#### From Scott Whitefield:

Questions on School Budget

 Slide 11 of the Jan 10 th budget update outlines an increase of \$455K in anticipated new positions – I assume that maps to the positions in the 2 nd figure below. If so - What does "potential staff needs" mean in the 2 nd figure below?

Yes, the potential new staff is FTE 1.0 Maintenance, 0.4 FTE Admin Assistant and potential 3.0 FTE staff needs at Flo Ro. Teachers have been identified to move from Swallow Union to Florence Roche, however due there may be additional support positions needed. At this time, we are anticipating 1.0 FTE in Grade 2 at Flo Ro (current grade only has 4 sections, 1 teacher coming from Swallow Union, need 1.0 to fill 6 classrooms if enrollment supports that), and additional 1.0 FTE for an ELL Teacher (we currently have 2.0, however the number of identified students currently in the district exceeds the state ratio of students to teachers) and a 1.0 FTE Behavioral Interventionist to address needs of all students.

• If we have to increase by 0.4 FTE in Admin Assistant due to more students in FloRo (assuming as part of the bringing back all Groton students to FloRo), shouldn't we be able to reduce 0.4 FTE of admin in Swallow Union?

No. There is currently only 1.0 FTE Admin Assistant currently at Swallow Union. There is also only one Administrator (Principal) in Swallow Union. A full time Admin Assistant is necessary to ensure that there is someone in the main office at all times.

 A previous version of the budget suggested that despite shifting a large number of students from Swallow Union to FloRo (I think it was about 125 students), we would still need to maintain the same number of teachers in Swallow Union. Is that still the case, and if so, can you explain why? My current assumption is that 125 students is about 5 classes worth (1 in each grade?), and that there should be no net increase in teachers simply by shifting students.

The plan is to move one teacher from each grade from Swallow Union to the New Flo Ro. The plan is to have 6 classrooms at each grade level to maintain class size, however currently at Grade 1 at Flo Ro, there are only 4 classrooms. Based on class size, we may need to add an additional teacher at this grade level.

How do we compare regarding the % of health insurance the district pays for on behalf
of staff relative to what each individual pays for – and what is our plan to reduce the %
the district is responsible for over time to get back in line (or better) than market
average?

The school district is currently in negotiations to address contribution rate. See comparable contribution splits below.

District or town portion of insurance

	НМО	PPO	Retiree	Dental	Individual	Family
Groton-Dunstable	85.0%	80.0%	65.0%	65.0%		
Littleton	70.0%	70.0%	70.0%	0.0%		
Westford	65.0%	60.0%	60.0%	0.0%		
Harvard	75.0%	50.0%	70.0%			
Chelmsford	75.0%	63.0%	60.0%	0.0%		
Acton-Box	75.0%	50.0%	50.0%	0.0%		
Lynnfield	85.0%	75.0%		0.0%		
North Reading	70.0%	50.0%	50.0%	0.0%		
Westwood	68.0%	68.0%	50.0%	0.0%		
Masconomet	74.0%	69.0%	72.5%	70.0%		
Bedford				50.0%	83.0%	61.0%

• Can you provide a list of all services that are included in the "level-services" budget, which are mandated by law and which are not (i.e., we choose to provide them), and the all-in cost for each service? For example, it costs us \$X to provide foreign language.

Level services basically covers everything we do. We are not adding any new programs. For example, we have not added World Language at the elementary level - that would be a new service as we do not have World Language at the elementary level. If we were to add a full-immersion program where students learn half the day in one language and half the day in another that would be a new program. If we added a Pathways program to the high school which would provide vocational training (bio-technology, culinary arts, auto mechanics) this would be a new service. BUT if we have two world language teachers at the middle school and this year one is teaching Spanish and one is teaching Latin then this is not a new program as we have always offered World Languages at the middle school. By the way we chose to hire our second world language teacher as one that could be a Latin teacher because we offer Latin at the high school and it has been under-subscribed and we hoped by hiring that teacher we would get more students who chose Latin as their world language.

How do you measure the value of each elective service (i.e., not required by law) relative to the cost to taxpayers to provide them? Have you ever surveyed parents and/or taxpayers to understand which elective services they find value in relative to what it costs them?

