

Tamworth Schools Long Range Planning Committee

Final Report

January 20, 2009

Committee Background and Purpose

The Tamworth Schools Long Range Planning Committee was established in response to a floor motion passed at the March 2007 School District meeting. The motion reflected concerns about the rapid growth in costs of the Tamworth School District and the impact that this growth is having on town taxes.

The Committee consists of a combination of school board officials, administrators, teachers, town officials and citizens. The membership includes the following individuals:

- Lisa Remick (Chair) – Chair of the Tamworth School Board
- Gwen Poirier, SAU 13 Superintendent
- Brenda Robinson, Tamworth School Board
- Noel Desousa, Brett School Principal
- Heather Booska, Teacher
- Dave Farley, representing the Board of Selectman
- Pat Farley, representing the Planning Commission
- John Cleveland, Citizen
- Charlie Pugh, Assistant Principal, Moultonborough Schools

Committee Purpose

The purpose of the committee is:

To make recommendations to the Tamworth School Board that will enable the district over the long term to achieve cost and quality performance that is equal to or exceeds comparable districts in the State.

It is important to emphasize two things in reference to this purpose:

- The Committee is not a decision-making body. Its only purpose is to provide advice and feedback to the School Board.
- The Committee has placed an emphasis on options that can control costs while maintaining academic performance.

Values

The Committee has sought to respect the following values as it conducted its work:

- Maintain a spirit of problem-solving and open inquiry.
- Base its recommendations in solid facts and data, not anecdotes.
- Taking a long-term point of view on the success of the district.
- Respect the sense of urgency the taxpayers have about the cost of education.

- Respect the professionalism and commitment of school district employees.
- Assure that the full range of opportunities has been considered.
- Achieve as broad citizen understanding of the school district and its budget challenges as possible, so that taxpayers can make informed decisions about the school budget.

Committee Activities

The committee undertook three basic activities:

- **Budget Understanding.** School districts are complex enterprises. The Committee has spent a fair amount of time educating its members on exactly how the district works – how it is structured; who makes what decisions; how the budget is constructed; what the key costs are; the nature of labor contracts; staffing structures; state regulations; etc.
- **Historical Performance.** The committee did an analysis of expense and revenue trends for the district over the last five years.
- **Comparison with Other Districts.** The committee compared Tamworth costs and some other data with similar data for seven comparable rural New Hampshire districts.

Summary of Findings

Below are the summary conclusions that the Committee has come to regarding the cost structure of the District.

Tamworth Costs, (Absolute and Per Student) Have Exceeded the Rate of Inflation Over the Last Five Years

Total costs have increased at over twice the rate of inflation, and per student costs have increased at over four times the inflation rate.

Tamworth Costs Exceed Comparable Districts

Our K-8 per pupil costs are, on average, 20% above those of comparable districts on a per student basis. (This difference with seven comparison districts ranges from 7% to 28%.) Tamworth costs exceed the state average by 34%.¹

¹ "It is appropriate to compare two districts only when they have the same grade range. Even when the grade ranges are identical, only the total figures should be considered comparable because different formulas may have been used to allocate district-wide costs." (NH Department of Education)

Per Pupil Costs Have Been Strongly Influenced by Declining Enrollments

Declining enrollment has had a strong impact on per pupil costs. Cost have not decreased as enrollments have decreased, leading to per pupil cost increases. This has been due to a number of factors including some fixed costs that cannot be reduced easily (such as debt and buildings); a concern about increasing class sizes; and a desire to enrich student programming. Declining enrollments in the face of some fixed costs is a common problem in many rural school districts.

Tamworth Student Performance is Similar to, or Slightly Below, Comparable Districts

Based on a comparison of NECAP (New England Common Assessment Program) scores, Tamworth math, writing and reading scores for students close to, or slightly lower than, those of the comparison districts.

Cost Improvements Will Require Strong Leadership By the Board and School and will Require a Long-Term Approach

Moving cost trends in a different direction will require strong cost control leadership on the part of the Board and District leadership. Making downward budget adjustments is always difficult, and needs to be done carefully not to have a negative impact on student achievement.

The changes in the cost profile of the school have occurred over a number of years, and any improvements will take multiple years to achieve. There is no “easy” solution; and no “silver bullet” approach.

Committee Members Differ in Their Approach to Improving Cost Performance

All committee members expressed a desire to achieve a good balance between the costs of the school and support for improved student performance. However, as might be expected, there were differences of opinion about how significant Tamworth’s cost differences are, and how quickly efforts to improve costs should be implemented. Some members consider the costs to be much higher than they should be and prefer a more aggressive approach to cost improvements, while others are more comfortable with the current cost levels, and prefer a gradual and cautious approach to improving cost performance.

