

FAIRFIELD BOARD OF EDUCATION
 MINUTES OF THE SPECIAL MEETING OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION
 Tuesday, January 17, 2012

FEB 28 2012

Minutes of the Special Meeting of the Board of Education held Tuesday, January 17, 2012, at 501 Kings Highway East, 2nd Floor Conference Room.

The meeting was called to order at 7:33 p.m. by Ms. Pamela Iacono, Chairman. Other Board members present were: Mrs. Sue Brand, Mr. John Convertito, Mr. Philip Dwyer, Mr. Paul Fattibene, Mrs. Jessica Gerber, Mrs. Jennifer Maxon Kennelly and Mr. Perry Liu. Mr. Tim Kery was absent. Also in attendance were Superintendent Dr. David Title and members of the administrative staff. Approximately 125 people comprised the remainder of the audience.

1. Ms. Iacono led the Board and audience in the Pledge of Allegiance.
2. Discussion of the Superintendent's Recommended 2012-2013 Budget Request-

Chairman Iacono stated that tonight is a Special Meeting where the Board will be discussing the Superintendent's Recommended 2012-2013 budget request. Board members sent questions ahead of time to Dr. Title and his staff. Dr. Title will go over some of the questions tonight and some will take a little more time to get answers. After that Board members will have an opportunity to ask additional questions they may have. Ms. Iacono stated that she would like to hold off on discussing the medical fund until Thursday since she anticipates that being a lengthy discussion.

Dr. Title stated that he will take some of the larger themes and try to tackle some of the bigger questions on the budget.

Q. Why didn't you put back in "x" that was cut last year or why didn't you put back in everything that was cut last year?

A. The budget was built based on the current budget that was adopted by the Board after the cuts were made. That is the base line and that is what the percentage increase is based on. Anything that is added to that is contractually required or has to compete with other priorities and needs to be fiscally responsible. For example, at the high school level additional staff is really needed to handle the increase in enrollment. That took priority over other things. The Special Ed Staffing Model may have crowded out some other things, and the extension of the Math Model from the elementary schools to the middle schools and the high school is also a priority. Basically, it becomes a matter of priorities.

Q. Budget versus Actual?

A. An example is teaching staff. When the budget is built, it is based on actual people and their actual salaries. If positions are added, an estimated or average dollar value for that position is used. Teachers transfer from one school to another, so if a number of higher salaried people move, the estimated expenditure at a particular school is going to be higher than budgeted, but somewhere else the opposite is going to be the case. When people retire and get replaced with a lower salaried person, the actual would be down. Occasionally a position will go either in or out of a grant and that will change the number in the operating budget. You have to look at it overall, the total estimated expenditure versus the total budget in a category. The change is the budget to budget differential, not the budget to actual; and the 2.6% is budget to budget.

Q. Since it reflects relative income of an individual, does it also reflect relative experience of the teachers and are we dispersing those equitably throughout the district?

A. The more experienced teachers make more money than less experienced teachers. There are numerous reasons why people might transfer. For example, if a section is collapsing, a teacher would have to go somewhere else so they float out and are placed in the best possible spot. We try to move people around equitably but experience is definitely correlated with salary.

