

Financial Affairs  
George M. Burgess, Chief Financial Officer

**SUBJECT: CLASS SIZE REDUCTION AND IMPLEMENTATION OF REMEDIAL PROGRAMS FOR 2003-04 SCHOOL YEAR**

On March 12, 2003, the Board received a preliminary plan and alternatives for implementation of Amendment 9: Class Size Reduction. **Attachment A** reflects the actual Amendment as approved by the voters in November 2002 which establishes maximum class size for Pre-K through grade 12 core curriculum courses. Implementation actions during the 2003-04 school year represent the first phase of a multi-stage plan which must be completed by 2010. All current House and Senate bills define core curriculum courses as mathematics, science, language arts/reading, social studies, foreign languages, English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL), Exceptional Student Education (ESE), and self-contained elementary school classrooms.

Determination of the average number of students per classroom shall be calculated at the district level beginning in 2003-04. By 2006-07, compliance determination will be calculated at the school level, and by 2008-09 class size reduction requirements must be attained for each classroom. CS for SB 1436/1646 identifies consequences for noncompliance. For 2003-04 and 2004-05, the consequence would be the transfer of the proportionate amount of class size reduction not accomplished from the district's class size reduction operating categorical to an approved fixed capital outlay appropriation for class size reduction in the affected district. **The calculation would be based upon the October survey.** For 2005-06, a district in noncompliance could be required to implement year round schools; double sessions; extended school year; and/or rezoning to meet required class size levels. Beginning in 2006-07, noncompliance could result in the suspension of school board members by the Governor. The Senate version should be modified to reflect that a school district has until the February survey to be in compliance prior to penalty for each year, including 2004. Under HB703 the consequence requires districts to implement rezoning, year-round schools, double sessions or Florida Learning Access Grants if the school district has not come into compliance **based upon the February 2004 survey.**

Although the Governor's Budget included \$628 million statewide to reduce class size, preliminary budget recommendations for this program are \$300 million in the House Budget and \$464.9 million in the Senate Budget, excluding capital outlay funds. The Governor's Budget included \$97 million for Miami-Dade for this program while the draft Senate budget includes \$72.5 million for Miami-Dade. If prorated similar to the Governor's Budget, Miami-Dade would receive \$46 million under the House proposal. Committee Substitute for Senate Bill 1436/1646 relating to Class Size Reduction has passed the Florida Senate. A similar bill (HB 703) has been filed in the House.

**SP-2**

Upon approval of this plan, schools will build their initial 2003-04 budget based upon estimated 2003-04 FTEs and the appropriate reduction to pupil/teacher ratios. Initial school-by-school FTE estimates will be lower than 2002-03 since it is anticipated that both charter school membership and enrollment shifts to private schools using corporate scholarships will increase between 50 and 100 percent (the Senate is recommending a 50 percent increase and the House a 100 percent increase). This would result in surplus instructional positions. While the final level of funding to implement the class size reduction program is uncertain, some level of funding is assured. Therefore, additional instructional positions will be provided to help mitigate the reduction of instructional staff due to lower FTEs.

**Attachment B** includes the financial impact of various proposals to meet the requirement of reducing average district wide class size. Following the summary of proposals are assumptions in calculating these numbers.

**Attachment C** outlines special guidelines in implementing a class size reduction to ensure funds are used for the purpose intended.

**RECOMMENDED APPROACH:**

The **K-12 School Allocation Plan** is scheduled for approval at the July 23, 2003 Board Meeting. This Plan will incorporate cost-neutral allocation adjustments resulting from a comprehensive review of our allocation methodologies, which will be presented to the Board at its April 9<sup>th</sup> meeting. Beyond these more technical adjustments, at this time, it is recommended that the Board approve a decrease in basic pupil-teacher ratios as reflected below:

		<b>FROM</b>	<b>TO</b>
Elementary:	K-1	1:26.90	1:25.90
	2-3	1:27.85	1:26.85
	4-5/6	1:32.35	1:31.35
K-8 Centers:	5-8	1:29.45	1:28.20
Middle Schools:	6-8	1:29.45	1:28.20
Senior High Schools:	9-12	1:29.45	1:28.20
Self Contained ESOL		1:26.00	1:25.00

These adjustments will reduce average class size in core curriculum and elementary self-contained basic and ESOL classes by approximately one student. This reduction has an associated cost of \$19.9 million.

