

FY 2018 BUDGET ADVISORY COUNCIL BUDGET QUESTIONS

#	QUESTION	DEPT.	RECEIVED	RESPONSE	DISTRIBUTED
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) With twelve FTEs (six psychologists, six social workers) added in last year's budget, which schools were able to have increased services? b) In adding psychologist and social workers services to APS schools for this school year, was any preference given to the schools with more than 40 percent free and reduced lunch students? c) With twelve FTEs (six psychologists, six social workers) to be added by the proposed FY2018 budget, which schools will be able to have increased services? d) In determining which schools will be able to have increased services from psychologists and social workers, were the needs and conditions assessed at those schools or does APS use average ratios of number of students per psychologist? e) Why was the cut to phasing in more psychologists and social workers placed in Tier 1 this year? Why is it of less relative importance to APS than proposed cuts in the other two tiers? 	DSSSE	3/15/17	3/21/17	3/22/17
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) What are the occupational groups which will receive increases to raise their pay to market levels? b) What has been the retention ratio in the past three years for each of those occupational groups? c) Would there be savings if APS raised the wages for those groups more quickly, in terms of losing fewer people who are trained and then leave for other jobs? d) Would it be possible to raise the wages in those areas by half the gap in year 1, by 30 percent in year 2, and then by 20 percent in year 3? e) If our need to recruit and retain bus drivers is the greatest relative need among those occupational groups, is it possible to eliminate the gap between APS bus driver pay and market wages at a faster rate than one third each year? f) What would be the additional cost in FY 2018 of moving bus driver pay up to market levels in one year, rather than by one third each year? g) Moving all under market wage employees up by one third of the gap each year does give those employees furthest away from market wages a larger percentage increase each year. As an alternative, would there be a benefit to bringing them all up to the same percentage each year? This would accelerate closing the gap for 	Human Resources/ Finance	3/15/17		

FY 2018 BUDGET ADVISORY COUNCIL BUDGET QUESTIONS

#	QUESTION	DEPT.	RECEIVED	RESPONSE	DISTRIBUTED
	those furthest away presently. Would that assist APS in reducing its retention problems in those occupational groups?				
3	<p><u>Tier 1 Cuts: Combining or Eliminating Under-Utilized After School Bus Services</u></p> <p>a) What is total amount that transportation accounts for in the operating budget?</p> <p>b) What is the ridership on the after school bus routes that they would cut under this proposal?</p> <p>c) Are there routes during the regular school day (to and from school) which have low ridership?</p>	Facilities & Operations	3/15/17	3/20/17	3/22/17
4	<p><u>Tier 1 Cuts: Reduce Funding for Professional In-Service</u></p> <p>a) Is the Professional In-Service program underutilized at current budget levels?</p> <p>b) The proposed cut to these services is \$100,000. What percent of the baseline budget does that represent?</p> <p>c) Has the Professional In-Service program been evaluated? What did that evaluation show?</p> <p>d) Are there alternative programs within APS to achieve the goal as the Professional In-Service program?</p>	Human Resources	3/15/17	3/21/17	3/22/17
5	<p>a) The Capital Outlays budget for APS (proposed) is \$17.2 million in FY 2018. This is an increase from \$13.4 million in FY 2017, but below the \$22.2 million in FY 2016. Of those three totals for capital outlays, how much was or will be for technology hardware and the associated software? Of those subtotals on computer hardware/software, how much was or will be for devices that are used in the Personalized Learning Devices Initiative?</p> <p>b) APS did not need any new funds for the Personalized Learning Device Initiative in FY 2017. What was the total spent on the Initiative as part of the baseline technology budget in FY 2017?</p>	Information Services/ Finance	3/15/17	3/21/17	3/22/17
6	<p>a) Does the Personalized Learning Device Initiative provide more educational benefit to APS students than holding the class sizes to their current low levels?</p> <p>b) Are there any data from the APS Student and Parent Satisfaction Surveys to better understand if the Personalized Learning Device Initiative is seen as effective among elementary school families? In particular, are there any data related to</p>	Instruction	3/15/17	4/25/17	4/28/17