Recommendations to the School Board:

The charge to the committee was to make recommendations to the school board. The committee is making two recommendations:

1. The School Board should take a strong leadership position on improving the costs structure of the district and set specific cost improvement goals for the district that balance cost controls with student performance.
2. The School Board should consider hiring an outside consulting organization to do a more detailed cost comparison of Tamworth to comparable school districts, and to make recommendations on options for cost improvement.

Attachments

Attachment 1 – Overview of the School District and the Structure of the Budget

Attachment 2 – Five Year Trends in Tamworth School Expenses and Revenues

Attachment 3 – Comparison of Tamworth with Other School Districts

Attachment 1:

Background on the Tamworth School District

As noted above, school districts are complex enterprises, and before coming to conclusions about the best strategies to simultaneously control costs and increase quality, it is necessary to have a basic understanding about how the District works.

District Structure

- Tamworth is part of the School Administrative Unit (SAU) 13, which includes Tamworth, Freedom and Madison.
- Each district has their own school board, which is responsible for the administration of the local schools, including the hiring of the principal.
- The three district boards meet jointly to serve as the governing body for SAU 13, including hiring of the SAU Superintendent.
- The SAU includes the Superintendent, a Special Education Director, Bus Coordinator, Business Administrator and clerical support positions.
- Each district pays an apportioned fee to support the SAU 13 office.

Kennett High School Contract

- The Tamworth School District has a tuition contract with the Conway School District that covers the terms under which Tamworth pays for its students to attend Kennett High School.
- The tuition is based on a formula that combines the district's equalized valuation and that Average Daily Attendance.
- Tamworth is also obligated to pay a portion of the High School bond payment on an annual basis.

Labor Contracts

- Each district negotiates its own collective bargaining agreements.
- There are two bargaining units for the district:
 - Tamworth Education Association (teachers)
 - Tamworth Educational Support Personnel Association (support staff)
- The contracts cover wages, benefits and work rules. Terms of the contract are generally similar to the terms of other districts.

School Budget Process

The process for developing and approving the budget includes the follow:

October – November	Administration Develops Draft Budget
November	Budget Forwarded to School Board
November – January	Board Deliberates on Budget
January -- February	Board Approves Budget
Early March	School District Meeting to Approve Budget
October	NH Department of Revenue Administration Sets the Tax Rate Based on the Budget

The Structure of the School Budget

There are two basic budget documents for the district:

- The first is the budget that is displayed in the “Annual Report of the School District of Tamworth New Hampshire.” This is the “green book” that is distributed each year in advance of the School District meeting and forms the basis for the School District meeting warrants related to approval of the school budget.
- The second, more detailed, document is a 50+ page spread sheet that shows every expenditure detail for the district in each account category.

Both these budgets are structured around a common set of “account classifications” or budget categories. These categories are standardized across all New Hampshire school districts in order to allow for more reliable comparisons across districts.

Structure of the Tamworth School Budget

Budget Code	Category
1100	Regular Education
1210	Special Education
1270	Gifted and Talented
1400	Other Instructional Programs
2112	Truant Officer
2120	Guidance Services
2130	Health Services
2140	Psychological Services
2150	Speech Pathology & Audiology
2210	Improvement of Instruction
2220, 2223	Educational Media
2310-2319	School Board & Related
2321	Office of the Superintendent
2410	Office of the Principal
2620, 2630	Physical Plant & Grounds
2722	Transportation
2724-25	Field Trips, Cocurricular
5100	Debt Service
5240-5245	Capital Reserves
3100	Food Service

The majority of the school budget is comprised of personnel costs – salaries, wages and fringe benefits. (In the 2006-2007 budget year personnel costs accounted for approximately 65% of the K-8 budget.)

Personnel are measured by “FTEs” or Full Time Equivalent positions. An FTE of 1.0, for instance, is one full time job. An FTE of 0.5 denotes a half-time position. So it is important for budget purposes to differentiate between “employees” and “FTEs.” If there are any part time positions (and the school has many), the number of employees will be greater than the number of FTEs.

