Envisioning Educational Excellence:
A Plan for All of Pittsburgh’s Children

Board Workshop

Monday, November 4, 2013
Board Homework Packet Objectives

• Clearly explain:
  – Our financial situation
    • The two ways it might be addressed
      – What we have more control over and what we have less control over
      – What we believe are the best options for spending reductions
  • Two informational pieces:
    – one on demographics and,
    – detail on transportation spending
Workshop Objectives

• Engage the Board in discussion of important decision points with each other and staff

• Provide guidance to the team

• Agree on the next steps
Workshop Summary

• Walkthrough of Materials
  – What’s in your Packet
• Academic strategy review & discussion
  – Promise Ready from Day One
• Financial strategy review & discussion
  – Revenue & Cost reductions
  – School Closure Considerations
• Next Steps
We must serve the Child, not just the student, while addressing the deficit.

“It is not just about reading and math, we must serve the whole child.”

Dr. Monica Lamar, Principal Pittsburgh Dilworth Comments on Achievement Gap Panel, WESA FM, October 29, 2013.
Our Plan Builds on Existing Priorities, Community Feedback and External Research

Assessment of Current Priorities and Exemplars

- Empowering Effective Teachers
- PA Core Standards
- Effective Schools
- Effective School Leadership & Central Office

Community Engagement

- Interviews
- Focus Groups
- Surveys
- Town Halls

External Research

- National Research
- Race to the Top Winners
- What Works Clearinghouse
Promise Ready from Day One

Context

Our vision for our students remains the same, that 80% of our students graduate with a 2 or 4 year college degree or workforce certification. However, in order for all of our children to be successful, this work must be done with a number of partners (staff, community, families and students).
Promise Ready from Day One

Context

Increase the effectiveness of our teachers, principals, and central office staff

People
Promise Ready from Day One

Context

Provide integrated student support to meet needs of all children

People

Structures
Promise Ready from Day One

Build strong school culture in all schools

Context

Culture

People

Structures
Promise Ready from Day One

View using the EQUITY Lens
The Effectiveness of Our Teachers, School Leaders, and Central Office Support Remains Critical To Raising School Quality

**Defining the Priority**
- Increasing the effectiveness of our teachers, principals, and central office staff

**Rationale**
- Effective teachers and leaders are greatest in-school determinants of academic growth. They need effective support from Central Office

**Continue / Expand**
- Use teacher effectiveness information to improve teacher practice, and align principal and central office support accordingly
- Implement the PA Core effectively

**New Focus**
- Increase central office transparency by publishing Department Goals, and progress at delivering effective support to schools
- Integrate comprehensive student assessment information (formative and summative) into teacher practice and principal planning
The Challenges Our Students Face Aren’t Just Academic; We Must Find Solutions Inside and Outside the Classroom

### Defining the Priority
- Provide integrated student support to meet needs of all children
- Provide equitable access to high quality schools, programs, and supports

### Rationale
- The District cannot address students’ needs in isolation; this work must be done in coordination with cross-sector community partners
- Access to high-performing schools varies significantly region to region
- African-American students are over-represented in the District’s lowest performing schools

### Continue / Expand
- Continue to work with key partners (e.g. Allegheny County DHS) to identify students’ support needs
- Identify ways to expand oversubscribed CTE programs
- Continue partnerships with charters to create a learning community

### New Focus
- Support the whole child through a multi-year Collective Impact effort
- Develop students’ non-cognitive and social-emotional skills
- Improve equitable pathways into CAPA, SciTech and Obama
- Expand Early College model offering dual enrollment
School and District Culture Both Require Attention In Order To Raise School Quality

**Defining the Priority**
- Build strong school cultures in all schools
- Build a district culture focused on service to schools

**Rationale**
- School culture shapes how people behave in service to a school vision
- Central Office staff and school leaders widely cited a need for greater District-wide trust, teamwork, and accountability

**Continue / Expand**
- Continue to learn from successful school cultures within PPS
- Continue to leverage both teacher and student feedback in gauging the overall health of a school’s climate and culture

**New Focus**
- Provide greater support for developing principal’s culture leadership
- Implement an accountability framework for Cabinet and Central Office staff aligned with delivering services that improve school quality
- Develop quarterly Central Office report on goal progress
We must focus on the strategies to achieve our Student Milestones