FY 2018 BUDGET ADVISORY COUNCIL BUDGET QUESTIONS

#	QUESTION	DEPT.	RECEIVED	RESPONSE	DISTRIBUTED
	how the Initiative is seen by families of second and third graders?				
7	The Virginia Technology-VPSA grant program, of which APS is a recipient, has a local match funding requirement, and within that local match, a requirement that local match funds be partially used to fund teacher training on how to utilize the educational technology coming from the state grant. This implies that at least 5 percent or so of funding should be for training, as a good practice. Looking at the overall funding by APS for the Personalized Learning Device technology, what percent represented teacher training?	Information Services	3/15/17	5/3/17	5/5/17
8	The FY 2017 budget noted that the Department of Information Services trained (during the FY2016 year) more than 350 teachers on how to utilize the Personalized Devices. Given that APS had about 2,500 teachers that year (with more now), what percent of total APS teachers are expected to plan curriculum and lead the use of the Devices in the classroom? (For example, elementary art teachers might not utilize the devices in class.) By the end of this school year, what percent of the Device utilizing APS teachers will have been trained in their use?	Information Services	3/15/17	3/30/17	3/31/17
9	For this school year, the APS budget added Information Technology Coordinator (ITC) positions so that six elementary schools would move to being able to have 1.0 FTE at their school. Are there any data or other evidence to show that student utilization of the Devices was more widespread or effective as a result of getting those six elementary schools up to having their own full time ITC?	Information Services	3/15/17	5/3/17	5/5/17
10	For the Personalized Learning Device Initiative, is there a plan and/or timetable for evaluating or measuring the effectiveness of the devices for APS as a whole and for each specific grade level?	Instruction	3/15/17	4/24/17	4/28/17
11	<p>a) The proposed FY 2018 budget increases include a preventive maintenance service contract for HVAC at two schools. One of the Tier 3 cuts being proposed would close the APS Print Shop and outsource for those services. Is APS considering other areas for outsourcing for services in future years?</p> <p>b) Does APS operate under any guidelines when reviewing the costs/benefits of contracting for services versus using in-house resources?</p>	Finance	3/15/17	3/20/17	3/22/17

Budget Advisory Council Budget Question #: 18-01

ARLINGTON PUBLIC SCHOOLS

MEMORANDUM

DATE: March 21, 2017
TO: Members of the School Board
Members of the Budget Advisory Council
VIA: Patrick K. Murphy
FROM: Brenda Wilks

BUDGET QUESTION:

- a) With twelve FTEs (six psychologists, six social workers) added in last year's budget, which schools were able to have increased services?
- b) In adding psychologists and social workers services to APS schools for this school year, was any preference given to the schools with more than 40 percent free and reduced lunch students?
- c) With twelve FTEs (six psychologists, six social workers) to be added by the proposed FY 2018 budget, which schools will be able to have increased services?
- d) In determining which schools will be able to have increased services from psychologists and social workers, were the needs and conditions assessed at those schools or does APS use average ratios of number of students per psychologist?
- e) Why was the cut to phasing in more psychologists and social workers placed in Tier 1 this year? Why is it of less relative importance to APS than proposed cuts in the other two tiers?

RESPONSE:

- a) Due to the additional positions, Office of Student Services was able to allocate additional help at each of the comprehensive high schools and middle schools resulting in increased mental, social and emotional support and services to students and families.