- Q. Several questions revolved around the issue of budgeted, actual and the change.
- A. Estimated expenditures on something like salary are pretty accurate in terms of what we are going to see year end; although that could change because someone could take a leave of absence or resign in the middle of the year and there could be movement but this is pretty accurate. Others are projections based on three, four or five months, and those are less reliable indicators of where we are going to be.
- Q. Are the numbers that are used on the staffing model hard numbers for the current staff?
- A. Yes.
- Q. When adding staff, what number is used for a placeholder?
- A. MA-1 step, which is \$55,000 and a single benefit is added which runs \$8,000-\$9,000.
- Q. Is turnover built into the budget?
- A. Some turnover is built into the budget. Just under 12 retirements were built in this year and another \$350,000 is budgeted for certified staff turnover, where someone is going out on a leave of absence and is going to be replaced with a lower paid person or someone is going to resign and that is a different figure.
- Q. Explain the new Special Ed Staffing Model?
- A. Ms. Leonardi explained the process used to develop this model. Months of study took place about what a school needs, what our kids need and what is the best way to do that. Special ed staffing for certified teachers and paraprofessionals was looked at from a zero base. Some of the parameters were to look at this from a school size level first and then from an individual student level. We didn't want to create a model that had huge swings of staffing year to year based solely on numbers of students. Some assumptions were also made about prevalence rates because we did not want to create a system that inadvertently awarded over identification of students with disabilities. While paraprofessionals play a critical role in the education of children with disabilities, from an instructional perspective the quality of instruction from certified staff took priority. A model approach was created to look at both what a whole school needs with a 10% prevalence rate, and our students who are going to be at the elementary level for the 2012-2013 school year based on their unique educational needs. About two-thirds of the para decreases are related to the model. The other one-third is related to a very large and needy fifth grade group moving on to the middle level. An additional complexity to paraprofessional staffing in special education is that 25 FTE paraprofessionals are budgeted in the IDEA grant and a commitment was made to continue to do that so the decrease in paraprofessionals would affect the Board of Ed side and not the grant. Paras may move from school to school based on need, but the total FTE in the grant stays the same. This model looks at increasing teachers; almost 11 teachers are being added across the elementary level based on size of school and a significant reduction in the total number of paraprofessionals at the elementary level as an offset. We believe this will provide a high level of support and structure to the kids instructionally at that early intervention time.

Board questions followed on the Special Education Staffing Model. Dr. Title stated that this was in the audit as something to look at; unfortunately, the auditors only counted the paraprofessional reduction in their savings and failed to account for the increase in certified staff necessary to transform the model.

- Q. Allocations were another theme in the questions. How come at school "x" there is a lot less money in "blank" than at school "y"?
- A. Not everything that benefits a school is in what is called their allocation. A per pupil allocation was established; and although the allocation number varies from elementary, middle or high school, it is the same per pupil allocation at each level. Included in the allocation are items such as supplies, books, materials, conferences, localized professional development, etc. At the high school level extra-curricular activities are included. Variances are often a result of a choice the principal or headmaster has made about what their school needs in that area. Substitute teachers are now budgeted centrally. Interns are treated as staff. You can't use your allocation to buy staff; staff is allocated based on formulas which are based on enrollment and student need. The

allocation is \$130 per student at the elementary school, \$157 per student at the middle school and \$490 per student at the high school.

- Q. Page 58, Business Services, line item 52010, Evening/Subs/Overtime, what is the reason for the increase of \$240,000?
- A. Overtime costs have consistently exceeded the budgeted amount. While we are working to bring those down, some of this is contractual; and until contract language is changed, we need to put in a number that is closer to reality.

Mr. Cullen distributed a custodial overtime comparison chart showing last year and year-to-date. Year-to-date is already \$318,981, which shows that we are on track to go over in this account. Some of the big drivers of custodial overtime are summer cleaning, storms, absences and non-billable which is for use of our schools by outside groups who incur overtime charges that we pick up. For example, when the Board of Finance has a meeting in this room, the custodian is here and we incur overtime for that.

Additional questions from Board members followed.

- Q. Why was the Osborn Hill window project moved up to this budget when that was not what was in the Facilities Plan?
- A. There is a long lead time on window projects. In order to do the project in the year it is in the Facilities Plan, the approval process needs to start now. A contract wouldn't be awarded until January 2013, then 16-20 weeks to fabricate the windows, and you are looking at 2013-2014 if all goes well.
- Q. On page 62, Pupil Personnel Services, line item 54935, Gifted Assessment, \$51,353 is allocated, what is that and why is there a disparity in the money allocated to gifted teachers among the schools?
- A. Money allocated to the gifted teachers among the schools is due to different contractual steps. They all have the same FTE for gifted. As part of the Gifted Program some additional assessments are being done this year and are being paid for in a variety of places, including a grant. Since it was scattered and hard to find, all of the gifted assessments have been consolidated into one line item.
- Q. Revenue to the Town-Building Rentals, the \$38,000 seems to be in direct conflict with Connecticut General Statutes that money would go to the Town. What is the history?
- A. Any money that comes in that is contributable to overtime costs is revenue to the Board that we keep. If it is an organization that pays above and beyond the overtime costs, that money goes to the Town. Setting of the fees is done in conjunction with the First Selectman.

