

**DRAFT COPY FOR DISCUSSION ONLY**

**A STUDY OF THE FEASIBILITY OF A NEW SENDING-RECEIVING AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE CALIFON SCHOOL DISTRICT AND THE LEBANON TOWNSHIP SCHOOL DISTRICT PERTAINING TO GRADES KINDERGARTEN THROUGH EIGHTH**

**PREPARED BY:**

**EFFECTIVE EDUCATION SOLUTIONS, LLC.**

**DAVID C. HESPE**

**April 30, 2018**

## **PART ONE: DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSAL BEING REVIEWED**

The Board of Education of the Borough of Califon has become increasingly concerned in recent years regarding enrollment declines across all grades in its elementary school resulting from demographic changes in the community. The borough's population has declined slightly from the 1990 census (1,073) to the 2010 Census (1,055), however, the number of children under 18 has declined far more sharply. Demographic studies performed for the district indicate that this long term downward enrollment trend line will continue (See Census data on family size and median age of the population in Table 1). Grade sizes of less than 8 students have become common leading the board to question the educational, social and emotional implications of this continuing downward trendline as well as the efficiency in operating such a heavily under-enrolled school. School leadership believes that this situation will quickly worsen and the district will likely experience grade sizes of less than 3 students with no gender diversity beginning next year. Although Califon has taken many steps to operate efficiently and effectively (such as a remarkable level of shared services including a shared superintendent with Lebanon), these steps will be insufficient to cope with the academic and cost consequences of the enrollment declines.

The board believes that entering into a sending-receiving relationship with Lebanon Township, which borders Califon Township on the East may be the best solution to this problem. Califon is exploring two options for accomplishing this:

Scenario A involves sending its students in Kindergarten through Fourth Grade to the Lebanon Valley View School on a tuition basis beginning in the 2018-19 school years, leaving grades Fifth through Eighth at the Califon School. In the 2019-20 school years, Califon would send grades Fifth through Eighth to Lebanon Township's Woodglen Middle School.

Scenario B involves sending students in Kindergarten, First Grade and Fifth Grade to Lebanon Valley View School in 2018-19 and then Second, Third, Fourth, Sixth, Seventh and Eighth Grades will attend Lebanon schools in 2019-20.

Under either scenario, after the 2018-19 school year, Califon will close Califon elementary school. The Califon board believes that the building would be sold to the municipal government which would operate it as a community center. Califon currently operates a preschool for three and four year old children (this is not a preschool handicapped program) on a purely tuition basis and this program is not a part of the proposed sending-receiving agreement but could be continued and operated by the municipality.

Effective Education Solutions, LLC. was asked to examine the feasibility of these two possible scenarios for a sending-receiving relationship. This study will determine the educational, financial, and demographic implications of the scenarios, and endeavor to answer the following questions:

1. What educational benefit will Califon students receive by attending the Lebanon schools through a new sending-receiving agreement?
2. What impact will the new agreement have on the students at Lebanon Township?
3. How will the new agreement impact the finances of both districts?

4. How will the new agreement impact the facilities of both districts?
5. How will the new agreement impact the staffing of both districts?
6. What operational issues, such as transportation, will need to be considered?
7. Are there any other important considerations for the districts as they enter into this agreement?

The implementation of this new sending-receiving relationship will lead to Califon being deemed a non-operating school district. N.J.S.A. 18A:8-44 provides that “the executive county superintendent of schools shall eliminate any non-operating district and merge that district with the district with which it participates in a sending-receiving relationship.” This study will **not** address the consequences of Califon being deemed a non-operating district including possible forced regionalization.

We also note that the Califon Board of Education will continue in existence until such time as regionalization occurs. During such time, Califon is entitled to representation on the Lebanon Township Board of Education so long as the number of sending students from Califon exceeds 10% of the total student body at Lebanon Schools in the grades covered under the agreement during the term of the Sending-Receiving relationship. In this regard, N.J.S.A. 18A:38-8.2. provides that:

If the pupils of the sending district comprise at least 10 percent of the total enrollment of the pupils in the grades of the receiving district in which the pupils of the sending district will be enrolled, the sending district shall have one representative on the receiving district board of education.

## **PART TWO: COMMUNITY DEMOGRAPHICS**

The first issue we will examine in this report is a comparison of the communities involved in order to identify any issues that may surface from differences in socio-economic or demographic characteristics.

Califon Borough and Lebanon Township are both municipalities in Hunterdon County, New Jersey that border each other. Lebanon Township was incorporated as one of New Jersey's initial 104 townships in 1798, and was subdivided to form a number of the surrounding communities, including Califon Borough, in 1918. In this way, the two communities have a common history. (Snyder, 1969).

Both the Califon School District and Lebanon School District serve students in grades pre-kindergarten through eighth grade. Both districts are part of the North Hunterdon-Voorhees Regional High School District, which includes Bethlehem Township, Califon Borough, Clinton Town, Clinton Township, Franklin Township, Lebanon Borough and Union Township. Students from Califon and Lebanon attend Voorhees High School.

Census data for both Califon and Lebanon are set forth in Table 1 below. Table 1 presents demographic characteristics of the municipalities drawn from the 2000 Census, the 2011-2015 American Community Survey ("ACS"), and the 2010 Census. Please note that the data must be read with caution. While some census data is based on the entire population (e.g., age, race, and total housing units), other data are based on a sampling methodology (e.g., median family income, educational attainment, poverty status, etc.). For smaller municipalities, ACS data represent a sample collected over a five-year time period, where the estimates represent the average characteristics between January 2011 and December 2015. This information does not represent a single point in time, and due to the small sample size, the sampling error is quite large. Finally, the Census Bureau does not consider Hispanic as a separate race but identifies the percentage of people having Hispanic origin. Hispanics in the census population can be part of the White, Black, Asian, or any of the other race categories.

Historically, the census data reveals that the population growth in Califon has been flat while Lebanon Township has grown slightly from 2000 to 2010. However, the American Community Survey estimates suggest that population growth in Lebanon Township has begun to decline with a 5 year average of 6,159 residents (down from 6,588 in 2010) with a median age of 47.4 (up from 45.4 in 2010). The ACS estimate also suggests that the median age in Califon will also continue to grow suggesting a lower population under 18 in the future.

The community demographic data available to us and set forth in Table 1 demonstrates that Califon and Lebanon are remarkably similar.

**Table 1: Demographics of the Communities**

<b>Census Category</b>	<b>Califon</b>		<b>Lebanon</b>	
	<b>2000 Census</b>	<b>2010 Census</b>	<b>2000 Census</b>	<b>2010 Census</b>
Population	1055	1076	5816	6588
Households	401	394	1963	2296
Families	301	309	1556	1761
Housing Units	410	419	2020	2439
Population Density	1,093/sq mile	1,133/sq mile	183.5	77.5/sq mile
Households with Children Under 18 %	36.7	40.1	38.5	33.6
Average Household Size	2.63	2.73	2.79	2.71
Median Age	39	41.9	40	45.4
*White %	98.67	96.1	96.97	95.01

*Black %	0	.28	.81	1.68
*Asian %	.76	.84	.93	1.47
*Hispanic %	.47	1.3	1.72	1.08
Median Household Income (ACS) \$	76,657	108,375	77,662	96,489
Families Below Poverty Line (ACS) %	3.3	1.7	1.0	4.4

(Source: Census/ACS data)

\*Race is based on 1 Race Data

DRAFT

## PART THREE: STUDENT DEMOGRAPHICS AND ENROLLMENT

### School Demographics

In the tables below, we have provided student demographic information for all of the impacted schools to provide a snapshot of the student body. The data was provided by the New Jersey Department of Education and by the Demographic Studies that were conducted by each district and updated during the Spring of 2018. Table 2 provides information on the special populations being served by the schools in each district in terms of special education programs, language barriers and absenteeism. Table 3 provides comparison information regarding the two districts in terms of race/ethnicity and students in poverty.

Table 2 reveals that both districts have similar patterns of students living in poverty, absenteeism and students with limited English ability. The only remarkable student characteristic is the relatively large percentage of students being classified in Lebanon Township Schools. Although this issue needs to be further examined by the Lebanon community, it may translate into an advantage for Califon students who are in need of special education programs and services as they will be able to take advantage of the specialized placement options developed by the Lebanon Township schools to serve this larger special needs population. We will discuss this issue in more detail later in the report.

**Table 2: Student Profiles- Percentage in Each Category for 2016-17 (%)**

School	Economically Disadvantaged	SPED	LEP	Absent 10+ Days	English Main Language
Califon %	2	14	0	23	97.8
Lebanon Elementary %	10	25	1	28	98.8
Lebanon Middle %	7	22	1	21	98.6

(Source: NJDOE School Performance Reports)

Table 3 demonstrates that there is little diversity in either district with the student body being almost entirely white and this data point is stable over time. The only trend line is a slight growth in the Hispanic population in both districts.

