

SOUTHINGTON BOARD OF EDUCATION

SOUTHINGTON, CONNECTICUT

REGULAR MEETING

JANUARY 24, 2013

The regular meeting of the Southington Board of Education was held on Thursday, January 24, 2013 at 7:30 p.m. in the Municipal Center Public Assembly Room, 200 North Main Street, Southington, Connecticut.

1. CALL TO ORDER

2. EXECUTIVE SESSION FOR STUDENT EXPULSIONS AND RESIDENCY

An Executive Session meeting was held 7:00 p.m. through 7:25 p.m. *(Minutes attached)*.

3. RECONVENE MEETING ~ REGULAR SESSION

The Regular Session was reconvened at 7:33 p.m. by Chairperson, Mr. Brian Goralski. Board members present were Mrs. Terri Carmody, Mrs. Colleen Clark, Mr. David Derynoski, Mrs. Patricia Johnson, Mrs. Terry Lombardi, Mrs. Jill Notar-Francesco, Mr. Zaya Oshana and Mrs. Patricia Queen.

Present from the administration were Dr. Joseph Erardi, Jr., Superintendent of Schools; Mrs. Karen Smith, Assistant Superintendent; Mrs. Sherri DiNello, Director of Business and Finance; Mr. Frederick Cox, Director of Operations; and Dr. Perri Murdica, Senior Coordinator of Special Services.

Student Representatives present were Miss Whitney DiMeo and Miss Abigail Harris.

There were approximately 62 people in the audience.

4. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Pledge of Allegiance was led by the student representatives.

Mr. Goralski called for a moment of silence in memory of Ms. Eleanor O'Neill, a former teacher in Southington, who taught for 18 years at Marion, Strong and Central Elementary Schools.

5. APPROVAL OF MINUTES ~ January 10, 2013

MOTION: by Mrs. Notar-Francesco, seconded by Mr. Derynoski:

“Move to approve the Board of Education minutes of January 10, 2013, as submitted.”

Motion carried unanimously by voice vote.

MOTION: by Mrs. Notar-Francesco, seconded by Mr. Derynoski:

“Move to approve the minutes of the Special Meeting on January 14, 2013.”

Mr. Goralski pointed out that these special meeting minutes (*Attachment #1*) were part of a concurrent Public Building Committee and Board of Education meeting and were taken by the Building Committee’s recording secretary.

Motion carried unanimously by voice vote.

6. COMMUNICATIONS

a. Communications from Audience

Mr. James Williamson, 66 Ciccio Road, spoke as a taxpayer, parent, and the President of the Community Foundation of Greater New Britain. He noted that in the course of his career he has moved from state to state seven times and in shopping for a house the first question the real estate agents asked was, “Do you have children?” He noted that the best schools were why they bought in certain areas, including Southington. He pointed out that the high quality education within the various towns he has lived protected and enhanced the value of his real estate. As a taxpayer, he felt that the best use of his tax dollars in Southington is to fund the proposed 2013-2014 education budget. As President of the Community Foundation of Greater New Britain, Mr. Williamson and his organization believed that investment in a full-day Kindergarten program would have a positive effect in all the other grades and the other programs offered. His organization made an investment in Early Childhood Development in Southington years ago to enhance teacher training, make childcare more accessible and affordable, and to partner with the school district on the creation and support of the Early Childhood Collaborative and its Family Resource Center. He noted that, from day one, the parent workshops and playgroups were sold out and continues to be that way, which speaks to the desire of Southington parents to prepare their child for the eventual school experience.

Mrs. Patricia Mazzearella, 90 Applegate Drive, spoke on behalf of the Southington Administrators Association (SAA). As an administrative group, they are in full support of the All-Day Kindergarten program. On behalf of the elementary principals, she expressed their gratitude to the central office administration for bringing this proposal forward and to the Board members for their thoughtful consideration of this proposal. She noted that the SAA has advocated for All-Day Kindergarten for many years. Personally, she is passionate about this and felt that All-Day Kindergarten would be a great benefit to all Southington children.

Mrs. Sandra Brino, 111 Brownstone Drive, spoke on behalf of FIRST Robotics and advocated that it be a line item in the budget. She noted that science and technology education and careers are in demand and that Southington High School has a great program, Project Lead the Way. But, that program can handle only so many students. All the other students who are

hungry for this education join the Robotics program. She noted that, as she was speaking, there were five students sitting in a classroom at Saucier Mechanical learning how to enter into CAD software and another three students programming a vision system. She emphasized that Robotics was not a club and was an educational program. She noted that the Cheshire and Meriden Board of Education's support their local Robotics Teams in their school budgets. She encouraged the Southington Board to pass the \$5,000 that Robotics was requesting in the budget and noted that the team would raise the rest of the funds to keep the program alive.

Ms. Stephanie Stasuski, 34 Eastwood Drive, stated that she was a sixth grade teacher in Cheshire and a Southington resident. She felt that children have a natural curiosity to learn and that All-Day Kindergarten would foster this curiosity. Developmental play is not currently in their program, but will be added to the all-day model. This component teaches valuable foundational learning skills such as problem-solving, spatial awareness and social skills. She understands that there are many changes to education with the implementation of Common Core State Standards and the SEED Evaluation for teachers. She knows firsthand the impact that the pilot model has had for All-Day Kindergarten for those who have participated. She hoped that the Board of Education would consider the data and growth that these children need in All-Day Kindergarten.

Mr. Bill Lutz, 165 Greystone Drive, spoke in support of All-Day Kindergarten and asked the Board to make it their number one priority. He noted that the world has changed and become more complex and competitive and that change has been reflected in the curriculum in schools throughout America. Kindergartens now are places of reading, writing, mathematics, science, and social studies, but they also need to be places for the traditional ideas of Kindergarten, such as developmental play, interpersonal relationships, and socialization. So much has been added to the Kindergarten curriculum that the only thing that has not been done is to add the resource of time. No matter how hard our teachers work, they cannot do justice to this curriculum because nothing gets done as well as it could be done. Mr. Lutz advocated for All-Day Kindergarten, not to make it more academic, but to restore the balance and the developmental part of Kindergarten. The students need to be given all the tools necessary to be successful students and citizens beginning in Kindergarten. He noted that trying to remediate children in sixth or eighth grade is much more expensive and much less successful. He asked the Board to make a persuasive argument to the Board of Finance and Town Council that these are the tools that our school district needs to move from very good to excellent.

Ms. Sabina Vance, 74 Ferncliff Drive, spoke in support of All-Day Kindergarten as a parent and teacher. Her four-year-old son has some special education needs and currently attends the Integrated Preschool Program at Hatton School four full days per week. He is growing, learning and thriving in that engaging learning environment. She felt that it would be a step backwards for him and other students who attend a full-day preschool program to only attend a half-day session of Kindergarten. Her biggest reason for support of All-Day Kindergarten is time to let students develop appropriately, learn social skills, get individualized instruction, benefit from small group lessons, participate in whole group lessons, learn to their full potential and play. She felt that the current Kindergarten schedule does not allow time for all of these things.

Mr. John Yuskis, 74 Valley View Court, spoke in support of All-Day Kindergarten. His youngest daughter will be entering Kindergarten next year. He noted that there is clear

evidence that children benefit scholastically from All-Day Kindergarten; however, he felt the children also would benefit from the social and behavioral interaction. There is so much pressure placed on the schools to meet the various state requirements that the teachers are losing the opportunity to focus on the personal and social development of their students. He felt that developing these skills were just as important as focusing on academic achievement. He thought that a move to All-Day Kindergarten would allow the teachers the time to foster this growth in their students. He believed that no matter the amount of extracurricular activities a parent can engage in with their children, it is not the same experience as a full-day Kindergarten class, whose model is built to help children grow academically and socially.