Mr. Cullen distributed a sheet showing the current year and the previous two years of custodial overtime fees received based on reservations from groups that paid for custodial fees. The second column of the chart shows building rental fees that were received from agencies or organizations that pay a fee to use a field or room based on the current list of over 5,000 organizations that rent space at the schools. Some are exempt from paying anything, some just pay custodial fees, and some pay a rental fee and a custodial fee. Money that is taken in for custodial overtime is signed out to the overtime budget, and building rental fees is money that goes to the Town.

- Q. Why is it called building rentals?
- A. Agencies pay to rent our facilities. If they request a turf field and are non-Fairfield based, they pay a fee to rent that field. There are agencies and groups that don't pay anything if they are Fairfield based, Fairfield resident, and benefiting Fairfield students. Backup materials were distributed showing some of the agencies that rent space.

Board questions and comments followed regarding revenue received from building rental fees; why the revenue goes to the Town but appears as revenue in the Board of Ed; including a line on page 7 under Other Sources to show an offset of the custodial fees received and remove it from

wherever it is in the budget; State Statute Section 10 Sub-section 222A speaks specifically towards reimbursement for janitorial fees and if a facility is being used after 9 p.m. or on a weekend an overtime fee for janitorial services should be charged; getting assurance that we are in full compliance with State Statute Chapter 70-10-222A that speaks to revenue; since the money from the rental of our buildings is going to the Town, there needs to be something built in for wear and tear and maintenance of these facilities and it was suggested that the Policy Committee look at this. Concern was expressed that we are incurring overtime expense that is truly not an education expense and we need to make sure we are getting reimbursed to the best of our abilities for those expenses, because it is making us look like we are spending a lot more money.

Q. What were some of the educational programs that new money was budgeted for this year and why World Language did not get reinstated?

A. Two of the larger programs are the Special Education Staffing Model at the elementary level and extending the Math Model into the middle school and high school. Some smaller improvements were included in English Language Learners, some additional work with social workers, and covering increased enrollment at the high school level. There are also some increases in instructional programs, particularly elementary music, elementary health, math and language arts that are reflected in the program implementation budgets. They are not staff but are improvements that will help all students. If you added them all together, they probably would not equal what it would cost to reinstate World Language. Dr. Title stated that we are still adjusting to the World Language cut, and he would like to see more about the impact of the cut before \$400,000 is reinstated. Educationally we picked up some instructional time in grades 4, 5, 6. Reinstatement of World Language didn't rise to the priority level of some of these other programs that were put in.

Q. Weren't the World Language cuts more like \$300,000?

A. World Language grade 6 is \$75,000 and at the elementary level it is in the \$300,000 range.

Q. FTE – Where do the actual bodies go in terms of increasing some teachers. Regarding the increasing population at the high school, where exactly are the teachers going to embrace this population?

A. Page 124 shows the staffing changes in the operating budget. Certified staff additions are on the left side. For example, the impact of the Elementary Special Education Model is 11.8 positions, the Elementary English Language Learner increase is .8, there are a few tweaks in the music program at the elementary level and an additional .5 Elementary Language Arts Specialist. Next is the middle school: Special Education; Physical Education; Math Resource, which is the improvement in the middle school mathematics support of one per school, and Speech & Language is an addition based on case needs. At the high school level these are estimates based on the current enrollment and the courses and teacher loads. Once students actually sign up for courses, this can be adjusted. At the Early Childhood Center there is a Speech & Language need. That is the total certified additions of 26.15.

