Shared Services Study

Prepared for

Deposit Central School
and
Hancock Central School

Alan D. Pole
Education Consultant
Castallo and Silky
4514 Whistler Circle
Manlius, NY 13104
polead@yahoo.com
315.692.4615

March 2012

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

A study with this purpose and scope could not have been accomplished without the support and cooperation of many individuals. I would first like to express my appreciation to the Deposit and Hancock Boards of Education for their vision and concern for their children and communities by engaging in this study.

I also appreciate the leadership and support of the two superintendents, Ed Shirkey in Deposit and Terry Dougherty in Hancock. These individuals supported this study in every way. They provided the consultant with information, made arrangements for the consultant to meet with their staffs, and generously gave of their time to ensure that the study was completed with accuracy and in a timely manner.

I also wish to thank the administrators and supervisors from both districts who met with me, provided me with information, and supported the study. From Deposit, these people included:

Dave Richards, Middle/High School Principal

Denise Cook, Elementary School Principal

Ethan Berry, Business Administrator

Bea Bailey, Director of Special Programs

Tom Williams, Director of Facilities

Guy Struble, Supervisor of Transportation

Lori Wheeler, School Lunch Manager

Ed Swartwout, Director of Athletics

From Hancock, these people included:

Carol Daddezio, K-12 Principal

Scott MacDowell, Business Official

Jason Hans, Director of Pupil Personnel Services

Bill Christian, Instructional Technology Coordinator

Frank Seely, Superintendent of Buildings and Grounds

Jodi Newman, Transportation Supervisor

Jo-Anne Smith, School Lunch Manager

Brandon Olbrys, Athletic Director

Last, but certainly not least, the superintendents' staff in both districts were most helpful in helping me complete this study. My sincere thanks go to Jennifer Macumber in Deposit and Jennifer Gill and Sue Heinrich in Hancock.

To these individuals and all other individuals who assisted in bringing this study to a successful conclusion, I offer my deepest gratitude.

CHAPTER 2
BACKGROUND FOR THE STUDY

A number of factors are affecting the operation of public school districts in New York State today. State standards continue to rise, requiring students to do more in order to attain a high school diploma. These standards are driven by a rapidly changing world where more skills than ever before are required in order to be successful in college and the world of work. Pressures on schools to increase the number of students who successfully complete high school continue to mount.

At the same time that communities strive to do more for their students, enrollments in many school districts are declining. In small districts like Deposit and Hancock, maintaining and expanding opportunities for students is an especially significant challenge when student enrollments are on a downward path.

The third challenge facing school districts in New York State is one of resources. As districts strive to provide more for their students, financial challenges continue to grow in our nation and in New York State in particular. Our national economy is more precarious than it has been in decades. Our state budget is in dire straits facing deficits of billions of dollars. Fixed costs for school districts continue to rise at a time when state aid to education is being cut and a cap on local property taxes has recently been legislated. Districts are spending down their fund balances knowing that this is a short-term solution at best. It clearly is time for courageous school leaders to begin discussions about doing business differently.

In the spring of 2011, the Boards of Education and the Superintendents of the Deposit and Hancock school districts engaged in a series of discussions about the sharing of programs, services, and equipment between the two districts. Their focus was on preserving and enhancing the quality of educational opportunity for students in a cost-effective manner through the sharing of existing programs, services, and operations in the two districts, thereby reducing costs.

Purpose of the Study

The Syracuse based education consulting firm of Castallo and Silky was engaged to conduct this study. The consultant met with the two superintendents in early October to define the purpose and scope of the study and reviewed the school district information that had been gathered by the districts. A deadline of mid-January was established for completion of the study.

The scope of the study centered on the following questions.

1. Is there a better way to share instructional programs, support services, and administrative services between the Deposit and Hancock school districts?
2. Are there additional instructional programs, support services, or administrative services that could be shared between the Deposit and Hancock school districts?
3. If so, (a) what are the financial implications; and (b) what process might be considered for the two districts to plan for and implement these additional sharing opportunities?

In the discussions about doing business more cost effectively, it is a generally accepted principle by the two districts that cost effectiveness can be achieved in one of two ways—getting more service for the same cost or getting the same service for a lesser cost. These two principles form the basis for the options contained in this report.

Change

The main premise undergirding this study is that business as usual in school districts will no longer be an option for the way districts operate. This implies that change must occur. Generally speaking, people don't like to change!

Change is especially difficult in small, rural school districts. Oftentimes, such as in Deposit and Hancock, the school district is the largest employer in the community. Income earned from school employment is an important factor in sustaining the local economy. People won't go out for dinner as much, buy new cars as often, or remodel their homes beyond necessity if they are not gainfully employed. In addition, the local

community is counted on to support the operation of the school district through the annual vote on the district's budget. People don't want to lose their jobs and, generally speaking, public employers are very reluctant to put people out of work….especially in small, rural school districts.

People don't like to change because it is often easier to do something on our own. When districts share, issues of distance, incompatible schedules, and convenience often are barriers to making the change. A district gives up something when it decides to share with another district. There is no sharing of services that does not come without its implementation challenges.

Recognizing the reluctance to change and the challenges associated with personnel change, significant change must involve people. Schools are labor-intensive organizations. In general, approximately 70% of a school district's budget is comprised of salaries and benefits. Given the financial challenges the schools face, cutting supplies and materials will not produce enough savings to make a difference.

Given this background, when is personnel change most palatable? History has shown that school districts are more apt to make a personnel change when a position is vacant rather than when an individual has to lose a job. This is a reality that must be considered when planning for change. In addition, it is recommended that consideration be given to consolidating positions in the two study districts. In recommending these consolidations, it is fully understood that changes in duties might have to be made. These changes do not mean that people are not busy in their current roles. In small districts, everyone pitches in to get the job done. However, these changes would assume that supervisors would spend all of their time supervising and managing their areas of responsibility.

In this report, changes are offered for consideration, they are not recommended. The purpose of this study is to identify areas for possible sharing, not to determine the most attractive option or to develop implementation plans. It is the school districts that will decide which of these changes may work and which may not.

In framing options, the same pattern has been followed for all areas under consideration that have financial implications. Cost estimates have been made in the most conservative manner so that, if anything, cost savings are underestimated in this report. When looking at alternative staffing structures, current staff members with the highest salaries have been used for estimating savings. In addition, every salary chosen has been increased by 10% to compensate for the individual taking on the responsibility of a second district. There is certainly no requirement that these salaries be increased by 10%. On the other hand, districts may decide to increase salaries by more than 10%. This figure is used simply to recognize the increased responsibilities that are a part of the sharing considerations contained herein.

BOCES

The final comment that should be made about sharing services involves BOCES. There are 37 Boards of Cooperative Educational Services in New York State. Their purpose is to provide cooperative services to school districts more cost effectively than the districts could provide those services on their own. Recognizing the challenges to sharing, the state pays school districts additional state aid to encourage sharing. This additional state support is called BOCES aid. For most services that are shared through BOCES (special education being the most notable exception), the state pays BOCES aid to districts consistent with the expenditures that districts make for BOCES services. Both districts receive about half of what they spend with BOCES as an additional expense driven revenue in BOCES aid. There is a cap of $30,000 on an individual's salary that can be aided by the state but all other expenditures are eligible for the BOCES aid for sharing. The $30,000 cap has been included where consideration is presented for a BOCES service. In reality, this BOCES aid is another revenue source for a school district. If these two school districts can find ways to share things through BOCES that they are currently funding in a local district line, they can make the same expenditures but get half of their money back in BOCES aid. This aid can compound the savings that the districts might realize through the sharing of services.

Finally, the study districts are members of two different BOCES. School districts routinely purchase services from their member BOCES and often are able to cross

contract with other BOCES for services. There are a number of times where this study suggests purchasing shared services from BOCES. Both BOCES offer a wide array of fine services, many of them quite similar. There is no attempt in this study to suggest from which BOCES any service should be purchased. That is a decision that is left solely to the local school districts to decide.

Shared Services, Not Merger

It should be made clear that this is a study about sharing services between the two districts and not a merger study. In this study, the consultant worked primarily with school staff while a merger study has significant community involvement. This study was be completed in approximately six months while a merger study would take 18-24 months to complete. Following this study, each of the districts will remain intact with their individual identities. And while some financial savings can be expected from a shared services study, there will not be the type of significant state financial incentives that could be expected in a merger study.

CHAPTER 3
PROCESS AND DATA COLLECTION

In September 2011, the consultant requested a significant amount of information from both school districts. On October 12, 2011, the consultant met with the superintendents from both districts to review the information that had been collected and to finalize the details of the study process. The consultant then scheduled follow-up visits on November 16 and 17, 2011 for Hancock and Deposit respectively where conversations were held with the following individuals.

DEPOSIT:

John Giannone, Board President
Dave Richards, Middle/High School Principal
Denise Cook, Elementary School Principal
Ethan Berry, Business Administrator
Bea Bailey, Director of Special Programs
Tom Williams, Director of Facilities
Guy Struble, Supervisor of Transportation
Lori Wheeler, School Lunch Manager
Ed Swartwout, Director of Athletics

HANCOCK:

Terry Whitt, Board President
Carol Daddezio, K-12 Principal
Scott MacDowell, Business Official
Jason Hans, Director of Pupil Personnel Services
Bill Christian, Instructional Technology Coordinator
Frank Seely, Superintendent of Buildings and Grounds
Jodi Newman, Transportation Supervisor
Jo-Anne Smith, School Lunch Manager
Brandon Olbrys, Athletic Director

Over the course of the study, the consultant gathered information on enrollment, academic programming, class size, athletics, extracurricular activities, facilities, finances, transportation, instructional technology, food service, custodial/maintenance services, staffing, and contractual agreements. The staffs in both schools were helpful in the information gathering process as well as in providing guidance as to possible areas of enhancing academic programs and areas of support service.

CHAPTER 4
THE SCHOOL DISTRICTS

The Deposit and Hancock Central School Districts are both located in the Southern Tier of New York State, both bordering Pennsylvania, approximately 30-40 miles east of Binghamton. Deposit is located in Broome and Delaware Counties while Hancock is located in the southern portion of Delaware County. The districts are rural in nature and are communities where the school buildings serve as the hub of school and community activity. The school buildings are both located within the confines of their respective villages. The villages of Deposit and Hancock are approximately 13 miles apart, Hancock being located southeast of Deposit. Both villages are in the Catskill Mountains and are connected by the Delaware River. There is no major industry in the area, with the school district being the largest employer in each of the communities. The vast majority of the property is residential and many of the residents are on fixed incomes.

Table 4.1 which follows provides background information on each of the study districts. In examining the table, it can be seen that, while the Deposit board of education has seven members, the Hancock board has five voting members and a non-voting member from Pennsylvania. This Pennsylvania representation recognizes the high school students from Pennsylvania that attend high school in Hancock. The year of term expiration for each board member is shown in parentheses. Also, the districts are component districts of two different BOCES, Deposit belonging to the Broome-Delaware-Tioga BOCES and Hancock belonging to the Delaware-Chenango-Madison-Otsego BOCES. Deposit has 543 students in grades K-12 while Hancock has 381.

Beyond the differences noted in the boards, the BOCES affiliation, and enrollment, it is readily apparent that the two districts are very similar. In looking at the area of the districts, the wealth of the districts, and the composition of the student bodies, Deposit and Hancock are very much alike.

Table 4.1 Background Information on the Study Districts		
	Deposit	*Hancock*
Board of Education (year of term expiration)	John Giannone, President (2012) Kermit Mott, Vice President (2014) Marcia Albrecht (2013) Mitchell Bush (2013) Jamie Cook (2014) Dean Price (2014) Alice Ray (2012)	Terry Whitt, President (2014) Linda O'Brien, Vice President (2013) Frank Brown (2012) Rebecca Smith (2012) Gene Homer (2013) Lothar Holbert (Non-voting Pennsylvania representative)
Superintendent	Ed Shirkey	Terry Dougherty
2010-11 Enrollment	543	381
Area of District	121 square miles	130 square miles
BOCES	Broome-Delaware-Tioga	Delaware-Chenango-Madison-Otsego
Transportation Aid Ratio	.795	.728
BOCES Aid Ratio	.482	.526
Selected Building Aid Ratio	.630	.788
Combined Wealth Ratio	.811	.661
Grade Level Configurations	Pre K-6; 7-12	Pre K-4; 5-12
Eligible for Free Lunch	42%	38%
Eligible for Reduced Price Lunch	15%	14%
White	95%	92%
African American	3%	3%
Hispanic	1%	4%
American Indian	1%	-

CHAPTER 5

STUDENT ENROLLMENT HISTORY AND PROJECTIONS

Accurate student enrollment projections are essential for district long range planning. Virtually all aspects of a school district's operation, including program, staffing, facilities, and finances, are related to the number of students enrolled. For this reason, updated enrollment projections are critical and serve as the first aspect of analysis for this study.

The procedure for projecting student enrollments is referred to as the Cohort Survival Method. This methodology is highly reliable and is the most frequently used projective technique for making short-term school enrollment projections. To calculate enrollment projections, the following data and procedures are used:

- Six years of district enrollment by grade level
- Calculation of survival ratios by grade level
- Kindergarten enrollment projections based on resident live births

A survival ratio is obtained by dividing a given grade's enrollment by the enrollment of the preceding grade a year earlier. For example, the number of students in grade three in any year is divided by the number of students in grade two of the previous year. The ratio indicates the proportion of the cohort "surviving" to the following year. Cohort refers to the enrollment in a grade for a given year.

Using grade-to-grade survival ratios, an average of these ratios for each cohort progression is obtained. This average is referred to as an average projective survival ratio. This ratio is then multiplied by each current grade enrollment to obtain the projected enrollment for the next successive year. The multiplicative process is continued for each successive year.

Survival ratios usually have values close to one, but may be less than or greater than one. Where the survival ratio is less than one, fewer students "survived" to the next grade. Where the survival ratio is more than one, more students "survived" to the next grade. Grade-to-grade survival ratios reflect the net effects of deaths, dropouts, the number of students who are home schooled, promotion policies, transfers to and from nonpublic schools, and migration patterns in and out of the school district.

