

# 2016-17 DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS

## STRENGTHS

- Stays away from classroom
- Equitable across programs
- Program budget impact percent is very small; makes it feel possible
- Some seem easy to implement
- Doesn't hit any one area or personnel too hard
- Dispersed among variety of areas
- Acting on some retirements
- No direct impact on students; Keeps the costs away from students
- Hiring cap is a strength, but can also be a challenge
- Sub cost pilot
- No actual positions impacted

## CHALLENGES

- How sustainable are these?
- Impact of special education adjustments on students/families?
- Are fees and instructional costs going to just be transferred onto families and staff?
- More reliance on PTO support for supplies
- Questions on substitutes allocation
- Transportation / diesel fuel adjustment not sustainable, one-time only
- Limited revenue opportunities
- Substitute costs – need appropriate facilities/space to achieve pilot
- Implementation of sub reductions may be challenging
- Hiring cap is a strength, but can also be a challenge by limiting applicant pool
- Be cautious with postage reductions

## ADDITIONAL THOUGHTS

- Need clarification of special education adjustments
- How are cost savings achieved/positioned?
- What is the connection/impact of these adjustments to Next Gen?
- Will the BATF get feedback on how these have worked?
- PTO willingness to take on instructional supplies and extra pay stipends
- Possible revenue source in future with new Activity Center
- Mailings look expensive – we don't need to be that pretty
- How do we engage the PTOs in the budget process
- People need to better understand the problem before engaging in solutions
- People don't feel like they are being heard

## CONSENSUS to advance recommendations

- 16 **green dots** (OK advancing recommendations)
- 6 **yellow dots** (OK advancing recommendations, but need additional clarification for public)
- 0 **red dots** (not OK w/advancing recommendations)