The chart below shows how additional school psychologists and social worker positions were allocated to support schools:

Psychologists (6 positions)*	Social Workers (6 positions)**
Wakefield HS (1 position)	H-B Woodlawn Secondary Program (1 position)
Washington-Lee HS (1 position)	1 position distributed across 3 schools: Career Center (2.5 days) Arlington Community High School (0.5 day) Hoffman-Boston ES (2 days)
Yorktown HS (1 position)	Child Find (1.2 positions)
H-B Woodlawn Secondary Program (1 position)	Distributed among middle schools to create a full time position at each school (1.2 positions)

Psychologists (6 positions)*	Social Workers (6 positions)**
Distributed across middle schools to create 1 full time position at each school (1.4 positions)	Distributed across high schools for additional days (1.6 positions) Wakefield HS (3 days) Washington–Lee (3 days) Yorktown (2 days)
Multicultural Assessment Team (0.6 position)	

*An additional full-time psychologist at Wakefield, Washington-Lee, and Yorktown high schools (each comprehensive high school now has two full-time psychologists). Each middle school now has one full-time psychologist. Additional staffing was added to support multicultural assessments.

**Each middle school now has a full-time Social Worker. Increased social worker time at Wakefield and Washington-Lee high schools from 1.0 FTE to 1.6; Yorktown HS increased from 1.0 FTE to 1.4. Additional staffing was also added to support Child Find.

- b) The additional positions for psychologists and social workers were allocated to each of the comprehensive high schools and middle schools to increase mental, social and emotional support and services to students and families. The decision to allocate the new positions at the high schools and middle schools was based on the data from the 2015 Assets survey conducted by the Arlington Partnership for Children, Youth and Families (APCYF) and the 2013 survey results from the Centers for Disease Control’s Youth Risk Behavior Survey.

Data from the 2015 Assets survey conducted by the APCYF of APS 6th, 8th, 10th, and 12th graders indicated that 33% of 6th graders and 17% of 8th, 10th, and 12th graders reported feeling sad or depressed in the last month. Results from the 2013 Centers for Disease Control’s Youth Risk Behavior Survey of the same age group indicated that 50-85 students reported attempting suicide. Thus, providing a higher ratio of school psychologists and social workers at each high school and middle schools was meant to improve and increase social and emotional supports for students, families, and APS teachers.

- c) With the twelve FTE psychologists and social workers services to be added to the FY 2018 budget, preference will be given to Title I schools with more than 50 percent free and reduced lunch students and offering countywide programs such as Multi-Intervention Program for Students with Autism (MIPA), Functional Life Skills Program (FLS), and the Interlude Program. In order to most effectively meet the needs of students with specialized needs, the additional psychologists and social workers at these schools will allow APS to concentrate resources to provide intensified, high fidelity social emotional services and supports to students who have significant interfering behaviors due to psychological or behavioral disorders.
- d) Allocation of additional FTE psychologists and social workers have been carefully determined in meeting the immediate needs of students as well as the needs and conditions of schools. By providing the additional help to Title I schools with countywide programs, the Office of Student Services wants to ensure that each child receives the social and emotional services and supports needed to help student reach success in their academics, and social and emotional lives.

- e) In the FY 2017 Adopted Budget, the original implementation plan was to staff schools at 1:775 school psychologists and social workers by adding 6.0 FTE's for both positions for the 2016-17; 2017-18 and 5.5 FTEs for the 2018-19 year for total of 17.5 FTEs each. APS strongly supports the increase of social-emotional support across all schools. The proposed Tier 1 reduction would not eliminate the initiative to reach the 1:775 ratio of psychologists and social workers to students in its entirety but instead delay the implementation by one year.

Budget Advisory Council Budget Question #: 18-3

ARLINGTON PUBLIC SCHOOLS

MEMORANDUM

DATE: March 20, 2017

TO: Members of the School Board
Members of the Budget Advisory Council

VIA: Patrick K. Murphy

FROM: John Chadwick

BUDGET QUESTION:

Tier 1 Cuts: Combining or Eliminating Under-Utilized After School Bus Services

- a) What is total amount that transportation accounts for in the operating budget?
- b) What is the ridership on the after school bus routes that they would cut under this proposal?
- c) Are there routes during the regular school day (to and from school) which have low ridership?