Academic Milestones

- Kindergarten Readiness
- 3rd Graders Reading on Grade Level
- Algebra Readiness by High School
- Graduates Promise, College, and Career Ready

Developmental Skills & Habits

- Learning-Related Skills (e.g., self-regulation and motivation)
- Socio-Emotional Competence
- Citizenship and College & Career Goal Setting
Workshop Summary

• Academic strategy review & discussion

• Financial strategy review & discussion
  – Options for increasing revenue and reducing costs
  – School closure considerations

• Next steps
The District Forecast Projects a $46M Deficit in 2016 and that it Will Fail To Meet the Fund Balance Requirement by 2016

Source: Multiyear rolling forecast as of 6/10/2013.
The Two Levers Available for Eliminating the Projected Budget Deficit Are Increasing Revenues and Reducing Costs

**Revenues**

- **Feasibility:** LOW
  - PPS has limited control of most revenue drivers

- **Some revenue opportunities have been identified,** but with low levels of magnitude and feasibility

**Costs**

- **Feasibility:** MODERATE
  - $202 million of the $522 million budget is ‘addressable’, or is feasible to make adjustments to

- **We have identified options for cost reductions.** For simplicity, we categorized 2 cost reduction options:
  - Moderate cost reductions (3-4% of budget, $17-23M)
  - Aggressive cost reductions (6-9% of budget, $32-45M)
Despite Diverse Revenue Streams, We Have Limited Control Over Increasing Revenue

We will continue to advocate for state funding and welcome the community to do the same.

Note: 1) “Other Sources” includes local revenue from special funds ($2.3M), sinking fund ($2.2M), various other subsidies ($3.3M), interest ($0.8M), tuition from other districts ($0.6M), and inter-fund transfers ($0.6M), local public utility realty tax ($0.4M), state medical and dental payments ($0.4M), and all other sources ($1.5M).

Source: PPS Three-Year Rolling Forecast; General Fund Budget Volume (FY13).
**Some Additional Revenue Opportunities Exist, But They Have Limited Feasibility or Low Net Contribution**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opportunity</th>
<th>Feasibility¹</th>
<th>Size of Net Contribution²</th>
<th>Considerations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increase real estate tax millage rate by the maximum allowable each year under Act 1</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>• Millage increases would need to account for declines in property taxes from lowered property assessments after appeals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expand Food Service offerings within and outside of the district</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>• Opportunities to increase offerings countywide, but would require additional costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enroll out-of-district high-needs Special Education students on a space available basis and never at the expense of Pittsburgh children</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>• Maximize current capacity in short-term and explore expanding in long-term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase and/or maximize permit fees</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Depends on policy</td>
<td>• Requires Board policy change, especially if adjusting current permit fee policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offer professional development services and materials around human capital, Common Core, and technology</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Depends on service model</td>
<td>• PPS perceived as a regional and national leader in this area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Net contribution depends on whether offering on space available basis or standalone business offering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Competitive, cyclical environment for PD service</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Favorable ⚫ Unfavorable

Note: 1) Feasibility based on level of investment required and assessment of market competitiveness if applicable; 2) Reflects net impact on budget after required investments.

Source: Envisioning consulting team discussions with PPS leadership.
Roughly $200M of the $520M General Fund Budget is Addressable; Reductions in Spending Must Come From This Portion of the Budget

FY2013 General Fund Budget in Millions of Dollars

Non-Addressable Components

- State reimbursements for transportation
- Special Education teachers and other personnel required by student IEPs, state law, and contract with the PFT
- General education teachers as required by contract with the PFT
- A principal to lead each school
- All charter payments
- All debt service
- All other compulsory spending

Although the forecasted $46M deficit represents 9% of the total general fund budget, it represents nearly 25% of the addressable general fund budget

Note: Other categories includes non-public and charter payments ($63M), debt service ($56M), and retirement payments ($12M) which are non-addressable as well as budget contingencies of $12M that are considered addressable.
We Have Identified Options Across Major Spending Categories In Order To Close the Financial Gap

A total of $17-45M (4-9%) of cost reductions have been identified, and the following pages provide detail on reductions within each spending category.