Q. Would a .5 be a part time teacher?

A. If you are a .5, you are working half time.

Q. Is a 1.0 a full time teacher?

A. Yes, except in the case of high school science. Generally we round to the nearest tenth. For example, a .1 at an elementary school is someone who works one morning or one afternoon one day a week. At the high school level, teachers teach 5 classes, and every time you add a class you are adding a .2. In the math model at the high school when two extra classes are added, you need a .4. The exception is science because there are labs that meet additional periods above and beyond. Science teachers teach 4 classes so one additional science class is a .25. In high school science we are estimating to need 3 additional classes and that is how you get the .75.

Q. Is it correct that for the entire district, elementary through high school and early childhood, only 26.15 additional certified staff?

A. Correct.

- Q. How are we going to deal with trying to embrace the population that is moving up from middle school to high school?
- A. We are helped out by some contract language on student load which will allow us to maintain our class sizes and programs at the high school with the additional staff members. Approximately 6 FTEs are being added at the high school level and some additional non-certified staff. The deletions at the middle school are largely a function of the contract language on community size. We are going into the second year of moving kids around; and some of the staff is moving over to Fairfield Woods which will have a greater population next year. The net effect is in the operating budget; the total body count is going down but there is an increase in the certified side. The net increase in certified is 18.80 and there is a decrease in non-certified but there is a cost because certified make more than non-certified. The total staffing is on page 123, which combines the grants and part-time permanent equivalents, who are people paid hourly.
- Q. Page 142, Object Code 313-Maintenance Services, Information Management Software – please elaborate what costs this entails, examples of how the system is used, other districts that have this system, and what will we get for this amount of money?
- A. \$425,478 is the increase for the whole object code of maintenance services. The number we are carrying for the student information system is \$250,000. Deputy Superintendent Karen Parks stated that the new student information management software was suggested in the audit. A committee began working on this about two months ago, it was put out to bid, six vendors sent in bids and the committee still has four vendors to look at. All of the bids included an implementation schedule with training in the price of the software. The training is 1-2 years across the system and is built into their costs. The new system would replace several other software programs in the district. Each of the vendors has provided a list of school districts that are using their programs, but we are not at the stage yet of going out to talk with other districts. She briefly explained the process being used to evaluate each of the programs that were presented. Mrs. Parks stated that she is hoping to bring a final selection to the Board in May and it would be implemented in July. Full implementation will take about two years.

Board questions followed on the new software system.

- Q. Page 95, line item 123-Info Tech Support Staff, wasn't this position cut in all the elementary schools?
- A. The position was reallocated. On pages 52 & 53 the line items are eliminated for the elementary schools but are rolled up into the Information Technology Department. There was a reduction in staff as a result of last year's budget, and there are folks who are now rotating between several buildings instead of being assigned to a particular building. As a result of this, the reporting structure changed so we thought it was more appropriate to put them in the Information Technology Department as a group rather than assigning them bit by bit to several buildings. They were shifted from an accounting perspective. We will still maintain the staff we have now.
- Q. Pages 113-116, Enrollment, the averages appear to be the same from one year to the next but the kindergarten class size is going up by 2 or 3 students per section. Specifically, Burr is at 17 & 18 this year and 22 next year, Holland Hill is at 17 & 18 this year and 20 next year, McKinley is at 18 & 19 this year and 19 & 20 next year and Riverfield is at 17 this year and 23 next year. The averages look good except at those particular schools; and third grade at Holland Hill will be at the class size max of 25, one more student and we will have to add a section. Could you comment on what appears to be an increase in class size in the kindergarten area, which generally you try to keep smaller?
- A. Kindergarten numbers are projections. Dr. Title explained the enrollment projection process that was used. MGT was asked to do a very quick one year update based on kindergarten as it landed and a cohort survival analysis on the rest, which is how the short-term projections were done. They went back to their model for projecting kindergarten by school and came up with the figures used for our enrollment. Class size guidelines across the district are then applied. When you have a class size limit of 23 in kindergarten and end up with 66 kids you get 3 sections. However, if 70 kindergarten students actually enrolled, they would be split into 4 sections. The