What we teach all students is determined by the DESE Frameworks and the state requirements for each grade based on those frameworks, and state requirements for graduation. The only exception to this would be some electives at the high school. We are not required to offer AP courses. We are not required to offer all the electives we offer. We only continue to offer courses at the high school that receive sufficient enrollment. Special education services are provided based on students' individualized education plans (Speech, OT, PT, Behavioral and mental health services). Also based on DESE guidelines we offer social emotional supports as well as mental health supports. With the exception of some of the electives at the high school none of those services are "elective". Also given the number of credits students must earn to graduate and the number of hours they must spend in time in learning (state regulation) it would be difficult to fill a student schedule and have them earn appropriate credits without these electives.

• What are the opportunities to consolidate responsibilities to be more efficient and thus reduce required headcount. For example, numerous districts (including Westford) are looking at shifting DEI responsibilities under the Assistant Superintendent to eliminate the need for a dedicated DEI-only focused position (which makes sense because over time, DEI should be how we operate, not a separate thing). Many corporations are also going in this direction. Are we considering this, and where are there similar opportunities outside of DEI?

As of the fall of 2023 we no longer have an FTE whose focus is DEI, nor do we have a FTE whose focus is SEL, nor do we have an FTE who focus is mental and behavioral health. We have two Multi-Tiered Systems of Support staff - one for Tier One and one for Tier Two that work in buildings with teachers to help design the supports for regular education students and non-special education supports (such as reading, behavioral support) that are needed by special education students in order for all students to be successful academically. DEI support is included in these two roles as it is the responsibility of these two staff members to provide diversified supports that are inclusive in order to ensure that all students have equitable outcomes.

 How do you define level service – at what level and who decides? For example, would you say offering Latin each year is level service? Or is offering foreign languages the "level service" and thus the number of languages offered (and the languages themselves) can flex within the "level-service" definition?

Please see my answer above for more information. Who defines level service depends on the service. We provide reading intervention for students who need it. The number of reading teachers that we have may vary depending on the number of students that need reading support. However, the we use a standardized assessment that indicates who needs reading and who does not, so it is not a subjective decision. However, if we were to also add reading coaches in the classroom (which some districts have) then that would not be level service as we do not have that role at this time. In terms of the language example, if the same number of World Language teachers are in place and World Language is only offered at the same grade levels it has always been offered then that is level services.

- What services have been added over the previous few years that would be considered "level service" from a 2024 to 2025 perspective, but not from a 2020-2025 perspective. For example, I believe Latin is a new class in the middle school this year. Why did we add that under level service?
  - Latin is a level service because it is offered at a grade level that we have always have had world language and we have the same number of teachers. The MTSS coordinators are responsible for all of the services provided by the SEL, DEI, and Mental and Behavioral Health coordinators who had been in place in the beginning of 2022. We did add a district wide social worker in 2021 after COVID, and although we have always had school counselors we did not have a social worker on staff so perhaps that could be considered maybe as a new service added in that year.
- How much professional development and planning time do our teachers have relative to average? How does our choice to have so many Friday half days in service of planning and/or development impact the budget? What proof do we have to suggest this approach is actually improving students' educational Outcomes?

Planning time and professional development time are included in the contract. Half days for students are included in the 183 days teachers are paid for in their contract. The only thing that adds to the budget perhaps is the three days (two before the school year and one day during the school year that teacher work. Therefore 3/183 of the budget for teachers salaries would be added to the budget. In terms of the correlation between PD and student outcomes, there is significant research that demonstrates that there is correlation between these two items. In terms of causation, in education there are too many variables to definitively say one thing is the cause of something else. A research article regarding this can be found at https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ773253.pdf

#### From Alison Manugian:

I don't know if the intent is to combine all of our questions or to simply forward emails on to the district. In general I don't think that the Fin Comm, Select Board or general public should be, or will be, content with a powerpoint. There really needs to be a document that writes up the budget items and pulls in the backup for many of the items. As usual, I'll go in order and let loose with questions/comments.

- The document needs to include what the budget guidance is that has been taken into consideration. The public can't be expected to find this document (which was very difficult), hunt for the budget guidance etc.
  - The revised Budget Guidance is attached. Budget Guidance is always included in our budget book, which will be available Monday, January 29th ahead of the Public Hearing on January 31st. I will work with the Technology Department to see if we can get budget documents on our webpage in a more direct manner.
- The document references level services. This is the right time/place to reference GD by the numbers and the finding that the existing services offered and costs are in line with other districts.