It is further recommended that remedial programs be established for retained 3<sup>rd</sup> graders, low performing 3<sup>rd</sup> graders and low performing secondary students at an estimated cost of \$37.6 million. **Attachment D** reflects a summary of four (4) remedial plans that may be utilized by schools. These plans will require the approval of the Chief Education Officer and Deputy Superintendent.

It is expected that the combined core class of one student reduction and remedial program for our most at-risk students will produce an overall average district wide class size reduction of at least two students and will cost approximately \$57.5 million.

This recommendation would be utilized to determine staffing for 2003-04 during the May Budget/Personnel conferences; however, final allocations may be revised based upon the funding level received from the Legislature. Final allocations will be reflected in the **K-12 School Allocation Plan**, which will be submitted to the Board for approval at the first Budget Public Hearing on July 23, 2003. While we may adjust our allocations depending on the action of the legislature and our estimates of the cost and further impact associated with various class size reduction initiatives, we will not know the actual results of our efforts until October when actual FTE counts are made.

**RECOMMENDED:** That The School Board of Miami-Dade County, Florida:

1. Approve a decrease in basic pupil-teacher ratios equivalent to one (1) student for core courses in secondary schools and elementary self-contained basic and ESOL classes for 2003-04; and
2. Authorize allocations for remedial programs for retained 3<sup>rd</sup> graders, low performing 3<sup>rd</sup> graders and low performing secondary students with a class size of 20 students.
3. Modify Miami-Dade County Public School's legislative program to seek a revision to the accountability portion that the class size reduction program be calculated after the third FEFP calculation (October survey) and calculated/implemented after the fourth FEFP calculation (February survey).

## ATTACHMENT A

### AMENDMENT 9: CLASS SIZE REDUCTION

To assure that children attending public schools obtain a high quality education, the legislature shall make adequate provision to ensure that, by the beginning of the 2010 school year, there are a sufficient number of classrooms so that:

1. The maximum number of students who are assigned to each teacher who is teaching in public school classrooms for prekindergarten through grade 3 does not exceed 18 students;
2. The maximum number of students who are assigned to each teacher who is teaching in public school classrooms for grades 4 through 8 does not exceed 22 students; and
3. The maximum number of students who are assigned to each teacher who is teaching public school classrooms for grades 9 through 12 does not exceed 25 students.

The class size requirements of this subsection do not apply to extracurricular classes. Payment of the costs associated with reducing class size to meet these requirements is the responsibility of the state and not of local school districts. Beginning with the 2003-2004 fiscal year, the legislature shall provide sufficient funds to reduce the average number of students in each classroom by at least two students per year until the maximum number of students per classroom does not exceed the requirement of this subsection.

## ATTACHMENT B

### FINANCIAL IMPACT OF VARIOUS PROPOSALS TO IMPLEMENT AMENDMENT 9: CLASS SIZE REDUCTION

Decrease class size by 1.0 student*	\$ 19,864,155
Decrease class size by 1.5 students*	28,983,373
Decrease class size by 2.0 students*	41,833,553
Remediation programs – elementary schools	10,564,619
Remediation programs – middle schools	11,930,824
Remediation programs – senior high schools	15,117,072

\*Based on core courses only in secondary schools.

NOTE: All of the above plans exclude additional transportation costs. Transportation costs would be high if several seventh period classes were established in secondary schools because the start or dismissal time would coincide with the elementary school schedule.

**FINANCIAL IMPACT  
PRELIMINARY PLAN FOR IMPLEMENTATION OF AMENDMENT 9  
CORE COURSE REDUCTION COST  
DECREASE RATIO BY ONE STUDENT**