RESPONSE:

- a) The total amount of Transportation's operating budget for FY 2017 is approximately \$16.6 million.
- b) We are still in the process of gathering data to determine the efficiency of our after school activity bus program. Preliminary findings indicate that numerous after school bus routes on Mondays and Fridays have low ridership (10 students or fewer).
- c) Yes, there are routes during the regular school day transporting students to and from countywide programs that have low ridership and are run under maximum capacity, due to time and distance.

Budget Advisory Council Budget Question #: 18-04

ARLINGTON PUBLIC SCHOOLS

MEMORANDUM

DATE: March 21, 2017

TO: Members of the School Board
Members of the Budget Advisory Council

VIA: Patrick K. Murphy

FROM: Kristi Murphy

BUDGET QUESTION: a) Is the Professional In-Service program underutilized at current budget levels?

RESPONSE: No.

BUDGET QUESTION: b) The proposed cut to these services is \$100,000. What percent of the baseline budget does that represent?

RESPONSE: Approximately one-third.

BUDGET QUESTION: c) Has the Professional In-Service program been evaluated? What did that evaluation show?

RESPONSE: This is a line item in Human Resources to support staff development and growth. The funds are used to support partnerships with local universities to increase teacher capacity in high need instructional areas.

BUDGET QUESTION: d) Are there alternative programs within APS to achieve the goal as the Professional In-Service program?

RESPONSE: Not at this time. A decrease in these funds would delay forming new cohorts moving forward.

Budget Advisory Council Budget Question #: 18-05

ARLINGTON PUBLIC SCHOOLS

MEMORANDUM

DATE: March 21, 2017

TO: Members of the School Board
Members of the Budget Advisory Council

VIA: Patrick K. Murphy

FROM: Raj Adusumilli
Leslie Peterson

BUDGET QUESTION:

- a) The Capital Outlays budget for APS (proposed) is \$17.2 million in FY 2018. This is an increase from \$13.4 million in FY 2017, but below the \$22.2 million in FY 2016. Of those three totals for capital outlays, how much was or will be for technology hardware and the associated software? Of those subtotals on computer hardware/software, how much was or will be for devices that are used in the Personalized Learning Devices Initiative?
- b) APS did not need any new funds for the Personalized Learning Device Initiative in FY 2017. What was the total spent on the Initiative as part of the baseline technology budget in FY 2017?

RESPONSE:

The FY 2018 proposed amount in capital outlays for Information Services is \$4.5 million. These funds cover costs for all infrastructure and network equipment including cabling, circuits and internet, telephone equipment, and computer equipment. Computer software is included in the materials and supplies accounts and totals \$0.5 million in the FY 2018 proposed budget. These costs are similar to the FY 2017 Adopted Budget excluding the additional technology funding provided in the FY 2018 Proposed budget. The cost of the Personalized Learning Device initiative is the difference between the cost of the student technology model where students shared general use devices (labs, carts) at a ratio of 1:4 and the cost of a 1:1 model where devices are issued to students. Both models have additional instructional technology requirements such as program-specific devices for technology education, science, etc. The change to an student-issued device model increased the costs for student devices by \$16 per student per year.

For FY 2017, that increase was \$422,000. This number is small for two reasons. First, prior to the transition to student-issued devices, APS already had over 16,000 student devices. The number of additional devices needed to transition to a 1:1 model was small. Second, at the elementary and middle school levels, students are issued iPads which reduces the average unit cost for student equipment.

Budget Advisory Council Budget Question #: 18-06

ARLINGTON PUBLIC SCHOOLS

MEMORANDUM

DATE: April 25, 2017

TO: Members of the School Board
Members of the Budget Advisory Council

VIA: Patrick K. Murphy

FROM: Tara Natrass

BUDGET QUESTION: Does the Personalized Learning Device Initiative provide more educational benefit to APS students than holding the class sizes to their current low levels?

Are there any data from the APS Student and Parent Satisfaction Surveys to better understand if the Personalized Learning Device Initiative is seen as effective among elementary school families? In particular, are there any data related to how the initiative is seen by families of second and third graders?

