak, John McKenna, Brian Mysliwy, James Newton, Carrie Oliver, Brian Opalinski, Mary Beth Scullion, Dennis Smilinich, Kelli Treichler, James Weber, Rita Zirnheld.

Dr. James Mills, Facilitator

(There were twenty-four appointed members. Several individuals were not able to attend meetings as scheduled and did not participate)

**BACKGROUND:**

The membership of the Task Force consists of community members, parents, administrators, teachers, and board members. The task force had our first general session meeting on September 24, 2009 followed by meetings on September 30, October 7, 22, and 29, November 5 and 16, December 7 and 21, January 5 and 14, 2010. Our meeting generally lasted between two and three hours in length.

**CHARGE:**

The charge by the Board of Education was to do the following:

- Review the Reconfiguration of the Elementary Schools
- Review the Student Enrollment trends in the District
- Review possible plans for future Elementary Building Configuration i.e.
  - Construct/renovate single site as Elementary Center similar to existing Middle/High School site
  - Develop two(2) elementary school sites designed as Primary (Grades Pre K-2 and Intermediate (Grades 3-5)
  - Maintain three (3) elementary facilities as per new configuration
- Develop timeframe for community input and Board of Education action

**STUDY METHODOLOGY:**

The initial work consisted of a review of available information related to enrollment and buildings. This included, but was not limited to:

1. District long range planning documents
2. District enrollment projections
3. Census data for 0-5
4. Floor plans
5. Class size data
6. Building condition surveys
7. Capital Debt and Amortization Schedule
8. Ramming staffing report
9. SMSI Report



**DATA ANALYSIS:**

The data provided an average score for each configuration. Based upon the ranking of the average scores "Configuration A: One P-5" scores highest with "Configuration G: Three P-5" scoring the lowest.

The data also shows that "Configuration A: One P-5" scores highest in each category under consideration.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

The Facilities Task Force recommends the following:

That the Tonawanda City School District Board of Education

1. Construct/renovate a single site elementary school housing Grades PK-Grade Five.
2. Begin the process of implementing this recommendation immediately with appropriate notification to the New York State Education Department relative to a potential building process.
3. Move forward with appropriate due diligence in meeting its fiduciary responsibilities related to cost and the communities ability to pay.
4. Exercise due diligence to avoid any transitioning of elementary students from building to building during the interim period while this recommendation is being implemented.
5. Update and confirm the District's enrollment projects and continue to monitor trends.
6. Make community input and information regarding progress a high priority during all phases of the implementation of item one above. This includes, but is not limited to regular updates at Board of Education Meeting and PTSA Meeting; frequent and informative information bulletins on the district website; public forums where and when appropriate; and Board appointed ad hoc committees to assist in planning and development as may be deemed necessary by the Board of Education.

**RECOMMENDATION RELATED COMMENTS:**

This recommendation is provided so that the Board of Education may move forward with the recommended reconfiguration of the district's elementary schools in a timely and appropriate manner given the challenges the district is currently facing related to declining enrollment and capital repairs to existing elementary school building. It must be understood that the Facilities Task Force was not authorized to, nor positioned to do cost analysis related to the various options considered or to do enrollment projections for the next ten-year period. We believe this recommendation provides the Board of Education with an informed recommendation on what would be the best configuration from the perspective of curriculum and instruction, student achievement, parental involvement, and overall quality. It will be the Board of Education's responsibility to do a comprehensive cost analysis related to the implementation of this recommendation. The Facilities Task Force is fully aware that after careful cost analysis by financial experts that it may be determined that the above recommendation is not within the means of the Tonawanda community in

which case alternative configurations evaluated by this task force, and documented in this report, should be considered.

However, our recommendation should be fully considered and implemented if it is deemed to be affordable by the Board of Education. This would include a voter referendum as may be necessary.

The Task Force recommendation does not address the potential location of the single site elementary school that it is recommending. The Task Force believes that the location decision best follows a review of potential sites in relation to desired construction or renovation.