The key elements of personnel costs include the following:

- Salaries and Wages
- Health Insurance
- Dental Insurance
- Disability Insurance
- FICA (Employer share of Social Security and Medicaid payments)
- Retirement
- Unemployment Insurance
- Workers Compensation Insurance

Other than salaries and wages, by far the largest of these is Health Insurance payments. The level of health insurance benefits is dictated by the terms of the collective bargaining contracts.²

Sources of Revenues

There are two basic sources of revenue for the district – local taxes and state aid (federal aid only accounts for 0.5% of the budget). Of these two sources, local taxes is by far the largest – accounting for approximately 85% of total revenue in 2007-2008.

Description of Budget Categories

Budget Category	Description
Regular Education	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teacher/staff salaries and benefits • Supplies and materials
High School	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Payments to Conway for Tamworth High School students
Special Education	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Special Ed teachers and paraprofessional personnel costs • Supplies and materials • Out of district tuition
Specialist Programs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Salaries, wages, benefits, supplies
Improvement of Instruction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Course reimbursement • Staff development • Education grants and Education Initiative program • Staff conferences/travel
Educational Media	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff salaries, wages, benefits • Library supplies and periodicals • Computer support and educational software
School Board	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Board member stipends • Conferences, advertising and printing • Treasurer salary; audit and legal services
Office of the Superintendent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tamworth's share of SAU 13 costs
Office of the Principal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Principal, administrative assistant and secretary personnel costs • Graduation expenses
Operation/Maintenance of Plant	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Custodian salaries and benefits • Contracted services (dumpster; septic; water test; maintenance) • Recycling • Insurance, telephone, electricity, fuel, building supplies • Grounds maintenance (plowing; mowing)
Transportation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pupil transport; special ed transport; athletic trips; field trips
Debt Service	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Principal and interest payments on school debt • Contributions to the Conway High School bond

² In the 2007-2008 budget, the Health Insurance costs per FTE ranged from \$6,500 to a little over \$18,000, depending on which plan the employees were eligible for. The cost of health care does not vary by wage level, so in a few cases the health insurance costs are actually higher than the wage costs. This also leads to health care constituting a very high percent of wage costs. For instance, in the Special Education budget, health care costs amount to 67% of salaries.

Attachment 2:

Six Year Trends in Tamworth School Expenses

The Excel spreadsheet below summarize cost increases for the budget years ending in June of 2003 through 2008.³ This data can be summarized in the following observations:

- Total High School costs rose by 14% from 2003 to 2008 (6 years), compared to a 34% increase in the total budget.
- The school budget grew at more than 2.5 times the rate of inflation, measured by increases in the Consumer Price Index. (The total budget rose by 34%, while the CPI rose by 13%.)
- The total budget (less High School expenses) grew by 39% during a period when enrollments dropped by 12%.
- The cost per elementary enrollment (including Special Education) rose by 63% during this time frame.
- The cost per elementary enrollment without Special Education rose by 63%.
- The Regular Education increase was the closest to the rate of inflation. Regular education increased by 23% during a period when inflation increased by 15%.

A couple of conclusions can be deduced from this analysis:

- A significant percent of the budget increase is related to Physical Plant and Debt (which is mostly physical plant related). These costs increased by \$477,000 over this time frame, accounting for about 31% of the total cost increases. (These costs increased over a five year period by 106.7%.)
- Costs have increased in an absolute way while enrollments have declined. This has led to a built-in overcapacity for the district. This overcapacity was acknowledged in the 2006 budget report, which states: "Hypothetically, we could accommodate 100, or slightly more, additional students with current staff and classroom space, making our average class size about 19." (P. 15)

³ 2008 data is based on the approved 2007-2008 budget.

Historical Tamworth School Expenses (\$1,000s)