**Table 3: Percentage Enrollment by Race/Ethnicity and Poverty (%)**

District	Years	White	Black	Asian	Hispanic	Other
Califon %	16-17	93.5	0	0	6.5	0
	11-12	95.7	2.2	0	2.2	0
Lebanon Valley View Elementary %	16-17	91.6	3	0	3.6	0.3
	11-12	95.2	0.5	2.8	1.5	0
Lebanon Woodglen Middle %	16-17	91.8	1.7	2	4.4	0
	11-12	93.5	1.4	3.1	2	0

(Source: NJDOE School Performance Reports)



Comparative Wealth of the School Districts

The NJDOE uses certain information regarding a school district’s property wealth and income to determine eligibility for State aid. A review of this data presented in the following table provide insights into the wealth of the respective communities and the ability to fund their schools. It is clear from this data that both Califon and Lebanon have similar wealth characteristics and substantial resources available to them to support their schools.

Table 4: School District Financial Indicators for 2014-15

		Equalized Valuation (\$)	Pers. Income (\$)	EVPP (\$)	PIPP (\$)	Wealth Ratio: EVPP (%)	Wealth Ratio: PIPP (%)
County	School District Name	2014-2015	2014-2015	2014-2015	2014-2015	2014-2015	2014-2015
Hunterdon	Califon	80,669,821	33,185,274	798,711.1	328,567.07	0.93	1.4
Hunterdon	Lebanon Twp	576,245,237	185,717,976	867,839.21	279,695.75	1.01	1.19

(Source: New Jersey Data Book(SM) Rutgers Center for Government Services, New Brunswick, N.J.<http://search.njdatatbook.rutgers.edu/action/IndicatorSearch#>)

Both districts are classified by the New Jersey Department of Education as being in District Factor Group "I", the second-highest of eight groupings (from lowest socioeconomic status to highest, the categories are A, B, CD, DE, FG, GH, I and J). District Factor Groups were created to allow for comparisons to be made through socioeconomic characteristics of the local districts.

Enrollment Impact: Historical and Under Proposal

A review of the enrollment data from the districts demographic studies will provide the context for understanding the impact of the proposal on the schools of both districts. In the Tables below, the enrollments for each district are disaggregated by grade level as currently configured and then as proposed.

<b>Grade</b>	<b>12/13</b>	<b>16/17 ASSA</b>	<b>Demo. Study Projections 17/18</b>	<b>Demo. Study Projections 18/19</b>	<b>Demo. Study Projections 20/21</b>
PK	19	11	18	17	17
K (f)	58	37	47	42	39
1	64	51	43	52	44
2	58	42	56	45	48
3	70	47	52	56	54
4	70	55	62	54	46
UnG	9	61	7*	7*	7*
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>348</b>	<b>272</b>	<b>285</b>	<b>273</b>	<b>255</b>
5	104	47	68	64	59
6	80	56	79	67	59
7	94	50	62	81	65
8	83	58	63	62	69
UnG	7	48	5*	5*	4*
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>368</b>	<b>291</b>	<b>287</b>	<b>279</b>	<b>251</b>
District Total	716	563	574	552	506

**Table 5: Califon Enrollment Historical and Projected**

Grade	12/13	16/17 Demo Study	Demo. Study Projections 17/18	Demo. Study Projections 18/19	District Projections 18-19	Feasibility Study Projections 18-19	Feasibility Study Projections 19-20	Demo. Study Projections 20/21
PK	6	10	12	12	12	12	12	12
K (f)	19	10	10	12	6	6	8	12
1	8	7	9	9	4	6	6	11
2	12	11	8	9	10	10	6	11
3	14	8	10	7	5	6	10	9
4	20	13	8	9	8	9	6	8
UnG	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Subtotal	79		57	58	45	49	48	63
5	16	8	12	7	5	6	9	6
6	14	10	8	12	13	12	6	8
7	14	11	10	8	8	9	12	7
8	20	10	11	10	7	8	9	11
UnG	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Subtotal	64		41	37	33	35	36	32
District Total	143		96	95	78	84	84	95

Source- NJDOE Data, Demographic Study.

UnG- Ungraded students (typically placed in a special education classroom).

Note- grade and school numbers rounded to whole numbers which may result in small differences.

Note- Does not include out of district placements (3 in 2017-18)

Table 5 provides Califon enrollment over time and into the future. Table 5 indicates clearly that the district will continue to enroll fewer students over time and likely fewer than projected in the demographic study. This volatility must be reflected in our projected enrollment numbers for Califon. We have provided enrollment data from the NJDOE, Demographic Study and the District's own projections above and have developed projections that are based on a conservative composite of these numbers (Feasibility Study Projections) to inform the questions under consideration in this report.

**Table 6: Lebanon Enrollment Historical and Projected**

Source- NJDOE Data, Demographic Study.

\*Allocated to each grade proportionally

UnG- Ungraded students (typically placed in a special education classroom.)

Note- grade and school numbers rounded to whole numbers which may result in small differences in sums.

Table 6 indicates that Lebanon has likely reached the high point of its enrollments in the current school year and will see a downward trend line into the future.

DRAFT

**Table 7: Califon Enrollment Projections Before/After New Sending-Receiving Agreement**

<b>Grade</b>	<b>Status Quo Projections 18/19</b>	<b>Scenario A Projections 18/19</b>	<b>Scenario B Projections 18/19</b>	<b>Status Quo Projections 19/20</b>	<b>Scenario A Projections 19/20</b>	<b>Scenario B Projections 19/20</b>
PK	12	12	12	12	0	0
K (f)	6	0	0	8	0	0
1	6	0	0	6	0	0
2	10	0	10	6	0	0
3	6	0	6	10	0	0
4	9	0	9	6	0	0
UnG	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
5	6	6	0	9	0	0
6	12	12	12	6	0	0
7	9	9	9	12	0	0
8	8	8	8	9	0	0
UnG	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>District Total</b>	<b>84</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>84</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

Source- Feasibility Study Projections Based established in Table 5.

UnG- Ungraded students (typically placed in a special education classroom.)

Note- grade and school numbers rounded to whole numbers which may result in small differences in sums.

Note- Does not include out of district placements (3 in SY2018)

Table 7 indicates that 37 students in grades K-4 are projected to attend Lebanon Valley View School in 2018-19 pursuant to Scenario A and 18 students in grades K, 1 and 5 pursuant to Scenario B. In 2019-20 another 35 students will be sent to Lebanon under Scenario A and another 54 students under Scenario B. There will be 72 total projected Califon students attending Lebanon schools in 2019-20.

**Table 8: Lebanon Enrollment Projections Before/After New Sending-Receiving Agreement**

<b>Grade</b>	<b>Status Quo Projections 18/19</b>	<b>Scenario A Projections 18/19</b>	<b>Scenario B Projections 18/19</b>	<b>Status Quo Projections 19/20</b>	<b>Scenario A Projections 19/20</b>	<b>Scenario B Projections 19/20</b>
PK	17	17	17	17	17	17
K (f)	42	48	48	40	48	48
1	52	58	58	46	52	52
2	45	55	45	54	60	60
3	56	62	56	45	55	55
4	54	63	54	57	63	63
UnG	7*	7*	7*	7*	7*	7*
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>273</b>	<b>310</b>	<b>285</b>	<b>266</b>	<b>302</b>	<b>302</b>
5	64	64	70	55	64	64
6	67	67	67	63	69	69
7	81	81	81	69	81	81
8	62	62	62	81	90	90
UnG	5*	5*	5*	5*	5*	5*
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>279</b>	<b>279</b>	<b>285</b>	<b>273</b>	<b>309</b>	<b>309</b>
<b>District Total</b>	<b>552</b>	<b>589</b>	<b>570</b>	<b>539</b>	<b>611</b>	<b>611</b>

Source- NJDOE Data, Demographic Study.

UnG- Ungraded students (typically placed in a special education classroom.)

\*Allocated to each grade proportionally

## PART FOUR: EDUCATIONAL IMPACT

The purpose of this section is to assess the educational impact that the proposal will have on the education of students in the two districts. We will determine how the addition of the elementary grades from Califon under a new sending-receiving relationship will impact both Califon and Lebanon students. The central question is whether the new sending-receiving relationship will have a significant positive or negative impact on the students and schools involved. The analysis in this section was informed by a review of the curriculum, the co-curricular opportunities at each school, the performance and achievement data, the demographic data, the school schedules, the grading policies and the organization of the instructional day. The information presented in this section was obtained from State reports, interviews with school personnel in each of the districts and school visits.

### **Impact on the Schools**

#### **Assessment Results**

The Statewide Testing program utilizes the PARCC Subject Area Tests. Student scores are divided into five categories: Not Meeting; Partially Meeting; Approaching; Meeting; and Exceeding Expectations. In addition, due to the impact of suppression rules (that protect privacy rights of small groups of students), in a number of areas it is difficult to draw insights from the disaggregated PARCC data. For this reason, data is not available for subgroup performance. The table below presents the percentage of students Meeting and Exceeding Expectations for All Students across the past three years. Both Califon and Lebanon outperform the State average almost across the board in absolute terms.

Another method for gauging student performance is to look at student achievement growth from year to year. The Table below also shows strong growth in scores from year to year and exceeding the State average in most grades. The true quality of a school focuses on the degree to which the school is able to take every child from where they are academically and to support them in their growth toward college and career readiness.