class size limit of 23 applies to K, 1, 2; the only exception is McKinley, which has a class size limit of 21 for K, 1, & 2. Grades 3, 4, 5 have a class size limit of 25. Sections can go up or down, and sometimes one child causes a section to get created and conversely one child not appearing could cause a section to collapse. This is monitored through the spring when kindergarten enrollment comes in and constantly thereafter. Principals do give additional paraprofessional support in kindergarten.

Q. If the current guidelines resulted in every one of our kindergarten classes with 23 children, would the guidelines find that acceptable?

A. Yes.

Q. Would the Board find it acceptable that slowly this creeps up to 23?

A. One of the items that was in the audit to address was the issue of kindergarten; full day, extended day and blended. Dr. Title stated that he decided not to address that issue this year because he doesn't want it to be a budget issue; he wants it to be a program issue. The kindergarten issue in general will be a topic for discussion next year, pre-budget.

Board comments followed.

Q. Six of the recommendations from the Operational Audit are in this budget. There was also another group of recommendations that may require further study. Is there any intent to look at some of those items toward next year's, 2013-2014 budget? What is in the hopper?

A. Dr. Title stated that the kindergarten program will be reviewed; he is not inclined to undergo a review of the house system in terms of revamping it, it serves us well and he would like to continue that; if we are going to look at anything at the high school level we need to look at the schedule. Purchasing procedures with the Town have been done and were signed off on the by Board of Finance in October. Custodial overtime has already been discussed. A suggestion by the audit team, who were not familiar with Connecticut State Law, was that we could save a lot of money if students were forced to permanently opt out of bus transportation as a condition of parking at the high school. Our attorney checked into this and said it is not legal in Connecticut to say, "use it or lose it" or make students opt out of bus transportation. Our default was to charge for a parking space, which we are doing. The audit team also thought we could save \$400,000 by not transporting private school students, which is also contrary to the law. There is an offset in the security line from the parking revenue. We anticipated taking in about \$50,000 in revenue from parking fees and it would cost us an additional \$10,000 to enforce it, so the net would be \$40,000. It turned out that we haven't spent a lot on enforcement; some of the existing security personnel are able to work that by changing their hours.

Q. On pages 63-67, Utility Services, the reduction in electricity costs appears to be quite substantial. Are those achievable and sustainable?

A. The Town and Board of Ed are together on a joint bid for heating fuel and electricity. The Town took advantage of a drop in electrical rates and locked in at a substantial decrease in the rate through December 2013. Not only is it sustainable through the next budget year but six months into the succeeding year.

Q. Page 61, Instructional Services, line item 52091-Program Assessment, has an increase of \$26,800 for a survey on how we are assessing school climate in our new bullying policy. Since the State is supposed to provide a survey of some nature and this being the first year of the program implementation, it might make sense to see what the State is going to do before spending \$30,000 of our money; maybe wait for the second year?

A. Dr. Title stated that Ms. Leonardi has looked at drafts of the State survey and has some significant concerns. The State does not have a lot of resources to do much developing, and survey development is costly if done well. The concern is that this would serve as baseline data, and if baseline data is lousy, then all of the subsequent data will be based on lousy data. The first year is the one you really want to do right and then in subsequent years if the State comes up with something that is usable at least we know our first year data is valid. We are carrying \$25,000 for the survey; \$26,500 is the whole account.

Board questions and comments followed.