Ms. Lisa Wrubleski and Ms. Erin Furniss spoke as parents of first grade students at Plantsville Elementary School. They spoke about the tragedy at Sandy Hook Elementary School and how the world has changed over the years. At one time the safety of our schools was not even a question. They would like to make their children's immediate world and town a kinder, friendlier, more caring community. They would like to pay tribute to the Sandy Hook victims by hosting an event on June 15, 2013 and planting 26 butterfly bushes in honor of each of the victims as a lasting reminder to never forget to look for ways to be kind to our neighbors and to pledge to make kindness and generosity the theme in Southington. The butterfly bushes would be planted along the Rails to Trails by groups of children and their families. They asked for the Board's approval and support of this project. The butterfly is a symbol of eternal life. They are in the process of planning the day and activities. The rain date is the following Saturday. The program will begin at 10:00 a.m. with Dr. Erardi as a speaker. Senator Blumenthal will be attending. Butterflies will also be released. One bush will be given to each of the schools in Southington including the Parochial schools for planting. It will be a day of bringing the community together to do something positive from a negative tragedy.

Mr. Keith Tomlinson, 42 Malcein Drive, spoke in support of All-Day Kindergarten as a parent and teacher. His daughter has been in a full-day preschool program for the past two years and has blossomed in a setting that encourages both academics and appropriate socialization. He felt that it would be a detriment to her growth to go from a full school day to two and one-half hours. Like many her age, he felt that she is developmentally ready and will have the stamina for a full-day program. He felt that a full school day would meet the needs of the children academically, emotionally and socially. He knows how rigorous the new Common Core State Standards are in a full-day fifth grade classroom. Under these new standards, Kindergarteners will be expected to add and subtract, spell words and describe measurable attributes of objects and to improve their learning by writing. He cannot see how it is possible to teach a full-day's material in only half the time. His wife is a Kindergarten teacher in the Portland Public Schools and served on the town committee to move from a half-day to a full-day Kindergarten. They had the same discussions and debates as Southington. Portland's Board of Education overwhelmingly approved a Full-Day Kindergarten program. He noted that Southington must prepare our children early for the rigors and demands issued by these new standards. He felt that a full-day curriculum does not fit into a half-day.

Mrs. Elizabeth Lutz, 165 Greystone Drive, [Principal at Kelley Elementary School] stated that she had very strong feelings in support of All-Day Kindergarten and had taught All-Day Kindergarten during her career. She has always viewed the Board members as responsible and caring because they think of children first and support the needs of children; therefore, she felt their decision could only be to support All-Day Kindergarten as put forth in the

administrative budget. She felt that it was the right thing to do for the children of Southington. They have never settled for second best and now was not the time to do so.

Krista Pringle, 48 Summershill Drive, spoke as the Director of the Family Resource Center housed at Hatton School and as a parent. She stated that the Family Resource Center staff was fully in support of an All-Day Kindergarten and that it was the best way to accommodate all of Southington's children. She is an Early Childhood educator and would like to see Southington's Kindergarten program move back towards developmentally appropriate practice and include play in the curriculum once again.

b. Communications from Board Members and Administration

Communication from the Board Members:

MOTION: by Mrs. Notar-Francesco, seconded by Mrs. Clark:

“Move to add Agenda Item 9.b. ‘Student Expulsions’ to the agenda.”

Motion carried unanimously by voice vote.

Mrs. Queen stated that the Board members have been receiving e-mails both in favor and against the All-Day Kindergarten proposal. She printed them so they could be submitted into the minutes. She only included the ones that were addressed to the Board as a whole or were forwarded to the Board by Dr. Erardi with the permission of the sender. There were 64 individuals who supported the All-Day Kindergarten program and there were seven who wrote against it. Mrs. Notar-Francesco cautioned that there were a multitude of emails received by the Board that did not have any names and addresses included, and they don't know if those people were Southington residents. She thought that those needed to be weeded out.

Mr. Goralski announced that February 21, 2013 is the only Board meeting date in February; however, Dr. Erardi will be at a conference on that date representing the Board of Education on a national level. The meeting will be moved to February 28, 2013 with the blessings of Mrs. Notar-Francesco and Mr. Oshana who will not be able to attend on February 28th. Mr. Goralski noted that February 9, 2013 is the Board Retreat from 8:00 a.m. through noon with the agenda focused on safety and security. It is an Executive Session meeting.

Mr. Goralski noted that the STEPS Advisory Conference is on January 26, 2013 from 8:00 a.m. through 2:00 p.m. at Hawk's Landing.

Mr. Goralski thanked the students, parents, faculty and jumpers who took part in the Polar Plunge at Camp Sloper. He was a jumper along with Mrs. Queen, Dr. Erardi and Mr. Bob Lasbury. The event raised over \$24,000 this year to help children attend camp this summer.

Communication from Administration:

Dr. Erardi reported on the following:

1. Introduction of Mr. Mario Cruz: Dr. Erardi introduced Mr. Mario Cruz who will be doing an internship with him during the second semester of the UConn Education Leadership Program. Mr. Cruz is the Principal at Smalley Academy in New Britain and has had a distinguished career in Vermont and New York.
2. Annual Retreat: Dr. Erardi noted that the Retreat will be held on February 9, 2013 in the Municipal Center Assembly Room starting at 8:30 a.m. with a light continental breakfast through noontime.
3. School Safety: Dr. Erardi stated that there will be a School Safety Forum held on January 29 at 7:00 p.m. in the Derynoski School auditorium for the entire community.
4. Middle School Referendum: Dr. Erardi stated that the Middle School Referendum conversation began today at the Parent Executive Council leadership meeting and at the Calendar House. The information has been well received.
5. State of the Town: Dr. Erardi reported that the State of the Town Address will take place on January 31, 2013 at the Manor Inn at 6:15 p.m.

c. Communication from the Student Representatives:

Miss DiMeo reported on the following:

- The Southington High School National Honor Society is hosting its Annual Movie Night on Thursday, January 31 at 6:30 p.m. The movie is *Toy Story*, for all ages, and refreshments will be served.

Miss Harris reported on the following:

- The midterms were finally over. They were bumped a day due to the snow day and started on Friday. The only problem was that so many people are sick with the flu and colds that there are a lot of make-ups.

7. COMMITTEE REPORTS

a. Curriculum & Instruction Meeting ~ January 15, 2013

Mrs. Carmody reported that representatives from the district Physical Education Department gave an overview of the curriculum. At the elementary level, Ms. Marcia Phelps explained to the committee how they work physical fitness into their everyday lessons, not just into physical education classes. The goal of the program is to create more active movement activities throughout the school day at the elementary level. At the middle school level, each student is measuring how physically fit they are to the end of the year. At the high school, the new Physical Education Department Chair is Mr. David Yanosy, who explained the different programs being offered at the high school. She thanked Ms. Marcia Phelps, Mr. Steven Madancy, Mr. Matthew Lefkowitz, Ms. Lisa Volpe and Mr. Dave Yanosky for their informative presentation on physical fitness within the school system. Mrs. Queen noted that at the high school they are having the students write an essay about physical fitness standards and what they need to do to achieve that, which ties into what Dr. Semmel said about all teachers teaching literacy.

8. OLD BUSINESS

a. Town Government Communications

Mr. Goralski announced that on January 28 the Town Council will be holding their public hearing on the second referendum for the middle schools at 7:00 p.m. in the Municipal Center Assembly Room.