That does not mean that there is no room for improvement. For example, we compared the districts scores against the average score for all DFG I districts. The average score for students either meeting or exceeding proficiency for ELA 4 2017 was 76.3% in DFG I as compared to 83.3% for Califon and 65.2% for Lebanon. In MAT4, the DFG I 2017 meet or exceeding score was 69.1% compared to 83.3% for Califon and 60.6% for Lebanon. The ELA 7 DFG I 2017 score was 77% compared with Califon at 100% and Lebanon at 76.1%. Finally, MAT07 DFG I meet or exceeding score in 2017 was 58.6% compared to Califon at 36.4% and Lebanon at 59.2%.

The PARCC data demonstrates that all of the schools are high performing and in this regard there should be no issues with continuing the academic performance of the Califon students at the Lebanon schools. The data demonstrates that Lebanon is successfully implementing the curriculum and instruction necessary for students to achieve the New Jersey Learning Standards that will prepare them for college and careers.

**Table 9: Percentage Meeting or Exceeding Proficiency**

2015                      2016                      2017                      2015-17

ELA03	CALIFON BORO	*	76.9	*	NR
ELA03	LEBANON TWP	50	52.4	59	9
ELA03	STATE	43.5	47.5	50.4	6.9
MAT03	CALIFON BORO	*	92.3	*	NR
MAT03	LEBANON TWP	45.7	57.1	67.2	21.5
MAT03	STATE	44.9	51.7	52.4	7.5
ELA04	CALIFON BORO	*	*	83.3	NR
ELA04	LEBANON TWP	46.3	60.3	65.2	18.9
ELA04	STATE	51.1	53.5	55.9	4.8
MAT04	CALIFON BORO	*	*	83.3	NR
MAT04	LEBANON TWP	38.9	45.8	60.6	21.7
MAT04	STATE	40.6	46.6	47.3	6.7
ELA05	CALIFON BORO	*	*	*	NR
ELA05	LEBANON TWP	67.1	71.2	65.8	-1.3
ELA05	STATE	52	53.3	58.9	7.4
MAT05	CALIFON BORO	*	*	*	NR
MAT05	LEBANON TWP	57.1	60.4	50	-7.1
MAT05	STATE	41	47.2	46.2	5.2
ELA06	CALIFON BORO	*	*	*	NR
ELA06	LEBANON TWP	77.9	84.5	82	4.1
ELA06	STATE	48.8	52.3	53.3	4.5
MAT06	CALIFON BORO	*	*	*	NR
MAT06	LEBANON TWP	61.8	67.6	65	3.2
MAT06	STATE	40.8	42.9	43.6	2.8
ELA07	CALIFON BORO	42.9	*	100	57.1
ELA07	LEBANON TWP	61.9	76.1	76.1	14.2
ELA07	STATE	51.6	56.3	59.2	7.6
MAT07	CALIFON BORO	7.1	*	36.4	29.3
MAT07	LEBANON TWP	34.7	57.1	59.2	24.5
MAT07	STATE	36.8	38.7	39.6	2.8
ELA08	CALIFON BORO	76.9	38.5	*	NR
ELA08	LEBANON TWP	60.5	67.3	86.8	26.3
ELA08	STATE	51.6	55.2	59.1	7.5
MAT08	CALIFON BORO	*	*	*	NR
MAT08	LEBANON TWP	19.3	41.1	70.4	51.1
MAT08	STATE	23.5	25.6	27.7	4.2



## Student Growth Percentile

The State calculates a Student Growth Percentile to show how students progressed from grade level to grade level when compared to students Statewide with similar test scores over time. Student Growth Percentile Methodology (SGP) creates a measure of how students progressed in grades 4 through 8 in Language Arts Literacy and in grades 4 through 7 in Math when compared to other students with a similar test score history. Low Growth is defined as a Student Growth Percentile of less than 35, Typical Growth between 35-65 and High Growth is a score higher than 65.

**Table 10: SGP Data**

Student Growth	School Median All	State Median All	School Median Disabled	State Median Disabled	School Median ED	State Median ED
Califon ELA	68.5	50	35	41	ND	ND
Califon Math	62	50	ND		ND	ND
Valley View ELA	38	50	20	41	ND	ND
Valley View Math	56	50	53	43	ND	ND
Woodglen ELA	58	50	54	41	50	47
Woodglen Math	55	50	50	43	54	46

(Source: NJDOE Performance Reports)

ND- No Data

Califon elementary school shows high growth in both math and ELA and typical growth for disaggregated students with disabilities. No data is reported for the Economic Disadvantaged subgroup due to small student numbers. Lebanon demonstrates typical growth across subjects and grades and is showing strong growth in the subgroups concerning disabled students and students from poverty as compared to the State as a whole.

## School Readiness and Climate Indicators

The NJDOE School Performance Reports establish a number of indicators that demonstrate student progress toward being prepared for college and careers. The table below presents comparative College and Career Readiness/School Climate indicators collected in the State School Performance Reports for school year 2015-16.

**Table 11: Comparison of School Climate and College and Career Readiness Indicators**

<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Califon</b>	<b>Lebanon Elem.</b>	<b>Lebanon Middle</b>
Instructional Time	6: 30	6: 05	5: 45
Length of School Day	6: 40	6: 30	6:30
Suspension Rate*	1.1	0	1.4
Teacher/Student Ratio	5/1	9/1	9/1
Teacher/Admin. Ratio	23/1	168/1	98/1
Technology Devices/student	1:1	1:3.1	1:1
Participation in Art and Music Courses	100	NA	100
Absenteeism over 10 days	23	28	21

(Source: School Performance Reports)

Students from Califon attending Lebanon schools will experience a similar length of the school day although less instructional time. Lebanon class sizes, although higher than at Califon, are still very low and as discussed below, arguably more appropriate in terms of teaching and learning. The intensive use of technology at Califon will continue at Lebanon, especially in the middle grades, where there is a one to one Chromebook initiative.

### School Day and Schedule

Califon Elementary and Lebanon Elementary/Middle School have very similar bell schedules, starting time and ending times which will help Califon students assimilate to the new schools. Califon Elementary begins at 8:35 and ends at 3:12. Lebanon Woodglen Middle School begins at 8:35 and ends at 3:10 and Lebanon Valley View Elementary School start time is 8:45 and ends at 3:20. The Lebanon Schools are sequenced ten minutes apart to account for bus schedules. Each bus route will pick up both elementary and middle school students with middle school students being dropped off first. This same schedule can be used to accommodate Califon students.

### School Safety and Security

An important condition for student success is a safe and secure school environment conducive to learning. The State of New Jersey requires school districts to report on an annual basis the number of incidents of violence and vandalism. The incidents are categorized into four areas: Violence, Vandalism, Weapons, and Substance Abuse. Schools with high numbers of incidents can be considered unsafe under the federal No Child Left Behind Act. The annual Violence and Vandalism report that is required to be filed annually with the State of New Jersey will provide insights into the learning environment for both PGHS and WHS students (See Table 12 below).

**Table 12: Violence and Vandalism Reports**

<b>District</b>	<b>Enrollment</b>	<b>Violence</b>	<b>Vandalism</b>	<b>Weapons</b>	<b>Substances</b>	<b>HIB</b>	<b>Total</b>
Califon	108	0	0	0	0	1	1
Lebanon	659	0	0	0	0	0	0
State	1,372,755	8,261	1,423	1,000	3,010	5,995	19,181

(Source: NJDOE data)

Breaking down the data, Califon has one incident per 108 students, while Lebanon had zero incidents per 659 students. To put these numbers into perspective, the Statewide numbers indicate 1 incident for every 72 students. Based upon the low number of incidents in both districts compared to the State average, we do not identify any issues concerning student safety in terms of Califon students attending Lebanon schools.

### School and Class Size

Califon class and grade sizes are extraordinarily low, in some cases with just a handful of students. All of the schools involved would be considered small in size. Lebanon Valley View elementary school will have a total student population **after the proposed reorganization** of under 400. These numbers would reflect a small school size which is supported by the research as promoting student achievement.

Lee and Loeb (2000) found that smaller school size positively influenced student achievement. They found that smaller school size will have a positive impact on teacher attitudes and motivations and because of that effect will result in higher student achievement. They recommended a school size of no more than 400 students.

Loeb believed that students will learn more in small schools since teachers will take personal responsibility for achievement due to higher levels of collective responsibility. This collective responsibility is due to the smaller organizational size facilitating greater personalized social interactions. In small schools teachers will interact more often with students and know them better and will thereby take personal responsibility for their success.

Mertens et al (2001) confirmed this indirect benefit from smaller school size. They found that middle schools with fewer than 750 students will have better instructional practices, more parent involvement, and more common planning time for teachers all of which are associated with higher student achievement. In this regard, Lebanon Woodglen middle school will be far below this threshold with a total student population after the addition of Califon students of approximately 600.

However, schools can be too small. When classes become too small the group dynamics will be increasingly difficult. For example, individual students are more easily able to dominate the group and disrupt learning. The range of ideas may not be as broad, life experiences as great and perspectives as diverse which may stunt discussion required to get at deeper learning and

problem solving. In addition, learning has both social and academic components and having too few students will restrict the ability for friend groups to form and the power of cliques may grow.