Note: All reductions are based on FY13 budget.
$3.0-6.4M (10-21%) Worth of Potential Reductions Have Been Identified within the Central Office

Spending Categories and Range of Identified Cost Reductions
Displayed as total General Fund budget and identified reductions as % of budget

Examples of Potential Non-Personnel Reductions

- Less usage of legal and actuarial services
- Deferred renewal of equipment leases
- Decline in budget reflective of the completion of one-time contracts
- Less usage of contracted services
- Implementation of a less robust employee assistance program
- Communications and supplies budgets
- Supplies and materials budgets
- Technical services budget

1) General Administration is primarily tax assessment & collection services ($2.4M), legal services ($0.9M), liability insurance ($0.6M), and the internal auditor’s office ($0.9M).

Note: Ranges of identified cost reductions in both options 1 and 2 include savings from personnel and non-personnel reductions, though examples are provided for non-personnel reductions only; for each Central Office department, all of the budget is addressable; all figures based on FY13 budget.
## Reductions in School Operations Could Save $4.8-12.1M (6-14%) Annually

### Spending Categories and Range of Identified Cost Reductions
*Displayed as total General Fund budget and identified reductions as % of budget*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spending Categories (Total GF Budget)</th>
<th>0%</th>
<th>10%</th>
<th>20%</th>
<th>30%</th>
<th>40%</th>
<th>50%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Facilities, Ops, &amp; Maintenance, Less Utilities ($37.7M)</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities ($9.2M)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation ($33.3M)</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Safety ($5.6M)</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total For School Operations ($85.8M)</strong></td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Examples of Potential Non-Personnel Reductions
- Changes in service standards for custodial, maintenance, and grounds keeping
- Changes to the District’s transportation model
- Closure of open positions

---

Note: Ranges of identified cost reductions in both options 1 and 2 include savings from personnel and non-personnel reductions, though examples are provided for non-personnel reductions only; all figures based on FY13 budget.
$1.9-4.7M (3-7%) Worth of Potential Reductions Have Been Identified within Special & Gifted Education

Examples of Potential Non-Personnel Reductions

- Review the efficacy and efficiency of the regional classroom model and other special education programs not required by law
- Changes in usage of contracted services
- Smaller professional services, purchased services, and textbook / periodical budgets

Note: Ranges of identified cost reductions in both options 1 and 2 include savings from personnel and non-personnel reductions, though examples are provided for non-personnel reductions only; all figures based on FY13 budget.
Aligning High School Class Sizes with District Targets and Other Changes Could Generate $3.6-13.9M (2-8%) in Educational Delivery Model Savings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spending Categories (Total GF Budget)</th>
<th>0%</th>
<th>5%</th>
<th>10%</th>
<th>15%</th>
<th>20%</th>
<th>25%</th>
<th>30%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Education (K-12) ($164.4M)</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselors, Social Workers, and other Student Support Services (Schools) ($6.5M)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Academic Officer &amp; Curriculum, Instruction, and Professional Development (EDM) ($3.5M)</td>
<td></td>
<td>17%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total for Schools (EDM) ($174.3M)</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples of Potential Non-Personnel Reductions
- Alignment of secondary class sizes with District targets
- Greater usage of existing contractual provisions around exceptional schedules
- Reduction in the number of instructional periods in the high school level (school day would remain the same length)
- Changes in allocations of librarians in K-5, K-8, and 6-8 schools
- No changes to allocations for counselors or social workers are being contemplated

Please see the appendix for additional information on the EDM

Note: Ranges of identified cost reductions in both options 1 and 2 include savings from personnel and non-personnel reductions, though examples are provided for non-personnel reductions only; all figures based on FY13 budget.
## Reductions to Non-Educational Delivery Model School

Spending Could Save $1.4-2.1M (10-15%)

### Spending Categories and Range of Identified Cost Reductions

*Displayed as total General Fund budget and identified reductions as % of budget*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spending Categories (Total GF Budget)</th>
<th>0%</th>
<th>5%</th>
<th>10%</th>
<th>15%</th>
<th>20%</th>
<th>25%</th>
<th>30%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Information Technology (Schools) ($5.1M)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing and Other Student Health Services ($5.0M)</td>
<td></td>
<td>12%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Athletics ($3.4M)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Academic Officer &amp; Curriculum, Instruction, and Professional Development (Textbooks) ($1M)</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total for Schools (Non-EDM) ($14M)</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Examples of Potential Non-Personnel Reductions

- Longer cycles between technology replacement
- Fewer sports offered in middle and high schools
- Extend textbook replacement cycle

