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Item  Board Staff Date of
Number Member Assignment Request

5 Morse Burden 1/11/2018

Can a total claims history and a proportional claims history (claims divided by the number of employees covered) be provided? Look for trends to see whether our programs continue to reduce the average annual claims.

Actual claims history for FY13 through FY17 and budgeted claims for FY18 and FY19 are shown below. Total enrollment encompasses all participants covered (employee, employee dependents, retirees).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Health Insurance</th>
<th>Prescriptions</th>
<th>Vision</th>
<th>Dental</th>
<th>Total Claims Expenses</th>
<th>Enrollment</th>
<th>Expense per Insured</th>
<th>Yrly change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY19 Proposed</td>
<td>133,577,814</td>
<td>43,742,376</td>
<td>897,350</td>
<td>10,680,580</td>
<td>188,898,120</td>
<td>23,778</td>
<td>7,944</td>
<td>732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY18 Adopted</td>
<td>120,273,943</td>
<td>36,458,677</td>
<td>914,635</td>
<td>10,238,648</td>
<td>167,885,903</td>
<td>23,278</td>
<td>7,212</td>
<td>389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY17 Actual</td>
<td>108,078,044</td>
<td>30,999,763</td>
<td>735,747</td>
<td>8,989,301</td>
<td>148,802,855</td>
<td>21,809</td>
<td>6,823</td>
<td>607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY16 Actual</td>
<td>99,430,994</td>
<td>25,211,926</td>
<td>712,379</td>
<td>8,459,418</td>
<td>133,814,718</td>
<td>21,529</td>
<td>6,216</td>
<td>(288)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY15 Actual</td>
<td>101,022,161</td>
<td>25,378,074</td>
<td>797,611</td>
<td>9,657,625</td>
<td>136,855,470</td>
<td>21,043</td>
<td>6,504</td>
<td>602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY14 Actual</td>
<td>90,678,727</td>
<td>23,085,770</td>
<td>685,845</td>
<td>8,074,657</td>
<td>122,524,999</td>
<td>20,763</td>
<td>5,901</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY13 Actual</td>
<td>88,750,346</td>
<td>21,286,629</td>
<td>711,325</td>
<td>7,643,419</td>
<td>118,391,719</td>
<td>20,618</td>
<td>5,742</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

25 Rose Ellis 1/18/2018

Did staff consider including elementary language immersion pilot program in this budget proposal? Please explain reasons why it was not included?

In preparation for the FY15 budget, staff developed projected costs for a pilot dual language immersion program at three schools. It was considered and not included in the FY19 proposed budget because of competing budget priorities to meet the goals set forth in the LCPS Strategic Actions.
Did staff consider restoring the FLE teacher positions eliminated in the last budget? Please explain why these positions were not included in the FY19 budget proposal. Please include in this answer a summary of the FLE program, the changes this year, and how many PE teachers delivered FLE curriculum. What feedback has been received from school staff, FLE teachers, students and parents?

In preparation for the FY19 budget, staff had conversations regarding FLE teacher positions. However, it is important to gather baseline data from teachers, parents, and school-based staff to determine program effectiveness since the elimination of the positions; therefore, no changes are reflected in the FY19 budget. Once we have more data, staff may consider recommending changes in the number of FTEs in the FY20 budget.

The VDOE recommends that school divisions convene a community involvement team comprised of central office staff, school principals, teachers, parents, members of the clergy and the medical profession to make curriculum recommendations. The FLE curriculum was reviewed by the committee, and a SOL crosswalk between Health Education and Family Life Education was done to determine how to reduce redundancies in lessons already addressed in Health Education. Additionally, the committee made recommendations on how to maximize the capacity of 10 FLE teachers (reduced by seven teachers in FY18). The degree of overlap between FLE and Health Education SOLs demonstrated that with quality teacher training, the current HPE educators are uniquely positioned to teach most of the FLE content and connect FLE and health education student learning. HPE educators currently instruct related FLE topics, such as relationships, proper use of social media, and hygiene. FLE teachers address sensitive content related to good touch/bad touch, puberty, childbirth, dating violence, and consent.