A school is too small when it is no longer able to provide a reasonable breadth and depth of courses, enrichment, and curriculars and to provide students with the social and emotional environment brought through a diverse set of classmates.

Attendance issues may also present learning challenges in very small classes. While one or two students missing a large class will not impact learning, a small number of absent students can make a big difference in a very small class.

Some academic activities require a minimum number of participants. Activities such as small group projects are much harder to implement in a small class because there are fewer students to divide into groups.

Finally, teachers in larger districts have more colleagues on which to draw for advice and discussion, interactions that arguably lead to improved effectiveness.

However, it is important to take steps to mitigate against the effect of the comparatively larger class sizes by not only keeping classes sizes below the norm for these grades (in the low 20s for elementary and 25 for middle) but providing greater support for these students, for example, an additional math teacher and a shared guidance counselor.

### School Transitions

Transitions from one school to another often pose challenges for students and families both academically and socially. This new sending-receiving agreement will add a new transition for students from Califon who will be leaving a K-8 setting and attending an elementary school and then a middle school in Lebanon.

In most parts of the country, students will make at least two transitions, elementary to middle and middle to high school. These transitions are important since student achievement often lags the year after the transition to a new school. For example, research suggests that after the transition to high school, students' grade point averages and attendance often decline. (Barone et al., 1991; Reyes et al, 1994).

Alsbaugh (1998) found that students experiencing a double transition (where the student moves from elementary to middle and then from middle to high school) experienced a greater achievement loss and higher dropout rates than did a single transition (from a K-to-8 school to high school).

This transition tends to be more difficult for those who did not perform well in the middle grades. Student achievement issues resulting from transitions can be attributed to lower levels of engagement which interfere with social networks, self-confidence and support systems (Barone et al, 1991; Hertzog et al, 1996). "New high school students find themselves in a larger, less personal and more competitive setting. Grades become more important than relationships;

teachers and peers become more diverse; and curricular and extracurricular activities become more demanding” (Feldlaufer et al, 1988).

The research suggests that transitional programs that include counseling, school visits, and special summer courses can be used to help students adjust to the new school environment. The Califon and Lebanon school districts should prepare a plan to provide and budget for these supports in order to lessen the impact of this new transition.

However, it is important to observe that having 7<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> graders attend the same school prior to being combined at the high school level may also positively impact student achievement. Research indicates that middle grade students in high school earned better grades if they attended the same high school as their middle grade classmates. (Schiller, 1999). This is attributed to a sense of place and belonging where students can increase self-esteem, participation and reduce anonymity. Increased collaboration across grade levels of students and teachers will also lead to this sense of belonging.

In conclusion, the proposal will add an additional transition for Califon students but that transition will bring both challenges in terms of the need for additional supports as well as opportunities in the form of a better bridge to high school for students from both districts. The addition of a guidance counselor to support Califon students at Valley View and Woodglen would be appropriate in the circumstances.

### Diversity

One additional positive impact of the proposed sending-receiving relationship and grade reconfiguration will be to increase diversity slightly for Califon students attending Lebanon schools. Califon Schools are 93.5 White while Lebanon elementary and middle schools are 91.6 and 91.8 White respectively. Although all of the schools would not be considered diverse, even small increases in diversity are important and the trend line in Lebanon is trending toward greater diversity.

In this regard, the positive impact of diversity on educational outcomes has been widely established. Orfield and Frankenberg (2011) indicated that:

The National Academy of Education, a group of 100 of the nation’s leading scholars, recently reviewed the massive body of research on school integration and found compelling evidence of its educational value. When desegregation is properly implemented, it is not an alternative to education reform or a barrier to educational change, but is, rather, an important education reform in itself. Desegregation increases learning, raises rates of graduation, and helps students from all backgrounds learn to understand, live, and work together in a diverse community, in a nation where half of the children born this year are not white and where all will live in a society of great diversity. (Page 35).

These benefits include improvements in critical thinking skills with all students becoming better problem solvers and communicators. Black and Latino student academic achievement is “generally higher in desegregated schools compared with black and Latino students in segregated minority schools.” The authors concluded that “Racially integrated schools enhance students’ learning, expand their future opportunities, and benefits society at large.” (Orfield and Frankenberg, 2011 at 35.)

### Impact on Curriculum and Gifted and Talented Educational (GATE) Programs

Due to the sharing of administrative and academic resources, the curriculum and specialized programs at the Califon and Lebanon schools are closely aligned including the Gifted and Talented Education Programs.

Both districts have a shared curriculum with similar instructional strategies to implement the New Jersey Learning Standards. Common curriculum and instructional strategies in the districts will allow for a smoother transition for Califon students. However, it will be important for both districts to analyze student performance data during the early years of the transition to identify any issues with the alignment of the curriculum with instructional strategies and to ensure that any curriculum gaps are identified and strategies such as professional development are developed to address them.

In terms of the Gifted and Talented program, each Lebanon school has a dedicated enrichment teacher. The programs are whole class, small group and individually identified students. On the other hand, Califon has only a part-time enrichment teacher with whole class instruction. Gifted and Talented Califon students will benefit from the additional program elements at Lebanon.

### Impact on Co-Curriculars and Athletics

In this section we will assess the co-curricular and athletic activities available at both middle schools. The table below presents the clubs and activities being provided by Califon and Lebanon:

**Table 13: Comparison of Cocurricular Offerings and Athletics**

<b>Activity</b>	<b>Lebanon Township</b>	<b>Califon</b>
Athletics: Interscholastic	Cross-country Soccer Field hockey Basketball (boys and girls) Baseball Softball	Cross-country Basketball-Boys Cheerleading
Athletics: Intramural	Soccer Basketball Volleyball	None
Clubs/Activities	Robotics Art club Business Club Family Science Photography Knitting School Musical *This is a sample of the existing co-curricular offerings Identified by the district	School Musical Trep\$ Destination Imagination

Although Lebanon currently offers a wide range of student enrichment activities, it plans to use the opportunity presented by this proposal to increase co-curricular activities. These additional co-curricular activities will now be available to Califon, representing significant educational opportunities not otherwise available to them.

Athletics are an important part of producing well rounded students in establishing a common school identity and culture and Califon students will now be able to participate in a number of school athletic programs at Lebanon schools. More athletic programs in middle school can form a bridge to high school interscholastic programs leading to a better student experience and higher participation rates. Participation in athletics at the middle school level provides many benefits such as promoting good citizenship, healthy life styles and experiences with diverse populations.

Guidance and Student Support

Lebanon will be able to use its tuition dollars to hire an additional Guidance Counselor serving the combined population who will be able to assist with the transition to the new school and provide support to all students as discussed earlier in this chapter.

In addition, the districts should consider adding extra professional development for teaching staff to support the transition from elementary to middle school for Califon students.

### Technology

Lebanon Middle School has created a learning environment that is fully integrated with instructional technology and provides rich experiences for students through a 1:1 Chromebook initiative. The proposed budget for the combined middle school will need to include resources to provide Califon students with the 1:1 technology.

### Special Learners

Students with Disabilities: Califon has a much lower classification rate (14%) than Lebanon Township Valley View (25%) and Woodglen (22%) schools. The Lebanon classification rates are high in comparison to the State average and the district has developed a continuum of programs and related services to address the needs of this population.

Given the small number of Califon students identified in need of Special Education and related services, there should not be any concerns with the ability of Lebanon to identify and provide services for Califon students in need of special education services.

Lebanon has a broad array of programs for special education services including the following specialized classes:

- Pre-school Disabilities
- Elementary LLD
- Elementary Autistic program
- Middle School Autistic program
- Middle School LLD

Califon currently has no self-contained classrooms and three Out of District Placements but all are placed in Lebanon programs. Lebanon currently has three Out of District Placements for low incidence disabilities.

At-Risk/LEP Students: in terms of at-risk students (students in poverty) Califon students will experience enhanced supports to assist them. Lebanon currently offers an RTI program for all at risk students in grade K-4. Students receive Tier II and III instruction for 30 minutes daily. Califon currently has no formal program for these students. Similarly, Califon has no formal support program for LEP students but Lebanon offers students one-on-one services (3 support periods of 45 minutes each per week).



Conclusion: Educational Impacts

Califon students will experience a similar high quality program in Lebanon schools. They will also experience a quality learning environment, a program that better aligns with the rigors of high school, and more co-curricular and athletic opportunities.

In sum, both of the communities will see the benefits of an elementary and middle school capable of providing a 21st century curriculum that can compete with the best schools in the State.

DRAFT

## PART FIVE: STAFFING IMPACTS

### 1. Staffing Analysis

In examining the impact of the proposed new sending-receiving relationships, a number of issues regarding staffing must be addressed. In order to do this, we must determine the impact of the proposals on staff in the Califon and Lebanon school districts. The tables below **simulate** the impact of the proposal on teaching, administrative, support and clerical staff assignments in both districts. This simulation is based on existing practices and will likely change as policy decisions are made by the respective boards of education in the future. However, it will be useful in providing guidance to the districts regarding the considerations that will need to be explored at that time. We also note that these charts focus on administrative, teaching and support assignments not actual school employees and, therefore, duties that may be accomplished on a part-time or contractual basis are indicated as fractional assignments. However, the reality of staffing in a particular school or district may not allow for such part time or contractual employment and deviations from these models are to be expected.