A Level Services budget is defined as taking the current year's level of services and projecting that same level of services forward one year. Services are the programs offered - general education curriculum and instruction, Tier II/III interventions in reading and math, special education services (same number of substantially separate programs, speech and language services, occupational therapy services, counseling services), guidance counseling services - these are all services.

 Not sure what new positions to maintain existing services really means. At a minimum this implies that there is more of an existing service being offered - are there more students in need, are the needs greater, why are more positions needed?

For the Maintenance and Admin Assistant positions, they are additional to maintain the same level of building maintenance and front office support as is in the current Flo Ro. These are not new positions that are doing anything above or different from what the school district is already providing. The 1.0 FTE Maintenance position is needed for the additional square footage that will need to be maintained. This position was included with the MSBA project budget as part of the future costs. The 0.4 FTE Admin Assistant is to increase the current 0.6 FTE Admin Assistant to full time. The estimated additional 125 students and the front office responsibilities that come with this position warrant the additional time. This too was included with the MSBA project budget as part of the future costs. We can not reduce the Swallow Union Admin Assistant because there is only a 1.0 FTE to be in the front office all day. The question below answers what the potential staff needs for the remaining 3.0 FTE's being proposed.

• The expansion for maintenance and admin as FR expands makes sense - the additional FTEs for 'potential staff needs' should be explained. These are the kinds of statements that are super frustrating for folks who want to understand and support the budget. Without knowing what this is I can't vocally support it - I'll get hit with questions I can't answer and then will lose face in the community. Part of the job of the committees and leaders is to make the budget and information available and digestible for the public.

The 3.0 Potential Additional Positions are: we are anticipating 1.0 FTE in Grade 2 at Flo Ro (current grade only has 4 sections, 1 teacher coming from Swallow Union, need 1.0 to fill 6 classrooms if enrollment supports that), and additional 1.0 FTE for an ELL Teacher (we currently have 2.0, however the number of identified students currently in the district exceeds the state ratio of students to teachers) and a 1.0 FTE Behavioral Interventionist to address needs of all students. These are not new services, these are services currently being delivered, however the number of students participating in these services are increasing beyond our current capacity.

 Again - the document needs to include the GD by the numbers info where necessary a reference isn't sufficient - at a minimum a link in the online documents should be provided.

We will include the link to this document in our handout on Saturday. We will also work with the webmaster to see what we can do to get budget information on the main page of the website so folks don't need to look too hard to find documents.

• Some of the student services, OT/PT etc.appear to be moving from educational needs to physical/medical. Is this typical to service via the schools? Has there been any feedback to the state about this model of service and the financial support for this?

OT and PT services are included in Individual Education Plans (IEP) per the law. This is a typical expense for school districts. There are some programs that allow us to recoup some of our costs via reimbursement such as Circuit Breaker Reimbursement and in some cases Medicaid (however you can not double dip). Circuit Breaker funds are then used to reduce assessments to Towns for Out of District Tuitions.

What is the anticipated dollar value of each 1% change in health insurance costs? If this
is actually 8% not 10% what is the savings?

1% of health insurance for active employees and retirees in the FY25 budget = \$82,997

• Out of District Tuitions are increasing for everyone. Has there been any push to the state that they cover these directly since they have the voice to control these costs?

Yes there has been significant push back. As a result we are receiving a small one time grant to cover the huge cost increase we saw last year. However, it is not equal to our increase in expenses. Last year's increase was 14.6%. This year the increase is 4.6%. We anticipate next year at 5.5%

• What is the current balance between granting services (high cost low risk) and pushing back (high risk low cost)?

If I understand this question correctly - if the IEP team determines that a student needs x services and we refuse to provide them due to cost we risk intervention by DESE and the Federal Office of Civil Rights. This is not a threat. Districts, including GDRSD, regularly get complaints regarding missing services (students did not get all the their services for some reason) and/or discrimination when not receiving services (you did not provide me services and therefore have impacted my access to Free and Appropriate Education). In both cases we have sometimes prevailed and sometimes the complainant has prevailed. Both DESE and OCR have the authority to require us to follow their ruling.

