

SOUTHINGTON BOARD OF EDUCATION

SOUTHINGTON, CONNECTICUT

REGULAR MEETING

AUGUST 26, 2010

The regular meeting of the Southington Board of Education was held on Thursday, August 26, 2010 at 7:30 p.m. in the Carl M. Small Regional Vocational Agriculture Center, 700 Pleasant Street, Southington, Connecticut.

At 7:20 p.m., in Celebration of Excellence, Dr. Erardi announced that Sandra VanValkenburgh was this year's State President of the Alpha Delta Kappa International Organization for Women Educators. Mrs. Joyce McAloon, President-elect of the Southington Chapter, introduced her colleagues in attendance (Sue Ross, Cheryl Robertson, Linda Lindsay, Joyce Frederick, Beverly Mazur, Trish Kenefick, Sandra VanValkenburgh and Dale Riedinger) representing the Alpha Gamma Chapter, which is part of Connecticut's Alpha Delta Kappa Organization. Their chapter, which is comprised of 30 teachers from Southington, presented two "World Understanding" books to the principals of each of the 11 schools in Southington. Mr. Goralski presented a Certificate of Excellence to the Southington Chapter of Alpha Delta Kappa for their gift to the students of Southington.

The second Celebration of Excellence was the recognition of the Reuben E. Thalberg Foundation for their generous gift to the Southington Public Schools in excess of \$200,000 to allow 22 Grade 5 classrooms and 18 Grade 4 classrooms to be equipped with an LCD Projector, document camera, and a SMART Board. Dr. Erardi introduced the Foundation members present who were Genevieve Thalberg, Joe Angelillo, Ralph Ingriselli, Stuart Bowen, and Nadine Britton. Mr. Goralski presented a Certificate of Excellence to the Foundation for this very generous gift that will affect current and future students. Mrs. Genevieve Thalberg stated that their greatest joy is to see so many benefitting from the gift.

1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 7:45 p.m. by Chairperson, Mr. Brian Goralski. Board members present were Mrs. Terri Carmody, Mrs. Colleen Clark, Mr. David Derynoski, Mrs. Rosemarie Fischer, Mrs. Patricia Johnson, Mrs. Jill Notar-Francesco, Mrs. Kathleen Rickard, and Ms. Michelle Schroeder.

Present from the administration were Dr. Joseph Erardi, Jr., Superintendent of Schools; Mr. Howard Thiery, Assistant Superintendent; Mrs. Sherri DiNello, Director of Business and Finance; Mr. Frederick Cox, Director of Operations and Ms. Frances Haag, Senior Special Education Coordinator.

2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Mr. Brian Goralski led the meeting with the Pledge of Allegiance.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES ~ JULY 8, 2010

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

“Move to approve the minutes of the regular meeting of July 8, 2010.”

ROLL CALL VOTE: YES – Mrs. Carmody, Mrs. Clark, Mr. Derynoski, Mrs. Notar-Francesco, Ms. Schroeder, Mrs. Johnson, Mr. Goralski. ABSTAIN: Mrs. Fischer, Mrs. Rickard. **Motion carried with seven in favor and two abstentions.**

4. COMMUNICATIONS

a. Communications from Audience

Mrs. Trish Kenefick, 49 Humiston Brook, thanked the administration for a motivating Convocation. She asked the Board to take the challenge for the top 10%-15% of the middle school students that need enrichment programming. The elementary students have enrichment programming, but the middle school was cut. The Gifted Program, especially at the middle school, is a haven for many students. It is where they fit in. She stated that Jill Chapman, a wonderful representative for Teacher of the Year, made an unforgettable speech at the Convocation when she spoke of her first year in her new job and noticed that many students read, but did not have a love for it. She stated that Jill Chapman noted that she worked with a student who was a non-reader and, after her mentoring, he not only could read but he loved reading. Mrs. Kenefick reflected back to her Gifted and Talented classes and felt that people think these students do not have special emotional and intellectual needs. She acknowledged that they do. They need special mentoring, additional challenges, and an opportunity to be with like-learners. These students have the high ability to do all of their class work, all of their projects, all of their homework and meet all the extra challenges that are offered to them in the Gifted Program. She stated that the Board had the opportunity to attend the Open House and listen to the students discuss, like experts and in detail, their extensive research. They have also excelled in the State Lego Competition and have been top winners. They have also been top winners in the Connecticut Stock Market Game, which encompasses over 600 teams throughout the state of Connecticut. She looked at the top students who graduated from the high school and she felt that she did her job. She taught them to love learning. They were offered an opportunity at the middle school to excel for the love of learning and it continued throughout high school. Almost every top student who graduated was in the Gifted Program. Mrs. Kenefick stated that the Board took away the opportunity for all the middle school children and asked them to use a small portion of the over \$1,000,000 dollars that will be given to the Board of Education for teachers and programming. She understood that more teachers retired than the 10 that Mrs. DiNello had anticipated in the budget for the year. She pointed out that teachers did not take a raise this year so that jobs and programs could be saved. She stated that she wrote to the Board all summer, along with her gifted students and their parents. She could not understand how the Board could not listen to the heartfelt letters of her students. To her, this is what education and the Board of Education was about. She hoped that they would reconsider and reinstate this program before Monday.