**Table 14: Califon Staffing Impact Scenario A**

	<b>17-18 Total</b>	<b>17-18 Prof. Allocated to K-4</b>	<b>17-18 Prof. Allocated to 5-8</b>	<b>17-18 Para. /support</b>	<b>Reduction Staff 18-19 Prof./ Support</b>	<b>Reduction Staff 19-20 Prof./ Support</b>
Principal	1	.5	.5		0	1
Vice Principal	0					
Secretary/Adm. Asst.	1			1	0	1
Guidance Counselor*	.20	.1	.1		.1	.1
Cafeteria	0					
Nurse	1	.5	.5		0	1
Librarian	.25	.125	.125		.125	.125
Phys. Ed.	1	.5	.5		.5	.5
Special Education	2.5	1	1.5		1	1.5
Teaching Aid	3			3	1	2
Custodian	2			2	0	2
PK Teacher	1	1	0		0	1
Kinder. Teacher	1	1	0		1	0
1 <sup>st</sup> Grade Teacher	1	1	0		1	0
2 <sup>nd</sup> Grade Teacher	1	1	0		1	0
3 <sup>rd</sup> Grade Teacher	1	1	0		1	0
4 <sup>th</sup> Grade Teacher	1	1	0		1	0
5 <sup>th</sup> Grade Teacher	1	0	1		0	1
ELA Teacher	1	0	1		0	1
Math Teacher	1.5	0	1.5		0	1.5
Science/STEM	1	0	1		0	1
History/Geo.. Teacher	1	0	1		0	1
Techn./Enrichment	.75	.375	.375		.375	.375
Spanish	1	.5	.5		.5	.5
Art	1	.5	.5		.5	.5
Music**	.5	.25	.25		.25	.25
<b>Total</b>	<b>26.70</b>	<b>10.35</b>	<b>10.35</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>9.35</b>	<b>17.35</b>

\*Contracted 1 day per week (estimated at \$10,000 per year)

\*\*Contracted Service (estimated at \$45,000 per year)

**Table 15: Lebanon Staffing Impact Valley View Scenario A**

	<b>17-18 Prof.</b>	<b>17-18 Para./ Support</b>	<b>Staff 18-19 Prof.</b>	<b>Staff 18-19 Para/ Support</b>
Principal	1		1	
Vice Principal	0			
Secretary/Adm. Asst.	0	2		2
Guidance Counselor	1		1.5	
Cafeteria	0	2		2
Nurse	1		1	
Librarian	.5		.5	
Phys. Ed.	1		1	
Special Education	6		7	
RTI Teacher	3		3	
Teaching Aid	0	20		21
Custodian	0	2.5		2.5
PK Teacher	1		1	
PK Resource	1		1	
Kinder. Teacher	3		3	
1 <sup>st</sup> Grade Teacher	3		3	
2 <sup>nd</sup> Grade Teacher	3		3	
3 <sup>rd</sup> Grade Teacher	3		4	
4 <sup>th</sup> Grade Teacher	3		4	
4 <sup>th</sup> Grade SPED	1		1	
Techn./Enrichment	.5		.5	
Spanish	.5		.5	
Art	.5		.5	
Music	1		1	
<b>Total</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>26.5</b>	<b>37.5</b>	<b>27.5</b>

Table 20 indicates that no additional regular instruction staff will need to be added to Valley View to account for additional Califon students in order to keep class sizes at manageable levels. However, one additional Special Education teacher and one additional aide will be necessary to support students with IEPs. We also believe that two additional teachers to support regular classroom teachers in core subjects and a shared additional guidance counselor would be advisable to ensure that educational quality continues to be strong. These additional staff are included in the staffing impact chart above.

**Table 16: Lebanon Staffing Impact Woodglen Scenario A**

	<b>17-18 Prof.</b>	<b>17-18 Para./ Support</b>	<b>19-20 Prof.</b>	<b>19-20 Para./Support</b>
Principal	1		1	
Vice Principal	0			
Secretary/Adm. Asst.		2		2
Guidance Counselor	1		1.5	
Cafeteria		1		1
Nurse	1		1	
Librarian	.5		.5	
Phys. Ed.	1		1	
Special Education	4		5	
Resource Room	5		5	
Teaching Aid		4		6
Custodian		2.5		2.5
8 <sup>th</sup> ELA Teacher	1		1	
8 <sup>th</sup> Science	1		1	
8 <sup>th</sup> Spanish	.5		.5	
8 <sup>th</sup> Social Studies	1		1	
8 <sup>th</sup> Grade Math	1		2	
7 <sup>th</sup> ELA Teacher	1		2	
7 <sup>th</sup> Math Teacher	1		1	
7 <sup>th</sup> Social Studies Teacher	1		1	
7 <sup>th</sup> Spanish	.5		.5	
7 <sup>th</sup> Science	1		1	
6 <sup>th</sup> ELA Teacher	1		1	
6 <sup>th</sup> Math Teacher	1		1	
6 <sup>th</sup> Social Studies Teacher	1		1	
6 <sup>th</sup> Spanish	.5		.5	
6 <sup>th</sup> Science	1		1	
5 <sup>th</sup> Grade Teacher	4		4	
5 <sup>th</sup> Spanish	.5		.5	
Art	.5		.5	
Music	1		1	
Technology	.5		.5	
<b>Total</b>	<b>33.5</b>	<b>9.5</b>	<b>37.0</b>	<b>11.5</b>

Table 21 indicates that no additional staff need to be added to Woodglen to account for additional Califon students in order to keep class sizes at manageable levels. However, one additional Special Education teacher and two additional aides will be necessary to support students with IEPs in 2019-20. We also believe that two additional teachers to support regular

classroom teachers in core subjects and a shared additional guidance counselor would be advisable in 2019-20 to ensure that educational quality continues to be strong. These additional staff are included in the staffing impact chart above.

**Table 17: Califon Staffing Impact Scenario B**

	<b>17-18 Total</b>	<b>17-18 Prof. Allocated to K, 1, 5</b>	<b>17-18 Prof. Allocated to PK, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8</b>	<b>17-18 Para. /support</b>	<b>Reduction Staff 18-19 Prof./ Support</b>	<b>Reduction Staff 19-20 Prof./ Support</b>
Principal	1	.33	.66		0	1
Vice Principal	0					
Secretary/Adm. Asst.	1			1	0	1
Guidance Counselor*	.20	.1	.1		0	.2
Cafeteria	0					
Nurse	1	.33	.66		0	1
Librarian	.25	.125	.125		.125	.125
Phys. Ed.	1	.33	.66		.35	.65
Special Education	2.5	1	1.5		.75	1.75
Teaching Aid	3			3	1	2
Custodian	2			2	0	2
PK Teacher	1	0	1		0	1
Kinder. Teacher	1	1	0		1	0
1 <sup>st</sup> Grade Teacher	1	1	0		1	0
2 <sup>nd</sup> Grade Teacher	1	0	1		0	0
3 <sup>rd</sup> Grade Teacher	1	0	1		0	0
4 <sup>th</sup> Grade Teacher	1	0	1		0	0
5 <sup>th</sup> Grade Teacher	1	1	0		1	1
ELA Teacher	1	0	1		0	1
Math Teacher	1.5	0	1.5		0	1.5
Science/STEM	1	0	1		0	1
History/Geo.. Teacher	1	0	1		0	1
Techn./Enrichment	.75	.25	.50		.25	.50
Spanish	1	.33	.66		.33	.66
Art	1	.33	.66		.33	.66
Music**	.5	.15	.35		.15	.35
<b>Total</b>	<b>26.70</b>	<b>7.285</b>	<b>14.35</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>6.285</b>	<b>20.415</b>

\*Contracted 1 day per week (\$10,000 per year)

\*\*Contracted Service (\$45,000 per year)

**Table 18: Lebanon Staffing Impact Valley View Scenario B**

	17-18 Prof.	17-18 Para./ Support	Staff 18-19 Prof.	Staff 18-19 Para/ Support	Staff 19-20 Prof.	Staff 19-20 Para/ Support
Principal	1		1		1	
Vice Principal	0					
Secretary/Adm. Asst.	0	2		2		2
Guidance Counselor	1		1		1.5	
Cafeteria	0	2		2		2
Nurse	1		1		1	
Librarian	.5		.5		.5	
Phys. Ed.	1		1		1	
Special Education	6		6		7	
RTI Teacher	3		3		3	
Teaching Aid	0	20		20		21
Custodian	0	2.5		2.5		2.5
PK Teacher	1		1		1	
PK Resource	1		1		1	
Kinder. Teacher	3		3		3	
1 <sup>st</sup> Grade	3		3		3	
2 <sup>nd</sup> Grade	3		3		3	
3 <sup>rd</sup> Grade	3		3		4	
4 <sup>th</sup> Grade	3		3		4	
4 <sup>th</sup> Grade SPED	1		1		1	
Techn./Enrich.	.5		.5		.5	
Spanish	.5		.5		.5	
Art	.5		.5		.5	
Music	1		1		1	
<b>Total</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>26.5</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>26.5</b>	<b>37.5</b>	<b>27.5</b>

Table 20 indicates that no additional regular instruction staff will need to be added to Valley View to account for additional Califon students in order to keep class sizes at manageable levels. However, one additional Special Education teacher and one additional aide will be necessary to support students with IEPs beginning in 2019-20. We also believe that in 2019-20 the addition of two teachers to support regular classroom teachers in core subjects and a shared additional guidance counselor would be advisable to ensure that educational quality continues to be strong. These additional staff are included in the staffing impact chart above.