Since estimating births introduces a possible source of error into the model, enrollment projections are most accurate when existing data on live residential births can be used. Live birth data is currently available from the New York State Department of Health for both school districts from 2002 through 2009. Enrollment projections are therefore most accurate for five years into the future for the elementary grades. This live birth data through 2009 was used to project the kindergarten enrollment through the 2014-15 school year. Birth data used to project kindergarten enrollments from 2015-16 and beyond are an average of the life births per year for the previous eight years.

Table 5.1
Deposit Enrollment Projections

Grade	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12		2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19
Birth Data		38	35	35	41	35		40	36	52	39	39	39	39
K	41	46	50	43	40	35	1.135219145	40	45	41	59	44	44	44
1	63	47	41	50	50	40	1.040087302	36	41	47	43	61	46	46
2	53	48	34	42	47	46	0.873939852	35	32	36	41	37	54	40
3	53	46	50	36	38	50	0.987401283	45	35	31	36	41	37	53
4	45	50	48	46	36	40	0.991901213	50	45	34	31	35	40	36
5	46	40	49	44	50	39	0.991169082	40	49	45	34	31	35	40
6	51	40	37	46	45	47	0.9392136	37	37	46	42	32	29	33
7	50	48	43	37	49	46	1.020723217	48	37	38	47	43	33	30
8	44	46	45	42	36	48	0.957361799	44	46	36	36	45	41	31
9	58	48	48	47	51	38	1.089734613	52	48	50	39	40	49	45
10	52	45	48	38	39	46	0.859855351	33	45	41	43	34	34	42
11	46	49	38	40	40	41	0.94479982	43	31	42	39	41	32	32
12	49	50	53	43	42	42	1.080033624	44	47	33	46	42	44	34
Total K-12	651	603	584	554	563	558		547	539	522	536	526	518	507
Non-Res*	0	0	0	0	0	0								
K-6 Total	352	317	309	307	306	297		282	285	281	286	282	285	293
7-12 Total	299	286	275	247	257	261		265	254	241	250	244	232	214

Table 5.2 Hancock Enrollment Projections														
Grade	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12		2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19
Birth Data		30	37	34	40	37		24	24	29	32	32	32	32
K	32	28	26	26	18	25	0.680945284	25	16	16	20	22	22	22
1	28	28	29	24	27	20	0.996672772	25	25	16	16	20	22	22
2	29	30	29	28	25	20	0.971013501	19	24	24	16	16	19	21
3	33	35	28	25	27	24	0.985316913	20	19	24	24	16	16	19
4	23	30	30	27	26	25	0.939289081	23	19	18	22	23	15	15
5	34	30	33	32	24	27	1.079672984	27	24	20	19	24	24	16
6	27	31	29	32	31	20	0.930042335	25	25	23	19	18	22	23
7	31	31	27	28	30	26	0.952168562	19	24	24	22	18	17	21
8	24	28	29	29	27	28	0.96208056	25	18	23	23	21	17	17
9	67	40	44	44	37	43	1.524758256	43	38	28	35	35	32	26
10	45	58	36	45	42	32	0.921561847	40	39	35	26	32	32	29
11	36	38	54	36	36	36	0.886524357	28	35	35	31	23	29	29
12	37	38	41	60	31	38	1.03245614	37	29	36	36	32	24	30
Total K-12	446	445	435	436	381	364		356	337	323	309	298	290	288
Non-Res*	0	0	0	0	0	0								
K-6 Total	206	212	204	194	178	161		164	153	141	136	138	140	137
7-12	240	233	231	242	203	203		192	184	181	173	161	150	151

**9th grade enrollments increase significantly in Hancock because of the influx of students from Pennsylvania who go to school for grades K-8 in Pennsylvania but then transfer to Hancock for high school.*

In examining the enrollment data from both districts, we find some important trends. In the past five years, the enrollment in Deposit has declined from 651 to 558, a decrease of 93 students (14.3%). For the same five-year period, Hancock's K-12 enrollment has declined from 446 to 364, a decrease of 82 students (18.4%). For the next seven-year period, the K-12 enrollments in Deposit and Hancock are both projected to continue to decline. Deposit is projected to drop from 558 students to 507 students, a further reduction of 51 students or 9.2%. For the same seven-year period, Hancock is projected to drop from 364 students to 288 students, a reduction of 76 students or 20.9%. Combining the enrollment history of the districts with the enrollment projections, for the period 2006-07 to 2018-19, the enrollment in Deposit will decline from 651 students to 507 students, a decrease of 144 students or 22.1%. For the same twelve-year period, the K-12 enrollment in Hancock will decline from 446 students to 288 students, a decrease of 158 students or 35.4%. This alone serves as a major impetus for the two districts to consider sharing services.

There is little reason to believe that there are any outside factors that will significantly impact the projections of student enrollments made in this report. There are no significant business expansions or start-ups that are anticipated for this area. No major housing developments are being contemplated.

The largest town in the Deposit school district is Sanford while the largest town in the Hancock school district is Hancock. Census data for these two towns were compared for 2000 and 2010. The population in Sanford has declined from 2,477 to 2,407 (-2.8%) while the population in Hancock has declined from 3,451 to 3,224 (-6.6%). This downward trend in the population of the major towns signifies fewer adults as well as fewer adults who are having children when considered in conjunction with the school district enrollment projections.

The number of district resident students attending non-public schools is an important consideration when projecting future enrollments, especially if there are a large number of students attending non-public schools and there is the possibility of one or more of the non-public schools closing with students returning to the public school system. Table 5.3 shows the number of students in both Deposit and Hancock that have attended non-public schools since 2006-07.

Table 5.3
Resident Students in Non-Public Schools from 2006-07 to 2010-11

Year	Deposit	Hancock
2006-07	3	4
2007-08	3	4
2008-09	4	2
2009-10	6	1
2010-11	9	1
AVERAGE	5.0	2.4

The number of students attending non-public schools from the two school districts varied from one to nine in each year. Deposit averaged five students per year and Hancock averaged approximately two students per year. Except for two students, all of the students who attended non-public schools attended religious schools. The majority of

these students attended Seton Catholic Central High School in Binghamton. Neither district provides any type of transportation to any of the students attending non-public schools.

We also examined the number of students in each district that are home schooled. The following table shows the homeschooled populations for both districts.

Table 5.4
Home Schooled Students from 2006-07 to 2010-11

Year	Deposit		Hancock	
	Number	% of total enrollment	Number	% of total enrollment
2006-07	23	3.50	5	1.12
2007-08	22	3.59	5	1.12
2008-09	20	3.42	7	1.61
2009-10	15	2.70	7	1.61
2010-11	65	11.1	7	1.84

The percentage of home-schooled students in New York State school districts usually ranges from 2-3% and is relatively constant. As can be seen from Table 5.4 above, Hancock has consistently been below that average figure and Deposit has consistently been above that average figure. In addition, it should be noted that there was a significant increase in the number of Deposit students who were home schooled in the 2010-11 school year. There is a significant Muslim population that resides in the Deposit school district. For years, this community sent their children to their own school called the Islamburg Academy. This academy closed in 2010-11 and most of the children that had heretofore attended that academy are now being home schooled. It should also be noted that the Deposit school district has a difficult time ascertaining the actual number of children who reside in the Muslim community. The academy has closed on a number of occasions but there was no corresponding increase in the number of students attending Deposit. There are always a small number of students from the Muslim community who attend Deposit. However, it is apparent that this number has never significantly impacted the operation of the district. It is for this reason that the assumption will be made that the

number of students residing in the Muslim community will not significantly impact the enrollment projections that have been made.

Based on these histories and the make-up of the communities, we see no reason to believe that the number of resident students in non-public schools or the number of home schooled students will change significantly or in any other way influence the student enrollment projections which are made in this chapter.

CHAPTER 6
INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS

The essential function of any school is to educate the students who attend that school. An important activity in analyzing the school districts in this study is to compare the curricular offerings that they currently provide to their students. The purpose of this chapter is to review the academic programs that are available to the students in Deposit and Hancock and the opportunities for sharing that might maintain or even expand the program for students.

Organization of the Districts

The grade configuration of school districts varies from one district to another.

Table 6.1
Grade Configurations of the Study Districts

Deposit	Hancock
Elementary: PreK-6	Elementary: PreK-4
Junior-Senior High: 7-12	Middle/High: 5-12

As can be seen in Table 6.1, Deposit has a PreK-6, 7-12 grade arrangement while Hancock is structured in a PreK-4, 5-12 configuration. Prior to 2011-12, Deposit had a PreK-5, 6-8, 9-12 configuration. However, with the elimination of the middle school principal's position in 2011-12, the current configuration was established. Deposit houses grades Prek-6 in one building and grades 7-12 in another building. These buildings are connected by a bridge. Hancock houses grades PreK-4 in the elementary school and grades 5-12 in the middle/high school building, both of which are on the same campus. If opportunities for sharing student programs are established, it does not appear that the grade configurations or the location of the school buildings will negatively impact such arrangements.

In researching opportunities for sharing student programs, it is important to identify the student day and the staff day for both districts. Table 6.2 looks at those times.

Table 6.2 Daily School Schedules				
	Deposit		Hancock	
	Start/End Times	**Length of Day**	**Start/End Times**	**Length of Day**
Staff Start	8:00	7 hours	8:00	7 hrs 10 min-Monday 7 hrs-Tuesday & Thursday 7 hrs 30 min-Wednesday 6 hrs 45 min-Friday
Staff End	3:00		3:10-Monday 3:00-Tuesday 3:30-Wednesday 3:00-Thursday Bus Departure-Friday	
ELEMENTARY SCHOOL				
Student Start	8:10	6 hours & 35 minutes	8:00	6 hours & 32 minutes
Student End	2:45		2:32	
MIDDLE SCHOOL/HIGH SCHOOL				
Student Start	8:08	6 hours & 29 minutes	8:10	6 hours & 22 minutes
Student End	2:37		2:32	

As can be seen in Table 6.2, there are some minor differences in both the staff and student days in Deposit and Hancock. However, these differences are relatively minor and should not pose major problems for the sharing of services.

Table 6.3 presents a summary of the kindergarten through grade 6 sections and the class size of each section. As a larger school district, Deposit has more sections of each elementary school grade than Hancock. In comparing the sections of grades kindergarten through 6, it is acknowledged that grades 5 and 6 are in the elementary school in Deposit and in the middle school in Hancock.

Table 6.3 Elementary School Sections/Section Sizes for 2010-11				
Grade Level	Deposit		Hancock	
	No. Of Sections	Section Sizes	No. Of Sections	Section Sizes
Kindergarten	3	12, 12, 11	2	13, 12
1	3	14, 13, 12	1	20
2	3	16, 15, 13	2	9, 11
3	3	17, 16, 17	2	13, 11
4	2	20, 20	2	12, 13
5	2	20, 19	2	12, 13
6	3	15, 16, 16	2	11, 9

3-8 Student Assessments

We now turn our attention to the academic performance of the students in grades 3-8. In New York State, the best way to accomplish this is by examining student performance on the English/Language Arts (ELA) and Mathematics state tests administered in grades 3-8. Before presenting recent results for Deposit and Hancock, it is important to understand the rating system currently used in New York. The following summary describes the four-level system in place.

Student Performance on State Assessments

Performance Level Descriptors

Level 1-Not Meeting Learning Standards---Student performance does not demonstrate an understanding of the content expected in the subject and grade level.

Level 2-Partially Meeting Learning Standards---Student performance demonstrates a partial understanding of the content expected in the subject and grade level.

Level 3-Meeting Learning Standards---Student performance demonstrates an understanding of the content expected in the subject and grade level.

Level 4-Meeting Learning Standards with Distinction---Student performance demonstrates a thorough understanding of the content expected in the subject and grade level.

Table 6.4 Percent of Students Scoring at Each Level English/Language Arts-Grade 3								
Level	**2007-08**		**2008-09**		**2009-10**		**2010-11**	
	DEP (45)	**HAN (32)**	**DEP (48)**	**HAN (27)**	**DEP (38)**	**HAN (24)**	**DEP (37)**	**HAN (28)**
1	0	6	0	11	8	4	5	11
2	9	28	10	22	37	38	41	29
3	75	60	77	52	44	37	54	57
4	16	6	13	15	11	21	0	3
( ) indicates the number tested								

Table 6.5 Percent of Students Scoring at Each Level Mathematics-Grade 3								
Level	**2007-08**		**2008-09**		**2009-10**		**2010-11**	
	DEP (45)	**HAN (31)**	**DEP (49)**	**HAN (27)**	**DEP (38)**	**HAN (24)**	**DEP (37)**	**HAN (28)**
1	0	0	0	0	8	0	5	0
2	0	6	2	0	24	12	46	14
3	64	68	69	52	44	38	41	57
4	36	26	29	48	24	50	8	29
( ) indicates the number tested								

Table 6.6 Percent of Students Scoring at Each Level English/Language Arts-Grade 4								
Level	**2007-08**		**2008-09**		**2009-10**		**2010-11**	
	DEP (50)	**HAN (29)**	**DEP (47)**	**HAN (30)**	**DEP (47)**	**HAN (25)**	**DEP (39)**	**HAN (25)**
1	0	14	0	7	2	8	2	4
2	6	14	6	10	15	32	31	44
3	66	62	83	80	68	48	67	52
4	28	10	11	3	15	12	0	0
( ) indicates the number tested								

Table 6.7 Percent of Students Scoring at Each Level Mathematics-Grade 4								
Level	**2007-08**		**2008-09**		**2009-10**		**2010-11**	
	DEP (50)	**HAN (29)**	**DEP (46)**	**HAN (30)**	**DEP (47)**	**HAN (25)**	**DEP (39)**	**HAN (25)**
1	0	0	0	0	2	0	5	0
2	4	10	4	7	7	4	3	16
3	46	62	37	60	44	56	59	56
4	50	28	59	33	47	40	33	28
( ) indicates the number tested								