Updated curriculum was provided to FLE and HPE teachers this year upon completion of the curriculum review. Division office staff is currently reviewing all feedback received regarding the FLE program. Preliminarily, school staff have reported that the content is more engaging and relevant for their students. FLE teachers are enthusiastic about the updated materials and the use of an evidence-based curriculum. The FLE teachers have commented that they feel supported and they believe the new blend of health education and science lends more credibility to the FLE lessons. While the HPE Supervisor has not had opportunities to interview students, she has observed on many occasions a greater degree of student engagement in lessons.

Approximately 60 parents previewed the FLE curriculum in the fall. Most commended the curriculum; however, some expressed a desire for additional FLE instruction on human trafficking. To date, no parent complaints about the FLE curriculum have been reported to DOI staff for SY17-18.
What has been the funding trajectory of instructional school allotments over the past 10 years? Please provide a 10-year history. What is the rationale associated with a smaller per pupil instructional allotment at the elementary school level?

Elementary instructional allotments are lower than secondary allotments because the elementary allotments support general education while the secondary allotments support more specialized instruction. Also, elementary schools do not have CTE (Career and Technical Education) programs. For example, science at the elementary level is more generalized in the supplies required, but middle school and high school may require chemicals, etc.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Elementary</th>
<th>Middle</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>34.38</td>
<td>40.05</td>
<td>40.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>34.38</td>
<td>40.05</td>
<td>40.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>34.38</td>
<td>40.05</td>
<td>40.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>34.38</td>
<td>40.05</td>
<td>40.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>33.38</td>
<td>38.88</td>
<td>38.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014*</td>
<td>32.38</td>
<td>38.88</td>
<td>38.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>33.38</td>
<td>38.88</td>
<td>38.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>32.41</td>
<td>37.75</td>
<td>37.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>32.41</td>
<td>37.75</td>
<td>37.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>38.13</td>
<td>43.55</td>
<td>43.55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Guilford, Rolling Ridge, Sugarland, and Sully were allotted $33.38 per pupil

28 Hornberger Burden 1/18/2018

Are there proposed increases in stipends in the Superintendent’s Proposed Budget? If so, how much is that proposed increase? Please also provide a 10-year history of average stipend increases. What are the proposed stipends for athletics in the Superintendent’s Proposed Budget (they were not included on page 296 of the Appendix).

There are no proposed increases in stipends in the Superintendent’s Proposed Budget. The athletic stipends are provided and will be included in the final budget book.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Adopted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY19</td>
<td>No Change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY18</td>
<td>Increase 2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY17</td>
<td>Increase 1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY10-16</td>
<td>No Change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item Number</td>
<td>Board Member</td>
<td>Staff Assignment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 cont.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ATHLETICS**

- **Baseball**
  - Head Coach: $4,045
  - Assistant Coach: $3,072
  - JV Head Coach: $3,072
  - JV Assistant Coach: $2,196

- **Basketball**
  - Girls’ Head Coach: $5,129
  - Boys’ Head Coach: $5,129
  - Girls’ Assistant Varsity Coach: $3,842
  - Boys’ Assistant Varsity Coach: $3,842
  - Girls’ JV Head Coach: $3,842
  - Boys’ JV Head Coach: $3,842
  - Girls’ Varsity Assistant Coach: $3,072
  - Boys’ Varsity Assistant Coach: $3,072
  - Girls’ JV Coach: $3,072
  - Boys’ JV Coach: $3,072

- **Cheerleading**
  - Fall Head Coach: $3,232
  - Fall Varsity Cheer Assistant: $2,196
  - Fall JV Head Coach: $2,196
  - Fall Freshman Head Coach: $2,196
  - Winter Head Coach: $3,072
  - Winter JV Head Coach: $2,196
  - Winter Freshman Head Coach: $2,196

- **Cross Country**
  - Head Coach: $3,232
  - Assistant Coach (2): $2,196

- **Field Hockey**
  - Head Coach: $4,045
  - Assistant Varsity Coach: $3,072

- **Football**
  - Head Coach: $5,393
  - Assistant Varsity Coach (2): $4,045
  - JV Head Coach: $4,045
  - JV Assistant Coach: $3,842
  - Freshman Head Coach: $4,045
  - Freshman Assistant Coach (2): $3,842