**Table 19: Lebanon Staffing Impact Woodglen Scenario B**

	<b>Staff 17-18 Prof.</b>	<b>Staff 17-18 Para./ Support</b>	<b>Staff 18-19 Prof.</b>	<b>Staff 18-19 Para./ Support</b>	<b>Staff 19-20 Prof.</b>	<b>Staff 19-20 Para./ Support</b>
Principal	1		1		1	
Vice Principal	0					
Secretary/Adm. Asst.		2		2		2
Guidance Counselor	1		1		1.5	
Cafeteria		1		1		1
Nurse	1		1		1	
Librarian	.5		.5		.5	
Phys. Ed.	1		1		1	
Special Education	4		4		5	
Resource Room	5		5		5	
Teaching Aid		4		4		6
Custodian		2.5		2.5		2.5
8 <sup>th</sup> ELA Teacher	1		1		1	
8 <sup>th</sup> Science	1		1		1	
8 <sup>th</sup> Spanish	.5		.5		.5	
8 <sup>th</sup> Social Studies	1		1		1	
8 <sup>th</sup> Grade Math	1		1		2	
7 <sup>th</sup> ELA	1		1		2	
7 <sup>th</sup> Math	1		1		1	
7 <sup>th</sup> Social Studies	1		1		1	
7 <sup>th</sup> Spanish	.5		.5		.5	
7 <sup>th</sup> Science	1		1		1	
6 <sup>th</sup> ELA	1		1		1	
6 <sup>th</sup> Math	1		1		1	
6 <sup>th</sup> Social Studies	1		1		1	
6 <sup>th</sup> Spanish	.5		.5		.5	
6 <sup>th</sup> Science	1		1		1	
5 <sup>th</sup> Grade	4		4		4	
5 <sup>th</sup> Spanish	.5		.5		.5	
Art	.5		.5		.5	
Music	1		1		1	
Technology	.5		.5		.5	
<b>Total</b>	<b>33.5</b>	<b>9.5</b>	<b>33.5</b>	<b>9.5</b>	<b>37.0</b>	<b>11.5</b>



Table 21 indicates that no additional staff need to be added to Woodglen to account for additional Califon students in order to keep class sizes at manageable levels. However, one additional Special Education teacher and two additional aides will be necessary to support students with IEPs. We also believe that two additional teacher to support regular classroom teachers and a shared additional guidance counselor would be advisable to ensure that educational quality continues to be strong. These additional staff are included in the staffing impact chart above.

**Table 20: Class Size Impact Valley View**

(3 classes per grade)

Grade	Status Quo Class Size SY19	Scenario A New Class Size SY19	Scenario A New Class Size SY20	Scenario B New Class Size SY19	Scenario B New Class Size SY20
K	14	16	16	16	16
1	17.33	19.33	17.33	19.33	17.33
2	15	18.33	20	15	20
3	18.66	20.66	18.33	18.66	18.33
4	18	21	21	18	21

**Table 21: Class Size Impact Woodglen**

(4 classes per grade)

Grade	Status Quo Class Size SY19	Status Quo Class Size SY20	Scenario A New Class Size SY19	Scenario A New Class Size SY20	Scenario B New Class Size SY19	Scenario B New Class Size SY20
5	16	13.75	16	16	17.5	16
6	16.75	15.75	16.75	17.25	16.75	17.25
7	20.25	17.25	20.25	20.25	20.25	20.25
8	15.5	20.25	15.5	22.5	15.5	22.5

We should note that these class sizes are within the average ranges for elementary and middle school grades in New Jersey and are conservative estimates as noted in the enrollment section of this report. Very importantly, these class sizes do not include the additional core subject teachers (two at Valley View and two at Woodglenn) that have been budgeted to assist regular classroom teachers in supporting students and, if there is an unexpected increase in class sizes, could be deployed as a regular classroom teacher.

In the following section we will discuss the considerations for the Califon district as it engages in right sizing its staffing and the impact of these reductions on Lebanon.

## 2. Transfers and Reduction in Force

The reduction of teaching staff in the Califon district due to the new sending-receiving relationship will be controlled by the provisions of NJSA 18A:28-6.1 which protects tenured teaching staff at the sending school in the event of such a new agreement. The statute reads as follows:

### 18A:28-6.1. Tenure upon discontinuance of school

Whenever, heretofore or hereafter, any board of education in any school district in this state shall discontinue any high school, junior high school, elementary school or any one or more of the grades from kindergarten through grade 12 in the district and shall, by agreement with another board of education, send the pupils in such schools or grades to such other district, all teaching staff members who are assigned for a majority of their time in such school, grade or grades and who have tenure of office at the time such schools or grades are discontinued shall be employed by the board of education of such other district in the same or nearest equivalent position; provided that any such teaching staff member may elect to remain in the employ of the former district in any position to which he may be entitled by virtue of his tenure and seniority rights by giving notice of said election to the boards of education in each of the school districts at least three months prior to the date on which such school, grade, or grades are to be discontinued. Teaching staff members so employed in such other district shall have their rights to tenure, seniority, pension and accumulated leave of absence, accorded under the laws of this state, recognized and preserved by the board of education of that district. Any periods of prior employment in such sending district shall count toward the acquisition of tenure in the other district to the same extent as if all such prior employment had been in such other district.

The statute provides that **tenured** Califon teaching staff members who teach a majority of their time in the grades to be covered by the new sending-receiving relationship will have the following protections:

- a. Transfer pursuant to their tenure/seniority rights to another position in Califon that they are certified for.
- b. Become employed by the Lebanon Township District in the “same or nearest equivalent position.” In this event, they will be covered under the Lebanon Collective Bargaining Agreement and the teacher’s tenure, seniority, pension, and accumulated leave of absence will be preserved in the Lebanon district.

- c. Impacted staff will have time in sending district count toward tenure rights in the receiving district.
- d. Impacted teaching staff have until 3 months prior to the effective date of the new agreement to notify the district of their decision.

Califon will need to notify impacted teachers 3 months prior to the effective date of the agreement and then need to terminate non-tenured staff and conduct a Reduction in Force for tenured staff bearing in mind the annual legal timelines for doing so. This will need to happen in both years 1 and year 2 to account for all staff members who will be displaced during the transitional period.

This study will not be able to determine the impact on **individual** staff members since that analysis will need to be done during the spring prior to the effective date of the new sending-receiving relationship based on the teaching roster and employment rights **at that time** including tenured versus non-tenured status, certifications held by individual teachers, and seniority rights. The district must also be mindful of the provisions of the applicable Collective Bargaining Agreement in the event of a Reduction in Force or transfer.

#### Impact on Salary Guide

The staffing implications referenced above will directly impact the compensation of teachers transferring from Califon to Lebanon pursuant to the Lebanon salary guide. As a part of this review, we have examined both salary guides that are currently in effect and note that the salary guide in Lebanon will compensate teachers at generally higher levels than similarly situated teachers in Califon. For example, the first step in Lebanon equates with a salary of \$54,555 while the first Step in Califon is only \$49,459, a \$5,096 differential. Similarly, the 11th step for Lebanon is \$60,995 while the 11th step in Califon is \$57,439, a \$3,556 differential. These higher salaries, that will apply to any teachers transferring from Califon to Lebanon, will need to be taken into account as financial estimates are developed in the following section.

## **PART SIX: FINANCIAL IMPACT**

### **1. Estimated Tuition Costs**

Traditionally school districts involved in a sending-receiving relationship work on a two year cycle for payments. At the beginning of the year the receiving district establishes an estimated tuition cost and once the final audit is completed the NJDOE establishes actual tuition costs. The sending district then reconciles with the receiving district the actual tuition costs and the actual student attendance.

The tuition amount is established pursuant to NJAC 6A:23A-17.1 which requires the calculation of an "actual cost per student" for determining the tuition rate, which "means the local cost per student in average daily enrollment, based upon audited expenditures for that year...". "The receiving district board of education shall include in its calculation all expenditures for each purpose except Federal and State special revenue fund expenditures and those specifically excluded..." in the regulations such as Legal Fees and principal on debt. The receiving district board of education must have the "actual cost per student" approved by the Commissioner of Education.