Mr. Goralski stated that the Turf Advisory Committee met last week and that there was a lot of work and cooperation between the Athletic Director, Mr. Swallow, and Mr. Lepreay of the Southington Parks and Recreation Department to make the schedule a reality.

Mr. Goralski reminded the Board that the presentation of the Board of Education budget to the Board of Finance is February 13, 2013.

b. Construction Update

Mr. Cox reported that the PCT (Planning Completion Test) for the Kennedy Middle School project took place on January 15 and that the designers and architects were very well prepared. The next project for review will be for DePaolo Middle School. He did not expect any issues there either.

Mr. Goralski stated that he and Mrs. Clark were very pleased at Tuesday's Building Committee meeting because only 34 items were addressed, which is quite impressive for a project of that magnitude.

Mr. Derynoski asked Mr. Cox the status of the closeout for the South End and Plantsville School projects. Mr. Cox had not heard anything from the state since the last Board meeting, even though he has sent messages to them. He is still awaiting responses. In early December, the state reviewed five Change Orders and approved 50% of the reimbursement on those. Dr. Erardi noted that over five weeks ago a request was made for enhanced reimbursement because of the Hartford Open Choice Program, and they have yet to hear a response on that.

9. NEW BUSINESS

a. Review / Adoption of the 2013-2014 Board of Education Budget

Mrs. DiNello distributed information (*Attachment #2*) that reflected the work of the Board of Education during the two budget workshops where the Board reached consensus on a 3.82% increase. Also included, per the request of some Board members, was a document that was prepared with the Superintendent's input regarding potential additional reductions. This document has not been discussed to date by the full Board.

Dr. Erardi thanked the Board of Education for all their time that they have spent on the budget besides the budget workshops. It is a lengthy process. He believed that whatever the Board decides this evening, they have never lost sight of what is best for children.

Mr. Goralski asked to start the discussion with the All-Day Kindergarten program. Mrs. Carmody stated that she was in full support of All-Day Kindergarten because she wants to give the children the best possible start. She believed that having the children in a classroom with a

teacher for six-hours versus two hours and 40-minutes was tremendously beneficial. The teachers get to know each one of their students and who might need some extra help. Mr. Derynoski agreed and added that it is the right thing to do.

Mrs. Notar-Francesco stated that she has struggled with this because she read the research and it tends to be inconclusive. She had explored what many towns have done, had gone through numerous e-mails, spoken with many educators and was guided by her own experience as a mother. She tried to find the balance of what is the need to change versus the want to have in all of this. She tried to understand why, within Southington, this was necessary. Over the last couple of days she had asked for some academic data because she is data-driven. She received that data in the form of DRA Language Arts data, which indicated that there were almost one-third of our children in Kindergarten not meeting their reading benchmark at the end of the Kindergarten year last year. She felt that was significant. She thanked administration for putting together the parent choice piece, which was important to her. With this, she supported All-Day Kindergarten.

Mr. Oshana struggled with All-Day Kindergarten because the studies are very contradictory. He stated that he was also data-driven. He felt that there was no real evidence out there right now that this works. Mr. Oshana's biggest concern was putting something into place that they don't know whether or not it works. He questioned if they have enough data to put it into place or are they going to end up being part of a guinea pig project. He asked what happens if it does not work? He believed that full-day Kindergarten will come to Southington, and that it belongs here because logic says it is the right thing to do, but his biggest concern is do they have the facts and the data to put it into place properly to make it work. He questioned what the Board would do if the Board of Finance cuts the budget.

Mrs. Johnson stated that this is a huge issue that the Board has been investigating for some time and respected everyone's opinion. One of the things that impressed her the most was an afternoon she spent recently in the classroom of an outstanding Kindergarten teacher. The teacher was doing a wonderful job with the children and the children were very responsive to her classroom management skills. The children were learning and by the end of the day there was not enough time to get everything in. The teacher told Mrs. Johnson that she could do so much more with the students if she had more time. Mrs. Johnson supported All-Day Kindergarten.

Mrs. Clark was in favor of All-Day Kindergarten and would rather give the children the time now than have to remediate later. If they are not getting it at the beginning, and they fall behind then what is going to happen down the road? If they don't get that love for learning in Kindergarten then when are they going to get it? If the Board does not give them the opportunity and that valuable time in Kindergarten, they will not have that opportunity again.

Mrs. Queen was in favor of All-Day Kindergarten and she began this process not sure. She did a lot of in-depth reading and had discussions with people who were both for and against it. She kept focusing on the idea of what was developmentally appropriate and, ironically, those who are against a full-day Kindergarten put forth the argument that it was developmentally inappropriate because of the amount of time, and those who are in favorite of it say that it is developmentally appropriate because of the amount of time. It seems to her that it is not about absolute time, it is how the time is used. She was reassured that the time was going to be used not to extend the current curriculum, but to elongate it throughout the day so that children do not

feel rushed or pressured and can truly develop that love of learning. She was comfortable and very excited about this proposal and endorsed it very strongly.

Mrs. Lombardi stated that she was a full proponent of All-Day Kindergarten. She approached it from the biggest picture and looked from the outside looking in. The outside being anything that she could get her hands on to read. She stated that she was biased because she had two years working in Kindergarten classrooms as part of learning centers, and observing teachers and talking to parents. However, she went on her journey and continued to look at more data and ask for more data. As a parent, she always looked at the curriculum her children were going into to see if it fit them and their learning styles. Within her experience of the curriculum, she could not see the teachers finishing the curriculum. All she saw was a lot of rushing around in order to do it. A classroom did not even have the time to go outside and have 10-minutes of recess without someone telling them they were supposed to be in the classroom. She stated that, if anyone has any questions, she would ask them to spend two hours and 40-minutes in one of the Kindergarten classes. She pointed out that we have waiting lists for the Extended-Day Kindergarten. The Board has fiduciary responsibilities, but also represents the parents of this town who have said overwhelmingly that they want their children in All-Day Kindergarten. She did not think the Board should go before the town with a 3.82% increase and that they need to look at the new data that Dr. Erardi has presented to them to reduce the budget.

Mr. Goralski has always supported All-Day Kindergarten. He pointed out that, when the Board presents the budget to the Board of Finance, it is their responsibility to stand behind it as individuals and as a group before the community. He was excited that the Board appears to support it, but he also shares some of Mr. Oshana's concerns. He felt that education was built on a foundation that has to be solid and that six hours is more solid than two hours and 40-minutes.

Mr. Oshana agreed that once the Board votes on the budget, what is on the budget, it is the Board's budget at that point and whether someone votes for, against, or abstains from this vote, they would have to stand behind it.

Looking at the big picture of the budget, Mrs. Queen thought that they are living in a period of increased expectations, both with curriculum and student achievement. They have the state Common Core Standards coming; she noted that 48 states have adopted these standards, which is national. Theoretically, they are benchmarked to international standards. These are actually world standards that they are trying to meet. They had NEASC come into our high school a couple of years ago and put forth recommendations with the new, resulting leveling program. They have secondary reform coming. At the same time, they have increased expectations of the students and the teachers, and they have increased accountability with the new evaluation plan that is coming. Mrs. Queen felt that it was their job to provide the teachers and the students with the resources that they need to meet these expectations. She understands both federal and state unfunded mandates, but the reality is that, when all is said and done, perhaps the federal and state governments will cut their budgets, but in Southington they still have to educate the students. They want to do it well. She did not think it was good enough to just maintain services. The world is changing, it is pushing, demanding, expecting and evolving and at a minimum Southington needs to keep pace; however, she believed that they need to do more than that. They need to excel and, when students graduate from high school, they are sent out into the world with a competitive edge. She hoped that every community in the country was having the same conversation and the same drive. She had no problem standing up for their

budget. Their priority is to the students and to present the needs so the fiscal entity in the town could look at those needs and do their best to try and fund it.