Michelle Brennan, 1487 East Street stated she came to the Board of Education on June 10, 2010 to express her concern with the size of the Grade 3 class for 2010-2011 at Hatton School. She had been in communication with the Board and Mr. Thiery's office monitoring the class size. She noted that the class size has increased to 49 children from the 48 projected as of May 11, 2010. She was very concerned with the size of the class at 26 and 23 students. She stated that these types of numbers are going to make for a very difficult learning year for the children. The incoming Grade 4 at Hatton has also been combined into two sections from three sections. This phenomenal class scored 100% on a few of the CMT sections. She also knew that this class finished their regular curriculum work in a very timely fashion. She would like to see the incoming Grade 3 class given the benefit of the smaller class size knowing that they are a very different class. Given the demands on the teachers and the students during their first CMT year, she would like to think that a smaller class size would be a true benefit. She thought that it would bring Hatton in line with the other schools in the district where she believed they have three sections, although she does not have current grid numbers. She realizes that this was a difficult financial year, but she is also very passionate about her children's education. She would appreciate the Board's consideration in this matter and would like to see three Grade 3 sections at Hatton School for 2010-2011.

b. Communications from Board Members and Administration

Communication from the Board Members:

Mrs. Rickard asked Dr. Erardi if the Lego League, Stock Market Game and newspaper were going to continue for the middle school students in an after school capacity. Dr. Erardi replied that was correct.

Mrs. Fischer asked if the Board ever considered parent volunteers helping at the middle school level. Mr. Thiery replied that Dr. Erardi directed him in the early summer to put together for this fall a committee to look at enrichment opportunities at the middle schools. It would include the Lego League, and Stock Market Game along with the newspaper and other opportunities such as math competitions, and student quiz bowls. They are in communication with the State Judicial Department regarding their mock trial program. He has just begun to put their committee together and has a couple parent representatives on the committee who brought that forward. He thought that they were a tremendous resource and that committee needs to look at the opportunity for parents to come in to offer support and enrichment. He stated that one member of the committee has been very successful as a mathematician and has done a lot with math enrichment at her elementary school. Her children will now be attending middle school. He felt that parent volunteers were a potential that they need to tap.

Mrs. Notar-Francesco asked if they would be looking at Gifted and Talented at the Curriculum Committee level. Mr. Goralski asked that it be called Project Discover because that is what it was really named. Mr. Thiery replied that the program is Project Discover and that the auspices in the State is certainly Gifted and Talented, which is the designation for it. He replied that they would absolutely be looking at it. Mrs. Carmody had already spoke to him tonight about the first agenda and indicated that she wanted an update on Gifted and Talented services, which would include Project Discover at the elementary schools and enrichment growth at the middle schools as well as the high school. In the past, they had conversations about the

comprehensiveness of high school offerings. They want to make sure that the opportunities that were there continue to be fostered such as the Coffee House, Boys' and Girls' State and things that were under the auspices of the former Gifted and Talented Program. Mrs. Notar-Francesco asked him if that was his intention to do exactly that and find a way to continue opportunities for these students. Mr. Thiery replied that their hope would be to continue to have a diverse and comprehensive offering for children.