Table 6.8 Percent of Students Scoring at Each Level English/Language Arts-Grade 5								
Level	**2007-08**		**2008-09**		**2009-10**		**2010-11**	
	DEP (38)	**HAN (30)**	**DEP (48)**	**HAN (35)**	**DEP (45)**	**HAN (28)**	**DEP (46)**	**HAN (22)**
1	0	0	0	0	11	4	6	18
2	8	37	4	17	40	39	20	32
3	87	63	65	72	40	53	67	45
4	5	0	31	11	9	4	7	5
( ) indicates the number tested								

Table 6.9 Percent of Students Scoring at Each Level Mathematics-Grade 5								
Level	**2007-08**		**2008-09**		**2009-10**		**2010-11**	
	DEP (38)	**HAN (30)**	**DEP (46)**	**HAN (34)**	**DEP (45)**	**HAN (28)**	**DEP (46)**	**HAN (22)**
1	0	3	0	0	2	0	0	9
2	5	24	0	12	20	25	30	23
3	69	56	46	56	58	61	61	27
4	26	17	54	32	20	14	9	41
( ) indicates the number tested								

Table 6.10 Percent of Students Scoring at Each Level English/Language Arts-Grade 6								
Level	2007-08		2008-09		2009-10		2010-11	
	DEP (40)	HAN (29)	DEP (36)	HAN (29)	DEP (48)	HAN (30)	DEP (42)	HAN (32)
1	0	0	0	0	8	7	5	6
2	37	28	17	28	23	30	36	28
3	58	72	77	69	63	60	60	66
4	5	0	6	3	6	3	0	0
( ) indicates the number tested								

Table 6.11 Percent of Students Scoring at Each Level Mathematics-Grade 6								
Level	2007-08		2008-09		2009-10		2010-11	
	DEP (40)	HAN (29)	DEP (36)	HAN (27)	DEP (48)	HAN (30)	DEP (42)	HAN (32)
1	2	0	0	0	0	3	7	3
2	38	3	9	11	42	27	36	34
3	47	66	65	63	35	50	43	50
4	13	31	26	26	23	20	14	13
( ) indicates the number tested								

Table 6.12 Percent of Students Scoring at Each Level English/Language Arts-Grade 7								
Level	2007-08		2008-09		2009-10		2010-11	
	DEP (46)	HAN (28)	DEP (42)	HAN (27)	DEP (35)	HAN (27)	DEP (49)	HAN (29)
1	0	4	0	0	6	22	8	14
2	20	35	21	11	43	37	37	41
3	78	61	74	82	42	41	55	45
4	2	0	5	7	9	0	0	0
( ) indicates the number tested								

Table 6.13 Percent of Students Scoring at Each Level Mathematics-Grade 7								
Level	**2007-08**		**2008-09**		**2009-10**		**2010-11**	
	DEP (45)	**HAN (30)**	**DEP (42)**	**HAN (28)**	**DEP (35)**	**HAN (27)**	**DEP (49)**	**HAN (29)**
1	0	0	0	0	3	7	10	7
2	16	13	5	4	43	34	29	38
3	77	74	71	78	23	44	37	48
4	7	13	24	18	31	15	24	7
( ) indicates the number tested								

Table 6.14 Percent of Students Scoring at Each Level English/Language Arts-Grade 8								
Level	**2007-08**		**2008-09**		**2009-10**		**2010-11**	
	DEP (46)	**HAN (28)**	**DEP (46)**	**HAN (29)**	**DEP (43)**	**HAN (25)**	**DEP (36)**	**HAN (27)**
1	4	0	2	0	7	12	3	7
2	26	43	24	38	42	32	56	63
3	59	53	70	55	44	52	42	30
4	11	4	4	7	7	4	0	0
( ) indicates the number tested								

Table 6.15 Percent of Students Scoring at Each Level Mathematics-Grade 8								
Level	**2007-08**		**2008-09**		**2009-10**		**2010-11**	
	DEP (48)	**HAN (28)**	**DEP (46)**	**HAN (29)**	**DEP (43)**	**HAN (25)**	**DEP (35)**	**HAN (27)**
1	2	11	0	0	9	0	3	15
2	42	28	7	14	65	32	46	70
3	50	57	84	76	24	56	37	11
4	6	4	9	10	2	12	14	4
( ) indicates the number tested								

In examining any assessment results between two school districts, there will always be some differences. Such is the case with Deposit and Hancock. There are times

when Deposit students score higher than Hancock students; eg. Grade 3 ELA in 2008-09, Grade 4 ELA in 2009-10, and Grade 5 ELA in 2007-08. There are also times when Hancock students score higher than Deposit students; eg. Grade 3 Math in 2009-10, Grade 6 Math in 2007-08, and Grade 8 Math in 2009-10. The scores in both districts declined in 2009-10 because of a rescaling of the scores. However, in looking at the big picture results of these assessments, the student performance for these two districts is remarkably similar.

Middle/High School

Table 6.16 that follows presents an overview of the curriculum in each district's high school. In addition to identifying the courses taught during 2011-12, the number of sections of each course and each section size is also shown in this table. For example, in Deposit there are two sections of English 9 with section sizes of 17 and 20; Hancock also has two sections of English 9 with section sizes of 18 and 23 students.

Table 6.16
High School Curriculum Offerings-2011-12

Course	Deposit	Hancock
ENGLISH		
English 9	17, 20	18, 23
English 9 Honors		4
English 10	19, 20, 8	7, 17
English 10 Honors		8
English 11	19, 14	4, 20
English 11 Honors		13
English 12		15, 21
College English 101		1
College English 102		1
AP Literature & Composition	5	
Senior English (1/2 year course)	15, 12, 16	
College English (1/2 year course)	11	
Film (1/2 year course)	13, 17	
High School English	4	
Journalism		8
Journalism 1A		4

Table 6.16 Continued High School Curriculum Offerings-2011-12		
Course	Deposit	Hancock
Journalism 2		4
Teenage Literature (1/2 year course	8	
Theatre (1/2 year course)	11	
English SAT Prep		1
English AIS	2, 4	4
SOCIAL STUDIES		
Social Studies 9	14, 19	17, 11, 19
Social Studies 10	15, 19, 19	13, 20
Social Studies 11	23, 23	15, 22
Economics (1/2 year course)	14, 10, 11	16, 22
Participation in Government (1/2 year course)	20, 6	16, 23
AP US History	6	
Vietnam (1/2 year course)	15	
Social Studies 12 Honors	2	
Psychology (1/2 year course)	17, 7	
Public Policy (1/2 year course)	12	
Criminal Law (1/2 year course)	11	
Social Studies AIS	2	1, 4
MATH		
Integrated Algebra	12, 19	
Geometry	20, 12	4, 18
Algebra 1		10
Algebra 1A		15, 15
Algebra 1B		7, 11
Algebra 2/Trigonometry (1/2 year course)	18, 18	
Algebra 2/Trigonometry		12
Advanced Math 12 (1/2 year course)	6	
High School Math	3	
Applied Algebra I	12, 12	
Applied Algebra II	17, 17	
Math Using Technology		9, 12
Math Applications		3
Consumer Math		6
Business Math		6
Pre Calculus A		5
Pre Calculus B		5
AP Calculus		6

Calculus (1/2 year course)	7	
Math SAT Prep		1
Math AIS	6, 1, 4, 3, 3, 1	1
SCIENCE		
Earth Science	17, 18	14, 7, 19
Unified Earth Science		14
Biology	12, 21, 15	8, 13
Chemistry	15	14
Physics	8	12
Environmental Science	6	12
Anatomy/Physiology (1/2 year course)	7	
Health	16, 14, 12	4, 7, 21
Animal Behavior (1/2 year course)	22	
Natural Disasters (1/2 year course)	14	
Science Seminar		9
Weight Training (Phys Ed credit)		8
Science AIS	4, 3	1, 1
FOREIGN LANGUAGE		
Spanish 1	7	14, 16
Spanish 2	14, 14	7, 5
Spanish 3	17, 8	12, 6
Spanish 4		9, 3
Spanish 5		5
BUSINESS		
Accounting	10	9
Business Law (1/2 year course)	7	
Computer Applications	12	6
Financial Applications	21, 13	
Sports & Entertainment Marketing (1/2 year course)	14	
Keyboarding		6
Computer Web Pages		6
ART		
Studio in Art	10, 9	11, 20
Drawing & Painting	9	10
Graphic Design	5	8
Design/Drawing for Production	15	
Ceramics		7
MUSIC		
High School Chorus	25	27
Chamber Choir		6
High School Band	26	4

Jazz Band	22	
Music Appreciation		3
Music-Independent Study	1	
CAREER DEVELOPMENT		
Child Development I (1/2 year course)	8	
Child Development II (1/2 year course)	4	
Basic Foods		7
Foods (1/2 year course)	7, 7	
Construction I (1/2 year course)	10	
Construction II (1/2 year course)	10	
Cabinet Making		7
Pre-Engineering		7
SPECIAL EDUCATION		
Self contained classroom	5	4

Both districts have a solid program in the core areas of English, math, science, and social studies for districts of their size. Both districts have Honors, Advanced Placement, and/or college level courses in English. Deposit offers Advanced Placement courses in US History and Literature/Composition. Hancock offers an Advanced Placement course in calculus. A significant number of elective courses are available in the core areas in both districts although most of them have small enrollments. Spanish is the only foreign language offered. It is offered in both districts with Deposit offering three years and Hancock offering five years.

The business area has a limited number of offerings. Deposit has six sections of business offerings with a total enrollment of 77 students. Hancock offers four sections of business courses with a total enrollment of 27 students. Both districts offer accounting and a course in computer applications.

Both districts offer five sections of art courses with Deposit having 48 students enrolled and Hancock having 56 students enrolled. Both districts offer high school chorus and have a significant number of students participating. Deposit has a high school band and a jazz band with 48 students participating. Hancock has a high school band with four students. Both districts have career development course offerings yet most sections have small enrollments.

In addition to the courses listed in Table 6.16, high school students from both districts have access to a wide array of Career and Technical Education courses from their individual BOCES. Deposit is a member of the Broome-Tioga BOCES and Hancock is a member of the Delaware-Chenango-Madison-Otsego BOCES. Table 6.17 which follows shows the number of students from each districts who are currently taking CTE courses at their BOCES:

Table 6.17 Enrollment in BOCES Career & Technical Education Courses-2010-11		
	Deposit	Hancock
Junior Class		
No. of Students in Class	40	36
No. of students in BOCES CTE	9	18
Senior Class		
No. of Students in Class	42	31
No. of Students in BOCES CTE	6	9
No. of Juniors and Seniors in BOCES CTE Courses	15 of 82	27 of 67
% of Juniors & Seniors in BOCES CTE Courses	18.3%	40.3%

As noted earlier, both districts have solid programs in the core academic areas for their students. For the most part, these core academic courses are well enrolled. However, as is the case in most small, rural school districts, two related issues arise. First, there are a limited number of higher-level courses to challenge the highest performing students. Second, while there certainly are some higher-level opportunities for students, many of the higher-level courses have sections with small enrollments.

For purposes of analyzing course sections with small enrollments, small is defined as an enrollment of fewer than ten students. It should be noted that there is nothing inherently wrong with class sections of fewer than ten students. Especially in higher-level courses, small enrollments allow personal attention and small group interaction that is

critical students getting the most from these experiences. However, two major factors impact section sizes that are small. First, enrollment for both districts is projected to decline for both districts over the next seven years. In Deposit this decline is expected to be 9.2% and in Hancock the decline is projected to be 20.9%. Factoring in this declining enrollment will make these small sections even smaller. Second, the financial pressures that school districts will face in the future will jeopardize the ability to offer classes that have such few students. To illustrate the magnitude of these small class sections, the following table is developed. This table excludes classes for special education students and academic intervention services classes.

Table 6.18
Section Sizes with Fewer Than Ten Students

	Deposit		Hancock	
Course Area	Number of Sections	Number of Sections with Fewer than 10 Students	Number of Sections	Number of Sections with Fewer than 10 Students
English	18	5	17	10
Social Studies	19	4	11	0
Math	13	3	17	10
Science	14	3	14	5
Spanish	5	2	9	6
Business	6	1	4	4
Art	5	3	5	2
Music	4	1	4	3
Career Development	6	4	3	3
Total	90	26 (29%)	84	43 (51%)

Factoring in future enrollment declines of between 9% and 21% will make these small sections even smaller and will also increase the number of sections that will have fewer than ten students. Fiscal pressures will make it very difficult to maintain the current level of student programming, let alone expand it. It is clear that high schools with a larger number of students offer a more diverse program than do smaller high schools. Larger high schools offer more college credit bearing courses, more electives, more Honors courses, and more Advanced Placement courses to their students. It is for this reason that Deposit and Hancock should give consideration to sharing academic courses.

Student Exchange Program

It is particularly important that members of the Deposit and Hancock school communities engage in discussions about increasing options for high school students in a cost-effective manner at this time. This topic is clearly on the front burner for educators nationally and is a major priority for New York State's Board of Regents as well. The following is taken from a November 9, 2009 memorandum from then Deputy Commissioner John King to the EMSC Committee of the Board of Regents:

> *"It may be time to rethink secondary school design to increase student engagement and to ensure that secondary schools equip students with the skills they will need to succeed in college and the global economy and society of the 21st century. Redesigning secondary school means looking at many issues, including, 1) high school diploma requirements, 2) Regents examinations, 3) seat time requirements vs. earning course credit through demonstration of competency, 4) innovative secondary models including virtual high schools and on-line courses, and 5) alternative secondary models designed to engage students including career and technical education (CTE), science, technology, engineering and mathematics (STEM) programs, arts programs, and early college high school programs. It also means developing standards of excellence for all students, including high performing students, that could possibly include the International Baccalaureate (IB), Advanced Placement tests, the British A-level examinations, and others."*

The foundation of this study from an instructional perspective is maintaining, if not enhancing, the quality of instructional programs available to Deposit and Hancock students in a cost-effective manner. As stated previously, a projected decline in enrollment will require school districts to consider various forms of sharing of resources, to include instructional programs. Economy of scale becomes especially important with a diminishing enrollment base.