	<b>POSITIONS</b>	<b>SALARIES</b>
<b>ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS</b>		
Core course reduction for all students		
Decrease ratio by 1 student	170	\$9,871,502
K -1 from 1:26.90 to 1:25.90		
2 - 3 from 1:27.85 to 1:26.85		
4 - 5/6 from 1:32.35 to 1:31.35		
5 - 8 from 1:29.45 to 1:28.20 (K-8 Centers)		
 ESOL Self-Contained	15	889,387
from 1:26 to 1:25		
 Elementary - Sub-Total	185	\$10,760,889
 <b>MIDDLE SCHOOLS</b>		
Core course reduction for all students		
Decrease ratio by 5/6 weighted teacher to student ratio	87	\$ 3,985,332
from 1:29.45 to 1:28.20		
 <b>SENIOR HIGH SCHOOLS</b>		
Core course reduction for all students		
Decrease ratio by 5/6 weighted teacher to student ratio	112	\$5,117,934
from 1:29.45 to 1:28.20		
 <b>Total Estimated Cost*</b>	<b>384</b>	<b>\$19,864,155</b>

\* Excludes transportation and remedial

**FINANCIAL IMPACT  
PRELIMINARY PLAN FOR IMPLEMENTATION OF AMENDMENT 9  
CORE COURSE REDUCTION COST  
DECREASE RATIO BY 1.5 STUDENTS**

	<b>POSITIONS</b>	<b>SALARIES</b>
<b>ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS</b>		
Core course reduction for all students		
Decrease ratio by 1.5 students	259	\$15,038,308
K - 1 from 1:26.90 to 1:25.40		
2 - 3 from 1:27.85 to 1:26.35		
4 - 5/6 from 1:32.35 to 1:30.85		
5 - 8 from 1:29.45 to 1:27.75 (K-8 Centers)		
 ESOL Self-Contained	<u>23</u>	<u>1,361,367</u>
from 1:26 to 1:24.50		
 Elementary - Sub-Total	<u>282</u>	<u>\$16,399,675</u>
<b>MIDDLE SCHOOLS</b>		
Core course reduction for all students		
Decrease ratio by 5/6 weighted teacher to student ratio	<u>121</u>	<u>\$ 5,510,532</u>
from 1:29.45 to 1:27.75		
<b>SENIOR HIGH SCHOOLS</b>		
Core course reduction for all students		
Decrease ratio by 5/6 weighted teacher to student ratio	<u>155</u>	<u>\$7,073,166</u>
from 1:29.45 to 1:27.75		
 <b>Total Estimated Cost*</b>	<u><u>558</u></u>	<u><u>\$28,983,373</u></u>

\* Excludes transportation and remedial

**FINANCIAL IMPACT  
PRELIMINARY PLAN FOR IMPLEMENTATION OF AMENDMENT 9  
CORE COURSE REDUCTION COST  
DECREASE RATIO BY TWO STUDENTS**

	<b>POSITIONS</b>	<b>SALARIES</b>
<b>ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS</b>		
Core course reduction for all students Decrease ratio by 2 students.	353	\$20,501,769
K -1 from 1:26.90 to 1:24.90		
2 - 3 from 1:27.85 to 1:25.85		
4 - 5/6 from 1:32.35 to 1:30.35		
5 - 8 from 1:29.45 to 1:26.90 (K-8 Centers)		
 ESOL Self-Contained	<u>32</u>	<u>1,852,503</u>
from 1:26 to 1:24		
 Elementary - Sub-Total	<u>385</u>	<u>\$22,354,272</u>
 <b>MIDDLE SCHOOLS</b>		
Core course reduction for all students Decrease ratio by 5/6 weighted teacher to student ratio	<u>187</u>	<u>\$ 8,534,454</u>
from 1:29.45 to 1:26.90		
 <b>SENIOR HIGH SCHOOLS</b>		
Core course reduction for all students Decrease ratio by 5/6 weighted teacher to student ratio	<u>240</u>	<u>\$10,944,827</u>
from 1:29.45 to 1:26.90		
 <b>Total Estimated Cost*</b>	<u><u>812</u></u>	<u><u>\$41,833,553</u></u>

\* Excludes transportation and remedial



**FINANCIAL IMPACT  
PRELIMINARY PLAN FOR IMPLEMENTATION OF AMENDMENT 9  
REMEDIAL COST**

**ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS**

Retained 3rd graders		
Enhanced ratio of 1:20	111	\$ 6,204,618
Projected low performing 3rd graders		
Enhanced ratio of 1:20	78	4,360,001
Elementary - Sub-Total	<u>189</u>	<u>\$10,564,619</u>