Mr. Goralski reported that Mrs. Albaitis, Executive Assistant to Dr. Erardi, asked him to remind the Board before the first PTO meeting to contact her and update their "Adopt-a-School" to make sure they have coverage for all the schools. He asked the Board members to contact her between now and September 9. Mrs. Notar-Francesco asked Dr. Erardi about putting Project Choice on the "Adopt-a-School" schedule. Dr. Erardi replied that on September 9 Administration was planning to bring an update to the Board meeting. He stated that the program continues to evolve as they have the privilege to educate 17 youngsters. He would update the Board at the next meeting on how the school year had begun at Plantsville and South End with the Project Choice students. He would like a liaison from the School Board to oversee the program at-large.

Mr. Goralski announced that he heard from the girls' volleyball coach, Mr. Heinz, and for the eighth year in a row, they are being recognized for their team's academic excellence. Mr. Goralski added that they deserve accolades for continuing to excel in academics. Dr. Erardi stated that he had planned to ask the volleyball team and their coaching staff to be part of the Celebration of Excellence in September.

Communication from Administration:

Dr. Erardi discussed the following (*Attachment #1*):

1. Administrative Institute - 2010: Mr. Thiery reported that he has done this for three years in a row now. He ran a two-day Administrative Institute for the leadership team that is funded by the Connecticut Center for School Change and the Graustein Foundation in cooperation with the Harvard School of Leadership, which is the SIIP Grant, the Systemic Instructional Improvement Grant. This work is all grant-funded. For the third year in a row, they continued to focus on the attributes of leadership. Last year's focus was on accountability and this year it was accountability, but also sustainability. They looked at how to sustain the work that has been put into place. He put together a booklet for the Board members to peruse with the agenda, PowerPoint, and the articles that the group was asked to read. He stated that he heard from the Connecticut Center for School Change and CAPPS (the Superintendents' Association in the State) that this particular program had been put forward to them by a Connecticut Center for School Change member as a model for Leadership Institutes in the state. The liaison who attended Southington's session, and has attended numerous sessions across the state, felt that Southington's stood out compared to the others and she felt that it needed to be submitted as a model for other districts to follow. Southington's program will be looked at as a model for Leadership Institutes for the other school districts in Connecticut.

2. Federal Funding: Jobs Legislation: Dr. Erardi reported that the present dollar figure that is expected from the Federal Legislation Job Fund Bill was \$1.16 million. He stated that he would never complain about \$1.16 million; however, he thought it important to remind the School Board that the present level of Education Cost Sharing (ECS Grant) is being subsidized at a 14% rate by the ARRA money from two years ago. For Southington, that represents approximately \$2.8 million that stabilized ECS over the past two years and that ends at the close of this year. Not known is what happens with the November election and how the newly elected officials would look at the ECS Grant and formula. He felt that it was vitally important to balance what could be a \$2.8 million shortfall with a \$1.16 million federal funding stream. At this time, he believed that for the next 27 months the intent of the federal legislation is to bring back and restore jobs for this school year. Local school boards have the option to do that with a combination of restoration and looking at fiscal 2011-2012. The expectation of the check should be some time in October. However, local Boards of Education have been authorized to go forward if they do plan to spend money this year and to do that now.
3. BOE/School Liaison: 2010-2011: Dr. Erardi reported that Mr. Goralski already spoke to this.
4. Building Tour – Opening Day: Dr. Erardi announced that the annual tour was scheduled for August 30 and would start at the high school at 7:15 a.m. before the buses arrive. He asked the Board members to contact Mrs. Albaitis if they will be attending.
5. Breakfast Program: Mrs. DiNello announced that, through donations and partnership with Bread for Life, they are expanding the Breakfast Program to all the elementary schools this school year. Last year, Flanders, Derynoski and Thalberg Schools were piloted and they will begin the Breakfast Program on Tuesday, September 7. The remaining five elementary schools will begin the following Monday. For the first week, the kitchen managers will shadow the kitchen employees at Thalberg to learn how to mirror the grab-and-go program at Thalberg, so they can replicate it in all the elementary schools. She noted that Sally Bernier, the kitchen manager at Thalberg, did a wonderful job with that program last year. Mr. Goralski added that, without Bread for Life, that expansion would have never taken place. Mrs. DiNello noted that Mr. Bill McDougall joined Dr. Erardi and herself at Thalberg School last spring to see the Breakfast Program in action. She added that all the principals have shared the information with teachers and every cafeteria manager was willing to pick-up the additional time to work the Breakfast Program.
6. PA 10-167: Dr. Erardi reported that he received a document from our legal counsel, Shipman and Goodwin, and he asked Mr. Thiery to pay very close attention to it. He believed that the document would drive the next few Board meetings regarding local change that must take place with the policy book and curriculum and instruction.
7. PA 10-91: Dr. Erardi stated this ran concurrent with the above explanation.
8. PA 10-111: Dr. Erardi reported this Act deals with the secondary school reform that was, unfortunately, an integral part of the Race to the Top Grant that was not funded. The Commissioner told Connecticut Superintendents that this was something that would