- **Golf**
  - Head Coach: $2,366

- **Gymnastics**
  - Head Coach: $4,045
  - Assistant Coach: $3,072

- **Indoor Track**
  - Head Coach: $2,805
  - Assistant Coach (2): $1,521

- **Lacrosse**
  - Girls’ Head Coach: $4,045
  - Boys’ Head Coach: $4,045
  - Girls’ Varsity Assistant Coach: $3,072
  - Boys’ Varsity Assistant Coach: $3,072
  - Girls’ JV Coach: $3,072
  - Boys’ JV Coach: $3,072
  - Girls’ JV Assistant Coach: $2,196
  - Boys’ JV Assistant Coach: $2,196

- **Soccer**
  - Girls’ Head Coach: $4,045
  - Boys’ Head Coach: $4,045
  - Girls’ Varsity Assistant Coach: $3,072
  - Boys’ Varsity Assistant Coach: $3,072
  - Girls’ JV Coach: $3,072
  - Boys’ JV Coach: $3,072
  - Girls’ JV Assistant Coach: $2,196
  - Boys’ JV Assistant Coach: $2,196

- **Softball**
  - Head Coach: $4,045
  - Assistant Coach: $3,072
  - JV Head Coach: $3,072
  - JV Assistant Coach: $2,196

- **Swimming**
  - Head Coach: $3,232
  - Assistant Coach: $2,196

- **Tennis**
  - Girls’ Head Coach: $2,356
  - Boys’ Head Coach: $2,356

- **Track**
  - Girls’ Head Coach: $4,045
  - Boys’ Head Coach: $4,045
  - Girls’ Assistant Coach: $2,196
  - Boys’ Assistant Coach: $2,196
  - Assistant Coach: $2,196

- **Volleyball**
  - Head Coach: $4,045
  - Assistant Coach: $3,072
  - JV Head Coach: $3,072
  - Freshman Head Coach: $2,196

- **Wrestling**
  - Head Coach: $4,045
  - Assistant Coach: $3,072
  - JV Head Coach: $3,072
What are the resulting per student ratios for Psychologists, Social Workers and Counselors within LCPS in general and at each instructional level (ES, MS and HS) within the Superintendent’s Proposed Budget? How does this compare to that of our comparator school divisions? What has been the staffing trajectory for LCPS in these areas over the last 10-years?

The following table shows the resulting per student ratios on the left and the staffing standards on the right. The calculated ratios differ from the staffing standards due to the distribution of students across the schools and rounding.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY19 Ratio</th>
<th>FY19 Staffing Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>Middle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychologist</td>
<td>1:2081</td>
<td>1:1196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Worker</td>
<td>1:2341</td>
<td>1:1196</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Surrounding jurisdiction’s FY18 staffing ratios are provided in the following table. The staffing ratios in LCPS are less generous than three of the four comparators for Psychologists, Social Workers and High School Counselors and less generous than two of the four comparators for Middle School Counselors.
Ten year staffing history is provided.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Board Member</th>
<th>Staff Assignment</th>
<th>Date of Request</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29 cont.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

30 Hornberger Burden 1/18/2018
Is the County experiencing similar post-implementation issues with Oracle?

The County payroll and benefits process are somewhat different than LCPS, but they are experiencing challenges as well during this stabilization period. One issue we are experiencing is that it took several months from their go live date in late July to work through the successful posting of Oracle payroll to the general ledger. Some other examples of issues we are experiencing that the County experienced as well include interfaces from external time entry systems, technical element setups for payroll/benefits modules, and appropriate treatment for benefits triggered by life events and associated deductions, if any. Similar to LCPS, the County has hired consultants to support resolution of these and other issues as they arise.