• In general it seems that a lot of the override need this year is due to the cliff that was created by COVID funding such as ARPA. Are there documents to reference or past discussions to highlight that make this situation seem like less of a surprise?

The funding cliff that was created by ARPA and ESSER funding was absorbed in the FY24 budget. The drivers of the increased assessments to the Towns are the reduced use of Excess & Deficiency Funds, the addition of some full day kindergarten expenses (per school committee guidance) and anticipated increases in wages to reflect market corrections and collective bargaining. Also, when the state only increases Chapter 70 funding by an estimated \$67,500 per year, the balance falls to the Towns.

Not sure what "Anticipated New Positions \*" means - there's no reference to the asterisk.
 Also the prior reference to 3FTEs doesn't correlate well to this \$455k number. Are these the same or other positions?

\$455,000 is the 1.0 FTE Maintenance position, the 0.4FTE increased Admin Assistant position and 3.0 Anticipated New Positions

• Capital needs are vaguely referenced on one page - what are the recent and anticipated uses for the capital funding currently dedicated to GD?

This will be included in the budget book, however the school district will prepare an update of current capital expenditures and anticipated capital expenditures for Saturday.

• Even without any other changes it appears that the annual wage growth is around \$2M. I'm not arguing that this is typical or that it's appropriate, but how do we fund this? What is/has been push back to the state regarding growth and restrictions due to prop 2.5? What are possible solutions to this problem from all sides? I don't relish the idea of the Select Board having to say no to the schools, but without other alternatives and efforts I fear that in the near future.

Good question. We have told the Administration that if the override is successful, we will have committed to a growth figure for the next 3 years, thus if anything needs to be added, something needs to be reduced.

 The capital projections for the costs of the HS windows and SU roof should be at least mentioned. What will the next few years of enrollment average contributions from Groton look like for repairs at SU?

Groton's proportional share of Swallow Union capital repairs (assuming 0 students from Groton attend Swallow Union after June 30, 2024) is estimated as follows:

	FY 25	FY26	FY27	FY28	FY29	FY30
Dunstable	62.86%	69.90%	77.46%	85.13%	92.69%	100%
Groton	37.14%	30.10%	22.54%	14.87%	7.31%	0%

When will there be full budget documents out for the public? It appears that the SC will
certify budget in late February and presumably this will follow a full budget document
being released? Such should really be available prior to the budget forums - otherwise
the entire night could be spent asking about school items and getting verbal information
that only very few can follow.

Since the last presentation was completed, the dates have changed. The budget book will be available on Monday, January 29th in advance of the public hearing to be held on Wednesday, January 31st. Thus, the information will be available prior to the budget forums.

General comments - Groton has shared two budgets - level services and no override -- the district needs to do the same so that we and the public can understand what could be lost. One comment I've heard is that without the funds we'll just have to have larger classes - I assume that's not the case and that this is much easier said than done. For folks who have little

understanding of the complexities of the school budget this seems like a reasonable solution. Leaving folks to fill in blanks on their own is not a good approach.

Salaries and benefits make up about 75 - 80% of our budget. If there is no override we will have to cut \$3.3 million from the budget. Estimating that an FTE is approximately \$110K for salaries and benefits, the district would have to cut between 30 - 33 FTE if the override does not pass. That level of cuts would span all departments - teachers, administrators, Central Office support, technology, cafeteria and maintenance. It may require increases in athletic fees and/or kindergarten fees.

Where are there current vacancies that can be eliminated without having to pay for unemployment etc? How many positions need to be trimmed in the no override approach?

All positions cut for override failure would be subject to unemployment claims. See answer above.

What other districts in general and in our market basket will have similar increases that contribute to or drive overrides in towns?

Districts are in different places in their budget cycle but Westford will be seeking an override above ours. Acton-Boxboro will be seeking an \$8million override. Andover will be seeking an override or cutting 30 positions.

A high level explanation of what elements remain in our district that are not state mandated would be helpful - there are not a lot of areas that can be trimmed.

We are required to provide half-day Kindergarten and full day grade 1 - 12 education that matches the state frameworks. We are required to provide special education services and 504 modifications and support. The district must have a superintendent, business manager, and special education director. We must provide lunch and transportation.

What revenue sources are in play? There's no likely increase from the state and not a long term ability to increase Town Assessments. Where are there user fees and other alternatives?