Sharing academic opportunities will, in some cases, involve the availability of courses and programs outside the individual school districts. As a result, mileage and student travel time between the school facilities are important. Accordingly, it has been determined that Deposit High School and Hancock High School are 13.2 miles apart requiring 21 minutes of travel time. It will be assumed in this study that the required travel time for school buses would be 25 minutes. It should be noted that students from these districts that travel to BOCES programs are on buses for 33.3 miles/45 minutes from Deposit to Broome-Tioga BOCES and for 32.7 miles/48 minutes from Hancock to the DCMO BOCES Harrold Campus.

The first manner of sharing academic programs that should be considered involves sharing students between the two high schools. It is clearly understood that this option cannot be realized without a great deal of planning and problem solving. Issues of scheduling and transportation alone will present significant challenges to making this student exchange program work. However, it must be remembered that the high school enrollments in both districts will be declining in the next several years. As a result, without doing something different with respective to the academic program, districts will be challenged to offer even their current level of student programming in the future.

Together, Deposit and Hancock have 19 sections of English and Social Studies courses that have fewer than ten students; they have twenty one sections of math and science courses that have fewer than ten students; all four of Hancock's business classes have fewer than ten students; three of Deposit's six art classes have fewer than ten students; seven of the nine career development classes in both districts have fewer then ten students. It is the assumption of this study that if some consolidation of academic opportunities does not occur for students in Deposit and Hancock, high school academic programming will be eroded in the future. Neither of these districts on its own will have a sufficient number of students to offer its program of choice, or perhaps even its current level of programming. However, by opening its doors to students from the other high school, each high school might find sufficient student interest to provide the desired programming.

There will be issues associated with implementing this student exchange program. The time that students spend on the bus is the first hurdle to be addressed. The cost of

that transportation and the logistics associated therewith will be the second challenge. Much like students who attend BOCES programs, it is anticipated that students should be scheduled for classes in the other high school for 2-3 periods per day. Could upper level students from Hancock take their upper level English, Social Studies, and business classes in Deposit while upper level Deposit students take their upper level math, science, and art courses in Hancock? If this were to occur, clearly the two high school schedules would have to be adjusted to allow for the appropriate programming and the 25-minute bus ride between districts. Clearly, this is no small task…but if providing the richest program possible to the students of both districts is the top priority, consideration must be given to this idea.

Should the planning begin for this important initiative, staff will be heartened to know that a similar model is working in another part of the state. Approximately 20 minutes south of Syracuse, three school districts have been doing this type of sharing. Fabius-Pompey, Lafayette, and Tully high schools have been sharing students for academic programs for the past four years. In the 2011-12 school year, Fabius-Pompey is offering business courses, Lafayette is offering a pre-engineering program called Project Lead the Way, and Tully is offering agriculture. Students from any of these districts that wish to take the cluster of courses offered in the either of the other districts are transported to that high school for the program. Approximately fifteen students are taking advantage of this student exchange for the current school year.

School districts in Wayne County, New York are offering similar student exchange programs for the first time in 2011-12. Following up on a study of regional high schools in the county, the BOCES is now offering satellite academic programs at host districts to be shared by surrounding school districts. Sharing the course offerings allows a pooling of resources and creates a critical number of students to maintain or expand curriculum offerings for students.

1. Project Lead the Way-Williamson, Lyons, and Palmyra-Macedon High Schools:
   - Design and Drawing for Production (DDP)
   - Principles of Engineering (POE)
   - Digital Electronics (DE)
   - Civil Engineering and Architecture (CEA)
   - Computer Integrated Manufacturing (CIM)
   - Biotechnical Engineering (PLTW)
   - Engineering Design and Development (PL

World of Technology
Construction
Manufacturing Materials and Processes
Robotics
Digital Imaging
TV & Video Production
3D Computer and Design

2. Small "Green Business" Academy-Clyde-Savannah High School
Young Entrepreneurs Academy
SUPA Entrepreneurship
Environmental Science
Understanding and Using Data
Marketing Analysis and Application
Sales and Advertising
Green Construction I and II
Green Recreation
Green Internships

3. Agri-Business Academy-Sodus High School
Basic Welding
Small Gas Engines
Basic Woodworking
Basic Electricity
Plant and Soil Science
Environmental Science

4. Advanced Placement (AP) Academy- Newark and North Rose Wolcott High School
AP Art
AP Biology
FLCC AP Calculus 1
Syracuse University English
Cap US History 201 (Cayuga Advantage Program)
Cap US History 202 (Cayuga Advantage Program)
Accounting
Agricultural Internship/Externship
College Accounting
Presentational Speaking
Entrepreneurship
Seminar Series
AP English Language and Composition
AP English Literature and Composition
AP Statistics
AP Calculus
AP/FLCC Chemistry
AP/FLCC European History

5. Mass Communication Program-Newark High School
Television and Video Production I
Television and Video Production II
Techniques of Audio Recording

6. College-Level Courses-Lyons High School-Partnership agreements currently exist with Finger Lakes Community College, Cayuga Community College, Syracuse University and Rochester Institute of Technology. Students may earn up to 41 college credits prior to high school graduation.

CCC Advanced College Biology
CCC Forensic Chemistry (Chemistry 108 Forensic Science)
FLCC English (English 101, 102 and Intro to Literature
FLCC Economics (Economics 100 – Survey Economics)
FLCC Government (Political Science 100 American Government)
FLCC US History I (110) and II (111) (Also serves as Junior US History and Government)
FLCC US History II
FLCC Pre Calculus (Math 152 – Pre Calculus)
SUPA Calculus (Math 295 – Calculus)

These examples of student exchange programs may well be overwhelming for small districts like Deposit and Hancock. The purpose in describing these offerings in this study is not to have the districts consider replicating these offerings. Rather, these options are presented to show the viability of such systems, to provide real examples of where student exchange programs are working, and to identify contact information for staff in the study districts should there be local interest in trying to replicate any of these programming options, albeit on a smaller scale.

There would be a cost associated with this student exchange program. Other than agreement on the part of both the sending and host high schools, and a convenient scheduling arrangement for the students, there would ordinarily be transportation and program costs. However, there would also be savings associated with this program if small sections could be reduced in each high school. Depending on the number of students and the number of programs affected, the costs/savings could vary widely. It appears that students in both high schools could potentially benefit from this exchange program. It is for this reason that, as part of the planning for this exchange program, an agreement should be reached that for the first three years, the student exchange program would be offered by both districts without charging any type of tuition. Further, each district would assume the cost of transporting its students to the other high school. All

costs would be monitored for this three-year period. At the end of the three-year pilot period, further discussions would be held to develop appropriate financing for the student exchange program.

E-learning

E-learning, or electronic learning, is an emerging term that is being used to describe student learning through a digital medium. High schools that are focused on providing more coursework to students electronically are sometimes referred to as virtual high schools. E-learning can be divided into the following two types of course delivery:

a. *On-line courses*-designed to be taken on a self-paced schedule, these courses can be accessed and completed by students anywhere and anytime. While this type of learning is not for everyone, it is utilized in many New York State high schools. Currently, there are a number of applications that might enhance student-learning opportunities. These include credit recovery, homebound students, electives, and low enrollment classes.

b. *Distance learning*-designed to have students at various locations take the same course at the same time through the use of technology. Distance learning has been delivered for the past twenty years through specially designed labs in high schools that were very costly to install. This method of delivery is rapidly being replaced by specially equipped moveable carts that are rolled in and out of classrooms as needed.

AccelerateU is a form of online learning that is currently a service offered by the Wayne-Finger Lakes BOCES. This program has been used by a number of school districts in New York State for a number of years. Each online course is "instructor-led" meaning that every student is guided by a teacher. Each of the teachers is a certified teacher in New York State and every course offers high school credit. The teacher provides information, answers questions, grades projects, and informs the student's home school district on the student's weekly progress. Teachers communicate with students several times per week through messaging or email. The amount of material and level of difficulty is at least equal to that of a traditional high school class.

The courses that are available through AccelerateU for the 2011-12 school year are:

Accounting 1a Grades: 9 10 11 12

Accounting 1b Grades: 9 10 11 12

Advanced Composition Writing Grades: 9 10 11 12

Algebra 1A Grades: 9 10 11 12

Algebra 1B Grades: 9 10 11 12

Algebra 2A Grades: 9 10 11 12

Algebra 2B Grades: 9 10 11 12

American History 1A Grades: 9 10 11 12

American History 1B Grades: 9 10 11 12

Anatomy and Physiology 1a Grades: 9 10 11 12

Anatomy and Physiology 1b Grades: 9 10 11 12

Anthropology Grades: 9 10 11 12

AP World History Ib Grades: 11 12

Art Appreciation Grades: 9 10 11 12

Beginning Composition Grades: 9 10 11 12

Biology - AP 1a Grades: 11 12

Biology - AP 1a Grades: 11 12

Biology - AP 1b Grades: 11 12

Business Communication Grades: 9 10 11 12

Business Consumer Math Grades: 9 10 11 12

Calculus 1a Grades: 9 10 11 12

Calculus 1b Grades: 9 10 11 12

Calculus AB - AP-1a Grades: 11 12

Calculus AB- AP- 1b Grades: 11 12

Calculus BC - AP 1a Grades: 11 12

Calculus BC - AP 1b Grades: 11 12

Career Planning Grades: 9 10 11 12

Chemistry 1a Grades: 9 10 11 12

Chemistry 1b Grades: 9 10 11 12

Chemistry - AP 1a Grades: 11 12

Chemistry - AP 1b Grades: 11 12

Chemistry 1a Grades: 9 10 11 12

Chemistry 1b Grades: 9 10 11 12

Chinese 1a Grades: 7 8 9 10 11 12

Chinese 1b Grades: 7 8 9 10 11 12

Chinese 2a Grades: 7 8 9 10 11 12
Chinese 2b Grades: 7 8 9 10 11 12
Civics Grades: 9 10 11 12
Coastal Ecology Grades: 9 10 11 12
Computer Science A - AP Grades: 11 12
Consumer Math 1A Grades: 9 10 11 12
Consumer Math 1B Grades: 9 10 11 12
Creative Writing Grades: 11 12
Creative Writing 1b Grades: 11 12
Digital Photography Grades: 9 10 11 12
Digital Photography II Grades: 9 10 11 12
Digital Video Production Grades: 9 10 11 12
Earth Science 1a Grades: 9 10 11 12
Earth Science 1b Grades: 9 10 11 12
Economics Grades: 9 10 11 12
English 10 1A Grades: 9 10 11 12
English 10 1B Grades: 9 10 11 12
English 11 - American Literature 1A Grades: 9 10 11 12
English 11 -American Literature 1B Grades: 9 10 11 12
English 4 Literature & Composition Grades: 9 10 11 12
English 7b Grades: 7
English 9a Grades: 8 9 10
English 9b Grades: 8 9 10
English Language and Composition - AP 1a Grades: 11 12
English Language and Composition - AP 1b Grades: 11 12
English Literature and Composition - AP 1a Grades: 11 12
English Literature and Composition - AP 1b Grades: 11 12
Flash Animation Grades: 9 10 11 12
Forensic Science Grades: 9 10 11 12
French 3a Grades: 9 10 11 12
French 3b Grades: 9 10 11 12
French 4a Grades: 9 10 11 12
French 4b Grades: 9 10 11 12
French Language - AP 1a Grades: 11 12
French Language - AP 1b Grades: 11 12

French Language I A Grades: 9 10 11 12
French Language I B Grades:
French Language II A Grades: 9 10 11 12
French Language II B Grades:
Game Design 1a Grades: 9 10 11 12
Geometry 1A Grades: 9 10 11 12
Geometry 1B Grades: 9 10 11 12
German 1a Grades: 9 10 11 12
German 1b Grades: 9 10 11 12
German 2a Grades: 9 10 11 12
German 2b Grades: 9 10 11 12
German 3a Grades: 9 10 11 12
German 3b Grades: 9 10 11 12
Global Studies 1A Grades: 9 10 11 12
Global Studies 1B Grades: 9 10 11 12
Global Studies 2A Grades: 9 10 11 12
Global Studies 2B Grades: 9 10 11 12
Health Grades: 9 10 11 12
Health Science: Interactive Health Science Grades: 9 10 11 12
Java Grades: 9 10 11 12
Java Script Grades: 9 10 11 12
Life Skills Grades: 9 10 11 12
Living Environment Grades: 9 10 11 12
Living Environment 1b Grades: 9 10 11 12
Macroeconomics - AP Grades: 11 12
Math 7a Grades: 7
Math 7b Grades: 7
Math 8a Grades: 8
Microeconomics - AP Grades: 11 12
Music Appreciation Grades: 9 10 11 12
Music Theory Grades: 9 10 11 12
Nutrition and Wellness Grades: 9 10 11 12
Oceanography Grades: 9 10 11 12
Participation in Government Grades: 9 10 11 12
Personal Economics and Finance Grades: 9 10 11 12

Physical Education 1a Grades: 9 10 11 12
Physical Education 1b Grades: 9 10 11 12
Physical Science 1a Grades: 9 10 11 12
Physical Science 1b Grades: 9 10 11 12
Physics 1a Grades: 10 11 12
Physics 1b Grades: 11 12
Physics 1a Grades: 9 10 11 12
Physics 1b Grades: 9 10 11 12
Physics B - AP - 1a Grades: 11 12
Physics B - AP - 1b Grades: 11 12
Physics B-AP-1a Grades: 11 12
Prealgebra 1A Grades: 9 10 11 12
Prealgebra 1B Grades: 9 10 11 12
Precalculus 1A Grades: 9 10 11 12
Precalculus 1B Grades: 9 10 11 12
Psychology Grades: 9 10 11 12
Psychology - AP Grades: 11 12
Science 7b Grades: 7
Social Studies 7b Grades: 7
Sociology 1a Grades: 9 10 11 12
Sociology 1b Grades:
Spanish - AP 1b Grades: 11 12
Spanish - AP 1a (Aventa)Grades: 11 12
Spanish 1 Alternative Grades: 8 9 10 11 12
Spanish 1b Alternative Grades: 8 9 10
Spanish 3a Grades: 9 10 11 12
Spanish 3b Grades: 9 10 11 12
Spanish Language AP 1B Grades: 11 12
Spanish Language 4 A Grades: 9 10 11 12
Spanish Language 4 B Grades: 9 10 11 12
Spanish Language AP 1A Grades: 11 12
Spanish Language I A Grades: 9 10 11 12
Spanish Language I B Grades: 9 10 11 12
Spanish Language II A Grades: 9 10 11 12
Spanish Language II B Grades: 9 10 11 12

Statistics - AP 1a Grades: 11 12
Statistics -AP 1b Grades: 11 12
Study Skills Grades: 9 10 11 12
Trigonometry Grades: 9 10 11 12
US Government and Politics - AP Grades: 11 12
US History - AP 1a Grades: 11 12
US History - AP 1b Grades: 11 12
VB.NET Grades: 9 10 11 12
Web Design Grades: 9 10 11 12
World History - AP 1a Grades: 11 12
World Literature Grades: 9 10 11 12

There are numerous online courses that are currently available through the other BOCES throughout New York State as well. Course content, access to courses, and costs for participation very from one BOCES to another. The districts are encouraged to explore the various options and determine which might best meet the needs of the students in Deposit and Hancock.