**MIDDLE SCHOOLS**

Low performing 7th period supplement		
Enhanced ratio of 1:20		<u>\$11,930,824</u>

**SENIOR HIGH SCHOOLS**

Low performing 7th period supplement		
Enhanced ratio of 1:20		<u>\$15,117,072</u>

<b>Total Estimated Cost*</b>	<u><u>189</u></u>	<u><u>\$37,612,515</u></u>
------------------------------	-------------------	----------------------------

\* Excludes transportation

## ATTACHMENT C

### SPECIAL GUIDELINES PERTAINING TO IMPLEMENTATION OF AMENDMENT 9: CLASS SIZE REDUCTION

1. The additional allocation of teachers should be used to reduce class size in defined core courses: language arts, mathematics, science, social studies, foreign language, and self-contained ESOL (Intensive English).
2. Teaching positions may be utilized in co-teaching situations or as a consulting/remedial teacher, if additional classroom space is not available. Such use of additional teaching positions shall be identified to the ACCESS Centers and be pre-approved by such in advance. Additional teacher positions may also be converted to extra-period supplements. All teaching positions must be identified with specific course codes/pupils/room location.
3. Every effort shall be made to establish separate classroom space situations for teachers in the core courses by maximally utilizing facilities, including resource rooms, auditoriums, and other similar spaces.
4. The number of released-time teaching periods, e.g., department heads, athletic director, business manager, department chair, etc. for senior highs shall be limited. Procedures will be established by the Chief Education Officer and Deputy Superintendent of Schools to monitor the number of released time teaching periods.
5. Schools shall limit their conversion of teaching positions generated by CASAS to a minimum and in no case shall convert more classroom teaching positions to discretionary funds or to other school positions than were converted in Final CASAS, 2002. Full-time teaching positions may be converted without limit to extra-period supplements, provided they are wholly used for district classroom instruction.
6. Schools not reducing their overall class size average in core classes during the October 2003 class size survey may be required to create additional teaching positions, whether utilized as stand-alone classroom teachers or as co-teaching/consulting/remedial/extra-period supplement teachers by November 15, 2003. All such teaching positions shall be assigned typical classroom teaching duties involving student contact.

## ATTACHMENT D

### CLASS SIZE REDUCTION/REMEDIAL PLAN FOR 2003-2004

#### SELF-CONTAINED FLEXIBLE MODEL

- 1:20 teacher-pupil ratio in classes with students that meet the remedial criteria (homogeneous group)
- Flexible scheduling such as possible reduction of other subject areas (e.g., art, music, physical education, Spanish) to one hour a day and extended reading/mathematics instructional time, wheel or block schedule
- Placement of students who have achieved standards in the self-contained model into regular classes

#### COMBINATION MODEL

Students for this model would be pulled from a regular classroom setting. Students would be provided remedial services using one of the following options:

- Hourly teachers pull-out model
  - OIT would have to design a way of assigning students to these teachers for class size reduction purposes
  - Hourly teachers hired for this model would have to meet certification requirements
- Resource teachers with assigned group(s) of students for reading instruction. Resource teachers would include (but not be limited to): reading facilitator, writing coach, Title I funded personnel including reading leaders, ESE teachers, ESOL teachers, CCHL teachers. OIT would have to design a way of assigning students to these teachers for class size reduction purposes.
- Full-time reading teacher who would take multiple reading groups of students who meet the criteria. This teacher would have assigned students in a way that counts towards CSR.

#### CO-TEACHING MODEL

- This model would involve two teachers in one classroom with students assigned to each teacher. This model could follow the guidelines established by the CSR grant co-teaching model. Class size needs to be capped at 20 per teacher.

#### INDIVIDUAL SCHOOL DEVELOPED PLAN

These plans would have to be approved by the District, service the students meeting the criteria, and meet the class size reduction intent.

## **PLAN A: GRADES 6-12**

### Enrollment Priority

Level 1 students in grades 6-10 and 11 and 12 grade students who have not passed either or both sections of the Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT).