RESPONSE: It is challenging to compare the Personalized Learning Device Initiative to class sizes as the devices provide resources for teaching and learning, whether via textbooks, devices, overhead projectors, etc., and are needed for instruction regardless of class size.

Previously we relied on textbooks which are static, do not meet the needs of all students, and cannot adapt for personalized learning progressions. The devices provide educational benefit because of the access they provide that expands beyond the school day to include anytime, anywhere learning for all students ensuring equal access. Our goal is to ensure that the devices support improvement in teaching and learning.

At this time, the APS student and parent satisfaction survey do not include questions about the Personalized Learning Device Initiative. Collecting information on how the initiative is understood and seen by families of elementary students could be a consideration for future surveys.

Budget Advisory Council Budget Question #: 18-07

ARLINGTON PUBLIC SCHOOLS

MEMORANDUM

DATE: May 3, 2017

TO: Members of the School Board
Members of the Budget Advisory Council

VIA: Patrick K. Murphy

FROM: Raj Adusumilli

BUDGET QUESTION: The Virginia Technology-VPESA grant program, of which APS is a recipient, has a local match funding requirement, and within that local match, a requirement that local match funds be partially used to fund teacher training on how to utilize the educational technology coming from the state grant. This implies that at least 5 percent or so of funding should be for training, as a good practice. Looking at the overall funding by APS for the Personalized Learning Device technology, what percent represented teacher training?

RESPONSE: APS receives \$1.1 million in funding from the VPESA grant program. This grant program requires a 20% local match (\$220,000) of which 25%, or \$55,000 for APS, must be used for teacher training in the use of technology. For FY17, the APS professional development budget is over \$2.6 million.

In addition, APS' Instructional Technology Coordinators (ITCs) provide teachers with professional learning on the integration of technology into the curriculum. Providing this support is the ITCs' primary job responsibility, as described in both the position description and the Virginia Standards of Quality (SOQs). APS currently has 34.0 FTE ITCs at an average cost of \$99,609 per ITC. When combined with other professional development opportunities provided throughout the year, the level of commitment by the division far exceeds the grant requirement.

Budget Advisory Council Budget Question #: 18-08

ARLINGTON PUBLIC SCHOOLS

MEMORANDUM

DATE: March 30, 2017

TO: Members of the School Board
Members of the Budget Advisory Council

VIA: Patrick K. Murphy

FROM: Raj Adusumilli
Tara Natrass

BUDGET QUESTION: The FY 2017 budget noted that the Department of Information Services trained (during the FY2016 year) more than 350 teachers on how to utilize the Personalized Devices. Given that APS had about 2,500 teachers that year (with more now), what percent of total APS teachers are expected to plan curriculum and lead the use of the Devices in the classroom? (For example, elementary art teachers might not utilize the devices in class.) By the end of this school year, what percent of the Device utilizing APS teachers will have been trained in their use?

RESPONSE: While departments have provided several specialized technology training opportunities for teachers, the foundation of the system of teacher professional growth in the integration of technology is the job-embedded professional learning provided to teachers by the Instructional Technology Coordinators (ITCs). The ITCs work full time at the schools, providing regular professional learning opportunities on technology integration to the school staff. The desired outcome of this professional learning is to ensure that every teacher has the skills necessary to effectively use technology as a tool to support student learning.

There has been increased conversation about technology professional learning since the inception of the Personalized Learning Device initiative. The professional learning provided by the ITCs predates this initiative and has continued with the transition from shared student devices to student-issued devices. Teachers have been building skills in technology integration since the first ITCs were hired. The transition to issued devices eliminated a key barrier to using technology in the classroom: teachers no longer need to compete for access to a limited number of computer carts or labs. Elimination of this barrier has corresponded with increased teacher demand for technology professional learning. Student devices have become like textbooks and overhead projectors – tools that are always available to support student learning and classroom operations. We have been able to keep up with this demand with the resources that have been in place to support teacher technology learning but will likely require additional resources in the future.