In recommending consideration of on-line learning opportunities for students, it is clear that not everyone thinks that on-line learning is not an ideal way of learning for all students. However, with a number of classes that currently have low enrollments, a future of declining enrollments for both districts, and financial pressures that will demand that districts look more closely at the viability of offering low enrollment classes, new options must be explored.

The expensive, space consuming distance learning labs of the past twenty years are rapidly being replaced by portable "electronic learning" systems. These rolling carts are equipped with a large flat screen TV, computer, camera, microphone, and related technology that allow a teacher to communicate with students in multiple classrooms in multiple locations and to see and hear each other in real time. There are many distance learning courses that are currently being offered by the Oneida-Herkimer-Madison BOCES. One of the more innovative distance learning applications through Oneida-Herkimer-Madison BOCES is the Mandarin Chinese courses which are taught to many students from twelve school districts in the Utica area. In addition to offering three years of Mandarin Chinese, distance learning courses are also being taught through the Oneida

BOCES in American Sign Language I, II, and III, Introduction to Psychology, and Introduction to Sociology. Beyond these currently existing courses, the additional possibilities are numerous. Should Deposit and Hancock choose to pursue some of these course offerings, either DCMO BOCES or BT BOCES could begin this as a new service or could contract with the Oneida-Herkimer-Madison BOCES to offer these opportunities to the two study districts as well as the other districts in their service area.

The electronic learning systems along with their related technology are currently available on the State purchasing contract. A teaching station costs approximately $20,000; a receiving station costs approximately $15,000. If this equipment is purchased as part of a BOCES E-learning service, the equipment and other costs related to this delivery method could be eligible for BOCES aid.

In creating a model for this E-learning option, it is assumed that each high school would serve both as a host site for course transmission as well as a receiving site. The transmitting district would have its students sitting in the classroom where the teacher is teaching the course; the receiving district would have its students sitting in its high school receiving the course electronically. To illustrate the programmatic and financial viability of this distance learning arrangement, a model is provided that assumes four current courses to be transmitted from each high school to other district.

The "model" cost calculation assumes that each district would annually purchase one E-Learning system through BOCES. The unit purchased in each successive year would serve as an additional unit or as a replacement unit. The current cost of an E-Learning is approximately $20,000. If the district's BOCES aid ratio is 50%, the purchase of a E-Learning system would be offset by half of the cost in BOCES aid received in *the following school year*. In this case the district would receive $10,000 in BOCES aid the following year. If the district was to use this $10,000 in BOCES aid as a revenue source for the purchase of an additional $20,000 unit, the district could purchase this additional unit at a net cost of $10,000. Continuing to roll over BOCES aid as an annual revenue source, the district can continue to keep state of the art technology at a relatively moderate annual cost. The purchase of one E-Learning system per year is sufficient, since each unit can be relocated from room to room.

Beyond the technology cost, the current BOCES charge for participation per student ranges between $500 and $1,000. For this example, $1000 is used. Assuming the total participation per course would be 20 students, the cost for the twenty students would be $20,000. This again is offset by the 50% BOCES aid, bringing the local cost for the participation of 20 students to $10,000.

In addition to acquiring the technology and the per student participation cost, there is a $12,000 annual BOCES program participation cost per district. This charge is also eligible for BOCES aid resulting in local cost (at 50%) of $6,000. Assuming that the district also serves as a host site for another Advanced Placement course each year, it receives a stipend from BOCES of $1,000 for providing the class. Lastly, the example includes a local cost for supervising the students while they are in the distance-learning environment. For this example, it is assumed that supervision is provided by a teaching assistant, at an estimated cost for the four periods of supervision of $12,150 (assuming a base salary of $18,000, 35% in benefits, and one half-day of the teaching assistant's assignment). Supervision may include basic supervision of one or more students participating in a distance learning course or ancillary support for a student with a disability. For purposes of the financial model, it is also assumed that the cost of the teaching assistant is not eligible for BOCES aid reimbursement.

The total cost for providing four courses to the 20 students via distance learning is illustrated in the table that follows.

Table 6.19
Cost of Providing E-learning

Item	Annual Expenditure	Annual Local Cost, after 50% BOCES aid
E-Learning System	$20,000	$10,000
Participation of 20 students @ $1000	$20,000	$10,000
BOCES Program Charge	$12,000	$6,000
Local Supervision	$12,150	$12,150
Total	$64,150	$38,150
Total, minus $1,000	$63,150	$37,150

This net cost of $37,150 compares favorably to the cost for providing the teachers for four academic classes. Moreover, it clearly demonstrates the cost effectiveness, through collaboration, that can be achieved by Deposit and Hancock in the future as they seek to maintain the quality of their instructional program while facing declining enrollment. Again, it should be remembered that BOCES aid follows the year after the service is purchased so that it is incumbent on the district to generate the full cost of the program in its first year of operation.

Finally, once distance learning is made available in a high school there is no limit to the course opportunities, thereby significantly enhancing the learning opportunities for students. The addition of other distance learning opportunities in a district becomes even more cost effective. Since the BOCES program charge is only paid once per year and since the E-Learning system has the capability to serve several classrooms in a day, adding more courses is an attractive, cost effective option. Additional courses can be added for only the local cost of $500 per student (50% of $1000), and the supervision cost for each course.

This section of the report examines the performance of high school students on Regents examinations. Table 6.20 that follow looks at this data.

Table 6.20 High School Regents Exam Performance									
Regents Examination	**Year**	**No. Tested**		**% at or above 55%**		**% at or above 65%**		**% at or above 85%**	
		DEP	**HAN**	**DEP**	**HAN**	**DEP**	**HAN**	**DEP**	**HAN**
English	07-08	54	41	100	100	94	90	33	34
	08-09	35	62	100	95	97	79	31	31
	09-10	44	34	100	97	98	82	39	32
	10-11	39	36	97	100	97	92	56	47
Algebra	07-08	1	30	0	100	0	93	0	27
	08-09	46	40	87	98	65	88	2	8
	09-10	52	37	90	100	83	84	6	19
	10-11	36	40	94.4	100	83.3	88	11.1	10
Algebra 2/ Trigonometry	07-08		-		-		-		-
	08-09		-		-		-		-
	09-10	19	14	79	86	68	71	26	36
	10-11	14	9	78	100	71	89	21	33
Geometry	07-08		-		-		-		-
	08-09		19		100		100		58
	09-10	24	18	88	94	75	94	8	22
	10-11	31	11	87	100	77	91	25	55
Global History	07-08	43	64	77	86	72	72	28	23
	08-09	56	40	89	93	63	78	11	33
	09-10	45	45	93	82	82	69	31	31
	10-11	48	34	91	88	68	76	25	38
US History	07-08	55	37	98	100	96	78	56	49
	08-09	40	64	100	89	93	78	43	34
	09-10	41	35	100	97	100	91	59	30
	10-11	32	35	96	100	96	89	56	57
Living Environment	07-08	29	39	97	100	97	97	52	31
	08-09	34	29	100	100	100	100	26	41
	09-10	42	23	98	100	86	96	33	26
	10-11	36	21	100	100	97	100	33	63
Earth Science	07-08	48	49	92	90	69	71	15	10
	08-09	44	43	91	81	80	67	36	19
	09-10	42	53	86	91	67	68	26	25
	10-11	46	34	93	91	76	85	28	24
Chemistry	07-08	19	14	84	93	53	79	0	0
	08-09	16	20	100	90	88	55	25	0
	09-10	20	19	80	84	20	68	0	5
	10-11	10	11	90	91	60	73	10	9

Physics	07-08	4	9	0	67	0	22	0	0
	08-09	7	12	86	92	86	83	57	25
	09-10	7	8	86	100	71	50	43	0
	10-11	4	7	100	86	75	86	25	14
Spanish	07-08	20	11	100	100	100	82	40	9
	08-09	19	23	100	100	100	100	63	61
	09-10	14	15	100	100	100	100	57	40
	10-11	20	16	100	100	90	94	35	44

As is the case when comparing any student achievement data, there are times when the performance of Deposit students exceeds that of the Hancock students and there are other times when the performance of Hancock students exceeds that of Deposit students. All in all, however, it is again true that the student performance results on Regents examinations are fairly similar. This is an important insight for districts that are considering the sharing of student academic services. When student performance is dramatically differently in two schools, one district or the other is often reluctant to consider sharing arrangements. However, given the similarity of student performance in the grades 3-8 assessments and the Regents examinations, there should be a genuine interest and openness to sharing.

Any time that a discussion begins about sharing academic services between two high schools, the issue of the bell schedule always arises. Table 6.21 which follows shows the high school bell schedules for the two districts.

Table 6.21 High School Bell Schedules				
Deposit			Hancock	
Period	Time		Period	Time
A	8:08-8:51		1	8:10-8:58
B	8:55-9:35		2	9:01-9:41
AM Announcements	9:35-9:37		3	9:44-10:24
C	9:41-10:21		4	10:27-11:07
D	10:25-11:05		5	11:10-11:50
E	11:09-11:49		Lunch C	11:53-12:33
F	11:53-12:23		6	12:26-1:06
G	12:27-1:07		6	11:53-12:33
H	1:11-1:51		Lunch D	12:26-1:06
I	1:55-2:35		7	1:09-1:49
PM Announcements	2:35-2:37		8	1:52-2:32

It is apparent from Table 6.21 above that the daily high school schedules of the two districts are quite similar, both in structure and in the length of the student day. High school schedules that are as similar as those in Deposit and Hancock will provide the opportunity to share instructional services. It will be important for the staffs from both districts to meet to discuss their current schedules and tweak them in order to develop an even more similar high school bell schedule. Again, there is good news for staff who choose to undertake this work. In southern Onondaga County, four school districts have recently agreed to develop a common high school bell schedule so that sharing of students and other programs could be facilitated. Fabius-Pompey, Tully, Lafayette, and Onondaga have recently adopted the same high school bell schedule.

Special Education

Both districts pursue a variety of options in educating their students with disabilities. Each district is oriented toward the consultant teacher model where teachers push into regular education classes to assist students with disabilities and provide small groups support to students with disabilities through supplemental learning opportunities in resource rooms. Deposit has 121 students with IEP's representing 21.7% of its K-12 population. Hancock has 62 students with IEP's that represents 17% of its enrollment.

Deposit runs an elementary self-contained special education classroom for students with severe needs. This class currently has five students, one of whom is from Hancock. Hancock, on the other hand, runs a self-contained middle school classroom for children with severe needs. This class currently has five students, one of whom is from Deposit. In addition to these classes, some students are sent out of the district for services. This can be shown in the following table.

Table 6.22
Out of District Placements for Students with Disabilities

Deposit			Hancock	
Number of Students	Placement		Number of Students	Placement
15	Broome-Tioga BOCES		4	DCMO BOCES Harrold Campus
5	DCMO BOCES		2	DCMO BOCES in Walton
2	Children's -Wyoming Conference-Binghamton			

Deposit educates most of its special education students in the district but also sends five students to classes in DCMO BOCES, fifteen students to BT BOCES, and two students to the Children's Home of the Wyoming Conference located in Binghamton. Hancock also educates most of its special education population in the district but also sends four students to classes at DCMO BOCES, two students to DCMO BOCES classes located in Walton, and one student to the self contained elementary class in Deposit.

Consideration should be given to sharing opportunities in special education. The districts currently share self-contained classrooms at the elementary and middle school levels. It may well be possible to create a self-contained special education class at the high school level that the districts could share. Such a class could alleviate the need to send high school students out of the district to classes that are located at BOCES or in other school districts. It is not within the purview of this report to calculate the cost savings that might be associated with bringing these high school children back into classes in their own districts. An analysis of each child would have to be made to

determine if a shared high school district placement would be appropriate. If it were appropriate, the costs of creating that class in the district would have to be compared with the tuition charges currently associated with sending those children to classes out of the district and the transportation costs associated with those placements.

Special education staffing is comprised of teachers, related service providers, and teaching assistants/teacher aides. Special education teacher staffing in Deposit is comprised of the following positions:

1.0 FTE-Primary self contained classroom-shared with Hancock
1.0 FTE-Kindergarten-2nd grade
1.0 FTE-3rd grade-4th grade
1.0 FTE-5th grade-6th grade
1.0 FTE-7th grade-8th grade
3.0 FTE's-9th grade-12th grade

The middle school special education teacher acts as a consultant teacher and teaches resource room classes. The high school special education teachers also act as consultant teachers and teach resource rooms. In addition, one of the high school teachers teaches a 15:1 class in English and another teacher teaches a 15:1 class in Math. There are plans to add a 15:1 class in science in the future. In addition to the special education teaching staff listed above, Deposit has 3 reading teachers, one each for grades Kindergarten-2, grades 3-5, and grade 6.