### Implementation Plan

**Require a seventh period for all students who meet the above criteria as an extension of the regular school day.**

Grades 6-8 school day extended until 4:50 pm

Grades 9-12 school day extended until 3:20 pm

### Courses Offered

Students scoring at Level 1 on the FCAT and 11 and 12 grade students who have not passed the FCAT will be required to take an additional reading/math elective as a seventh course.

### Class Size

Class size will be limited to 20 students.

### Advantages

- Ensures double dosing of all Level 1 students and 11 and 12 grade students who have not passed FCAT;
- Offers opportunities for intensive remediation with low teacher:student ratio;
- Offers teachers the opportunity to receive monetary incentive for extra period (1/8 of salary); and
- Does not negatively impact elective courses.

### Disadvantages

- Shortage of instructional personnel who are highly qualified/certified and willing to teach an additional hour in the extended school day;
- Negatively impacts participation in athletics and other after school activities;
- Negative impact for students who work after school;
- Additional transportation required for participating students;
- Additional security personnel required;
- Additional hours for administrator(s) without compensation;
- Equity issue since only Level 1 students and 11 and 12 grade students who have not passed the FCAT are eligible.

### Additional issues that must be addressed

- Revisions of the Pupil Progression Plan.

### **PLAN B: GRADES 6-12**

#### Enrollment Priority

Level 1 students in grades 6-10 and 11<sup>th</sup> and 12<sup>th</sup> graders who have not passed either or both sections of the Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT).

#### Implementation Plan

**Require a reading/math course in lieu of an elective as part of the regular 6 period day for all students who meet the above criteria.**

#### Courses Offered

Students scoring at Level 1 on the FCAT and 11 and 12 grade students who have not passed FCAT will be required to take an additional reading/math elective.

#### Class Size

Class size will be limited to 20 students.

#### Advantages

- Required course is part of the current school day; therefore transportation, activities and athletics are not impacted;
- Ensures double dosing of all Level 1 students and 11 and 12 grade students who have not passed FCAT;
- Offers opportunities for intensive remediation with low teacher:student ratio; and
- Offers teachers the opportunity to receive monetary incentive for extra period (1/8 of salary).

#### Disadvantages

- Shortage of instructional personnel who are highly qualified/certified and willing to teach a sixth period;
- Negatively impacts elective courses;
- May result in surplus personnel from elective areas;
- Equity issue since only Level 1 students and 11 and 12 grade students who have not passed the FCAT are eligible.

### Additional issues that must be addressed

- Revisions of the Pupil Progression Plan.

### **PLAN C: GRADES 6-12**

#### Enrollment Priority

Level 1 students in grades 6-10 and 11 and 12 grade students who have not passed either or both sections of the Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT).

#### Implementation Plan

**Require a seventh period within regular school hours for all students who meet the above criteria.** Achieve by reducing class time each period by 10 minutes and dismissing non-participating students 50 minutes earlier. **This plan would require the approval of the EESAC.**

- Grades 6-8
  - o Non-participating students dismissed at 2:50 pm
  - o Participating students dismissed at 3:40 pm
- Grades 9-12
  - o Non-participating students dismissed at 1:40 pm
  - o Participating students dismissed at 2:30 pm

#### Courses Offered

Students scoring at Level 1 on the FCAT and 11 and 12 grade students who have not passed the FCAT will be required to take an additional reading/math elective as a seventh course within the regular school day.

#### Class Size

Class size will be limited to 20 students.

#### Advantages

- Ensures double dosing of all Level 1 students and 11 and 12 grade students who have not passed FCAT;
- Offers opportunities for intensive remediation with low teacher:student ratio;
- Offers teachers the opportunity to receive monetary incentive for extra period (1/8 of salary); and
- Does not negatively impact elective courses.

### Disadvantages

- Shortage of instructional personnel who are highly qualified/certified and willing to teach a sixth period;
- Two dismissals create administrative and security issues;
- Two dismissals require additional transportation;
- Equity issue since only Level 1 students and 11 and 12 grade students that have not passed the FCAT are eligible.

### Additional issues that must be addressed

- Revisions of the Pupil Progression Plan.

### **PLAN D: GRADES 6-12, INDIVIDUAL SCHOOL DEVELOPED PLAN**

These plans would have to be approved by the ACCESS Centers and the District, service the students meeting the criteria, and meet the class size reduction intent.