- Q. High school enrollment is increasing, in particular at Fairfield Ludlowe High School. Looking at page 133, Ludlowe is scheduled for a 3.15 FTE increase and Warde is scheduled for a 2.80 FTE increase. Would that be sufficient to accommodate the needs of the students at Ludlowe being that their enrollment is scheduled to increase greater than Warde?
- A. That is our belief now. Based on the enrollment and the projected numbers at each school, there are a greater number of students going into Ludlowe; but you also have to look at what the various capacities are in each department to handle additional kids.

Board questions followed.

Dr. Title stated that this does not make any attempt to reduce class size. With Ludlowe and the increase of staff, it becomes more of a site issue relative to how many kids you can put in a class.

- Q. Do you anticipate what the impact is going to be on class size?
- A. There are only so many classes to put the kids in. Some spaces have been identified in the Ludlowe building right now that are not currently used as full time classrooms that could be recaptured as classrooms with some modest work by our own staff.
- Q. Page 147, Annual Refresh of Computer Hardware, have we priced out whether or not it would be advantageous to lease computers with a service contract as opposed to continuing to purchase?
- A. The Board of Finance and the RTM have prohibited us from leasing computers. They don't want to get into the rental business.
- Q. Can you highlight some of the things in this budget that speak to the District Improvement Plans?
- A. All school improvement plans are in now. Many of the plans do not require additional resources, rather focus on reallocating resources. At the elementary level there are improvements in our curriculum and instructional model in mathematics and language arts and money has been put into those areas. At the middle school and high school level the mathematics support model, which is part of what is called scientifically research based intervention (SRBI), is all part of improvement plans. A lot of what we are trying to accomplish with these improvement plans doesn't necessarily cost additional dollars, so you will not necessarily see huge increases, you may see some individual principal budgets where they direct some of the allocation toward staff training. It is too early to say exactly what the financial impact will be, but a lot is being done at the district level with teachers observing each other and learning from each other. That does sometimes require substitute teacher costs, which were not specifically built in because this is the first year and a lot of this is refocusing existing work.
- Q. Will AON be at the meeting on Thursday? Moving forward would like to have a summary explanation to page 141 that has the insurance.
- A. Dr. Title stated that AON is not available on Thursday. In lieu of that he will try to contact them with the questions that have been put on the table and is hoping to get some written responses.
- Q. The \$80,000 increase in preschool tuition, is that a change in the rates or growth in the program?
- A. The tuition is not increasing for next year. This number is actually very close to what we will get this year, somewhere mid to high \$90's, so we just carried that forward. There is no change in number of kids, number of slots, or tuition.
- Q. Is it more efficient to pay custodial overtime as opposed to hiring an additional staff member?
- A. That is a discussion that needs to take place with the union because there is a past practice. There are some floaters, unassigned custodians, who get full pay and benefits. They are used to do some of the offset but that is not a long-term solution. That is an issue that needs to be looked at. One of the benefits of custodial overtime is that they are custodians we know, they know the buildings, etc., and someone new coming in may not be as efficient.