The Task Force has concerns over the transitioning of elementary students, feeling that frequent moving from one school building to another is difficult on students and parents, and can be a factor in student learning. Therefore, the Task Force would like the Board of Education to avoid such transitions while implementing the recommendation. More specifically, the Task Force recommends that until our current recommendation is implemented, or until such time as there is an alternative solution implemented, that the current configuration shall remain in place.

The Task Force believes that community support is essential as the Board of Education moves forward with this recommendation. The Task Force believes that transparency of the decision making process and frequent opportunities for the parents and community to be involved are important components in building community support.

#### **RECOMMENDATION RATIONALE:**

Below is a listing of various reasons that support the Facilities Task Force's recommendation. This is not meant to be an all inclusive listing of the supporting rationale, but provides the general themes that formed the foundation for our recommendation.

One building complex housing all elementary grades:

1. Provides the best opportunity for clear and shared focus for the elementary program. The focus will be formed around a common set of beliefs and values, creating a consistent direction for all elementary children in the district.
2. Provides the best opportunity for sharing both curriculum and instructional resources.
3. Provides the best opportunity for the alignment of curriculum both horizontally across a grade level and vertically between grade levels. Alignment of curriculum is essential to assuring that classroom instruction is focused on the learning standards.
4. Provides the best opportunity for grade level collaboration and communication. Greater grade level teaming increases the potential for sharing and professional development among the professional teaching staff.
5. Provides the most overall flexibility in adjusting for educational needs of students. This includes, but is not limited to, special education program options, early literacy interventions, and title one program availability.

6. Provides the greatest flexibility for maintaining consistent class sizes when grade level student populations are disproportional.
7. Has the greatest potential for having state of the art technology and related software and provides the easiest platform for continued updates and maintenance of the technology.
8. Provides the greatest potential for consistent extended-day programming.
9. Eliminates attendance zones and the shifting of attendance zone lines.
10. Reduces the amount of transitions from school to school at the elementary level and provides the best funnel into the middle school.
11. Helps reduce the potential socio-economic stigma associated with geographically based neighborhoods.
12. Provides the greatest potential to be a totally up-to-date educational environment that is environmentally friendly and provides the best overall learning environment.
13. Provides the best opportunity for a united Tonawanda community focused around parental participation at one centralized elementary complex over an extended period of time.

**APPRECIATION:**

We would like to extend our appreciation to the Tonawanda City School District Board of Education and to its Superintendent for providing us this opportunity to serve the school district and to provide thoughtful input into an issue confronting the school district.

We would like to thank all those persons that provided us with valuable information to help us formulate our thoughts: Paul Maziarz, Joseph Giarrizzo, Joseph Tripi, Chris Trapp, Carl Zeisz, Ron Pillozzi, Jim Kossow, and Collen Perkins.



ENDNOTES  
REFERENCES

---

<sup>i</sup> OSPI State of Washington. OSPI reviewed 20 recent research studies that have examined the common characteristics of high performing schools. Some of the studies were reviews of other research that has taken place over many year on the same topic, while others examined these schools in specific settings and locations, such as high performing elementary schools in a large urban setting. This body of research represents findings from both Washington state and around the nation.

<sup>ii</sup> Definitions used for each category were as follows:

**PROGRAM/CURRICULUM:**

All the learning which is planned and guided by the school, whether it is carried on in groups or individually, inside or outside the school.