Note: Ranges of identified cost reductions in both options 1 and 2 include savings from personnel and non-personnel reductions, though examples are provided for non-personnel reductions only; all figures based on FY13 budget.
Workshop Summary

• Academic strategy review & discussion

• Financial strategy review & discussion
  – Options for increasing revenue and reducing costs
  – School closure considerations

• Next steps
• Closing Remarks
Proposed Path Forward for School Closures: School Year 2014-2015 and 2015-2016

• Close one school at the end of this school year
  – Board vote to open the public process November 26, 2013, and set hearing date
  – Public Comment Period is 90 days
  – Actual Closure Vote March 2014

• Agree on process to consider options for additional closures. These closures would take effect in the 2015-2016 School Year.
We Recommend Closing Woolslair Elementary, the District's Smallest K-5 School with 110 Enrolled Students, for the 2014-15 School Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Considerations</th>
<th>Detail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Rationale for Closure | • Enrollment: 110 students (11 in Kindergarten)  
• Improve Academic Performance  
• New School of Attendance- Arsenal PreK-5 |
| Special Education | • Two regional special education classrooms move with others students |
| Transportation | • 38 students are receiving transportation  
• Approximately 50-65% (~55-73 students) next year |
| Building Usage | • Arsenal PK-5 Capacity: 675  
• Arsenal PK-5 Enrollment: 287 |

The District will reduce expenditures by $650-950K per year from this closure
Woolslair Has Less Than Half the Enrollment and Costs Twice As Much Per Pupil Relative to Comparable K-5 Schools Across PPS

### Average School Cost Per Student Based on ‘13-14 enrollment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Enroll.</th>
<th>师*</th>
<th>Cost/Student</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spring Hill K-5</td>
<td>297</td>
<td></td>
<td>$6,563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Liberty K-5</td>
<td>292</td>
<td></td>
<td>$6,912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miller PreK-5</td>
<td>283</td>
<td></td>
<td>$7,248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arsenal PreK-5</td>
<td>287</td>
<td></td>
<td>$7,961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woolslair K-5</td>
<td>110</td>
<td></td>
<td>$14,492</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Cost Components

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Components</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>• Contracted carrier and Port Authority bus costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>• Electricity, gas, and water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Custodial</td>
<td>• Custodial staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>• Principals, social workers, counselors, librarians, data system specialists, secretaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>• General education teachers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: '13-14 enrollment values are provided for each school.*
The New Arsenal Feeder Area Would Be a Consolidation of the Woolslair K-5 and Arsenal PreK-5 Feeder Areas

Current Woolslair K-5 PPS Feeder Area (239 PPS students; 110 enrolled)

Current Arsenal K-5 PPS Feeder Area (369 PPS Students; 287 enrolled)
A Majority of the Students in the Woolslair Feeder Area Reside in the Northern Part of the Region Near the Arsenal Feeder Area

Current Woolslair K-5 PPS Feeder Area (239 PPS students; 110 enrolled)
Workshop Summary

- Academic strategy review & discussion
- Financial strategy review & discussion
- Next steps
Envisioning Next Steps

• Incorporate feedback from Board, funders, and other community partners prior to releasing the Envisioning plan in early December

• Finalize written plan, presentations, and other communications materials for the Envisioning plan

• Share detailed recommendations with Board in early December (date TBD)

• Share summary recommendations with the broader community during State of the District on December 4th

• Initiate public comment period for proposed Woolslair closure
Efforts in Pittsburgh Could Begin by Leveraging an Existing Initiative Called the Campaign for Grade Level Reading, Which Addresses Readiness, Attendance, and Summer Learning Loss

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rationale for Campaign for Grade Level Reading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Readiness Gap</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Too many children from low-income families begin school already far behind. The research also shows that these children are less likely to be read or spoken to regularly or to have access to books, literacy-rich environments, high-quality early care, and prekindergarten programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• As a consequence, these children may hear as many as 30 million fewer words than their middle-income peers before reaching kindergarten. Research shows that such interactions are critical for language development, an important precursor to literacy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Attendance Gap (Chronic Absence)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Too many children from low-income families miss too many days of school. Research has found that one in 10 kindergarten and first grade students nationwide misses nearly a month of school each year in excused and unexcused absences. These students can ill-afford to lose time on task, especially in the early years when reading instruction is a central part of the curriculum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Summer Slide (Summer Learning Loss)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Too many children lose ground over the summer months. Without access to the enriching activities available to more-affluent peers, research shows that children from low-income families lose as much as three months of reading comprehension skills over the summer. By the end of fifth grade, they are nearly three grade levels behind their peers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
City of Pittsburgh and Mt. Oliver Borough: Share of Population and Share of Households with Children Under Age 18, 1980-2010