Mr. Goralski added that Kindergarten represents 1.12% of the increase in the budget; benefits are another 1% of the increase, existing salaries are .5% of the increase, and the next big proposal is technology which is .58% of the increase.

Mr. Oshana addressed technology and how the unemployment rate is so high. He felt part of the problem was they don't have the right skills out in the workforce right now. He thought that technology was critical in preparing students for these jobs. He pointed out that Mrs. Brino addressed the Board about Robotics and that he is trying to hire an automation engineer at his workplace with difficulty because they are not out there. He stated that technology is always changing and that he supported keeping technology in the budget.

Mrs. Clark felt that the Board should be able to replace and get the latest technology in a fiscally responsible way, which is what they are trying to do with this budget. They don't want to wait until the computers are eight or ten-years-old before they are replaced. She felt that they were being very responsible with this Technology Plan.

Mrs. Notar-Francesco felt that the Technology Plan was untouchable and that it was definitely a need versus a want.

Mrs. Queen understood that part of the plan was over time to convert the computers that the district owns to leased computers so that it eventually becomes a stable line item in the budget and that they are continually upgrading the lease process. She felt that the building of the infrastructure, which was making every building Wi-Fi accessible, was essential also. She noted that they want it to happen in one year; however, because of the fiduciary responsibility, they have spread it out over three years. She thought that they were very thoughtful in the way in which they are going about it and they are putting the emphasis on preparing themselves for what is changing, and what is coming, as opposed to investing in something that may be obsolete in a little while.

Mrs. Lombardi pointed out that technology was one of the reasons that she came on the Board. She explained that the Board submitted their Technology Plan to the state over one year ago and it was a great plan. But, they asked themselves if this was the best that they could do. After that conversation, they decided that it was not the best that they could do. They started attending conferences and Mrs. Veilleux was doing research. They found that the technology equipment was well beyond the life of servers and computers, and was eight to ten-years-old. This was the condition they were in for several years, holding the line and doing whatever they could. The infrastructure isn't only for testing; it is needed to teach and to learn. She believed that this was equal to All-Day Kindergarten. She felt the Technology Plan was very responsible for three years.

Mr. Goralski summarized that he sees the Board at a solid, strong belief in 3.2%; however, the budget they have before them right now is 3.82%. They also have a document before them that is some advice from administration, which causes great discomfort to some people.

Mr. Derynoski stated that he felt very uncomfortable with the \$30,000 reduction of new textbooks in classroom libraries because every year they hit that line item and have not supported it over the last three or four years. He felt the other items on the list for reduction were well thought out and he supported them. Mrs. Carmody questioned if the classroom libraries were supported by the PTOs. Mrs. Smith stated that it was a bit complicated and added that they are grateful to have that funding source from PTOs. This request is for informational text and non-fiction materials. She said that it depends upon the PTO and their ability to raise funds through Book Fairs and other means, and depending upon the priority for that particular school building, and the administration working with the PTO. The profit from the proceeds that may have gone to increasing libraries might now have turned to technology or points for certain types of things that can be purchased for the classroom. Because the school equipment accounts have been very small over the years, many schools have opted not to purchase or receive as many books as payment, but equipment instead. Mrs. DiNello pointed out that the New Textbook request was a total of \$202,056 and, at the second workshop, they reduced that request by \$52,000 and that was all coming from classroom libraries. She pointed out that they started out the budget process with just over \$112,000 for classroom libraries, they were down to \$60,444 at the end of Thursday and now with the new document before them they would be looking at cutting that in half by an additional \$30,000. She wanted to make sure the Board was following the history of it over the past two weeks.

Dr. Erardi commented that on the last document that he shared with the Board there is one item that they should parcel out and be comfortable with that is under object code 42200, the Ag-Science reduction of \$31,147. In ongoing conversations that Mrs. DiNello had with the State Board of Education and their Ag-Science division, they were given permission to remove that from the operational plan with no penalty for what they still need in regard to service and equipment. In essence, they were able to take that away and it is actually absorbed into the salary account in Ag-Science without compromising the equipment line item. It is a savings to the Board of \$31,147 without compromising any part of that program. He strongly encouraged the Board to support that item moving forward.

Mrs. Lombardi looked into the Alio employee self-service timesheets and found it a matter of efficiency within the system in terms of running the system and reducing manual time. This is happening for approximately 500 people. She noted that it was all paper that is processed every other week. Mrs. Queen added that also the school principals are spending a chunk of their time reviewing paper and double-checking the math. Mrs. Lombardi continued that there were so many people involved in this process. For \$16,284, there would be process improvement. Her proposal was to relook at that and cut more of the Professional Development by \$15,000 or \$10,000. She noted that they started with Professional Development that went from \$66,000 to \$183,000. They have already cut \$50,000 and she is proposing that they take \$25,000 additional besides the \$15,000 recommended on the list. She thought that they could further cut the SERC training and still leave all the other Professional Development for the middle and elementary schools in order to get the Alio employee self-service timesheets.

Mr. Derynoski was in favor of taking the \$16,000; he was not in favor of cutting the Professional Development. He would prefer to wait with the Alio system and put in a proper system that would be beneficial for a school system of this size. He did not feel that there was a real dollar savings associated with this software. Mrs. DiNello clarified that what they would be saving by going to either system was time for administrators to do other administrative work

rather than processing timesheets and checking math. There are 1,100 employees and a payroll staff of two, who also oversee benefits. She would challenge anyone to go out and find a company that employs 1,100 people and runs a payroll office with two people including benefits. They are looking to streamline the process. It is not going to reduce any overall payroll costs for personnel, but it would free up time. Her main concern was that they may never get to the point where they could fully fund the biometric system. However, there are options to phase that in. She felt that, if the Board was not in favor of moving forward with the Alio self-serve portal, then they should look into phasing in the biometric system. A biometric system is a fingerprint scanner. Mr. Oshana agreed that this was an efficiency that would save a lot of soft time for the administration at the schools. He questioned if they even needed to go to a biometric system and went to a card carrying system instead. The only thing that he would recommend is if they can get this system in place and do it properly the first time. Mrs. DiNello replied that they could look at pricing the cards. The hardware is down to one-third of the cost originally for the fingerprint scanners and her thought on that is a person might not always have the card with them, but they always have a finger for a scanner.

Mrs. Queen did not want to cut anything on the list except the clocks. If they move to BYOD (Bring Your Own Device) then everybody will have the time on their device. She is not in support of cutting Professional Development any further because there are a lot of changes happening and they have to support the teachers. She is looking at what she could agree to cut, not cutting the whole list.

Mrs. Clark had a problem with cutting classroom libraries because she knows how important those are, especially at the elementary level. Other than that, she is going with the wisdom of what the administrators are saying that they can live without for another year.

MOTION: by Mr. Derynoski, (there was no second).

“Move to establish a budget for the 2013-2014 school year at \$85,351,652.”

Mrs. Notar-Francesco noted that the motion would be just putting back in the textbooks and leaving everything else as is on the reduction list. Mrs. DiNello stated that the budget would be 3.53%, adding back the \$30,000 for the classroom libraries.