We have limited Excess and Deficiency funds (free cash), Chapter 70 (state funding), athletic fees and kindergarten fees. Only the fees could be increased.

#### From David Manugian:

 GD mentions it market basket comparison schools. Are the other schools also struggling with funding? I know Bedford is asking for 6% or 6.5%, well above the fincom guidance, but I don't know the other schools.

#### See 3 questions above for answer.

 GD identifies level services as maintaining services. Can they be prepared to talk in general terms how that translates to balancing class sizes, course offerings, and staffing?

#### From Mary Linskey:

My biggest concerns for which I would be looking for Laura to address are the following:

- School's definition of level-service.
  - A year ago the School budget for FY24 was reported to be level-service. Then
    we learned from another FinCom member with child in middle school that Latin
    was added to middle school curriculum for FY24.

#### Please see the response to this question above.

- Justification for phasing out a revenue source (kindergarten fees) when annual growth in school budget continuously exceeds levy limits without override.
  - This is a matter of concern when such emphasis has been and continues to be on finding new sources of and growing revenues.

Phasing out of kindergarten fees is based on school committee guidance. We are one of only a handful of districts across the state that do not offer free kindergarten.

 Long-term need to cut cost as growth not sustainable. Not looking for justification of costs or comparability to other towns. What is being done to operate within the Town's means?

The only two options to change this is to increase revenue or decrease expenses. In order to increase revenues there would need to be an increase in Chapter 70, a increase in the use of E & D, and/or increased fees. In order to reduce expenses in a budget that is 75 - 80% salaries and benefits you would have to cut staff.

- Municipal budget scrubbed to have growth of 2.2%. School 13% for FY25.
- What happens after three year override if don't get a handle on it now? More overrides?

This is not accurate. The budget has gone up about 8.9%. This is the expenses. The assessment has increased that much due to changes in use of E & D, level of kindergarten fees, and what the state requires the towns to do as a result of Local Minimum Contribution. These are revenue sources.

#### From Becky Pine:

As you requested, here are a couple questions for the School Com/Supt to answer on Saturday.

• Please provide figures/comparative data to address the commonly held belief that GDRSD is top-heavy with administrators.

How does the amount spent on budget categories (which some may interpret as services) compare to our Market Basket districts?

			1							
District	Admn	Instl. Ldrs	Teach	Other instruct. service s	Profess Dev	Inst. Mat.	Guid.	Pupil Srv	Opr.	Benefit
AB	3%	8%	38%	13%	1%	2%	3%	8%	11%	13%
Bedford	4%	6%	44%	8%	1%	3%	5%	8%	6%	15%
Chelmsford	3%	6%	40%	7%	0%	5%	3%	11%	6%	15%
GD	3%	8%	37%	10%	1%	1%	3%	9%	8%	21%
Harvard	3%	6%	38%	9%	1%	3%	3%	13%	7%	17%
Littleton	5%	7%	35%	8%	1%	2%	4%	8%	14%	16%
Lynnfield	4%	6%	41%	9%	1%	1%	3%	10%	9%	15%
MASCO	4%	7%	40%	5%	1%	3%	4%	12%	9%	16%
N. Reading	3%	5%	42%	8%	1%	2%	3%	9%	8%	18%
Westford	2%	6%	34%	7%	0%	1%	3%	28%	6%	13%
Westwood	3%	8%	38%	13%	1%	2%	3%	8%	11%	13%

- And similar question regarding the number of paraprofessionals
- In the past, the ratio of FTEs to enrollment was used as a way to determine appropriate staffing levels. Can we see that ratio for GDRSD and how it compares with comparable districts/systems?

District	Student/Teacher Ratio	Overall Enrollment	Students w/disabilities
Bedford	10.7 to 1	2559	18.7%
North Reading	11.3 to 1	2317	18.4%
Harvard	11.6 to 1	1019	18.8%
GD	12.2 to 1	2305	18.0%
Westwood	12.3 to 1	2881	21.5%

Westford	12.7 to 1	4451	18.5%
MASCO	12.8 to 1	1535	18.9%
AB	12. 9 to 1	5089	16.1%
Chelmsford	13.0 to 1	5130	19.9%
Lynnfield	13.6 to 1	2186	18.5%
Littleton	13.8 to 1	1674	18.1%