- A strong and viable curriculum at each grade level
- Alignment of the curriculum at each grade level that consistently and logically flows to the next grade level
- Availability of curriculum related resources for all grades at all levels (Assemblies/Field Experiences)
- Program options available to all students on a consistent and equitable basis (i.e. Reading Programs; Special Education Programs including physical, occupational, and speech therapy; Program for Advanced Students; Students at Risk; Art, Music, P.E, Library, Foreign Language; Social Services, Physiological Services)
- Adequate technology hardware at each grade level with grade level appropriate software

**INSTRUCTION:**

The act of instructing, teaching, or furnishing with knowledge

- Instruction at each grade level is at a high quality level and consistent from class to class and grade level to grade level.
- Teachers know what to teach and how to teach at each grade level.
- There is sufficient supervision of instruction to assure that students receive the expected high level of instruction.
- Class size and balance
- Professional development opportunities for continual improvement

**STUDENT PERFORMANCE:**

- High level of student performance on state test and preparation for the next grade level.

**FINANCIAL/COST:**

- Current cost vs. future cost
- Cost of repair vs. cost to construct
- Short-term expenses vs. long term expenses
- Communities ability to pay

**COMMUNITY AND PARENTS:**

- Parent participation in the life of the school
- High level of parent expectations
- Supportive learning environment

# **Staffing Study for the Tonawanda City School District**

**Prepared by  
Thomas M. Ramming, Ed.D.  
Western New York Educational Service Council  
March 20, 2007**

## **Introduction**

Earlier this school year, the Tonawanda Board of Education entered into an agreement with the Western New York Educational Service for a K-12 certified staffing study. Broadly speaking, the study was to analyze current staffing and develop three different analyses for 2007-08: 1) current building configuration, 2) closing Highland Elementary and 3) closing Fletcher Elementary.

In order to gather accurate information regarding current staffing and program, the consultant had multiple meetings with the Superintendent, Assistant Superintendents, and Principals. The number of certified staff serving in each area (i.e., grade level, subject, etc.) and enrollment (current and projected) were provided by the District. Guidelines pertaining to the number of daily assignments for elementary special area teachers and class sizes/daily teacher loads (i.e., number of students) for secondary teachers were provided by the consultant at the request of the Superintendent.

While this study will provide observations and recommendations regarding staffing, it does not contain an in-depth review of the following variables that can affect staffing: 1) scheduling of electives, 2) scheduling of science labs, 3) special education/pupil services, 4) music, 5) value of the current courses/programs, 6) extracurricular activities and interscholastic sports and 6) assignments of Teaching Assistants. Such a review might be worthwhile, but that was not the focus of this staffing study.

## **Elementary Schools**

**Classroom** – Consistent Class Size Guidelines – Current (2006-07) average class size ceilings are:

- **Kindergarten** – up to 19
- **Grades 1, 2 & 3** – up to 21
- **Grades 4 & 5** – up to 25

The consultant was asked by the Superintendent to recommend class size guidelines that: 1) are reflective of class sizes in other Erie County suburban school districts, and 2) would not result in a significant number of new positions regardless of building configuration. Looking at projected staffing under three different scenarios, the consultant recommends the following average class size ceilings:

- **Kindergarten** – up to 22
- **Grades 1-5** – up to 24

Note: Given the relatively small student population within each school, class size ceilings are more meaningful than class size ranges.

In developing staffing projections that involve the closing of an elementary school (Fletcher or Highland), the consultant evenly distributed the students who would have attended the school that is closed. How the District might go about redistricting the students in the attendance area of the school that would be closed could affect these projections. Also, for purposes of this study, any time projected average class sizes were less than one student from the ceiling, an additional section was added for planning purposes, e.g., if the class size ceiling was 24 and the projected average class size was 23.4, an additional section was added. A summary of the projected total K-5 sections is shown below.

<u>2006-07</u>	<u>All Four Schools Remain Open</u>	<u>Close Highland</u>	<u>Close Fletcher</u>
47	48 (+1)	45 (-2)	46 (-1)

**Assignment of Special Area Teachers** – Generally speaking, two requirements affect the number of special area (Art, Vocal Music, Physical Education and Library) teachers assigned to an elementary school: 1) SED requirements for instruction in these areas and 2) commitments for planning time/minimum staffing levels contained in the collective bargaining agreement. Based on these two variables, most districts typically attempt to schedule special area teachers for up to 30 periods a week. Travel time for teachers shared by two or more schools and other variables can reduce the number of assigned periods.