Mrs. Carmody had a question on the Technology Assistants. She thought that they could take all of them out for this year. Mrs. DiNello explained that they started with 10 part-time staff members, they reduced it to eight, and the proposal on the list in front of the Board would be to have four start at the beginning of the school year and four would begin on January 2. Mr. Goralski stated that would be a \$78,920 reduction. Mrs. Johnson asked for clarification on the Technology Assistants and Analysts. Mrs. DiNello explained that they have five Technology Analysts, and originally Mrs. Veilleux proposed to add 10 part-time Technology Assistants. There is a difference in skill level between an Assistant and Analyst. Mr. Derynoski thought that there was not enough time in the school day to have five Technology Analysts cover all the schools. He thought that the part-time approach was cost effective and there are no benefit implications and it was a need. Mr. Oshana was concerned that, if they have the hardware in the schools and it goes down, they need someone to be there to fix it. Dr. Erardi clarified that administration originally was asking for 10 employees, all part-time, 19 ½ hours. They reduced that to eight employees. Presently, if they start four employees mid-year, from a fiscal

perspective, it is six employees for 19 ½ hours. Administration feels that is critical. The reduction is something that he does not support, but it offers the Board the opportunity to save money. Mrs. Clark looks at these positions as being Tier I and Tier II. The Tier I position is for the everyday problems and the Tier II support would be the “bigger guns” called in to fix what Tier I cannot fix. Her concern was adding the eight employees; she would like to see that cut to five without doing the mid-year thing. She realized the administration sees a need for 10, but she cannot justify that. Mrs. Lombardi would like to drop the number down to four starting the beginning of the school year and going forward. Mrs. DiNello explained that the total cost of four Technology Assistants would be \$39,460 and they were currently budgeting \$78,920, so the reduction would be \$39,460.

Mrs. Queen thought that the Board needed to remember that these cuts are not supported by the administration. She did not think the list was presented as a package deal and she would be more comfortable going item by item on the list. The Board agreed.

Mr. Goralski took a consensus on the list of reductions to the Superintendent’s Budget, as follows:

Technology Assistants:

Reduction changed to four (4) Technology Assistants all year from the beginning of the school year.

Consensus: YES – Mrs. Clark, Mrs. Johnson, Mrs. Carmody, Mrs. Notar-Francesco, Mrs. Lombardi, Mr. Goralski. NO – Mr. Derynoski, Mr. Oshana, Mrs. Queen.

Mrs. DiNello stated that the reduction would change from \$19,728 to \$39,460.

Certified Staff Teacher Leader:

Reduction of Certified Staff Teacher Leader for assisting with evaluations at the elementary level.

Consensus: YES – Mr. Oshana, Mr. Derynoski, Mrs. Lombardi, Mrs. Notar-Francesco, Mrs. Carmody, Mrs. Clark. NO – Mrs. Queen, Mrs. Johnson, Mr. Goralski.

SHS Teacher Specialist:

Dr. Erardi noted that Dr. Semmel was looking to retain two of those four positions for specialists. Presently at the high school there is only one Literacy Specialist. Dr. Semmel was looking for a Math Specialist also. The reduction on the list leaves one left for Dr. Semmel to make a decision on whether he feels math or English would be the place for this specialist.

Consensus: YES – Mrs. Carmody, Mrs. Notar-Francesco, Mrs. Lombardi, Mr. Derynoski, Mrs. Clark, Mrs. Johnson, Mr. Goralski. NO – Mrs. Queen, Mr. Oshana.

Professional Development: Reduction of \$15,000

Consensus: YES – Mrs. Clark, Mrs. Johnson, Mrs. Carmody, Mrs. Lombardi, Mr. Goralski. NO – Mr. Oshana, Mr. Derynoski, Mrs. Queen, Mrs. Notar-Francesco.

Tuition Bank – SEA: This was added in because it was contractual.

New Textbooks – Classroom Libraries:

As a compromise, Mrs. Notar-Francesco would like to reduce it to \$15,000 instead of \$30,000.

Consensus: YES – Mrs. Notar-Francesco, Mr. Derynoski, Mrs. Johnson, Mrs. Lombardi, Mr. Goralski. NO – Mrs. Clark, Mrs. Carmody, Mrs. Queen, Mr. Oshana.

District Software-Data Collection:

Dr. Erardi explained that this was the INFORM software that was shared with the Board that was critical moving forward for data entry to be able to move student records from point A to point B from year to year. In essence, there is nothing on the list that the administration supports cutting, but this would be delayed for one year to work towards a better bottom line for the Board. The consensus is to reduce an item that administration needs by one year.

Consensus: YES – Mrs. Carmody, Mrs. Lombardi, Mr. Derynoski, Mr. Oshana, Mrs. Johnson, Mrs. Clark, Mrs. Notar-Francesco, Mr. Goralski. NO – Mrs. Queen.

Alio Employee Self-Service Timesheets:

Mrs. Clark asked if the Alio timesheets would be obsolete if they went to the fingerprint or the hand scan. Mrs. DiNello replied that, if they leave the \$16,284 in the budget, they would be using an enhanced product with the current Alio system and move to electronic timesheets. It is not a time and attendance system where you are clocking people in and out. It is the honor system, which is used now. Instead of employees filling out timesheets on paper, it would be done electronically. The math would be done electronically. If the Board went with the fingerprint scan, it would make a lot of this obsolete, but a portion of it would still be useable. Mrs. DiNello's preference would either be to do the \$16,284 or phase something in with the time and attendance. If the Board is considering a phase-in, Mrs. DiNello asked that the Board leave somewhere between \$16,000-\$20,000 in the budget so that administration can study it between now and May, and bring to reallocation what the phase-in would look like. Mr. Goralski would like the consensus to be to leave this in with the flexibility to look at what is more efficient for the district, or to take it out.

Mrs. Lombardi asked what the increase was because she wanted to stay within a certain percentage. Mrs. DiNello replied that, if the list stays with all of the consensus items the Board has reached so far, and with the remaining items on the sheet as listed, they are at a \$85,316,920 or a 3.49% increase.

Consensus: ALIO – Leave in – The consensus was unanimously in favor.

Clocks: To take the clocks out or to leave them in.

Consensus: The consensus was unanimous to take it out.

Furniture Replacement – Office:

Consensus: The consensus was unanimous to take it out.

Mrs. DiNello stated that the Board was at \$85,333,204 for a 3.51% increase.

The Board took a recess from 9:30 to 9:45 p.m.

Mrs. Smith thanked the Board members who have indicated that they value the recommended proposal for All-Day Kindergarten. She valued the Board members who feel that

they would like more data or more evidence because she tends to be that way herself. She wanted, on the record, a couple of added pieces of data that perhaps the Board was not aware of because she only finished collecting this data at 4:45 p.m. this afternoon. She personally contacted every community within our DRG D by a telephone call and spoke to a knowledgeable individual in every single one of the 23 towns (24 including Southington). She asked if they have All-Day Kindergarten. The replies were as follows: YES: Berlin, Bethel, Branford, Clinton, Colchester (they have some now by a lottery system, it is going well and they are making a budget proposal for the rest for next year), Cromwell, East Granby, East Hampton (they have one full-day class and three half-day classes with the goal of all of their classes being full-day next year), East Lyme, Ledyard, Mildford, New Milford, Newington, North Haven, Old Saybrook (for many years), Rocky Hill (it is a pilot this year with the hope to make it permanent next year), Stonington, Waterford, Windsor, , Watertown (Yes, partially with parents paying, but discussing including full-day at Board of Education expense next year or the year after), Wethersfield. NO: Wallingford (not yet), Shelton. PROPOSED: Southington.