Budget Item	Budget Ending in June of:						03-'08 Increase	% of 2008 total	% Increase Over Prior Year						5 Yr %
	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008			2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	
Elementary -- Regular	\$1,409	\$1,322	\$1,463	\$1,515	\$1,685	\$1,820	\$411		NA	-6.2%	10.7%	3.6%	11.2%	8.0%	29.2%
High School -- Regular	\$869	\$884	\$991	\$1,073	\$1,108	\$987	\$118		NA	1.7%	12.1%	8.3%	3.3%	-10.9%	13.6%
Special Education	\$759	\$782	\$825	\$988	\$972	\$1,070	\$311		NA	3.0%	5.5%	19.8%	-1.6%	10.1%	41.0%
Enrichment/Gifted	\$44	\$47	\$50	\$54	\$56	\$61	\$17		NA	6.8%	6.4%	8.0%	3.7%	8.9%	38.6%
Co-Curricular	\$18	\$17	\$20	\$20	\$21	\$21	\$3		NA	-5.6%	17.6%	0.0%	5.0%	0.0%	16.7%
Truant Officer	\$1	\$1	\$1	\$1	\$1	\$1	\$0		NA	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Guidance Service	\$49	\$53	\$57	\$60	\$63	\$71	\$22		NA	8.2%	7.5%	5.3%	5.0%	12.7%	44.9%
Health Service	\$42	\$42	\$54	\$61	\$65	\$70	\$28		NA	0.0%	28.6%	13.0%	6.6%	7.7%	66.7%
Psychological Service	\$69	\$73	\$75	\$77	\$79	\$81	\$12		NA	5.8%	2.7%	2.7%	2.6%	2.5%	17.4%
Speech Services	\$69	\$79	\$82	\$74	\$76	\$101	\$32		NA	14.5%	3.8%	-9.8%	2.7%	32.9%	46.4%
Improvement of Instr.	\$57	\$42	\$42	\$52	\$43	\$42	-\$15		NA	-26.3%	0.0%	23.8%	-17.3%	-2.3%	-26.3%
Educational Media	\$75	\$94	\$102	\$113	\$129	\$141	\$66		NA	25.3%	8.5%	10.8%	14.2%	9.3%	88.0%
School Board Services	\$22	\$26	\$33	\$35	\$31	\$31	\$9		NA	18.2%	26.9%	6.1%	-11.4%	0.0%	40.9%
Office of Superintendent	\$156	\$166	\$176	\$186	\$189	\$189	\$33		NA	6.4%	6.0%	5.7%	1.6%	0.0%	21.2%
Office of Principal	\$134	\$136	\$170	\$187	\$198	\$201	\$67		NA	1.5%	25.0%	10.0%	5.9%	1.5%	50.0%
Operation of Plant	\$244	\$275	\$305	\$324	\$353	\$356	\$112		NA	12.7%	10.9%	6.2%	9.0%	0.8%	45.9%
Pupil Transportation	\$238	\$217	\$201	\$186	\$187	\$176	-\$62		NA	-8.8%	-7.4%	-7.5%	0.5%	-5.9%	-26.1%
Debt Service	\$148	\$460	\$643	\$616	\$542	\$543	\$395		NA	210.8%	39.8%	-4.2%	-12.0%	0.2%	266.9%
Food Service	\$78	\$78	\$88	\$85	\$91	\$105	\$27		NA	0.0%	12.8%	-3.4%	7.1%	15.4%	34.6%
Transfer to Food Service	\$15	\$15	\$15	\$15	\$15	\$15	\$0		NA	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Modular Classrooms	\$30	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	-\$30		NA	-100.0%					
Capital Reserve	\$25	\$25	\$25	\$25	\$25	\$25	\$0		NA	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
							\$0								
Total	\$4,551	\$4,834	\$5,418	\$5,747	\$5,929	\$6,107	\$1,556		NA	6.2%	12.1%	6.1%	3.2%	3.0%	34.2%
CPI Increase Each Year										3.3%	3.4%	2.5%	3.8%	0.1%	13.1%
Summary:															
Regular Education	\$2,278	\$2,206	\$2,454	\$2,588	\$2,793	\$2,807	\$529	34.0%	NA	-3.2%	11.2%	5.5%	7.9%	0.5%	23.2%
Special Education	\$759	\$782	\$825	\$988	\$972	\$1,070	\$311	20.0%	NA	3.0%	5.5%	19.8%	-1.6%	10.1%	41.0%
Instructional Support	\$423	\$447	\$482	\$511	\$532	\$588	\$165	10.6%	NA	5.7%	7.8%	6.0%	4.1%	10.5%	39.0%
Administration	\$312	\$328	\$379	\$408	\$418	\$421	\$109	7.0%	NA	5.1%	15.5%	7.7%	2.5%	0.7%	34.9%
Physical Plant & Debt	\$447	\$760	\$973	\$965	\$920	\$924	\$477	30.7%	NA	70.0%	28.0%	-0.8%	-4.7%	0.4%	106.7%
Transportation & Other	\$331	\$310	\$304	\$286	\$293	\$296	-\$35	-2.2%	NA	-6.3%	-1.9%	-5.9%	2.4%	1.0%	-10.6%
Total	\$4,550	\$4,833	\$5,417	\$5,746	\$5,928	\$6,106	\$1,556	100.0%	NA	6.2%	12.1%	6.1%	3.2%	3.0%	34.2%
Costs Per Enrollment															
Total, Less High School	\$3,681	\$3,949	\$4,426	\$4,673	\$4,820	\$5,119				7.3%	12.1%	5.6%	3.1%	6.2%	39.1%
Elementary Enrollments	269	262	249	251	236	229				-2.6%	-5.0%	0.8%	-6.0%	-3.0%	-14.9%
Cost Per Elem. Enrollment	\$13.68	\$15.07	\$17.78	\$18.62	\$20.42	\$22.35				10.1%	17.9%	4.7%	9.7%	9.4%	63.4%
Total, Less HS & Spec Ed	\$2,922	\$3,167	\$3,601	\$3,685	\$3,848	\$4,049				8.4%	13.7%	2.3%	4.4%	5.2%	38.6%
Cost Per Reg El. Enrollment	\$10.86	\$12.09	\$14.46	\$14.68	\$16.31	\$17.68				11.3%	19.6%	1.5%	11.1%	8.4%	62.8%