A review of the scheduling of special area teachers in Tonawanda indicates that, despite the fact that many teachers travel, they are being deployed efficiently. With the closing of one elementary school, one Library-media Specialist (LMS) position could be eliminated. If a school is closed, it may also be possible to more efficiently schedule some of the other special area teachers (due to reduced travel time), but an overall reduction in staff would likely be less than one teacher in Art, Music and Physical Education.

<u>2006-07</u>	<u>All Four Schools Remain Open</u>	<u>Close Highland</u>	<u>Close Fletcher</u>
12.4	N/C	-1 LMS	-1 LMS

**Summary** – Generally speaking, large elementary schools can be staffed more efficiently than small elementary schools. With large elementary schools, narrow class size ranges can be established while travel for special area teachers can be reduced or eliminated. Based on the number of available classrooms, none of Tonawanda's elementary schools can be categorized as large. Nonetheless, closing one of four elementary schools would slightly reduce the number of sections/teachers required.



**Total K-5 Staff Projections**

<u>All Four Schools Remain Open</u> + 1 FTE	<u>Close Highland</u> -3 FTE	<u>Close Fletcher</u> -2 FTE
--	---------------------------------	---------------------------------

(1) Should a school be closed, costs/savings do not include savings from salaries and benefits for administrative and school related personnel.

(2) A comprehensive redistricting study, prepared by a group including parents, should precede any final decision to close a school.

(3) The number of teachers/sections required could be reduced significantly if all K-5 students were housed in one or two buildings. However, some research indicates that small elementary schools promote higher student achievement.

**Middle School**

**Determinants for Staffing** – In middle schools, three variables tend to impact staffing: 1) student enrollment, 2) program and 3) class size and teacher load guidelines.

**Program** – This study does not contemplate any significant changes to program.

**Enrollment** – 2007-08 projected enrollment is 61 students less than 2006-07 actual enrollment.

	<u>Grade 6</u>	<u>Grade 7</u>	<u>Grade 8</u>	<u>Total</u>	
2006-07	149	161	195		505
2007-08	134 (-15)	149 (-12)	161 (-34)	444 (-61)	

This decrease will have a significant impact on staffing.

**Class Size and Teacher Load Guidelines** – Current class sizes and teacher loads (i.e., the number of students a teacher has over a 5-6 period day) in academic subject areas are relatively low and should be increased. The actual versus consultant's recommendations for average teacher load are shown below. Average class sizes are in parentheses.

<u>Grade/Subject</u>	<u>2006-07</u>	<u>2007-08</u>
6 <sup>th</sup> grade	22-26 (24.8)	22-26 (22.3)
English, Social Studies, Science, Math and Foreign Language	89 (17.8)	120 (24)
Art, Technology, Home and Careers and Music (vocal)	79-126 (15.8-25.1)	110 (22)

<u>Grade/Subject</u>	<u>2006-07</u>	<u>2007-08</u>
Physical Education and Health	126 (25.1)	125 (25)
Guidance	252	275

Strictly applying these guidelines to English, Math, Science and Social Studies could result in the loss of one full time position in each subject area as well as the reduction of one full time position to part-time status in 2007-08. However, the administration is exploring the reassignment of one teacher in each area to Academic Intervention Services (AIS) two periods a day, resulting in only one less position in each area. For example, one social studies position would be eliminated while the teacher in one of the three remaining social studies positions would be assigned to AIS two periods each day.

**Summary** – A decrease in student enrollment and proposed increases in teacher loads would reduce the number of teachers needed at the Middle School in 2007-08. For a more detailed analysis, see Attachment 2.