Mrs. Smith thought that this data was important and, if she had thought of it, she would have asked if it was successful. She noted that the districts were tremendously optimistic about the potential of what the data is going to show them as well. Mrs. Smith explained that for the last two weeks she had been in two Kindergarten classrooms to teach. She had the opportunity to implement the Common Core Standards for Kindergarten in English and language arts in two hours 40 minutes in Mrs. Rose Risser's class, and two hours 40 minutes in Mrs. Paula Gorham's class. She was amazed at her pacing and how slow it was. It was slow because of content of what was expected via that lesson plan to accomplish in those two hours 40 minutes. She found that what she was doing was not helping the children academically at all because she wanted to spend the entire time listening to what they were trying to tell her, but she had to keep moving on to the next activities. She acknowledged that the Kindergarten classroom of today is different and the data that she has seen shows that there has been major changes in the requirements of the Kindergarten program. While the State of Connecticut Department of Education does not mandate half-day Kindergarten, they do mandate that the Kindergarten children leave at a DRA level 4. She questioned how they could have one without the other.

MODIFIED MOTION: by Mr. Derynoski, seconded by Mrs. Notar-Francesco:

“Move to establish a budget for the 2013-2014 school year at \$85,333,204.”

Mr. Oshana felt that it was important that they recognize this is the Board's budget when it ultimately gets done. He thought that All-Day Kindergarten would come to Southington; however, he still had some concerns that the studies don't show. He appreciated the data from Mrs. Smith. He thought that it would be interesting to see where were they and where are they now in terms of how the students are doing for those school districts who are one or two years into it. The Board needs to make sure that they provide the best possible budget to educate the students for their best possible future. Right now, he has an issue supporting full-day Kindergarten. However, he does not have an issue supporting the rest of the budget and he does believe that full-day Kindergarten should come to Southington at some point. He did not want the school system to be a guinea pig. He was not going to vote 'no,' but he was not prepared to vote 'yes' either.

Mrs. Queen agreed that the budget is the Board's budget and she voted 'no' to almost all of the cuts they made tonight having felt that all the cuts they made throughout all the budget workshops were sufficient. She will support the budget as a whole because she is one-ninth of the Board. She felt that they eliminated a lot of what was proposed and what they were told was needed to move forward as a district. She felt that there was not room for any more cuts in this budget. Now, the Board has to really push hard that this budget does not get cut any further because they have eliminated over \$1 million out of the original proposed Superintendent's budget and that did not even reflect needs that were expressed prior to that point, which the Board never saw. She will vote to support this budget, but she felt that this was as far as the Board could go in reductions.

ROLL CALL VOTE: YES – Mr. Derynoski, Mrs. Johnson, Mrs. Lombardi, Mrs. Notar-Francesco, Mrs. Queen, Mrs. Carmody, Mrs. Clark, Mr. Goralski. ABSTAIN: Mr. Oshana.
Motion carried with eight in favor and one abstention.

b. Student Expulsions

MOTION: by Mrs. Notar-Francesco, seconded by Mr. Derynoski:

“Move to expel student 2012-2013-06 as stipulated by the Superintendent of Schools.”

Motion carried unanimously by voice vote.

MOTION: by Mrs. Notar-Francesco, seconded by Mr. Derynoski:

“Move to expel student 2012-2013-07 as stipulated by the Superintendent of Schools.”

Motion carried unanimously by voice vote.

12. ADJOURNMENT

MOTION: by Mrs. Notar-Francesco, seconded by Mrs. Clark:

“Move to adjourn.”

Motion carried unanimously by voice vote.

The meeting adjourned at 9:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Linda Blanchard
Recording Secretary

SOUTHINGTON BOARD OF EDUCATION
SOUTHINGTON, CONNECTICUT

EXECUTIVE SESSION
JANUARY 24, 2013

Board Members Present: Mrs. Terri Carmody, Mrs. Colleen Clark, Mr. David Derynoski, Mrs. Patricia Johnson, Mrs. Terry Lombardi, Mrs. Jill Notar-Francesco, Mr. Zaya Oshana, Mrs. Patricia Queen, and Mr. Brian Goralski.

Administration Present: Dr. Joseph V. Erardi, Jr., Superintendent of Schools, and Mrs. Karen Smith, Assistant Superintendent.

1. CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Brian Goralski, Board Chairperson, called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

2. EXECUTIVE SESSION FOR STUDENT EXPULSIONS AND RESIDENCY

MOTION: by Mr. Derynoski, seconded by Mrs. Notar-Francesco:

“Move to go into Executive Session, excluding the public and the press, for the purpose of discussing Student Expulsions and Residency, and upon conclusion reconvene to public session.”

Motion carried unanimously by voice vote.

The Board went into Executive Session at 7:02 p.m.

MOTION: by Mr. Derynoski, seconded by Mrs. Clark:

“Move to reconvene into public session.”

Motion carried unanimously by voice vote.

The Board exited Executive Session and recessed at 7:25 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Jill Notar-Francesco, Secretary
Southington Board of Education

**MIDDLE SCHOOLS BUILDING COMMITTEE
JOINT MEETING WITH BOARD OF EDUCATION
JANUARY 14, 2013**

MINUTES

BRIAN GORALSKI, Chairman of the Board of Education, called the meeting to order at 5:09 p.m. at the Municipal Center, 200 North Main Street, Southington, Connecticut with the following members in attendance: Terri Carmody, Colleen Clark, David Derynoski, Patricia Johnson, Jill Notar-Francesco, Patricia Queen. Absent were Terry Lombardi and Zaya Oshana. Mr. Goralski stated both are well informed and in support of what happens tonight.

EDWARD POCOCK, JR., Chairman of the Building Committee, called the meeting to order at 5:10 p.m. with the following in attendance: Venard Chanski, Colleen Clark, Brian Goralski, Christopher Palmieri, Melissa Sheffy.

Also in attendance: Mark J. Sciota, Deputy Town Manager/Town Attorney
Dr. Joseph Erardi, Superintendent of Schools
Fred Cox, Board of Education
Angela Cahill, Fletcher Thompson
Tom DiMauro, Newfield Construction
Barry Blades, Blades & Goven

A quorum was determined.

Several members of the public were in attendance.

Mr. Goralski deferred leadership on the agenda to Edward Pocock, Chairman of the Building Committee.

Christopher Palmieri presented an overview of the project, where it stands today and where it goes from here in a power point presentation (attached hereto). In addition, he stated through the combined efforts of Deputy DEEP Commissioner McCleary and Congressman John Larson's office a phone conference was held today with himself, Attorney Sciota, Rudy Brown, Congressional Liaison, Dr. Chow, Regional Coordinator's Office and Kim Tisa from the Region 1 EPA office. He reported as long as conditions remain the same with the air quality, it will be recommended maintaining the vapor barrier in all non-construction areas. All areas that will be under construction will be remediated. To grant this exception, annual air quality tests will be required for ten years after construction is completed. Jim Twitchell from Hygenix estimates the cost for testing to be \$7,700 for both schools, significantly less than having to remove the vapor barrier.

The project total is over the \$85 million originally approved. The amount needed is now \$89,715,347. Original state reimbursement would have been 52.52% due to square footage overage. Plan revisions made through value engineering reduced square footage, now there will be no penalty for square footage overage and state reimbursement will be 56.07%. Also, because Southington is part of the Open Choice program at the elementary level, by the time the project is complete these students will be middle school age and we can take advantage of a Choice participation rate between 2-3%. This will help offset the 2% estimated ineligible miscellaneous items budgeted. Therefore, though the project cost has increased by \$4,715,347, Southington's share has decreased by an expected range of \$946,048-\$1,843,202.