#### Is this ratio a useful metric?

The ratio of student to teacher as compiled by the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education is a metric that is somewhat informative. The data can be found on school and district profiles at www.doe.mass.edu. There are many factors that can affect this ratio. A school district may only be grades 7 through 12. If teachers are not assigned to a specific grade span they may be used to ensure a higher student to teacher ratio. Whereas if a school district is K - 12, it is usually the case the lower grades have lower students in each class and therefore a lower student to teacher ratio. If a district has a number of special education specialized programs that allows that district to educate students as opposed to sending them out to out of district placements then that district would have a number of classrooms that have a small number of students per teacher. This would impact the student to teacher ratio in that district. However, keeping the students in district as opposed to out of district will help the district to save money as out of district placements and the transportation to those placements is very expensive. In addition, the larger the district the easier it is for that district to impact their student to teacher ratio as it is much more likely that in AP classes and self-selecting electives there will be a higher number of students enrolled as when the enrollment of a district is higher the number of students within that district that are interested in that course are much more likely to be higher.

Do we identify more students as having a disability than the the districts in our market basket (see above). Of our Market Baskets, 2 districts have a lower percentage of students that are identified as students with disabilities and 8 district have a higher percentage of students with disabilities.

#### From Jeff Wallens

For the schools.

- 1) I would like a breakdown for 2019, 2020, 2021, 2022 and 2023 (current) for;
  - A) number of students at GD See Appendix A at the end
  - B) number of students at Charter Schools See Appendix A at the end
  - C) number of students home schooled See Appendix A at the end
  - D) number of students attending private schools See Appendix A at the end

Details of grade level would be helpful

District Enrollment	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024
Linoillient	2010	2013		2021	2022	2023	2024
Westwood	3,150	3,122	3,040	2,979	2894	2890	2881
MASCO	1,844	1,812	1,766	1,733	1642	1549	1535
Harvard	1,142	1,116	1,097	1,058	1025	1020	1019
Bedford	2,690	2,715	2,734	2,672	2602	2539	2559
Westford	5,149	5,166	5,030	4,850	4668	4710	4451
N. Reading	2,529	2,452	2,448	2,387	2321	2354	2317
GD	2,539	2,523	2,472	2,365	2315	2351	2305
AB	5,761	5,710	5,566	5,344	5188	5133	5099
Lynnfield	2,256	2,236	2,241	2,204	2167	2195	2186
Littleton	1,791	1,783	1,782	1,672	1642	1690	1674
Chelmsford	5,261	5,273	5,257	5,068	4943	5055	5130

2) We used COVID money for at least 2 administrators, DEI and SEL (I think that there may have been a third). I know that those particular positions are gone, but isn't it true that new administrators appeared to take their places, just structured by tier. In other words, we used temporary COVID money to fund operating budget, and this has carried over. How much are these admins costing us, and what services are these new tier-based admins providing. Are these state-mandated positions?

The DEI coordinator and the district team chair (a special education position) were paid for using COVID funds the first year. The second year (FY24) those positions were incorporated into the regular operating budget. The SEL coordinator and the Mental and Behavioral Health coordinator were always funded through the operational budget. Only the district team chair is truly an administrative position as the other positions do not evaluate and supervise staff. The other positions work with teachers and principals across the district and spent time in classrooms working with students. The three positions that you outlined (DEI, SEL, Mental and Behavioral health) have been collapsed into two positions - Multi-Tiered system of support Tier I and Multi-tiered system of support Tier II/III. They cover not only DEI, SEL, and mental and behavioral health coordination, but also work with teachers on providing the appropriate instructional strategies to help all students be successful. Only the team chair and the two MTSS positions remain the budget. These three positions including benefits are about \$265,000. Again only the district team chair (special education position ) is a true administrative position (a position that supervises and evaluates).

3) is it true that we pay for curriculum from a company owned by a former Superintendent and Assistant Superintendent? Have these services gone through a bidding process? Are other members of the staff or administration receiving remuneration from the curriculum provider?

This is not true. We have no curriculum that is owned by any former employees of the district. There are two former employees that have written a number of books that are about the concept of Universal Design for Learning, but this is an open source paradigm that is not owned by anyone. It would be analogous to people writing books about how to use the instructional technique of students using project based learning or critical thinking. Neither of those things (project based learning, critical thinking) are owned by anyone.