<u>Grade/Subject</u>	<u>2006-07</u>	<u>2007-08</u>
6 <sup>th</sup> grade	6	6
English, Social Studies, Science, and Math	4 ea.	3 ea. (-4.0)
Art (-.4)	1.4	1
Technology	1.6	1.6
Home and Careers	1	1
Physical Education and Health	3	3
Guidance	2	1.7 (-.3)*
Teaching Assistant	5	4.5 (-.5)
<b>Total</b>		<b>-5.2</b>

\* Given the proximity of the Middle and High School guidance offices, the District may wish to consider combining the staff into a single, comprehensive grades 6-12 guidance department. Doing so could lead to the elimination of one-half a position (.5 FTE).

### High School

**Determinants for Staffing** – As with the Middle School, three variables tend to impact staffing at the High School: 1) student enrollment, 2) class size and teacher load guidelines and 3) program. Because of the many variables and nuances related to

programs, staffing recommendations are less precise than similar recommendations for elementary and middle schools.

**Enrollment** – The projected enrollment for 2007-08 is the same as 2006-07 enrollment, 761. Enrollments in specific subject areas are projected by multiplying total projected enrollment by the percentage of students in the subject area in 2006-07. For example, this year 88% of the total population is currently enrolled in a Math course. Multiplying next year’s projected enrollment by .88 produces the number of students expected to enroll in a math course in 2007-08.

**Program** - This study does not contemplate any significant changes to program. However, the District may wish to more closely examine programs within subject areas. For example, if the District decides to continue a program that provides science labs for each student every other day, it may want to assign all science teachers to six teaching periods and no supervisory period. It may be possible to send students in Level 1 French and Spanish (14 total) to Level 1 classes in the Middle School. The District could also consider:

- Implementing clear guidelines with regard to minimum class size (15?);
- Reviewing academic standards for electives;
- Introducing Project Lead the Way;
- Recruiting more students for French or looking at another language; and
- Adding more college credit and Advanced Placement courses.

**Class Size and Teacher Load Guidelines** – Because of the variety of electives, labs and the sequence of courses needed for a Regents Diploma, teacher loads in the academic subjects may be less than the teacher loads for the same subjects at the Middle School. The actual versus the consultant’s recommendations for average teacher loads are shown below. Average class sizes are in parentheses.

<u>Grade/Subject</u>	<u>2006-07</u>	<u>2007-08</u>	<u>FTE's</u>
English	116.4 (23.3)	115 (23)	7 (n/c)
Math	111.8 (22.4)	115 (23)	6 (n/c)
Science (including labs)	98.9 (19.8)	105 (21)	9 (-.6)a
Social Studies	114 (22.8)	115 (23)	7 (n/c)
Foreign Language	86 (17.2)	115 (23)	2.6 (-.4)b
Art	88.2 (17.6)	110 (22)	2.2 (-.6)c
Business	110.3 (22.1)	110 (22)	3 (n/c)
Technology	95 (19)	110 (22)	1.4 (n/c)d
Physical Education	118.9 (23.8)	125 (25)	3 (n/c)



Health	122.5 (24.5)	125 (25)	.8 (n/c)
Guidance	190	275	3.8 (-.2)e
<b>Total</b>			<b>-1.8</b>

**a** – The administration indicates that student enrollment in Science for the 07-08 school year has increased and a reduction in staff is not possible. It is suggested that the 9-12 Science enrollment (by course), program, scheduling and the overall minimum class size be reviewed prior to making a final determination.

**b** – While a .4 reduction in Foreign Language is recommended, the administration suggests reassigning this .4 position to ESL. (A Foreign Language teacher is certified to teach ESL.) Students in Level 1 French and Level 1 Spanish would take these courses in the Middle School.

**c** – Actual reduction may be slightly less due to course requests.

**d** – While it is possible to reduce one full time technology teacher to part-time, this is not recommended because staffing a part-time position in technology with a high quality teacher will likely be problematic.

**e** – Combining the Middle and High School guidance offices into one grades 6-12 office could lead to the reduction of a one-half counselor and improve service to students. Also, one additional counselor at the High School is assigned as a ‘counselor/social worker.’