- Population Under 18:
  - 1980: 28%
  - 1990: 26%
  - 2000: 25%
  - 2010: 20%

- Households with Person Under 18:
  - 1980: 16%
  - 1990: 20%
  - 2000: 20%
  - 2010: 20%
Pittsburgh’s school-age population (ages 5-17) has declined at a faster rate (-43%) compared to the overall Pittsburgh population (-17%) in the last 20 years.

Between 2000 and 2010, the Population of School-Age Children in Pittsburgh Decreased by 29% to Less Than 38,000

However, After More than a Decade of Decline, Births Have Leveled Off and Should Start to Stabilize School-Age Numbers

Births in Pittsburgh – 1992 to 2011

1992-2002: -31%

2002-today: flat

First year of “flow through”: 2002 babies entering pre-K

Source: Pennsylvania Department of Health (2011 data is preliminary).
Some Additional Revenue Opportunities Exist, But Net Income Would Not Offset The Need for Further Cost Reductions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opportunity</th>
<th>Investment Required</th>
<th>Market Competitiveness</th>
<th>Size of Net Contribution</th>
<th>Considerations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increase real estate tax millage rate by the maximum allowable each year under Act 1</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>• Board recently lowered millage rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase food service offerings throughout Allegheny County</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>• Opportunity to max out capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Additional shipping, marketing, and facility costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase internal catering offerings</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>• Prior analysis found not to be cost-effective; need to reduce required labor and start small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase breakfast participation through expansion of grab-n-go program</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>• Would increase reimbursement we receive for each lunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raise price of full-priced meals (with Board approval)</td>
<td>Very Low</td>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>• Would require Board approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enroll out-of-district high-needs students on a space available basis</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>• Maximize current capacity in short-term and explore expanding in long-term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase and/or maximize permit fees</td>
<td>Low / Moderate</td>
<td>Low / Moderate</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>• Requires Board policy change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offer professional development services and materials around human capital, Common Core, and technology</td>
<td>Low / Moderate</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>• Depends on whether offering on space available basis or standalone business offering</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Envisioning consulting team discussions with PPS leadership.
With Limited or No Control Over Most of its Revenue Streams, PPS Will Largely Need to Reduce Costs in Order to Address its Budget Deficit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Level of Control</th>
<th>Predicted Stability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate Tax (Local)</td>
<td>$164.3M</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>• <strong>Moderate</strong> – Allowed 0.16 mill increase per year with Board approval; referendum needed for any additional increase</td>
<td>• <strong>Low</strong> – Difficult to forecast due to uncertainty of property value growth, lag time from infrequent property value assessment cycles, and appeals to property value assessments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic Instructional Subsidy (State)</td>
<td>$152.5M</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>• <strong>None</strong> – Allocated on per-pupil basis, based on Act 31 of 1983</td>
<td>• <strong>Moderate</strong> – PPS has been held harmless amidst declining enrollment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earned Income Taxes (Local)</td>
<td>$96.7M</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>• <strong>None</strong> – Based on current 2.0% levy, of which PPS must share 1/8 with the city</td>
<td>• <strong>High</strong> – Stable growth projected, based on PNC’s median household income forecast data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education Subsidy (State)</td>
<td>$27.8M</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>• <strong>None</strong> – Allocated on per-pupil basis, based on Act 31 of 1983</td>
<td>• <strong>Moderate</strong> – PPS has been held harmless amidst declining enrollment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retirement and Social Security Payments (State)</td>
<td>$22.6M</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>• <strong>None</strong> – Federal law requires state to remit portion of district’s social security and retirement contributions</td>
<td>• <strong>High</strong> – Gap between PPS contribution (expense) and state’s remittance (revenue) is widening as SS and PSERS rates increase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Tax Reduction Allocation (State)</td>
<td>$15.6M</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>• <strong>None</strong> – Would require tax law amendment</td>
<td>• <strong>High</strong> – Based on PA Tax Relief Act (reducing property taxes from slot machine proceeds)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Subsidy (State)</td>
<td>$13.7M</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>• <strong>Low</strong> – Based on district aid ratio and bus age, mileage, capacity, and utilization</td>
<td>• <strong>High</strong> – All else equal, subsidy rates decrease with fleet age and with lower bus utilization (e.g., due to more dispersed enrollment)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate Transfer Tax (Local)</td>
<td>$7.0M</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>• <strong>None</strong> – Would require tax law amendment</td>
<td>• <strong>Low</strong> – Based on transfers of interest within properties owned by the district</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Sources¹</td>
<td>$11.8M</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>• <strong>Low or None</strong></td>
<td>• <strong>Moderate or High</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total FY13 Revenues</strong></td>
<td><strong>$512.0M</strong></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 1) “Other Sources” includes local revenue from special funds ($2.3M), sinking fund ($2.2M), various other subsidies ($3.3M), interest ($0.8M), tuition from other districts ($0.6M), and inter-fund transfers ($0.6M), local public utility realty tax ($0.4M), state medical and dental payments ($0.4M), and all other sources ($1.5M).