Hancock primarily uses the consultant teacher model for special education. To support this model, Hancock has six consultant special education teachers, two each at the elementary, middle, and high school levels. In addition, Hancock has a self-contained middle school special education teacher.

In addition to the teaching positions, both districts use a number of staff to provide related services to students. The table that follows shows the current level of related service providers.

Table 6.23 Related Service Staff		
Service	Deposit	Hancock
Occupational Therapy	1.0 FTE	.4 FTE (through BOCES)
Physical Therapy	.4 FTE (through BOCES)	3 hrs/week (through BOCES)
Speech	1.0 FTE	1.0 FTE (through BOCES)
Psychology	1.0 FTE	.5 FTE (private contract)
Social Work	2.0 FTE	P/T-Delaware County DSS

As can be seen from the table above, a variety of employment arrangements are in place for the provision of related services to students. It seems quite apparent that the opportunity to share related service providers is at hand. Sharing might turn part time employment into full time employment for some people. Sharing might even out the workload for some related service providers and lead to greater stability for some staff. Immediate consideration should be given to sharing related service providers. Consideration should also be given to having these services provided through BOCES. If these services are all provided to students with disabilities, there will probably be no aid advantage to running these services through BOCES. However, if these services are provided to regular education students, there may be financial advantages to sharing this staff through BOCES.

CHAPTER 7

EXTRA-CURRICULAR ACTIVITIES

School athletic teams are often a great sense of pride for a community. In addition, there is a significant amount of research that shows a strong correlation between participation in extra-curricular activities and student success in high school. Oftentimes, districts are highly protective of their teams. However, the boards of education in Deposit and Hancock should be commended on their initiative to combine athletic teams as participation numbers have declined. By their actions, they have made student participation and opportunity the most important factors in inter-scholastic athletics.

This chapter shows each of the sports that are offered in Deposit and Hancock as well as the participation levels for each of the sports. It should be emphasized that the participation rates for these sports were taken from the 2010-11 school year only. Consideration for consolidating/sharing sports teams is based only on these participation rates. Should participation in various sports decrease, it will become even more important to consolidate sports to maintain opportunities for students. On the other hand, should participation rates increase for these sports, it might be possible for the districts to maintain their own teams for a longer period of time.

Of the athletic teams that were sponsored by Deposit and Hancock during the 2010-11 school year, four of the teams were shared between the two districts; football, wrestling, bowling, and track. The participation in these shared sports is shown in Table 7.1 that follows.

Table 7.1
Athletic Participation-Shared Sports-2010-11

Sport	Deposit	Hancock	Total
Football, Varsity	10	13	23
Football, JV	13	7	20
Football, Modified	23	8	31
Wrestling, Varsity	14	1	15
Wrestling, Modified	9	-	9
Bowling, Varsity	15	16	31
Bowling, JV	-	6	6
Track, Varsity	20	3	23
Track, Modified	12	-	12

Not all of the athletic teams for the districts were shared. Table 7.2 that follows shows the athletic teams that were offered by each district individually along with the district's participation for each sport.

Table 7.2 **Athletic Participation-Non Shared Sports-2010-11**		
Sport	Deposit	Hancock
Baseball, Varsity	10	16
Baseball, JV	12	10
Baseball, Modified	18	12
Basketball, Varsity Boys	12	12
Basketball, JV Boys	11	8
Basketball, Modified Boys	18	9
Basketball, Varsity Girls	10	15
Basketball, JV Girls	10	9
Basketball, Modified Girls	17	14
Cheerleading	5	
Cross Country, Varsity	10	
Cross Country, Modified	6	
Field Hockey, Varsity	14	12
Field Hockey, JV	13	12
Field Hockey, Modified	12	13
Golf, Varsity Boys		20
Softball, Varsity	12	15
Softball, JV	14	11
Softball, Modified	17	16
Tennis, Varsity Boys		5
Tennis, Varsity Girls		9
Volleyball, Varsity	11	10
Volleyball, JV	12	9
Volleyball, Modified	26	15

In examining the participation rates in the previous table, it is clear that not all sports are offered at both schools. Deposit does not offer golf or tennis; Hancock does not offer cross country. It is interesting to note that the sports that are not offered at both schools are life sports. They are sports that can be enjoyed throughout one's lifetime and can be a factor in developing and maintaining a fit and healthy lifestyle for all individuals. Consideration should be give for the districts to design a way that these lifetime sports are made available to students from both districts. This would mean

opening up participation on the golf, tennis, and cross country teams to students from the other district.

As enrollments in Deposit and Hancock continue to decline, continued sharing of teams will be necessary if the students in these two districts are going to continue to have opportunities to play. The enrollment projections for these districts show a decline in student enrollment of between 9% and 21% for the next seven years. Isolating athletic programs will quickly mean that there will be an insufficient number of students to field teams in the sports that currently exist. Baseball, field hockey, and volleyball appear particularly vulnerable to surviving on their own in each district and will be the first candidates for expanding the number of shared teams between the two districts if opportunities are going to continue to exist for the students. Consideration should be given to developing a plan to share the baseball, field hockey, and volleyball teams in the very near future. It is also highly probable that additional athletic teams should be considered for merger in the future, especially in light of future declining enrollments.

Table 7.3 presents a summary of the clubs and extracurricular activities offered by each district's high school in 2010-11 and the number of students participating in each.

Table 7.3
Middle/High School Clubs/Extra-Curricular Activities-2010-11

Activity	Deposit	Hancock
All School Play		26
Business Club	20	
Color Guard	19	
Envirothon	15	
Chorus		32
Journalism Club		20
Harp	15	
Honor Society		9
Jazz Band	32	
Marching Band	68	
Concert Band	64	
Science Olympiad	15	
Senior Play	20	13
Spanish Club		13
Student Council	35	25
Speech & Debate Club		3
Writing Club	5	
Yearbook		3

In analyzing the table above regarding clubs and other extra-curricular activities, the only common activity between the two districts is student council. Most districts are usually willing to start any club in which there is sufficient student interest and a faculty advisor can be secured. Districts find clubs much more affordable than inter-scholastic athletics and much easier to administer. This would appear to be a relatively easy area for the two study districts to share services. Especially where participation rates are relatively low, opening participation to students from the other district would provide stability to the activities. Arranging opportunities for student activities to be shared would also open up the opportunity to expand the number of activities available to students of the two districts.

CHAPTER 8

FINANCE

In addition to enhancing educational opportunities for students, a second major consideration in any discussion of sharing services involves finances. Therefore, this section of the report provides an overview of the financial condition of each study district and offers insight into the potential financial ramifications of the districts sharing financial services.

As Table 8.1 below illustrates, the residents of both Deposit and Hancock consistently support annual spending plans put forth by their respective boards of education.

Table 8.1
Budget Vote History

	Deposit					Hancock			
Year	**YES**	**NO**	**Total**	**% YES**		**YES**	**NO**	**Total**	**% YES**
2000-01	222	70	292	76%		220	86	306	72%
2001-02	181	47	228	79%		166	81	247	67%
2002-03	182	55	237	77%		222	81	303	73%
2003-04	248	49	297	84%		300	62	362	83%
2004-05	172	76	248	69%		171	47	218	78%
2005-06	182	51	233	78%		185	34	219	84%
2006-07	249	59	308	81%		160	50	210	76%
2007-08	249	59	308	81%		125	20	145	86%
2008-09	161	95	256	63%		108	43	151	72%
2009-10	289	100	389	74%		113	35	148	76%
2010-11	224	223	447	50%		123	35	158	78%
2011-12	345	163	508	68%		112	38	150	75%

Over the past twelve years, the budget vote has passed in both districts every year. Given the margin of the approvals, this is truly a remarkable record for both districts and shows tremendous community support for their school spending plans.

In addition to the support shown for budget votes, similar community support has been shown for purchasing school buses in both districts. From the period 2000-01

through 2011-12, Deposit had twelve votes to purchase school buses and all twelve votes were approved by the public. For that some twelve-year period, Hancock had ten votes to purchase buses and all ten votes passed. Again this is a most enviable record and demonstrates exceptional community support for its schools.

It should also be noted that community support for capital projects has also been strong in both districts. Table 8.2 that follows shows the capital project votes in both districts.

Table 8.2
Capital Project Votes

Deposit					Hancock			
Year	Yes	No	Pass ?		Year	Yes	No	Pass ?
1990	670	237	Pass		2000	87	35	Pass
1996	135	150	Fail		2000	88	34	Pass
1997	302	220	Pass		2007	407	101	Pass
2007	164	7	Pass					
2009	168	110	Pass					

Again we see significant community support for the districts' initiatives with respect to capital projects. The only defeated project was the 1996 project in Deposit that was later approved in 1997. This support has allowed the districts to maintain their facilities in very good condition.

Table 8.3 that follows compares the 2011-12 budgets for the school districts.

Table 8.3
Comparison of 2011-12 Budgets

Item	Deposit	Hancock
Total Budget	$14,207,130	$10,102,523
Local Revenue	$7,149,290	$4,415,350
Appropriated Fund Balance	$1,030,347	$455,000
State and Federal Aid	$6,027,493	$5,232,173

The table above illustrates a concern about funding school budgets in future years. Expenses for school districts continue to increase. State aid has been reduced to school districts in recent years. Federal funding that has been available for schools will be eliminated at the end of the 2011-12 school year. A new tax cap of 2% will further limit the ability of school districts to raise revenues to meet their expenses. For the 2011-12 school year, Deposit and Hancock have appropriated revenue from their fund balances. Deposit appropriated $1,030,347 while Hancock appropriated $455,000. This strategy to close the gap between budget expenditures and available revenues has become very commonplace in school districts. However, this is not a good long-term strategy. It amounts to using one's savings account to pay for ongoing bills. The savings account will quickly be exhausted and financial distress will be close at hand. This is a reason why this study is so important as a way to reduce costs for the districts.

As school districts prepare for the difficult fiscal times ahead, most districts have created and funded reserve accounts as a means to mitigate against future cost obligations. Table 8.4 that follows tracks the reserve accounts for the study districts for the past five years.

Table 8.4
History of Reserve Accounts

Year	Deposit	Hancock
2007	$1,039,104	$3,419,588
2008	$2,035,588	$2,160,471
2009	$4,351,887	$3,178,766
2010	$3,880,448	$3,852,079
2011	$4,442,382	$4,050,134

Within these reserve balances, there are a number of specific reserves such as a capital fund reserve, a tax certiorari reserve, etc. Generally these funds can only be spent on the purposes for which the reserves were created. It is good that the districts have these reserves since it will help them with costs associated with the specific reserve accounts. However, it is not a strategy for dealing with the ongoing challenges of generating revenues to balance the regular, ongoing expenses in the budget.

Finally, we examine the full value tax rate history of the two districts. The full value tax rate is the only way to compare tax rates from one district to another even though it is not the same assessed rate that drives the actual calculation of taxes for a property owner.

Table 8.5 History of Full Value Tax Rates		
Year	Deposit	Hancock
2007	$14.74	$13.92
2008	$14.25	$12.80
2009	$13.64	$13.16
2010	$13.47	$14.39
2011	$13.86	$13.17

As can be seen from the table above, the local tax rates for the two districts are quite similar and have been quite stable over the past five years. In fact, both districts have a lower tax rate in 2011 than they had in 2007.

Given the data we have reviewed, these two districts have planned well for the challenging fiscal times ahead. However, school districts have never faced the types of financial challenges that they now confront. State aid to education is being drastically cut. Programs are being eliminated. Fund balances are being eaten up to finance recurring expenses without being replenished. Studies across the state are projecting the year in which school districts will run out of money. School districts in New York State are now fighting for their financial survival. These are the very real challenges that are facing Deposit and Hancock. While they have managed their money well and are in a sound fiscal condition today, the future is very challenging.

CHAPTER 9

ADMINISTRATIVE AND SUPERVISORY SERVICES

As school districts all over New York State look to optimize student programming with limited resources, consolidations or staff reductions are often necessary. Seventy to seventy-five percent of most school district budgets are devoted to paying staff salaries and fringe benefits. Significant savings can only be realized by reducing staff. If staff reductions, either through lay offs or through attrition, are inevitable, districts generally want to make changes by reducing their instructional program only as a last resort.

Given this priority to maintain student programs, districts often look to consolidate functions that support the educational program rather than to make reductions at the classroom level. It has become quite commonplace in the last decade for school districts to look to consolidate support services. This has become known as functional consolidation. This initiative is based on the belief that not every school district has to provide its own support services or its own supervision for support services. Typical school support functions like operations and maintenance, business, food service, and transportation would be categorized as support services and would be under prime consideration for functional consolidation. The purpose of this chapter is to examine those opportunities for functional consolidation that may exist in Deposit and Hancock.

Superintendent's Office

The superintendent is the chief executive officer of the school district. Both Deposit and Hancock have a superintendent and a secretary. This is very standard practice in New York State. However, in light of the current economic conditions, there has been an increasing interest in having school districts share superintendents.

Section 1527-c of the New York State education law allows school districts with enrollments of less than one thousand students to share a superintendent. For the 2011-12 school year, the St. Regis Falls and Brushton-Moira central school districts in northern New York are sharing a superintendent. This arrangement is being watched carefully by school districts across the state. A limited number of other shared superintendent arrangements exist across the state but those involve tiny K-6 or K-8 districts.

There are advantages and disadvantages to sharing a superintendent that are generally accepted across the state. One advantage is obvious-it can save the school districts money. Another advantage is that the superintendent's immediate access to both districts may provide opportunities to discover ways to develop efficiencies between the two districts and save the districts even more money.