As indicated above, the tuition amount is established pursuant to NJAC 6A:23A-17.1 which requires the calculation of an "actual cost per student" minus certain exclusions. Those exclusions include: transportation to and from school that is paid by the resident district board of education; employee retirement and social security contributions for TPAF members that are fully funded by the State; principal on lease-purchase agreements; tuition; community services; resource rooms, which are permitted as a separate charge over and above tuition for general education classes; accredited adult education programs and nonaccredited adult and evening programs; and extraordinary services provided to special education students for which a district board of education may bill directly. The tuition calculation may include a building use charge based on the interest charges incurred by the district that are not reimbursed by the State.

The tuition charged to the sending district may not exceed this actual cost per pupil. Often the sending and receiving districts will agree to a fixed amount that is less than the actual cost per student in order to take account of the transitional costs to the sending district in the beginning years of the agreement.

In the situation presented in this study both Califon and Lebanon Township have agreed to a set tuition amount for the first three years of the agreement as follows:

Year 1- \$11,000 per pupil  
Year 2- \$11,500 per pupil  
Year 3 through 5- \$12,000 per pupil

We will use these amounts as we model the financial impact on both Califon and Lebanon Township but note that the costs of special education programs and services outside of the regular classroom are not included in these tuition amounts. Other costs will also be outside the Sending-Receiving Tuition calculation such as for Child Study Teams and transportation.

Tuition Estimate Scenario A

Year 1 Tuition Estimate- 37 students (K-4) times \$11,000 = \$407,000

Year 2 Tuition Estimate- 72 students (K-8) times \$11,500 = \$828,000

Tuition Estimate Scenario B

Year 1 Tuition Estimate- 18 students (K, 1 and 5) times \$11,000 = \$198,000

Year 2 Tuition Estimate- 72 students (K-8) times \$11,500 = \$828,000

**2. Net Financial Impact on Lebanon**

In modeling these calculations, we note that there are many policy decisions that will need to be made by the districts following submission of this report in relation to such things as class sizes, staffing, electives and technology that will substantially impact these estimates. In this regard, the study is not intended to recreate the respective budgets but to provide general policy guidance regarding the financial implications of the new sending-receiving agreement.

The actual additional costs to Lebanon for the education of the Califon students will include a) staff salaries and benefits and b) instructional materials and technology as follows.

a) Staff salaries and benefits

Year 1 (SY19) Additional Staffing Costs:

Scenario A

Valley View- As noted in Table 15 above, additional recommended staff are one special education teacher, a shared guidance counselor (hired entirely in Year 1), two core subject teachers, and one special education aide.

Woodglenn- No additional staff will be required.

The costs to Lebanon Township of this additional staff for year 1 can be calculated as follows:

Approximate Year 1 Additional Staffing Costs Scenario A

Teaching Staff: 4 x \$85,000 (estimated salary plus benefits) \$ 340,000

Teacher Aides: 1 x \$25,000 (estimated salary per aid no benefits) \$ 25,000

Total Staffing: \$365,000

Scenario B

Valley View- No additional staff will be required.

Woodglenn- No additional staff will be required.

Year 2 (SY20) Additional Staffing Costs:

Scenario A

Valley View- No additional staff will be required.

Woodglenn- As indicated in Table 16, additional recommended staff are one special education teacher, two teachers to support classroom instruction and two additional

aides will be required. The costs to Lebanon Township of the additional staff can be calculated as follows:

<b>Approximate Year 2 Additional Staffing Costs Scenario A</b>	
Teaching Staff: 3 x \$85,000 (estimated salary plus benefits)	\$255,000
Teacher Aides: 2 x \$25,000 (estimated salary per aid no benefits)	<u>\$ 50,000</u>
<b>Total Staffing:</b>	<b>\$305,000</b>

**Scenario B**

Valley View- As noted in Table 18 above, recommended additional staff are: one special education teacher, one shared time guidance counselor, two additional teacher, and one special education aide.

Woodglen- As noted in Table 19 above, one additional special education teacher, two teachers to support classroom instruction and two additional aides will be required. The costs to Lebanon Township of this additional staff for year 1 can be calculated as follows:

<b>Approximate Year 2 Additional Staffing Costs Scenario B</b>	
Teaching Staff: 7 x \$85,000 (estimated salary plus benefits)	\$ 595,000
Teacher Aides: 3 x \$25,000 (estimated salary per aid no benefits)	<u>\$ 75,000</u>
<b>Total Staffing:</b>	<b>\$670,000</b>

b) Instructional materials and technology. Added to these staffing costs will be the costs for substitutes/instructional resources such as textbooks and technology (ie., Chromebooks in the middle grades) and to expand co-curricular offerings/athletics that we can estimate at \$1,000 per pupil or \$37,000 in Year 1 under Scenario A and \$18,000 per year under Scenario B. These costs will equal \$72,000 in Year 2 under either scenario.

Therefore, total additional costs (a. plus b.) can be estimated at:

<b>Scenario A:</b>	Year 1- \$402,000 (\$365,000 plus \$37,000)
	Year 2- \$742,000 (\$402,000 Year 1 plus \$340,000 [\$305,000 plus \$35,000] additional in Year 2.)
<b>Scenario B:</b>	Year 1- \$18,000
	Year 2- \$742,000 (\$18,000 Year 1 plus \$724,000 [670,000 plus \$54,000] additional in Year 2.)

**We can then calculate Net Tuition Revenues to Lebanon of:**

<b>Scenario A:</b>	<b>Year 1: \$ 5,000 (\$407,000 tuition- \$402,000 costs)</b>
	<b>Year 2: \$ 86,000 (\$828,000 tuition-\$742,000 costs).</b>
<b>Scenario B:</b>	<b>Year 1: \$180,000 (\$198,000 tuition- \$18,000 costs)</b>
	<b>Year 2: \$ 86,000 (\$828,000 tuition-\$742,000 costs).</b>

These additional dollars can be used to increase educational programs and services or to reduce the tax burden. We note that these are conservative estimates and we can predict that under the assumptions used in this report there will no negative impact on taxpayers.

### **3. Net Financial Impact on Califon**

The total estimated costs to Califon will equal the tuition estimates calculated above plus the estimated costs for transportation. As discussed in the Transportation Section below, Califon will incur an additional cost for the transportation of students from Califon to Lebanon. The distance is only about 3 miles from Califon to Lebanon schools. Using the current State In Lieu of Transportation amount of \$885 provides a good estimate of total transportation costs to Califon that can be projected as follows:

- Scenario A: Year 1-\$32,745 (\$885 times the 37 estimated students in year 1)  
Year 2- \$63,720- (\$885 times 72 estimated students in year 2)
- Scenario B: Year 1- \$15,930 (\$885 times 18 estimated students in year 1)  
Year 2- \$63,720- (\$885 times 72 estimated students in year 2)

The total gross costs to Califon can, therefore, be estimated as:

- Scenario A: Year 1- \$439,745 (\$407,000 tuition plus \$32,745)  
Year 2- \$891,720 (\$828,000 tuition plus \$63,720).
- Scenario B: Year 1- \$213,930 (\$198,000 tuition plus \$15,930)  
Year 2- \$891,720 (\$828,000 tuition plus \$63,720).

We will next determine the net financial impact on Califon by subtracting the total gross costs from the anticipated costs savings. Califon will be able to reduce costs due to the need for less staff and instructional resources at Califon Elementary School due to the departure of the students which we will estimate below.

#### **Scenario A: Anticipated Cost Saving Projections**

Year 1 Reductions: As indicated in Table 14 above, Califon will be able to reduce staffing attributable to the movement out of district of the K-4 graders in year 1 by an estimated 8.35 teachers and 1.0 aides:

8.35 Teachers	@ \$80,000 (Salary and benefits)=	\$ 668,000
1.0 Aides	@ \$25,000 (Salary, no benefits)=	<u>\$ 25,000</u>
		\$ 693,000

Year 2 reductions will equal 12.35 professional staff plus 5 non-instructional staff:

1 administrator	@ 145,000 (salary and benefits)=	\$ 145,000
1 clerical	@ 65,000 (salary and benefits)	\$ 65,000
2 custodian	@ 65,000 (salary and benefits)	\$ 130,000
2 aides	@ 25,000 (salary; no benefits)	\$ 50,000

11.35 teaching staff	@80,000 (salary and benefits)	<u>\$ 908,000</u>
		\$1,298,000

Added to this amount are savings in substitutes/instructional resources such as textbooks and technology that we can estimate at \$1,000 per pupil or \$37,000 in Year 1 and \$72,000 in Year 2.

Scenario B: Anticipated Cost Saving Projections

Year 1 reductions: As indicated in Table 17 above, Califon will be able to reduce staffing attributable to the movement out of district of the K, 1 and 5 graders in year 1 by an estimated 5.285 teachers and 1.0 aides.

5.285 Teachers	@\$80,000 (Salary and benefits)=	\$ 422,800
1.0 Aides	@\$25,000 (Salary, no benefits)=	<u>\$ 25,000</u>
		\$ 447,800

Year 2 reductions equal 20.415 staff (15.415 professional staff plus 5 non-instructional staff):

1 administrator	@ 145,000 (salary and benefits)=	\$ 145,000
1 clerical	@ 65,000 (salary and benefits)	\$ 65,000
2 custodian	@ 65,000 (salary and benefits)	\$ 130,000
2 aides	@ 25,000 (salary; no benefits)	\$ 50,000
14.415 teaching staff	@80,000 (salary and benefits)	<u>\$ 1,153,200</u>
		\$1,543,200

Added to this amount are savings in substitutes/instructional resources such as textbooks and technology that we can estimate at \$1,000 per pupil or in Year 1 will equal \$37,000 under Scenario A and \$18,000 under Scenario B. In Year 2 these costs will equal \$72,000 under both Scenario A or B.