A Special Referendum has been scheduled on March 19, 2013 at Derynoski Elementary School from 6:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m.

3/4. Presentation by Fletcher Thompson for DePaolo Middle School and Kennedy Middle School plans and specifications to be submitted to the State of Connecticut.

Angela Cahill of Fletcher Thompson asked the Building Committee and Board of Education for approval to move forward with the project and for her to submit documents to State Bureau of School Facilities at a PCT tomorrow morning which will enable state funding for a portion of the project. She asked Barry Blades, of Blades & Goven Landscape Architects to give a presentation on the site plans.

Mr. Blades shared the plans for Kennedy which are the same plans shown for the approval process with Planning and Zoning. The vast majority of site improvements were traffic circulation, adding additional parking, the bus loop, parent drop off with one way drive in. The majority of staff parking is in one location, one directional drop off area for special education buses. The athletic fields will be maintained where they are now. The extent of improvements consists of code requirements with accessibility to infields, and replacing paved play area and basketball courts in back of school.

Mrs. Johnson stated residents living on the north side of property on Werking St. were concerned with lighting and privacy as their yards back up to the property, how has this been addressed? Mr. Blades stated property has been purchased adding to the school property creating an additional buffer. A double row of arborvitaes will provide stronger screening and he proposes the planting occur early in the project to allow for an additional growing period. Chain link fencing will be replaced, lighting plans will help cut glare and will be oriented away from adjacent residences.

Mrs. Johnson asked how the student drop off and staff entry will be managed? Mr. Blades stated student drop off will have an outbound exit only, staff will proceed to parking in the back. All exits outbound will provide both right and left turn maneuver at that driveway.

Mr. Derynoski asked how the exit/entrance on south side of property would be maintained. Mr. Blades stated essentially, what is shown will be maintained as is with very few modifications, one way in and one way out.

Mr. Blades next presented the DePaolo site which was more of a challenge because of the amount of land that the athletic fields take up. A different design approach was used handling the circulation of parking and he tried to use the same strategy for separating vehicles. A dedicated bus loop for drop off and pick up will have some visitor parking on the interior of bus loop with restrictions not allowing use during certain times of the day. Staff will be using parking area on the north. Athletic field improvements have same code requirements with accessibility to ball fields. Back of building will have paved play area and basketball courts.

Mrs. Johnson asked if the path from the school to Pleasant St. would be maintained. Mr. Blades stated it would and will be used as part of accessibility.

Ms. Cahill gave her presentation. She stated the buildings are identical and staff and administrators were very accommodating during the design and development period to give solutions as similar as possible. Actual floor plans apply to both DePaolo and Kennedy. The PCT scheduled for tomorrow is on Kennedy, the PCT on DePaolo is in two weeks. Through great team work, a 6,000 square footage reduction was accomplished through value engineering without impacting the educational program and maintaining the ed specs. A rendering of the plans was shown with both the renovations and new classroom additions. Very detailed sections showing how contractors will construct walls, interior elevations showing all millwork and required materials. Three dimensional views showed the addition to the education wing, the media center which is a critical aesthetic feature, along with an image under the canopy in front of the building, which give the buildings a state of the art feel and a brand new look. She was prepared to sit with the state tomorrow.

Mr. Goralski stated since the last presentation to the Board of Education and Planning and Zoning took place, minor changes have taken place and asked Ms. Cahill to address those changes. Ms. Cahill stated a discussion was had on collaborative faculty space to make the most of the footprint. It was decided to split the two business labs rather than keep them adjacent, one is now located in the tech ed wing, one adjacent to a multi-purpose classroom. A centralized area on the second floor will house the two art rooms which will be adjacent to each other as they will share a kiln. The addition to the cafeteria and faculty dining were deleted and the food service area was redesigned to meet program needs.

Mr. Palmieri asked if the district coordinators office had been moved as it is not part of the everyday operations of the school. Ms. Cahill stated it could be switched with the speech room as it is the same square footage.

5. Report from Construction Manager on plans and specifications to be submitted to the State of Connecticut

Mr. DiMauro of Newfield Construction presented a Construction Document Estimate Summary totaling \$89,592,643 (attached hereto). With the proposed referendum of \$4,725,000, the total estimated project costs came in \$132,357 under budget. Soft costs which are not considered construction costs differed slightly. Soft costs for DePaolo are \$5,340,615 and Kennedy are \$5,600,954, for a total of \$10,941,569. Estimate contingencies listed at 3%, escalation contingency at .75%, construction manager contingency at 2%. A construction contingency, for any unforeseen expenses, listed at 6.5%. List of Alternates, which can be accepted or not at bidding, controls what you get in buildings, (i.e., air handling units) and will try to get the same for both schools. Additional security cameras are included as well as a flooring alternative to control bidding.

Attorney Sciota asked Mr. DiMauro if he was comfortable with the contingencies. Both he and Ms. Cahill stated yes.

6. Questions and Comments

1. Arthur Cyr asked Fletcher & Thompson to speak on the new administrative suites, entrance security, as it is much different from both schools today.

Ms. Cahill stated her firm started to implement a different approach to security after Columbine and she was pleased that Southington thought the same way and had a clear vision from the start of this project. Once school begins, all exterior perimeter doors will be locked and there will be no entrance unless buzzed in. Both schools will have vestibules, and once buzzed in, visitors must enter the administrative offices before proceeding into the school; administration controls visitors in the building. The greatest feature of the administrative offices is the visibility with a clear view of the main entrance, bus loop, and the ability to see people before buzzing them in.

Mr. Pocock asked about glass doors and changing the style of the front entrance doors. Ms. Cahill stated they continue to work with administration on that issue.

2. Tony Casale member of the Board of Finance, asked someone to speak on the remediation process, what takes place and when and also how security will be handled during the construction process.

Mr. DiMauro stated the hazmat abatement will be done primarily in two summers as well as school vacations. Not much can be done when students are in session. Background checks and a badging system have been proposed for construction workers. Mrs. Sheffy stated workers will be completely separated from students inside the school, including use of bathrooms.

3. Sandra Feld, asked what assurances they have regarding the state contribution and when will Southington know what the state contribution will be.

Mr. Palmieri stated he has spoken with Representative Zoni and Representative Aresimowicz and they are well of aware of our concerns and are very close to this issue. Although they can't guarantee it, they know what we need from state funding.

Mr. Goralski stated as with all building projects the Board of Education is the contact for the entire delegation. They had a legislative breakfast last week and one of the key topics was middle school funding and the best they could do to assist us with that. We anticipate 56%. We are waiting to close out South End and Plantsville School and some work from this project could potentially result in additional savings for Southington because, for example, Open Choice seats. Mr. Palmieri spoke earlier of this project costing less to the Southington community vs. what we did in the original referendum and part of that is Open Choice which we in Southington are seeing in the close out potential with Plantsville and South End. So the true dollar value to our community won't occur until the project is complete and closed out with the state, before you today are the estimates from our experts.

Mr. Palmieri stated this will be presented to the Town Council tonight and Board of Finance on Wednesday night. The legislative delegation will be at the next Town Council meeting two weeks from tonight where he plans on sharing with them his concern to make sure funding is intact.

Mr. Derynoski asked if the agreement with the EPA is to conduct air testing for the next ten years, does it end after that or go on forever and would those funds come from the Board of Education budget? Mr. Palmieri stated in speaking with Jim Twitchell of Hygenix, the EPA could apply for an extension and go beyond, however, there is potential to reduce the amount if, after three years the air samples come back very good, we could petition to have them done bi-annually rather than annually. This is still significantly cheaper than the millions it would cost to take down the vapor barrier. The funds would come from the Board of Education budget, not the building project.