On the other hand, there appear to be some disadvantages. Can a superintendent effectively serve two communities? If the perceptions of the effectiveness of the superintendent vary from one board of education to another, problems could arise. How will the superintendent show allegiance to both communities? Will the longevity of the superintendent be shortened by having to attend twice as many board meetings, school concerts, and athletic events? How will a crisis be handled in District A if the superintendent is in District B? The shared superintendent arrangement that is being piloted in northern New York this year will hopefully shed additional light on this way of sharing services.

In light of the issues surrounding the sharing arrangement for superintendents, consideration should be given to the two study districts sharing a superintendent and the superintendent's secretary. Currently, the cost of operating these offices, the cost of sharing a superintendent and the savings realized is seen in the table that follows. In showing these figures, it should be noted that both superintendents are the lowest or among the lowest paid superintendents in their regions.

Table 9.1
Personnel Cost of the Superintendents' Offices-Salaries and Benefits

Item	Cost
1 superintendent and 1 superintendent's secretary in Deposit	$221,677
1 superintendent and .6 superintendent's secretary in Hancock*	$167,989
Total cost	$389,666
1 superintendent and 1 superintendent's secretary shared 50%/50%	$240,246
Total Savings	$149,420

*40% of the superintendent's secretary in Hancock has been allocated to the business office

In examining the costs associated with the personnel costs of the superintendents' offices, it should be noted that salaries always differ from one school district to another. Factors that influence these costs can change periodically so that one office that might appear to be more costly in one year may turn out to be less costly in another year. It should also be emphasized that these costs include only 60% of the salary of the Hancock secretary since the other 40% of her salary is allocated to the business office.

In calculating the cost of the shared superintendent, the higher superintendent's salary and the higher secretary's salary were both used. Both salaries were then increased by 10% to cover the additional responsibilities of serving both districts. Using this model, Deposit would save $101,5545 and Hancock would save $47,866. This scenario is being offered for consideration; it is not being recommended. It will be up to each district to determine whether or not the savings identified above is worth the "loss" of a superintendent and a superintendent's secretary for half of the time.

Business Office Operations

Deposit's budget is $14,207,130 while the budget in Hancock is $10,102,523. Both Deposit and Hancock have a business office that is responsible for managing the financial affairs of the districts. However, those offices are organized and managed in very different ways. Deposit shares a business official with Susquehanna Valley as a BOCES itinerant service. Deposit has 40% of the business official and Susquehanna Valley has 60% of this individual. In addition, Deposit also has a full time account clerk in the business office that also acts as the tax collector. Business office support is provided through the Broome-Tioga BOCES central business office service. The central business office provides centralized business services, such as payroll, accounting, accounts payable, and budgeting through a professional business manager and shared support staff. Deposit also belongs to the BOCES service for cooperative purchasing. Deposit also participates in the state aid planning and GASB 45 planning services through Questar BOCES.

Unlike Deposit, Hancock manages its business functions internally. Hancock has a full time business official who also acts as the district's treasurer. In addition, he is

responsible for accounts receivable, cash flow, state aid, and the budget. There is also a full time account clerk whose responsibilities include accounts payable, federal funds, payroll, and the management of some fringe benefits. Finally, the superintendent's secretary works approximately 40% of her time on business office matters by processing purchase orders, doing bank reconciliations, and inputting journal entries. Hancock also participates in the DCMO BOCES cooperative purchasing service. Hancock also participates in the GASB 45 planning service through Questar BOCES.

In calculating the cost of operating these business offices, we have chosen to look at the personnel costs of salaries and fringe benefits as well as contracts with BOCES for business office support. In calculating the fringe benefit costs, actual costs attributed to each staff member have been used. The reader is cautioned about drawing conclusions about one district being more or less expensive to operate than the other. Often, whether or not the staff member participates in the district's insurance programs can cause costs to fluctuate between $15-20,000 per staff member. Given these cautions, the cost of operating the Deposit business office can be estimated as follows:

Table 9.2
Cost of Deposit Business Office

Item	Cost
40% of shared business official (through BOCES)	$46,963
1.0 FTE account clerk	$38,873
Central business office (through BOCES)	$88,900
MUNIS business office software (through BOCES)	$19,112
Cooperative Purchasing (through BOCES)	$4,150
State aid planning service (through BOCES)	$3,054
GASB 45 planning service (through BOCES)	$5,000
Total cost	$206,052

Similarly, the cost of operating the Hancock business office can be estimated as shown in the following table.

Table 9.3 Cost of Hancock Business Office	
Item	Cost
1.0 FTE business official	$126,028
1.0 FTE account clerk	$65,151
.4 FTE superintendent's secretary	$20,348
Cooperative Purchasing (through BOCES)	$2,738
GASB 45 planning service (through BOCES)	$3,218
Total cost	$217,483

Further analysis should be undertaken to more completely understand the costs associated with the business offices and the way they are funded. Because some of the costs associated with the business offices are for services purchased at BOCES, the districts receive BOCES aid on those charges. Deposit receives 48% BOCES aid and Hancock receives 52% BOCES aid. While BOCES aid is not paid on individual salaries in excess of $30,000, for purposes of this analysis it will be assumed that all charges are aidable. Adding the BOCES aid for BOCES services produces the following table for Deposit costs that show the net local cost to the district.

Table 9.4 Cost of Deposit Business Office After BOCES Aid			
Item	Cost	BOCES Aid at 48%	Net Local Cost After BOCES aid
40% of shared business official (through BOCES)	$46,963	$22,542	$24,421
1.0 FTE account clerk	$38,873	N/A	$38,873
Central business office (through BOCES)	$88,900	$42,672	$46,228
MUNIS business office software (through BOCES)	$19,112	$9,174	$9,938
Cooperative Purchasing (through BOCES)	$4,150	$1,992	$2,158
State aid planning service (through BOCES)	$3,054	1,466	$1,588
GASB 45 planning service (through BOCES)	$5,000	$2,400	$2,600
Total cost	$206,052	$80,246	$125,806

Table 9.5 Cost of Hancock Business Office After BOCES Aid			
Item	Cost	BOCES Aid at 52%	Net Local Cost After BOCES aid
1.0 FTE business official	$126,028	N/A	$126,028
1.0 FTE account clerk	$65,151	N/A	$65,151
.4 FTE superintendent's secretary	$20,348	N/A	$20,348
Cooperative Purchasing (through BOCES)	$2,738	$1,424	$1,314
GASB 45 planning service (through BOCES)	$3,218	$1,673	$1,545
Total cost	$217,483	$3,097	$214,386

As can be seen from Tables 9.4 and 9.5 above, Deposit benefits financially from managing most of its business office functions through BOCES. By purchasing these shared business services, Deposit receives $80,246 in BOCES aid that it would not receive if the same functions were performed by Deposit staff. Hancock, on the other hand, receives BOCES aid at 52% for the $5,956 that it spends with DCMO BOCES. This amounts to $3,097 in revenue as BOCES aid. Hancock receives substantially less revenue from BOCES aid since most if its business office function is handled internally. Together, the two business offices cost $423,535 before BOCES aid and $340,192 after BOCES aid.

Consideration should be given to consolidating the management of the two business offices in Deposit and Hancock. In offering this consideration, it is understood that the business officials are more than managers of people and that they also perform some of the daily business functions of the office. Consideration should further be given to sharing this management position through BOCES in order to generate the BOCES aid as additional revenue. For purposes of this report, it is assumed that no other positions or services in the business offices are reduced from their current levels. It is further assumed that the position of business official is shared equally between the two districts and that the BOCES aid which is paid for this shared position is limited to the first $30,000 of salary. It is also assumed that the higher paid of the current business officials is hired for this position and that a salary increase of 10% is added to this individual's salary for

handling both districts. A BOCES aid ratio of 50% is also assumed. Based on these assumptions, the following table shows the savings that would result.

Table 9.6 Savings from Consolidating the Management of the Business Offices			
Item	Cost	BOCES Aid at 48%	Net Local Cost After BOCES aid
Current Deposit cost of 40% of shared business official (through BOCES)	$46,963	$22,542	$24,421
Current cost of Hancock 1.0 FTE business official	$126,028	N/A	$126,028
Total cost	$172,991	$22,542	$150,449
Item	Cost	BOCES Aid at 50%	Net Local Cost After BOCES aid
Projected cost of business official shared 50%-Deposit and 50%-Hancock	$136,902	$33,329	$103,573
Projected Savings			$46,876

It is clearly understood that this individual scenario creates an unusual situation for the two districts. It clearly points out one of the problems of sharing positions. In this example, Deposit would see its level of service increase from 40% FTE to 50% FTE while its cost before BOCES aid would increase from $46,963 to 50% of $136,902 or $68,451. The cost for Deposit after BOCES aid would increase from $24,421 to 50% of $103,573 or $51,787. Hancock, on the other hand, would see its level of service drop from 100% FTE to 50% FTE while its cost before BOCES aid would drop from $126,028 to 50% of $136,902 or $68,451. The cost for Hancock after BOCES aid would decrease from $126,028 to 50% of $103,573 or $51,787, or savings of $74,241.

If two school districts are interested in sharing more services, these districts must understand that the savings for the two districts will never be the same. As is the case in the consolidation of business office management, one district might even end up paying more that it is currently spending. However, it is imperative that the districts look at the sharing on a much broader scale understanding that they will save money on some services and may save little or nothing on other services….indeed, they may even spend more. It is also feasible that more of the local business office staff functions could be

switched to BOCES central business office services in order to reduce costs, generate more BOCES aid, and have the districts realize even more savings. In considering this opportunity, it should be noted that both the BT BOCES and the DCMO BOCES offer central business office services. It is not the purpose of this report to recommend one BOCES service over another but the financial advantages of choosing one or the other cooperative service arrangement should not be overlooked by the districts.

Food Service Operations

Deposit has two kitchens that prepare meals for students, one located in the elementary section of the building and one located in the middle/high school section of the building. Hancock operates one kitchen that is located in the middle/high school building. The student meals are then delivered to the elementary school. Both districts provide breakfast and lunch to their students. Meal prices are shown in the table that follows.

Table 9.7
School Meal Prices

Meal	Deposit	Hancock
Breakfast	$1.40	$1.25
Lunch-Elementary	$1.95	$2.00
Lunch-Middle/High School	$2.15	$2.25

The preparation of the meals for the students is fairly similar in both districts. However, the management of the food service programs is quite different. Management responsibilities routinely involve menu planning, hiring, ordering, and completing required paperwork. Deposit contracts with the BT BOCES for the management of its program and also employs a part-time food service manager. Hancock has a full-time School Lunch Manager on staff. Both districts participate in their BOCES cooperative purchasing program for the purchase of food. While both managers have the responsibility for the on-site management of the food service program, it is very clear that they also "pitch in" with the rest of the staff and have an active role in preparing the meals for the students on a daily basis.

Table 9.8 Personnel Cost of Deposit Food Service Operations	
Item	Cost
1 food service helper-6 hours/day	$18,554
2 food service helpers-3 hours/day	$13,059
1 food service helper-part-time	$6,396
3 cooks-6 hours/day*	$80,594
1 part-time cook manager	$9,379
BOCES food service management	$97,522
Total cost	$225,504

* 2 of the 3 cooks carry the title of teacher aide

Table 9.9 Personnel Cost of Hancock Food Service Operations	
Item	Cost
3 food service workers-3 hours/day	$24,585
1 food service worker-6 hours/day	$40,656
1 food service worker-6.5 hours/day	$38,108
1 head cook-8 hours/day	$48,686
1 school lunch manager-8 hours/day	$75,517
Total cost	$227,552

As can be seen from the tables above, the personnel costs associated with the food service programs are very similar. It can also be assumed that the $97,522 cost that Deposit has for the BOCES food service management program will generate BOCES aid. Given the Deposit BOCES aid ratio of 48% on the $97,522 charge for the BOCES service, the district would receive $46,811 back in BOCES aid. This means that the local personnel cost of providing the food service program in Deposit would be $178,693 after BOCES aid.

Consideration should be given to consolidating the management of the two districts' food service operations. One manager should be able to supervise both programs. In suggesting this option, it may well be that some additional staff would have to be hired at one or both of the districts to do the daily food service work that the current

managers are performing. However, these individuals, if necessary, will be hired at salaries that are significantly less than the current cost of managing these programs. The table that follows shows that potential savings that could accrue to the districts if the management of the food service operations was consolidated, assuming a 50%/50% share of the food service management responsibilities.

Table 9.10
Savings from Consolidating the Management of the Food Service Operations

Item	Cost	BOCES Aid at 48%	Net Local Cost After BOCES aid
Current Deposit cost of part-time cook manager	$9,379	N/A	$9,379
Current Deposit cost food service management program (through BOCES)	$97,522	$46,811	$50,711
Current cost of Hancock 1.0 FTE school lunch manager	$75,517	N/A	$75,517
Total cost	$182,418	$46,811	$135,607
Item	Cost	BOCES Aid at 50%	Net Local Cost After BOCES aid
Projected cost of school lunch manager shared 50%-Deposit and 50%-Hancock (through BOCES)	$81,263	$29,145	$52,118
Projected Savings			$83,489

In projecting these cost savings, it is again assumed that the higher paid food service manager's salary would be used in the calculation and that this salary would be increased by 10% for the responsibilities associated with covering both districts. It is also assumed that the management of this program would be associated with one of the two BOCES programs which both offer food service management in their array of services. The BOCES AID calculation is limited to the first $30,000 of the food service manager's salary. Given these assumptions, Deposit's costs would be reduced from $60,090 to $41,745, a savings of $18,345. Hancock's costs would be reduced from $75,517 to $41,745, a savings of $33,772.

Operations and Maintenance

The facilities in both Deposit and Hancock have been well maintained. In addition, recent capital projects in both districts have given the students of these districts facilities that serve their educational needs very well.

The Deposit Central School District is located on one campus in the village of Deposit. The main educational building houses the elementary school and the middle/high school. Also located in this building are the district offices. On the same campus is the bus garage that is currently undergoing a significant renovation and expansion. The Hancock Central School is located on a single campus in the village of Hancock. There are two educational buildings located on this campus, approximately 150 yards apart. The larger of these two building houses the middle/high school and the district offices. The second building houses the elementary school and the district's main gymnasium. The district's bus garage is located off campus. The Hancock staff is also responsible for cleaning the public library in the village three days a week for approximately 1 ½ hours each day. The following table shows the square footage of these major buildings.