Attachment 3:

Comparison of Tamworth with Other School Districts

This attachment shows comparisons between Tamworth and the seven other districts on a combination of costs, standardized test performance and selected other data. The districts and their 2007-2008 enrollments include:

District	2007-2008 Enrollment
Tamworth	229
Ashland	157
Bartlett	312
Campton	307
Chichester	242
Holderness	199
Rumney	150
Thornton	197

Cost Comparison Definitions

When we say: "Tamworth's costs are X% above/below other districts", this percentage refers to the cost difference as a percentage of Tamworth's costs. In other words, Tamworth would have to decrease/increase its costs by this percentage to equal the costs of other districts. **This is the definition we have used of comparative percentages, unless specifically indicated otherwise.**

The other potential way to calculate the % difference is as a percentage of the other districts' costs. This would represent the amount the other districts would have to increase/decrease their costs to equal Tamworth's. Given that Tamworth's costs are higher than all the other districts, this percentage amount would be higher than the percentage amount in the other calculation.

Cost Comparison Data

The state of New Hampshire publishes annual data on average per pupil costs for NH Districts. State of NH Cost per Pupil statistics are based on current expenditures as reported on each school district's Annual Financial Report (DOE-25).

- Cost per pupil represents current expenditures less tuition and transportation costs.
- Out of district special education tuition is not included.
- Any food service revenue is deducted from current expenditures before dividing by ADM in attendance.
- Capital and debt service are not current expenditures and are not included.
- Data are based on actual financial statements, not the budget.

The Committee attempted to compare detailed 2007-2008 budget data from the seven comparison districts, but this proved too complicated a task, and decided to conduct the cost comparison based on the state data.

Summary

Based on the State of New Hampshire 2006-2007 per pupil cost data:

- Tamworth costs are higher than all the other districts, and 20% higher than the average of the seven other districts.
- The difference with other districts ranges from only 7% above Ashland to 27% above Chichester.
- Tamworth costs are 34% higher than the state average. Tamworth costs are 150% of the state average (\$16,155 vs. \$10,716).
- Tamworth costs have increased at a more rapid rate than the other districts since 2003.
 - In 2003, Tamworth’s costs were only 9% higher than the average of the other seven districts. (One district – Holderness – had costs higher than Tamworth.)
 - Tamworth costs have increased 53% since 2003, compared to an average of 34% for the other districts.

State of New Hampshire Cost Per Pupil Comparisons

2006-2007 Costs Compared to the Other Seven Districts

The following table compares Tamworth costs to the other seven districts, based on the State of New Hampshire “Cost Per Pupil” database. This database is only available for the 2006-2007 school year.

Comparison of State Per Pupil Costs	Tamworth	Ashland	Bartlett	Campton	Chichester	Holderness	Rumney	Thomton	Ave.
Cost Per Pupil -- State Data, 2006-2007	\$16,155	\$15,089	\$12,514	\$12,436	\$11,714	\$14,843	\$11,908	\$12,184	\$12,955.43
State Rank (out of 154 districts)	7	14	39	44	66	18	59	50	
Tamworth Above/Below Other Districts	\$0	\$1,066	\$3,641	\$3,719	\$4,441	\$1,312	\$4,247	\$3,971	\$3,200
Difference as % Tamworth		7%	23%	23%	27%	8%	26%	25%	20%

Based on this data, Tamworth costs are on average 20% higher than other districts (meaning Tamworth would have to reduce its budget by 20% to be at the average of the other seven districts), and the difference ranged from a low of 7% to a high of 27%.

Per Pupil Cost Increases, 2003-2007

The table below compares the State of NH per pupil costs from 2002-2003, compared to 2006-2007. It shows that Tamworth costs have risen at a much higher rate in this time period compared with other districts.

