

**Possibilities for Offering HS Students 14 Blocks of Instruction under 3 Revenue Scenarios**

	<b>Revenue Scenario A (worst case)</b>	<b>Revenue Scenario B (better)</b>	<b>Revenue Scenario C (best)</b>
<b>Revenue Assumptions</b>	5% reduction to state aid No override funds	0% reduction to state aid no override funds	0% reduction to state aid \$950k override funds
<b>Reference to Prioritized Cut List</b>	Rows 10-76 cut	Rows 27-76 cut	Rows 45-76 cut
<b>Staffing Adjustments Needed to Yield Sufficient Sections of Electives to Seat All Students in 14<sup>th</sup> Block</b>	Reduce an additional 37-48 sections/3.7-4.8 academic teachers beyond those cut in Rows 24, 15, 13 and 3; replace them with 4.5-6.0 restored elective teachers from Rows 9, 10, 11, 12, 20 and 22.	Reduce 45-60 sections/4.5-6.0 academic teachers from Rows 24, 15, 13 and 3; replace them with 4.5-6.0 restored (from Rows 9, 10, 11, 12, 20 and 22) and newly hired elective teachers.	Proceed with proposed cuts to lines 25 + 29-36 + 40-42; reduce 5-10 sections/.5-1.0 academic teachers (from Row 24); replace them with 4.5-6.0 restored (from Rows 9, 10, 11, 12, 20 and 22) and newly hired elective teachers.
<b>Projected Average Academic Class Size using Current Elective Class Sizes</b>  (assume range of at least +/-3 to account for scheduling various levels of instruction and electives within academic departments)	English: 32 Math: 32 Social Studies: 33 Science: 31	English: 27 Math: 27 Social Studies: 28 Science: 23	English: 23 Math: 23 Social Studies: 24 Science: 22
<b>Projected Average Academic Class Size using Projected Increases based on Redesigning Elective Courses to hold 24+ and Running only those that Fill</b>  (assume range of at least +/-3 to account for scheduling various levels of instruction and electives within academic departments)	English: 29 Math: 29 Social Studies: 30 Science: 28	English: 25 Math: 25 Social Studies: 26 Science: 22	English: 22 Math: 22 Social Studies: 23 Science: 21

## Possibilities for Offering HS Students 14 Blocks of Instruction under 3 Revenue Scenarios

This chart sets up three speculative revenue scenarios and examines the implications for staffing and academic and elective class size at the high school. At the outset it is important to recognize the limitations of this chart as a predictor of the desired outcome of appropriate course schedules for every HS student, given how difficult it is to account for student preference, teacher schedule constraints, and facilities constraints when building a master schedule. Projected departmental average class size is an artificial indicator in that it masks the range of section sizes across departments due to various levels of courses, and elective offerings within academic departments. Reducing the number of sections does not just increase the departmental average, it broadens the range. For example:

- If 18 students request a class (e.g. AP Environmental Science or Physics Waves), we must either not run the class, further reducing our course offerings, because it does not meet the needed projected average standard of 25, or other sections in the same department must run with enrollments way over 25 to balance the 18-student singleton.

- If 50 students request a class (e.g. AP European History or CP Constitutional Law), constraints in the scheduling process will result not in two balanced sections of 25, but rather one in the teens and one in the thirties.

- Some academic courses are intentionally capped at enrollments of 20 or under in order to promote success for students who have struggled and who will need additional support in order to meet graduation and MCAS requirements. Our low income and special education students are already underperforming on MCAS, and there have been significant cuts to supports for struggling students over the last five years (MCAS tutorials, Prep Academy II, the Reading Program, Special Education staff). These students, as much as any of our highest achievers, need to graduate ARHS with a strong academic transcript, prepared for post-secondary success.

- A “tightened” master schedule will result in de facto tracking, as students whose schedules must include particular ELL, Special Education, or AP courses are channeled into the only available section of their academic and elective classes.

- The tightness of the master schedule that results from reducing sections decreases options for students to get the academic courses they need in different blocks, which may box them out of getting into an elective they want. Ironically, under some of the scenarios laid out in this chart, we could end up with unfilled seats in restored elective classes because the students who want seats in those electives are not able to get their academics in blocks which enable them to be free to take the elective they want. A student might be forced to choose between continuing in an upper-level world language and continuing to play an instrument in a musical ensemble.

Regarding the prospect of re-designing elective programs to handle increased student enrollments, we can't assume that there will be alignment between student interest in electives and the electives that have high enrollment capacity. For example, enrollment in computer-based technology classes, wood technology classes, foods, clothing and some art classes is limited by available lab stations, safety concerns, or other facilities limitations. We only have two art classrooms which can accommodate 25 students per section. On the other hand, high-enrollment capacity PE classes do not attract students in numbers to fill sections at the numbers they can handle.

Therefore it is essential that the HS administration retain some degree of flexibility to make determinations regarding where to make staffing reductions and additions within the academic and elective realms, and what courses to run or not run based on enrollment, regardless of the total number of blocks offered to students in 2010-11. Otherwise neither balanced class sizes nor desirable, appropriate student schedules will be within our grasp.