Table 9.11
Square Footage of District Facilities

Building	Deposit	Hancock
Elementary/Middle/High School	191,000	
Elementary School		39,739
Middle/High School		92,390
Bus Garage	11,200 (being expanded to 15,000)	8,250
Total Square Footage	202,200/206,000	140,379

The operations and maintenance department in each district is responsible for the ongoing maintenance of the school facilities. This includes daily cleaning of the buildings, grounds maintenance, athletic field preparation, and building systems maintenance. In addition to this routine work of maintaining the campuses, specialized work in carpentry, plumbing, electrical, and masonry is sometimes required. Both

districts have maintenance persons who can do some of this type of work. When district staff cannot handle this work, both districts may contract with private vendors to get this work completed.

Tables 9.12 and 9.13 that follow show the personnel costs of operating the operations and maintenance departments in Deposit and Hancock. The cost of the director of facilities in Deposit includes a salary stipend of $12,000 for acting as the clerk of the works for the district's current building project. This is a nominal stipend to pay for the type of service that is provided by the clerk of the works and is saving the district significantly compared to securing a similar service from an outside vendor. In calculating the savings that might accrue to the districts with the consolidation of these positions, the clerk of the works stipend is not included in the duties of the shared manager.

Table 9.12
Personnel Cost of Deposit Operations & Maintenance Department

Item	Cost
1 maintenance worker	$49,850
1 high school head custodian	$70,416
2 high school custodians	$88,924
1 elementary school head custodian	$47,037
2 elementary school custodians	$50,432
1 director of facilities*	$113,628
Total cost	$420,287

* includes a $12,000 stipend and related benefits for acting as clerk of the works

Table 9.13
Personnel Cost of Hancock Operations & Maintenance Department

Item	Cost
1 grounds worker	$60,033
2 elementary school custodial maintenance workers-8 hrs/day	$95,414
1 elementary school custodial maintenance worker-3 hrs/day	$7,994
1 high school custodian-8 hrs/day	$55,565
1 high school custodial maintenance worker-8 hrs/day	$58,562
1 high school custodial maintenance worker-5 hrs/day	$35,532
1 security guard-19 hrs/week	$13,751
1 superintendent of buildings and grounds	$90,626
Total cost	$417,477

As can be seen from the tables above, the personnel costs associated with maintaining the districts' facilities are nearly identical. Consideration should be given to consolidating the management of the two districts' operations and maintenance departments. One manager should be able to supervise both programs. In suggesting this option, it may well be that some additional staff would have to be hired at one or both of the districts to do the work that the current supervisors are performing. However, these individuals, if necessary, will be hired at salaries that are significantly less than the current cost of supervising these operations. The table that follows shows that potential savings that could accrue to the districts if the management of the operations and maintenance departments was consolidated, assuming a 50%/50% share of the management responsibilities. It is also suggested that the management of these departments be explored with the districts' BOCES offices to see whether this shared position could be considered as shared through BOCES and, as a result, generate BOCES aid.

Table 9.14
Savings from Consolidating the Management of the Operations & Maintenance Departments

Item	Cost	BOCES Aid at 48%/52%	Net Local Cost After BOCES aid
Current Deposit cost of 1.0 FTE Director of Facilities (not including the stipend for clerk of the works)	$98,585	N/A	$98,585
Current cost of Hancock 1.0 FTE Superintendent of Buildings and Grounds	$90,626	N/A	$90,626
Total cost	$189,211	N/A	$189,211
Item	Cost	BOCES Aid at 50%	Net Local Cost After BOCES aid
Projected cost of facilities manager shared 50%-Deposit and 50%-Hancock (through BOCES)	$102,444	$30,157	$72,287
Projected Savings			$116,924

In Table 9.14 above, the districts would each spend $36,144 after BOCES aid and would save a total of $116,924. Given this arrangement, Deposit would save $62,441 and Hancock would save $54,482.

Transportation

Since Deposit and Hancock are rural districts that cover a fairly large geographic area, transportation is an important function for both districts. Deposit covers 121 square miles and has a transportation aid ratio of 79.5%. Hancock covers 130 square miles and has a transportation aid ratio of 72.8%. Both districts have maintained their fleet of buses well and have a regular replacement schedule for buying new buses. Deposit buys buses through referendum and tries to purchase two buses per year. Hancock buys their buses by budgeting funds in its regular budget. When a major flood hit Hancock in 2006, nearly all of the buses were destroyed. As a result, nearly all of the Hancock fleet is new within the past five years.

Both districts handle all of their transportation needs in house. There is no outside contracting for any transportation services. Both districts single trip their runs with Deposit having ten regular runs and Hancock having seven regular runs. Both districts have special runs for students attending BOCES and for students with disabilities that may attend classes in other districts. An examination of the routes that these buses travel revealed no duplication and therefore little potential for sharing runs.

Both districts employ a number of full time and part time bus drivers. The schedules of these drivers are annually designed to meet the needs of the students being transported. In addition, Deposit has a bus mechanic who works 15 hours per week and a mechanic helper who also drives a bus. Hancock has a full time head mechanic and a full time mechanic helper. Deposit has a transportation supervisor who is a 12-month employee while the transportation supervisor in Hancock works 10 months per year. The table that follows defines the personnel cost centers associated with the transportation programs.

Table 9.15 Personnel Cost of Deposit Transportation Department	
Item	Cost
17 full and part time bus drivers	$433,674
1 part time bus mechanic and 1 part time mechanic helper	$36,769
1 transportation supervisor-12 months	$55,382
Total cost	$525,825

Table 9.16 Personnel Cost of Hancock Transportation Department	
Item	Cost
11 full and part time bus drivers	$212,894
1 head mechanic and 1 mechanic helper	$98,364
1 transportation supervisor-10 months	$46,098
Total cost	$357,356

Consideration should be given to studying the merging of the bus maintenance functions for the districts. Deposit is nearing the completion of the final phases of a renovated and expanded bus garage that is expected to be finished by June 2012. It might well be that a single bus garage could serve the bus maintenance needs for both districts. Should the maintenance function be consolidated into one facility, cost efficiencies associated with the facilities and the number of mechanics could be realized. However, these apparent savings would certainly have to be studied to determine if the extra transportation of the buses to and from a single bus garage would indeed yield real savings. It is not the purpose of this study to do a comprehensive transportation study or to analyze the work patterns of the mechanics. It is therefore recommended that a study be undertaken to determine if cost efficiencies could be realized by combining the districts' bus maintenance work into one facility.

Given the number of buses, the number of staff, and the number of routes, consideration should be given to consolidating the supervisory functions for the transportation departments. It appears that one supervisor should be able to supervise the two district programs. Assuming an equal split of a supervisor between the districts and

using the higher supervisor's salary increased by 10%, the following table shows the savings that could be realized.

Table 9.17 Personnel Cost of Shared Transportation Department	
Item	Cost
Deposit 12 month transportation supervisor	$55,382
Hancock 10 month transportation supervisor	$46,098
Total cost for transportation supervisors	$101,480
Cost of 12 month shared transportation supervisor	$57,269
Savings from sharing transportation supervisor	$44,211

If this transportation supervisor sharing were to occur, Deposit would save $26,747 and Hancock would save $17,463, assuming an equal share of the supervisor's time between the two districts.

Special Education Supervision

Each district has a full time supervisor for its special education programs. In Deposit, that individual is called the Director of Special Education and Related Services and in Hancock, that person has the title of Director of Pupil Personnel. Both individuals have the immediate supervisory responsibility for the special education programs, related service providers, and the district's homeless program. In Hancock, the individual also provides teacher support with instructional technology.

Consideration should also be given to sharing the supervisor position for these special education programs. The following table shows the costs that are associated with the current offices of the special education supervisors.

Table 9.18 Personnel Costs for Special Education Supervision	
Item	Cost
1.0 FTE supervisor-Deposit	$118,591
1.0 FTE supervisor-Hancock	$113,192
1.0 FTE secretary-Deposit	$44,967
2.0 FTE secretaries-Hancock	$83,261
Total Cost	$360,011

It might reasonably be assumed that the supervision of both special education programs could be accomplished with one supervisor and two secretaries. Taking the higher salaried supervisor and the two highest salaried secretaries and increasing their salaries by 10% would yield the following.

Table 9.19 Personnel Costs for Special Education Supervision	
Item	Cost
1.0 FTE supervisor-Deposit	$118,591
1.0 FTE supervisor-Hancock	$113,192
1.0 FTE secretary-Deposit	$44,967
2.0 FTE secretaries-Hancock	$83,261
Total Cost	$360,011
Cost of 1.0 FTE shared special education supervisor	$128,570
Cost of 2.0 shared special education secretaries	$89,217
Total Cost of shared supervision service	217,787
Savings from shared special education supervision	$142,224

Given this sharing arrangement and assuming a 50%/50% split between the two districts, each district would be spending $71,112. Deposit currently spends $163,558 so a savings of $92,446 could be realized. Hancock currently spends $196,453 that would result in a savings of $125,341.

CHAPTER 10

MECHANISM FOR IMPLEMENTING SHARING INITIATIVES

Given the merit of these sharing considerations, serious thought should be given to forming a single standing Collaboration Committee for the purpose of continued communication and collaboration. The good will behind this current study has grown and matured throughout its duration. The initiative and interest in the common good of the two districts/communities exhibited by the two boards of education, the two superintendents, and their administrative staffs, are exemplary. The study process serves as a model for all districts; certainly those in close proximity to one another with similar community characteristics. The formation of a joint Collaboration Committee would benefit the common educational and financial good of the districts.

Sharing is difficult. Each partner in a sharing relationship gives up things in order to contribute to an effective sharing relationship. There may be a perceived loss of control with a shared service. The service might be delivered in a location that is away from the district. Scheduling and staffing issues often complicate the sharing arrangement. Oftentimes it is just easier to do something alone. However, these are not ordinary times. Maintaining and enhancing programs in the face of declining enrollments and severe financial challenges demand a different model for doing business. We believe that model must involve sharing services.

The Collaboration Committee should meet on a regular basis. The committee should be co-chaired by the two superintendents or by a respected individual who has the trust of both school communities and is jointly selected by the two districts. The location of the meetings should be regularly alternated between the two districts. The committee should be given the charge by the two boards of education to assess needs, prioritize needs, plan, develop shared programs, and evaluate whether or not the shared initiatives are successful.

The work of the collaboration committee is staff work. Having said that, it is important that the boards of education sanction the work of the committee, give the committee its charge, and regularly monitor the progress of the committee. The

committee should be appointed by the boards of education and should contain an equal number of individuals from each district. The committee should be large enough to offer the expertise that is necessary to move its work forward yet not be so large that the committee becomes cumbersome. Consideration might be given to constituting the committee as follows:

2 superintendents

2 business officials

2 athletic directors

2 teachers

2 administrators

2 support staff

Effective sharing of services by the Deposit and Hancock school districts could also be enhanced through the cooperation of the two BOCES organizations. Staff from both BOCES can be key facilitators and can work cooperatively to assist the districts in their planning. BOCES staff can help the districts identify and organize their needs, can find model programs across the state for the districts to visit, and can assist in the development of numerous shared services.

The sharing of services through BOCES by the study districts is somewhat complicated by the fact that these districts are components of two different BOCES. It will be incumbent upon district staff and BOCES leaders to work closely together so that the opportunities that the two BOCES offer facilitate the development of shared services rather than becoming an obstacle to sharing services. It is suggested that the following principles be considered when the districts consider sharing services through BOCES:

1. The best interests of the districts will be the primary consideration for developing shared services through BOCES.

2. Where “BOCES A” offers a particular service and “BOCES B” does not, it is anticipated that the District Superintendent of “BOCES B” will authorize a cross contract for the provision of that service.

3. Where both BOCES offer a service that is requested by the districts, a meeting of the two district board presidents, two superintendents, and two District Superintendents will be held to determine the best way to provide the service that best meets the needs the districts.

4. In matters of providing shared services through BOCES, the decisions of the District Superintendents will prevail.

A topic that could well become a significant dimension of the Collaboration Committee is staffing. From a very real human perspective, the impact of decreased staffing levels has a profound impact on those affected and those around them. Efforts must be carefully undertaken to mitigate the negative impact that staff reductions would have. Careful planning could boost morale and benefit the districts individually as well as collectively.

It is recommended that the two districts form a standing Collaboration Committee.

CHAPTER 11

SUMMARY

Numerous ideas for sharing have been discussed in this study. Care has been taken to ask the districts to consider these changes rather than recommending that the districts implement all of the changes. Only the districts will know which of these changes will work and which might better be left for a later time. Great care, patience, and thought must be given to the changes that are made and to the way that changes are made.

Consideration of the following changes are contained in this report:

- ✓ Development of a student exchange program-page 33
- ✓ Development of an electronic learning program-page 38
- ✓ Development of a common high school bell schedule-page 48
- ✓ Development of a shared high school special education classroom-page 50
- ✓ Sharing of related service providers-page 51
- ✓ Open up participation on the golf, tennis, and cross-country teams-page 54
- ✓ Combine athletic teams in baseball, field hockey, and volleyball-page 55
- ✓ Shared superintendent-page 61
- ✓ Shared business office-page 64
- ✓ Shared business management-page 66
- ✓ Shared food service manager-page 69
- ✓ Shared superintendent of buildings and grounds-page 72
- ✓ Shared bus maintenance programs-page 75
- ✓ Shared transportation supervisor-page 75
- ✓ Shared supervisor of special education-page 76

This is a daunting yet very exciting time to be a leader in public education. The challenges are great but the opportunity to reinvent our schools in invigorating. Courageous leaders, like those in Deposit and Hancock, will try new things. Some will work and others will not. However, this innovative work will serve our students and our communities extremely well for the future.