Source: PPS Three-Year Rolling Forecast; General Fund Budget Volume (FY13).
Transportation Costs Are Based on Several Financial Drivers, Which Ultimately Hinge on Underlying Operational and Policy Levers

- **Financial Levers**
  - Number of students transported
  - Number of students per seat (utilization)
  - Number of seats per bus (capacity)
  - Number of routes per bus per day
  - Incremental duration per route
  - Daily fixed costs and hourly marginal costs per bus

- **Operational Levers**
  - Fleet composition (size and type of buses used)
  - Tiering structure (number of routes per bus)
  - Route density and complexity (distance traveled, stops made, total time)

- **Policy Levers**
  - Distribution of students on yellow buses vs. Port Authority
  - Size of walk zones
  - School bell times
  - School portfolio, feeder patterns, and level of choice
  - Prevalence of regional classrooms
Transportation Costs Per Student Vary Significantly Depending upon the Situation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Segment</th>
<th>Number of Students</th>
<th>Average Daily Miles Driven Per Student</th>
<th>Average Daily Minutes Driven Per Student</th>
<th>Average Annual Cost Per Student ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PPS Neighborhood Schools</td>
<td>6,501</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>$834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular Education Students</td>
<td>5,406</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>$777</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education Students</td>
<td>1,095</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>$1,116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPS Partial Magnet</td>
<td>3,278</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>$940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPS Full Magnet</td>
<td>4,221</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>$1,019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-PPS</td>
<td>6,273</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>$2,024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPS Regional Classroom</td>
<td>558</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>$4,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPS Special School</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>$4,916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Students (Excluding P.A.T.)</td>
<td>21,162</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>$1,406</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Regional classroom students based on SS24 codes (“RC”); special education students based on 2012-2013 Audit Data with Oliver. Source: Rider List, 2012-2013; Audit Data with Oliver; Consulting team analysis.
The Woolslair Building Is In Relatively Good Condition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Name</th>
<th>Facility Condition (Level of Repairs Needed)</th>
<th>2012 Utility Costs</th>
<th>Plant Ops Costs</th>
<th>Util. + Plant Ops Per Pupil</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Woolslair K-5</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>$33,608</td>
<td>$88,316</td>
<td>$564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arsenal K-5</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>$147,252</td>
<td>$299,913</td>
<td>$994</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: 1) Facility condition obtained from DeJong Facility study utilized by PPS during the 2011 Realignment.
Every Effort Will Be Made to Ensure That the Consolidated School at Arsenal Performs at the Highest Levels

Transition Support
- Develop transition teams comprised of principals, teachers, staff, parents, students and community members to develop a shared vision for the consolidated school and ensure a smooth and successful school opening

Differentiated Resources
- Consider providing differentiated resources for the unique needs of the consolidated school community (e.g., dedicated Central Office staff support to respond to family questions)

School Improvement
- Partner the new consolidated Arsenal Elementary with other schools in the District that have successfully improved student outcomes and school culture after closure and consolidation. Partner schools can share best practices and lessons learned

At the center of each of these efforts is thoughtful consideration of the needs of the Woolslair and Arsenal students