31 Hornberger Burden 1/18/2018
Can we obtain comparison staffing for security personnel from surrounding jurisdictions?

### FY18 School-Based Safety & Security Staffing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division</th>
<th>Safety &amp; Security Specialist/Officer</th>
<th>Safety &amp; Security Assistant</th>
<th>Number of MS, HS, Alternative Schools</th>
<th>FTE per School Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staffing Standard</td>
<td>FTEs</td>
<td>Staffing Standard</td>
<td>FTEs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexandria*</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>ES - 1.0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arlington**</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairfax</td>
<td>1.0 per HS/alternative school</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>3.0 per HS 1.5 per alternative school 1.0 per MS +1.0 additional at HS based on need</td>
<td>106.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loudoun</td>
<td>1.0 per HS/career &amp; technical center/ alternative school</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prince William</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>MS - 17.0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>MS - 4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HS/ALT - 12.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>HS - 28.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LCPS FY19 Proposed Staffing Standard Enhancement - +4.0 Safety & Security Specialists to be assigned at the discretion of Support Services**

*Contracts an additional 12 specialists for HS.
**Additional security is provided by the Arlington County Police Department.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Number</th>
<th>Board Member</th>
<th>Staff Assignment</th>
<th>Date of Request</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Hornberger</td>
<td>Lewis</td>
<td>1/18/2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How will Monroe be utilized before renovation?

The Monroe building will be utilized as an interim location for the Adult Education Program and a temporary Douglass Annex. These programs will take up approximately four classrooms and a small office space. Custodial staffing consists of two FTEs that will remain at the school through FY2019. In addition to serving the instructional programs listed above, the facility will require staff to maintain the building and exterior grounds as well as assist in the transition of the programs to the new Academies of Loudoun facility. It should be noted that after over forty years of service, the facility will require significant purging and heavy cleaning in preparation of the next phase of instructional service. Facilities Services will reassess the custodial staffing needs for the facility for FY2020.

33 Sheridan Lewis 1/18/2018

Is there the opportunity for increased Afterschool Fuel, etc activities/funding?

AfterSchool Fuel and universal free breakfast have very specific criteria to implement. Preliminary assessments by School Nutrition Services Staff indicate that one (1) additional school may qualify for the breakfast in the classroom program in the fall. School Nutrition Services Staff annually review program availability and continue to seek expansion opportunities for program offerings.

34 Rose Lewis 1/18/2018

Can a list of the priority items from the Principal Safety Task Force be provided?

Principal Safety Task Force Recommendations:

- Implement enhanced Safety and Security measures in LCPS schools
  - Additional school based Safety and Security Specialists
  - Additional oversight to schools during after school and evening events
  - Day-time patrol response during the hours of school to support administrators in daily operations for matters that may not yet rise to a law enforcement response. (i.e. suspicious people, vehicles, hostile parents or employees)
  - Continued staff training for preparedness and operationalization of “Run, Hide, Fight” decision making tactics and safety measures during active-violent intruder incidents.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Number</th>
<th>Board Member</th>
<th>Staff Assignment</th>
<th>Date of Request</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Hornberger</td>
<td>Ellis</td>
<td>1/20/2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The proposed budget includes an increase of 12 Teacher FTEs associated with the expansion of AET, AOS and MATA within the new Academies of Loudoun facility. How is the number of teachers within the programs determined? Please provide the current (FY 2018) and anticipated (FY 2019) teacher staffing ratios within each of the three programs within the Academies of Loudoun?

*Question is being worked on.*

---

36 Marshall Ellis/Burden 1/22/2018

When reviewing the responses of FY 19 School Board Questions (page 5), dated January 18, 2018, I learned that to continue supporting Loudoun students at Thomas Jefferson (TJHSST) in Fairfax County with an enrollment of 270 students, 9-12 the cost per pupil was $14,697, which incidentally was $1,390 more, per pupil, than our costs for supporting AOS and AET students at the Academies of Loudoun. If we were to begin to phase out our association with TJ by not funding the rising ninth graders (using numbers in the response provided, approximately 69 students) would we not save $1,014,093?

If we wanted a more gradual phase-out and the Board arbitrarily limited the number of students to 35 for FY 19 funding, as an example, our cost would be $514,395 and our savings would be $499,698. Am I correct in stating, that under our contract with Fairfax, County, Loudoun can limit the number of students we send regardless of the number of applicants TJ could accept?

*Question is being worked on.*

---

37 Marshall Ellis 1/22/2018

When in the school year for FY 19 do students apply for Thomas Jefferson HS for Science and Technology and/or AET and AOS? Who makes these decisions and when are the decision(s) made on acceptance to these various programs? Can you confirm that LCPS can limit the number of students who attend TJ, per our contract/MOU with Fairfax County? How many students who apply to TJ also apply to AOS or AET?

*Question is being worked on.*