2002-2003 Data	Tamworth	Ashland	Bartlett	Campton	Chichester	Holderness	Rumney	Thornton	Ave.
Cost Per Pupil -- State Data, 2002-2003	\$10,593	\$10,499	\$9,758	\$9,889	\$7,936	\$11,324	\$9,249	\$9,079	\$9,676
Tamworth Above/Below Other Districts	\$0	\$94	\$835	\$704	\$2,657	(\$731)	\$1,344	\$1,514	\$917
Difference as % of Tamworth	0%	1%	8%	7%	25%	-7%	13%	14%	9%
Increase, 2003 to 2007	\$5,562	\$4,590	\$2,756	\$2,547	\$3,778	\$3,519	\$2,659	\$3,105	\$3,279
Percent Increase, 2003-2007	53%	44%	28%	26%	48%	31%	29%	34%	34%
Tamworth Increase as % of Other Districts		121%	202%	218%	147%	158%	209%	179%	170%

- During this time frame, Tamworth costs increased by 53%, compared to an average of 34% for the other districts.
- Tamworth's increase is 170% of the increase of the average for the other districts.

Tamworth Comparison to State Average

- Tamworth's 2006-2007 costs of \$16,155 are 150% of the state average of \$10,716.⁴
- Tamworth costs would have to be reduced by 34% to match the state average.
- In 2003, Tamworth's costs exceeded the state average by 25% (compared to 34% in the 2007 budget year.)

⁴ "It is appropriate to compare two districts only when they have the same grade range. Even when the grade ranges are identical, only the total figures should be considered comparable because different formulas may have been used to allocate district-wide costs." (NH Department of Education)

Comparison of NECAP Scores

The costs of the District need to be weighed against district educational outcomes. The Committee looked at Tamworth scores on the New England Common Assessment Program (NECAP) scores in math, writing and reading across grades 3-8 for the fall of 2007.

New England Common Assessment Program (NECAP) Score Comparison

Reading	Grade	Chichester	Holderness	Bartlett	Campton	Thornton	Ashland	6 District Ave.	Tamworth	NH
	3	67	83	78	84	62	91	78	56	77
4	65	74	74	62	81	75	72	84	74	
5	79	100	78	76	79	92	84	72	71	
6	90	80	91	60	65	79	78	69	73	
7	77	74	87	62	85	86	79	66	75	
8	66	70	91	51	84	100	77	73	67	
Total		74*	80	84	66*	74*	87	78	70*	72*
Math	Grade									
	3	67	79	77	67	66	73	72	65	73
	4	69	73	67	29	51	63	59	76	68
	5	95	78	66	68	84	36	71	72	69
	6	86	76	70	45	50	47	62	60	68
	7	68	74	64	58	63	57	64	51	63
	8	69	65	85	56	89	100	77	61	58
	Total		74	74	72	54	67*	62*	67*	64*
Writing	Grade									
	5	48	50	58	46	68	71	57	52	52
	8	46	60	80	44	50	85	61	50	43

* No significant Statistical difference from Tamworth.

- In Reading, there is no statistical significance between Tamworth and three other districts; with three districts being significantly higher than Tamworth.
- In Math, two districts are at Tamworth's level; three are higher; and one is lower.
- In Writing, two districts are at Tamworth's level; three are higher; and one is lower.
- Tamworth is at the state average on both the reading and math tests.

Other Comparative School Data

The table below shows selected other data comparing Tamworth to comparable districts.

Selected School Data

	Tamworth	Ashland	Bartlett	Campton	Chichester	Holderness	Thomton	Ave. 6 districts
Free & Reduced Lunch Percentage	32%	43%	20%	35%	9%	10%	30%	25%
Average Class Size, Grades 1-2 (2008)	11	19	15	19	14	12	12	15.2
Average Class Size, Grades 3-4 (2008)	13	19	14	16	14	12	15	15.0
Average Class Size, Grades 5-8 (2008)	14	15	21	17	15	18	15	16.8
Student Teacher Ratio, 2007-2008	8.1	7.9	11.2	11.1	9.8	7.7	9.2	9.5

- Tamworth Free and Reduced lunch percentage is significantly higher than three other districts; equal to or lower than three districts; and above the average of the other 6 districts.
- Tamworth class sizes are lower than the average of the other 6 districts, with the greatest difference being in grades 1-2.
- The Tamworth student teacher ratio is slightly lower than the average of the other six districts.