#### **APPENDIX A**

Grade Level	GDRSD	Charter Schools	Public	Home Schooled	Private
January 2024					
Kindergarten	148	0	1	2	11
Grade 1	158	0	1	7	9
Grade 2	180	0	0	4	11
Grade 3	171	3	3	5	5
Grade 4	180	0	0	9	2
Grade 5	188	3	3	7	9
Grade 6	182	3	3	8	4
Grade 7	187	2	2	1	9
Grade 8	157	0	0	5	6
Grade 9	181	3	19	0	10
Grade 10	167	2	2	5	13
Grade 11	165	14	14	2	34
Grade 12	182	17	17	2	22
Total	2246	47	65	57	145
January 2023					
Kindergarten	149	0	0	4	11
Grade 1	174	0	3	3	5
Grade 2	168	0	0	5	2
Grade 3	176	0	0	8	2
Grade 4	186	0	3	10	9
Grade 5	177	3	3	7	4
Grade 6	186	2	2	7	9
Grade 7	157	0	0	7	6
Grade 8	202	3	3	2	10
Grade 9	162	2	2	6	13
Grade 10	162	14	14	2	34
Grade 11	174	17	17	4	22
Grade 12	169	8	26	2	31
Total	2242	49	73	67	158
January 2022					
Kindergarten	167	0	2	3	13
Grade 1	127	1	0	11	3
Grade 2	151	0	2	12	6
Grade 3	166	0	5	7	5

Grade 4	167	1	1	10	8
Grade 5	173	2	0	3	7
Grade 6	175	2	3	5	8
Grade 7	194	4	1	0	12
Grade 8	169	9	3		16
Grade 9	178	7		10	21
Grade 10	168		16	3	
Grade 10	162	6 8	23	3	23
Grade 11 Grade 12			10		26
	185	3	27	0	41
Total	2162	43	93	69	189
January 2021					
January 2021	427	4	0	4.2	12
Kindergarten	127	1	0	12	12
Grade 1	151	0	3	22	3
Grade 2	166	0	7	18	3
Grade 3	167	1	1	23	6
Grade 4	173	0	1	7	8
Grade 5	155	2	6	10	10
Grade 6	194	2	3	8	13
Grade 7	169	9	4	12	17
Grade 8	178	4	7	8	9
Grade 9	168	6	18	4	18
Grade 10	162	8	12	3	27
Grade 11	185	3	26	0	37
Grade 12	192	4	17	1	30
Total	2187	40	105	128	193
January 2020					
Kindergarten	148	0	2	2	15
Grade 1	168	0	4	10	3
Grade 2	170	1	1	4	7
Grade 3	166	0	3	0	10
Grade 4	160	1	4	4	9
Grade 5	197	1	0	2	10
Grade 6	170	3	3	2	16
Grade 7	182	4	6	2	6
Grade 8	200	9	2	2	12
Grade 9	163	11	8	0	26
Grade 10	177	5	28	0	38
Grade 11	188	5	17	2	27
Grade 12	180	7	25	0	26

Total	2269	47	103	30	205
January 2019					
Kindergarten	163	0	4	1	9
Grade 1	147	1	1	4	5
Grade 2	149	0	0	1	7
Grade 3	161	2	2	3	9
Grade 4	190	0	0	1	10
Grade 5	170	3	2	6	16
Grade 6	184	1	4	0	9
Grade 7	197	11	0	0	12
Grade 8	172	14	1	3	12
Grade 9	176	4	21	0	43
Grade 10	188	5	16	2	32
Grade 11	177	6	24	2	25
Grade 12	204	8	14	2	36
Total	2278	55	89	25	225
January 2018					
Kindergarten	155	0	1	2	13
Grade 1	163	0	0	1	6
Grade 2	150	0	2	1	6
Grade 3	183	0	0	0	8
Grade 4	167	0	3	5	11
Grade 5	178	2	3	0	7
Grade 6	202	1	1	0	16
Grade 7	173	9	2	3	14
Grade 8	200	5	4	2	14
Grade 9	183	5	15	1	27
Grade 10	181	5	21	4	27
Grade 11	204	9	16	1	32
Grade 12	207	6	6	1	42
Total	2346	42	74	21	223