Mr. Goralski stated that Mr. Cox reminded the committee this is similar to radon testing, and once the project is done becomes an operational expense. Mr. Twitchell has stated the cost of environmental testing such as this tend to go down over time as more labs do them, and can anticipate the same cost or better.

Mrs. Sheffy spoke to clarify the schedule and stated construction workers would not mix in with the student or staff population and to keep the project on schedule Newfield had to be creative to keep up with deadlines.

Mr. DiMauro stated this is an aggressive schedule with nine stages of construction. To accommodate the amount of remediation, double shifts will be running over both summers at both schools starting in the summer of 2013 to begin PCB abatement. The first ten months will work on construction additions and some interior renovations. Real interior renovations will begin in April, 2014 and he is working with administrators to minimize the impact on teaching.

7. Vote on plans and specifications for DePaolo Middle School to be submitted to the State of Connecticut.

Upon a motion by Mr. Chanski and seconded by Mr. Palmieri, a roll call vote was taken:

Chanski-YES, Clark-YES, Fortier-YES, Goralski-YES, Sheffy-YES, Palmieri-YES, Pocock-YES

Motion passed unanimously, 7-0.

8. Vote on plans and specifications for Kennedy Middle School to be submitted to the State of Connecticut.

Upon a motion by Mr. Chanski and seconded by Mr. Palmieri, a roll call vote was taken:

Chanski-YES, Clark-YES, Fortier-YES, Goralski-YES, Sheffy-YES, Palmieri-YES, Pocock-YES

Motion passed unanimously, 7-0.

Mr. Goralski, Chairman of the Board of Education, moved to approve plans and specifications for DePaolo Middle School.

Upon a motion by Mrs. Clark and seconded by Mrs. Carmody, a roll call vote was taken:

Carmody-YES, Clark-YES, Derynoski-YES, Johnson-YES, Notar-Francesco-YES, Queen-YES, Goralski-YES

Motion passes unanimously, 7-0.

Mr. Goralski, Chairman of the Board of Education, moved to approve plans and specifications for Kennedy Middle School.

Upon a motion by Mrs. Clark and seconded by Mrs. Carmody, a roll call vote was taken:

Carmody-YES, Clark-YES, Derynoski-YES, Johnson-YES, Notar-Francesco-YES, Queen-YES, Goralski-YES

Motion passes unanimously, 7-0.

Board of Education meeting adjourned at 6:00 p.m.

9. Adjournment of Building Committee Meeting

Upon a motion by Mr. Palmieri and seconded by Mrs. Clark and voted unanimously on voice vote, meeting adjourned at 6:01 p.m.

Submitted

Edward Pocock, Jr.
Chairman

**ADJUSTMENTS TO
SUPERINTENDENT'S BUDGET
2013-2014**

SUPERINTENDENT'S BUDGET

\$86,450,290 4.87%

ACCOUNT NO.	ADDITION / REDUCTION	ACCOUNT TITLE	\$ AMOUNT
	Reduction	<u>Anticipated Turnover</u> <i>An estimate of 10 teachers was used in the development of the budget and as of 1/15/13 we have 14 retirements. The additional 4 results in an increased savings.</i>	(140,120)
33800	Addition	<u>Tuition Magnet Schools</u> <i>Preschool magnet tuitions were not included in this account because SDE was covering the costs due to the outcome of a lawsuit filed by many districts. The General Assembly passed a interim deficit mitigation plan on 12/19/12 that resulted in local district once again be legally obligated to pay the cost.</i>	14,960

PROPOSED CHANGES

(\$125,160)

TOTAL ADJUSTED SUPERINTENDENT'S OPERATING BUDGET

\$86,325,130 4.72%

**ADJUSTMENTS TO
SUPERINTENDENT'S BUDGET
2013-2014**

Consensus Adjustments from Workshop #2

ACCOUNT NO.	ADDITION / REDUCTION	ACCOUNT TITLE	\$ AMOUNT	
		<u>New Personnel-Tier II</u>		
	Reduction	Certified Staff	(162,450)	
	Reduction	Noncertified Staff	(73,312)	
	Reduction	Tutors moved back grants	(103,740)	
				(339,502)
	Reduction	<u>Salaries-Turnover</u>		
		Certified Teachers & Administrators	(150,120)	
				(150,120)
		<u>Purchased Services</u>		
31200	Reduction	Professional development	(50,000)	
32316	Reduction	All other contracts	(4,150)	
				(54,150)
		<u>Supplies</u>		
41420	Reduction	Operation of Vehicle	(4,000)	
42100	Reduction	Textbook Replacement	(11,483)	
42200	Reduction	New Textbooks	(52,056)	
43100	Reduction	Library Books	(14,180)	
46200	Reduction	New Athletic Equipment	(1,500)	
				(83,219)
		<u>Equipment</u>		
54100	Reduction	Line Striper	(3,495)	
54100	Reduction	Automatic floor scrubber	(6,927)	
				(10,422)
		<u>Special Education</u>		
83337	Reduction	Professional Development	(2,000)	
	Reduction	Change in Special ed programming	(102,000)	
				(104,000)

Suggested Reduction Sub-total

(\$741,413)

**TOTAL ADJUSTED SUPERINTENDENT'S OPERATING BUDGET
AFTER WORKSHOP #2**

85,583,717 3.82%

**ADJUSTMENTS TO
SUPERINTENDENT'S BUDGET
2013-2014**

Additional budget adjustments to be discussed 1/24/13

ACCOUNT NO.	ADDITION / REDUCTION	ACCOUNT TITLE	\$ AMOUNT	
		<u>New Personnel-Tier I</u>		
	Reduction	Certified Staff		
		Teacher Leader	(46,060)	
	Reduction	Noncertified Staff	(19,728)	
		Technology Assistants (start 4 on 1/1/14)		(65,788)
		<u>Existing Staff reassignment (K proposal)</u>		
	Reduction	SHS Teacher Specialist	(46,060)	
				(46,060)
		<u>Purchased Services</u>		
31200	Reduction	Professional Development	(15,000)	
	Addition	Tuition Bank- SEA	20,000	
				5,000
		<u>Supplies</u>		
42200	Reduction	New Textbooks-classroom libraries	(30,000)	
				(30,000)
		<u>Special Budgets</u>		
		Vocational Agriculture (acct TBD)	(31,147)	
				(31,147)
		<u>Special Project</u>		
70000	Reduction	District Software-Data collection	(37,083)	
70000	Reduction	ALIO employee self service-timesheets	(16,284)	
				(53,367)
		<u>Major Projects and Equipment</u>		
	Reduction	Clocks	(34,278)	
	Reduction	Furniture Replacement-office	(6,425)	
				(40,703)
Suggested Reduction Sub-total				
				<u>(\$262,065)</u>
				<u>85,321,652</u>
				3.50%

Proce comparison for Electronic Time Sheet vs. Electronic Time Attendance System

Alio self serv portal with electronic time sheets-2013-14 budget request	16,284.00
--	-----------

Quote for:

TimeCentre (Vendor)

Time & Attendance system hardware, software, training & licensing	29,820.00
Server purchase-Have yet to determine if we would need to purchase	5,000.00
Alio Interface cost & training	6,000.00
	<hr/>
	40,820.00

Annual maintenance costs	3,000.00
--------------------------	----------

Comparisons:

Milford implemented time and attendance with TimeCentre back in 2010	98,996.00
Annual maintenance costs	3,756.00

Wallingford implemented with Time Clock Plus in 2005	117,658.00
Annual maintenance costs	10,882.00