As we plan for the future, we will be supplementing the professional learning provided by ITCs through:

- Developing Personalized Learning Teacher Design Teams to create “model” classrooms throughout the division
- Supporting professional learning opportunities for reading specialists, lead teachers, and administrators to provide additional coaching and support within classrooms

- Embedding International Society for Technology in Education (ISTE) standards into curriculum documents
- Implementing a Learning Management System
- Providing opportunities for teachers to attend professional learning with colleagues within APS through Festival of the Minds and early release professional learning opportunities as well as with colleagues from outside APS at events such as the Google Summit and NOVA EdCamps

These steps will provide teachers with additional strategies for personalizing learning environments for students.

Budget Advisory Council Budget Question #: 18-09

ARLINGTON PUBLIC SCHOOLS

MEMORANDUM

DATE: May 3, 2017

TO: Members of the School Board
Members of the Budget Advisory Council

VIA: Patrick K. Murphy

FROM: Raj Adusumilli

BUDGET QUESTION: For this school year, the APS budget added Information Technology Coordinator (ITC) positions so that six elementary schools would move to being able to have 1.0 FTE at their school. Are there any data or other evidence to show that student utilization of the Devices was more widespread or effective as a result of getting those six elementary schools up to having their own full time ITC?

RESPONSE: The primary reason for the request for additional ITCs was to address challenges in supporting the instructional professional learning needs for teachers and students while keeping up with the demands of the various technical support requirements for the personalized learning devices.

Placing full-time ITCs at the schools has created a significant increase in the amount of technology professional learning provided to the schools. The teachers in the six schools have received 72% more technology professional learning to date in 2016-17 as compared to all of the 2015-16 school year. This additional professional learning drives improved technology integration, a foundation for the division's Personalized Learning Initiative.

In addition to the documented increase in professional learning, the principals of these schools have provided significant anecdotal data that show that having a full-time ITC brings significant value to the school's instructional program. Feedback provided during the annual technology planning meeting with the schools has been consistently positive and now aligns with the feedback provided by other schools.

Budget Advisory Council Budget Question #: 18-10

ARLINGTON PUBLIC SCHOOLS

MEMORANDUM

DATE: April 24, 2017

TO: Members of the School Board
Members of the Budget Advisory Council

VIA: Patrick K. Murphy

FROM: Tara Natrass

BUDGET QUESTION: For the Personalized Learning Device Initiative, is there a plan and/or timetable for evaluating or measuring the effectiveness of the devices for APS as a whole and for each specific grade level?

RESPONSE: As we continue with the Personalized Learning Device Initiative, we are planning strategies for evaluating both the implementation as well as the impact and effectiveness of this work.

In the area of implementation, we will be evaluating the impact on instructional practices as well as student engagement. We have already begun this work through the practice of classroom walk-throughs. We will continue to focus on implementation as we thoroughly analyze resources for classroom use and support collaboration and communication through the Learning Management System. Measuring the impact and effectiveness of the Personalized Learning Device Initiative on student learning and achievement will be more challenging. In order to directly measure the impact, we would need to isolate this practice from all others implemented within our schools (for example, after school and summer programs, problem-based learning, guided reading, etc.) to conclude that increases in student learning can be directly attributed to the Personalized Learning Device Initiative.

Budget Advisory Council Budget Question #: 18-11

ARLINGTON PUBLIC SCHOOLS

MEMORANDUM

DATE: March 20, 2017

TO: Members of the School Board
Members of the Budget Advisory Council

VIA: Patrick K. Murphy

FROM: Leslie Peterson

BUDGET QUESTION:

- a) The proposed FY 2018 budget increases include a preventive maintenance service contract for HVAC at two schools. One of the Tier 3 cuts being proposed would close the APS Print Shop and outsource for those services. Is APS considering other areas for outsourcing for services in future years?
- b) Does APS operate under any guidelines when reviewing the costs/benefits of contracting for services versus using in-house resources?

RESPONSE:

- a) At this time, APS is not considering other areas for outsourcing in future years.
- b) There are no specific written policies or guidelines APS follows when determining whether or not to outsource a particular service or function.