**Summary** – A few areas in the High School appear to be somewhat overstaffed. However, if the District chooses to continue to offer the same programs/courses and operate sections with fewer than 15 students, staffing for 07-08 will be about the same as staffing for 06-07. For a more detailed analysis, see Attachment 3.

**Special Education, Speech, Pupil Services, Academic Intervention Services, Structured Suspension, and Life Skills** – Because staffing for these areas is dependent on variables beyond the scope of this study, it is generally not possible to make staffing recommendations. Nonetheless, the number of students assigned to some speech teachers at the elementary level is unusually low and a reduction in staff may be possible.

**“If-Needed” Positions**

Because of enrollment changes that can occur between now and September 1, it is recommended that up to two additional positions be included in the staffing/budget plan. These resources would be used to address changes in enrollment that cannot be addressed through a reallocation of existing resources.

**Executive Summary** – In most any school district in New York, personnel costs (salaries and benefits) account for nearly eighty percent of total expenditures. In Tonawanda, a single teacher, near the entry level of the salary schedule, costs about \$50,000. A cost-effective staffing model, aligned with District goals and effective programs, is critical in helping students achieve success. The model must take into consideration the program provided to students at each level and, by applying reasonable Teacher Load and Class Size Guidelines, provide staffing for each school.

- Continuing to operate four elementary schools is, from a staffing/cost perspective, inefficient. (Two or even a single elementary school, perhaps with a K-2 and 3-5 structure, would lead to reductions in staff without affecting class size ceilings.) However, before a school is closed, capacity for the remaining buildings must be precisely determined and a comprehensive redistricting plan developed with input from parents. If a school is closed, it would be possible to abolish 2-3 teaching positions as well as one principal's position and some support staff positions. However, as the 2005 Long Range Plan notes, closing a school "...would have an impact on instruction, specifically special areas of music and art (in the remaining three schools, p. 30)."
- With declining enrollment and the relatively low class sizes that are currently operating in the Middle School, staff cuts are not only possible but probably unavoidable. Projections show that as many as 5.2 positions could be eliminated. Note: Many teachers working in the Middle School have tenure rights in the subject area for grades 7-12. Therefore, abolishing Middle School positions could result in Middle School teachers "bumping" High School teachers serving in the same tenure area.
- As was noted above, the nuances and variables in a High School program/schedule result in less precise staffing predictions and recommendations. However, staffing based on subject area enrollment projections and the creation of a 6-12 guidance office could result in the reduction of 1.8 positions. It is recommended that the administration continue to carefully examine programs, scheduling of teachers and the practice of operating courses/sections with less than 15 students in order to determine if resources are being used effectively and efficiently.
- Finally, today's schools are under pressure to create better opportunities for more students to achieve academic success. The changing job market, international economic competition and social change all require a higher level of education and achievement for today's graduates. While this study presents some options for reducing staff, the District should also consider reallocating resources in order to create new or enhanced opportunities that will support higher levels of student achievement.

- 2007-08 Staffing Recommendations

- Elementary

- Add 1 classroom teacher
    - Examine number of students assigned to speech teachers in order to determine if a reduction in staff is required

- Middle School

- Reduce 1 position in each of the following – English, Math, Science and Social Studies
    - Assign one (each) English, Math, Science and Social Studies teacher to two periods of AIS daily and monitor results
    - Between the Middle School and High School, reduce 1 art position
    - Combine Middle School and High School guidance offices into a single 6-12 office, possibly reducing one full time Counselor to part-time (.5)
    - Reduce one of five Teaching Assistants to part-time (.5)

- High School

- The reduction of some full time positions to part-time status seems, “on paper,” to be feasible. However, this will require further analysis of schedules, student course requests, minimum class sizes and teacher assignments.

- “If Needed”

- For budgeting purposes, include up to two positions to accommodate increases in grade level and subject area enrollment that may occur before school opens in September