- Q. Pages 53-56, \$127,000 for part-time clerical staff and lunch aides at the elementary schools. Why is it a priority over opening up computer labs that were shuttered because of budget cuts and world language classes that were taken away?
- A. Lunch aides are out of the allocations. Most of this is adding part-time elementary clericals in the afternoon. This is an issue of coverage, safety and security at the elementary schools. This is to address the need in the front office of the elementary schools in the afternoon; and rather than adding another secretarial position, we went with a clerk. The elementary school offices basically shut down at 4:00 p.m. when the secretary leaves for the day. At times the buses return to school with children after 4 p.m. because a parent was not home and the bus drivers do not leave students at home alone, or at times parents can't back to school to pick up their kids before 4:00 p.m. and there is no front office staff to cover that. Many times there are meetings or professional development that occurs after school so staff is not available to sit with students or call parents. At the elementary level you are not going to leave a child in the front office alone waiting for their parent. There is also the issue that from about 12:30 p.m. to 4:00 p.m. the front offices are very busy and manned with only one person. The best way to address the issue at the elementary level was to add a part-time clerk in nine of the schools. At this time two of our schools already have a full-time secretary and a part-time clerk.
- Q. Lunch aides at the elementary schools; is the additional cost at some of the schools a result of the paraprofessionals being cut?
- A. Yes and that is out of the allocations.
- Q. Page 17, code 105-Administrators, states that the agreement provides salary increases of 1.75% for each fiscal year of the contract. Salary schedules were not available when the 2012-2013 budget was developed; consequently, salary increases are included in the wage and benefit reserve on page 59. The 1.75% is about \$95,000 and the wage and benefit reserve is \$432,590; is there a status update on that and what else is in the wage and benefit reserve?
- A. We don't have a final signed off salary schedule yet for the administrators. If that comes in time to put the real number in and reduce the wage and benefit reserve before the budget goes to the Town, we can do that. It won't change the bottom line. It is 39 people. The rest is mostly unsettled contracts, and they are for every non-certified bargaining unit with the exception of secretaries. We are talking about ed trainers, paraprofessionals, custodian/maintenance and other non-certified. There is an estimated settlement number that we hold that is lumped together. If there are new positions in the budget that require benefits, that is held in the wage and benefit reserve.
- Q. Page 19, code 207-Pension/Retirement, there is a 17% increase to fund non-certified Board of Education employees. What is that?
- A. Certified employees are not part of the Town's pension program so this is only non-certified employees. Retirees have a defined benefit plan, and every year the actuaries go over the numbers and come up with an estimated contribution that is needed to meet the ongoing obligations of the retirees. The Town hires an outside firm to do this work. They give the number to the Town and it is divided up the same percentage for both sides, Town and Board of Ed. It depends on the performance of the pension fund; if the pension fund does well or if the markets do well, then in a given year our contribution may go down or not go up as much. There is nothing we can do about this, it is a fixed increase.
- Q. Page 169, Food Service Program, Proposed Budget 2011-2012 is that a typo?
- A. The Food Service budget is not done until June. This is included for information purposes. It is a Board discussion item in June when there is a Food Service review.
- Q. Pages 137 & 138 show the staffing cost implications for the special education initiative and the math initiative; and when looking at some line items within the budget there are additional costs for instructional supplies, training or whatever that are connected to those two initiatives. If that is correct, wouldn't it be better to put all of the increased costs associated with the initiatives on those pages and not just the staffing costs? There is a page in the budget where every subject has an extra \$1,000 or \$2,000 but on the math line it is an extra \$20,000?

A. The math initiative is really just a staff increase. On page 73, Program Implementation lines, there is a large increase in mathematics; this page is tied directly to page 139, which is the Curriculum Review Cycle. These numbers will fluctuate every year based on what is happening in the review cycle. Mathematics is a big year coming up at the elementary level PK-2 and grades 6-12. This large increase is related to revamping the curriculum, tying it to the Common Core State Standards, and some professional development, not specifically the math resource positions. The same is true with the Special Education Staffing Model. One initiative that does have a cost is the climate team training. We are carrying an increase in the general staff development line on page 73; a big part of that increase is toward the climate team training. Staff development related to Gifted was moved out of its own line and put in here, as well as the TEAM/BEST requirements. Some professional development lines were also consolidated into staff development.

Q. Relative to the capital projects, have the in-ground oil tanks been tested to be sure none of them are leaking?

A. They have not been tested. Once we test, the tank has to be removed immediately and we need to get funding.

Board comments followed on the oil tanks.

Board comments followed regarding increasing the insurance contribution for non-union employees just as the unions have done, the Gifted Program and how it is working, having the gifted allocation correspond to the volume of students as opposed to site by site, additional clerical staff at the elementary schools, having a time associated with it if it is a safety issue and the possibility that there may not be a need at every elementary school since the workload is related to volume of students at the site.

3. Mr. Convertito moved, seconded by Mr. Liu that this meeting of the Board of Education adjourn at 10:24 p.m.

Motion carried: 8:0:0.

Jessica Gerber
Secretary