**The total estimated annual savings for Califon can, therefore, be estimated at:**

Year 1:

Scenario A- **\$290,255 Net Estimated Annual Savings** will equal total savings of \$730,000 (\$693,000 plus \$37,000) minus total costs of \$439,745.

Scenario B- **\$251,870 Net Estimated Annual Savings** will equal \$465,800 (\$447,800 plus \$18,000) minus total costs of \$213,930.

Year 2:

Scenario A- **\$1,171,280 total two year Net Estimated Annual Savings** calculated by taking total savings of \$2,063,000 (\$1,991,000 [year 1 plus year 2 staffing savings] plus \$72,000 instructional costs) minus total tuition/transportation costs of \$891,720).

Scenario B- **\$1,171,280 total two year Net Estimated Annual Savings** calculated by taking total savings of \$2,063,000 (1,991,000 [year 1 plus year 2 staffing savings] plus \$72,000) minus total tuition/transportation costs of \$891,720.



These dollars can be used to increase educational programs and services or to reduce the tax burden. There will certainly be no negative impact on taxpayers due to the new sending-receiving agreement.

However, the new sending-receiving relationship could also serve to potentially save the district substantial funds in the utilities, maintenance and upkeep of the school building that can be conservatively estimated at \$50,000 year which is not included in the above calculations. The district would also be the beneficiary of the proceeds on the sale or lease of the facility which is also not included in the savings estimate but could be substantial. These amounts, however, do not factor in the cost of mothballing the school in the event alternative uses of the building are not identified and implemented immediately at the end of the two-year transition period.

#### **4. Transportation**

The primary issue with transportation will be the movement of Califon students who are not currently being bused to Lebanon Valley View (1.5 miles) and Woodglen (3.0 miles). This will be more of a cost issue than a logistical one since the distance between the three schools is very small and can be traversed in a short period of time. This should not present a transportation hardship for either the students or the district in modifying existing routes.

Finally, we have reviewed the access and drop off areas for Valley View and Woodglen and did not observe any significant issues with accommodating the additional Califon students.

## **PART SEVEN: FACILITIES IMPACT**

### Suitability of Lebanon Valley View and Woodglen

The Lebanon buildings are well maintained and suitable to accommodate curriculum, programs and co-curricular activities needed for students to enter high school on track for graduation and ready for college and careers.

The ability of Valley View and Woodglen to accommodate additional students is an important component in assessing the impact of the new sending-receiving relationship. Building suitability is determined through its functional capacity which will determine if there is sufficient space to educate the number of children that will be expected to attend the school. Exceeding the functional capacity of a building can lead to overcrowding of classes, cause disruption to the bell schedule, and negatively impact the learning environment.

### Functional Capacity

The New Jersey Department of Education defines functional capacity as the “number of students that can be housed in a building in order to have sufficient space for the building to be educationally adequate for the delivery of programs and services necessary for student achievement of the Core Curriculum Content Standards. Functional capacity is determined by dividing the adjusted gross square footage of a school facility by the minimum area allowance per FTE student for the grade level students contained therein.”

In determining functional capacity, the department will rely on one of two methodologies. The District Practices methodology considers how the building is utilized by the school district and its targeted student-teacher ratios. This method does not take into account square footage allowances per student, which is the FES methodology. Capacity determined using FES methodology is often lower than when using District Practices methodology but is used by the State for funding purposes.

The Educational Practices methodology model looks at how the district is actually using spaces within the school building and is, therefore, greatly impacted by class sizes. In fact, class size represents one of the major reasons for differences between capacity calculations using the FES and District Practices model. The district will be able to exceed its FES functional capacity by using spaces more aggressively.

The functional capacity of each school is set forth in the New Jersey Department of Education Long-Range Facilities Plan Final Determination letters. Although these letters were issued some ten years ago, they are still informative so long as the district has conducted a major facilities project since then to add capacity.

The following table shows the existing functional educational capacity for the elementary and middle schools of Lebanon Township as calculated by the NJDOE in comparison to both the

actual enrollment in 2017-18 and the projected enrollment for future years if additional students were to attend the school through the Sending Receiving relationship. Using the building capacities from the district’s approved LRFP, the gap between the capacity of the school and the seats needed to accommodate current and projected students is calculated. Although Valley View has sufficient Functional Capacity, Woodglen has 20.87 unhoused students under this calculation in SY20 under either Scenario A or Scenario B. However, the District Practices model will allow for additional enrollments over this number. For this reason, we believe that both schools have sufficient capacity to house both current students and projected students under the proposal and note that the demographic study predicts a downward trend line in enrollments so that the small number of unhoused students in SY20 will decline in future years. Regardless, we recommend that the facilities practices pertaining to the Woodglen School be closely monitored to ensure that any changes in use do not negatively impact students or the permissible capacity of the school.

**Table 19: Building Capacity**

School	Functional Capacity	SY19 Enr.*	Diff.	Scenario A SY19 Enr.**	Diff.	Scenario B SY19 Enr.**	Diff.	Scenario A or B SY20 Enr. **	Diff.
Valley View	433.23	273	160.23	310	123.23	285	148.23	302	131.23
Woodglen	289.87	279	10.87	279	10.87	285	4.87	309	-20.87

\*From Demographic Study

\*\*From Feasibility Study Estimates

Includes estimated Ungraded students allocated to applicable grades

Source: NJDOE Determination Letters, LRFP, Full text of the letters are available at the NJ Department of Education Division of Facilities Planning web site.

## **PART EIGHT: RECOMMENDATIONS**

The Califon School District and Lebanon Township School District are facing a number of challenges in terms of changing enrollments that currently impact and will continue to impact the educational programs, finances and facilities of the districts into the future. The districts have identified one possible solution involving a new sending-receiving relationship between the districts in which K-8<sup>th</sup> graders from Califon will attend Lebanon Valley View and Woodglen Schools. This study explores two possible configurations.

Lebanon has excess capacity in its schools and a reputation for providing a quality education which will make it a desirable receiving district. The net tuition received by the district through the potential sending-receiving relationships will provide much needed budgetary relief.

Califon Elementary School has steadily lost enrollments and its K-8 School is approaching 100 total students with many grades having just a handful of students, some with only one gender. Sending students to Lebanon will provide both educational benefits and financial relief to Califon taxpayers who are struggling with funding a severely under-enrolled school. Students from Califon will also benefit through expanded co-curricular offerings and athletics. The comingling of the populations prior to their jointly attending high school will also serve as a solid bridge to their high school years, both socially and academically.

For the reasons indicted above, this new relationship provides both districts with potential advantages and could present a viable solution to many of the challenges they are facing.

It is recommended that both districts form a working group at the board and administrative level to develop a plan for moving forward that provides the policy and operational framework for a further understanding of the educational, financial and facilities impact of the proposed sending-receiving agreement on the communities involved.

## REFERENCES

- Alspaugh, J. (1998) Achievement Loss Associated with the Transition to Middle School and High School. *Journal of Educational Research*, v92 n1 p20-25 Sep-Oct 1998.
- Barone, C., Aguirre-Deandreis, A. I., & Trickett, E. J. (1991). Mean-ends problem-solving skills, life stress, and social support as mediators of adjustment in the normative transition to high school. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 19(2).
- Hertzog et al, 1996). Hertzog, C. J., Morgan, P. L., Diamond, P. A., & Walker, M. J. (1996). Transition to high school: A look at student perceptions. *Becoming*, 7(2), 6-8.
- Lee and Loeb (2000). School Size in Chicago Elementary Schools: Effects on Teachers' Attitudes and Students' Achievement, *American Educational Research Journal*, Spring 2000, Vol. 37, No. 1, pp. 3-31
- Mertens et al (2001) Mertens, S., Flowers, N., & Mulhall, P. (1998). The Middle Start Initiative, phase I: a longitudinal analysis of Michigan middle-level schools. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois. (See also <http://www.middlestart.org/research.htm>)
- Orfield and Frankenber (2011). Diversity and Educational Gains: a plan for a changing county and its schools, Civil Rights Project, <https://www.civilrightsproject.ucla.edu/research/k-12-education/integration-and-diversity/diversity-and-education-gains-a-plan-for-a-changing-county-and-its-schools>. Accessed August 1, 2017.
- Reyes, O., Gillock, K., & Kobus, K. (1994). A longitudinal study of school adjustment in urban, minority adolescents: Effects of a high school transition program. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 22(3).
- Snyder, J. (1969). The Story of New Jersey's Civil Boundaries: 1606-1968. Reprinted by New Jersey Geological Survey, 2004, page 215-218, <http://www.state.nj.us/dep/njgs/enviroed/oldpubs/bulletin67.pdf>, page 215-218, accessed August 1, 2017.