continue to go forward as legislation passed last year. Dr. Erardi planned to enthusiastically endorse the concept and be vocally opposed to the position of the Commissioner. The impact on the local School Board regarding facility, instruction and staffing is outrageous. He and his colleagues believe that for every 1,000 students in a local high school, this would require an additional eight teachers per credit. Right now, Southington High School students are required to graduate with 22 credits. If the student population is rounded to 2,000, they would be looking to hire 16 teachers times three, which is 48 educators. He noted that 48 educators represented almost \$2 million. He stated that the incoming class of 2014 and 2015 starts the process with 2018 the graduation requirement. This means that there is instructional and credit implications with that class in Grade 7. He stated that 2012, which is two years away, would start this process. He thought that it was daunting to conceptualize another 50 teachers at the high school. The question becomes where would they teach because our matrix grid is at about 95% capacity and we would be talking about a science lab and classrooms that don't exist. He thought that it was incredibly unfair to mandate without any funds. He could not imagine putting any further burden on the local taxpayer. He hoped that the School Board would read the Public Act 10-111 and share their opinions with him.

Mr. Derynoski noted that they do not have to look very far for their topic at the Legislative Breakfast this year. He felt that the Board would want to do something right after Election Day because there was no way that they could fulfill the obligations of the law without something that should have started three years ago regarding the facilities. They need to do something right now.

Mrs. Johnson noted that a Legislative Forum sponsored by the Southington Chamber of Commerce on September 8 at Mulberry Gardens was being held with the local legislators and their opponents. She thought that it would be an excellent topic to discuss with these candidates.

Ms. Frances Haag introduced Sandy Kujawski who is the new hire to the special education administrative team. She noted that Ms. Kujawski had a similar position in Wallingford and the transition has been very smooth. She also noted that Ms. Kujawski was a product of the Southington schools and a lifelong resident of Southington.

5. COMMITTEE REPORTS

a. Finance Committee Meeting ~ August 16, 2010

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

“Move to approve the draft rental agreement for Top Driver Acquisitions use of space at Southington High School for the 2010-2011 school year with the appropriate insurance coverage added to Item #17.”

ROLL CALL VOTE: YES – Mr. Derynoski, Mrs. Fischer, Ms. Schroeder, Mrs. Johnson, Mrs. Notar-Francesco, Mrs. Rickard, Mrs. Carmody, Mrs. Clark, Mr. Goralski. **Motion carried unanimously.**

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

“Move to approve increasing the Family Pass from \$75 to \$85 for the 2010-2011 school year and then to \$100 for the 2011-2012 school year.”

Mrs. Carmody was against raising the price of the Family Pass. She felt that they already ask too much from the parents who have children involved in sports at the high school. She felt that they were already paying a lot of money for their child playing a sport through fundraisers because the parents end up buying everything that the child has to sell.

Mr. Derynoski agreed with Mrs. Carmody. He thought that the Family Passes were a bargain; however, for the number of times that they are used he did not think it would be that much of a detriment to the program as far as having people taking up space that could be filled with people who buy a ticket at the door. He agreed that it was the parents of the players who normally purchase these passes along with paying for special equipment and supporting the fundraisers. He felt that it was not the appropriate time for an increase, especially with the way the economy is.

Mrs. Notar-Francesco pointed out that she and Mrs. DiNello had numerous conversations about this and tried to figure out ways that they could do something else that might be more appealing since some members of the Board were not happy with the price increase. She asked Mrs. DiNello to share some of the things that they talked about.

Mrs. DiNello replied that, at the Finance Committee meeting, a Board member asked her to get information from other districts regarding family passes. A committee member also asked about individual passes. Although she did not have a big response from districts, the idea of a family pass is not widespread throughout the state. Southington is one of few districts that currently offer the family pass and she did not have any comparison about the price. However, many districts offer individual passes (student or adult passes) for athletic events. The dollar amount ranged depending on the school's location in the state. She spoke to Eric Swallow, Athletic Director, once she received the information, and asked him what he thought an appropriate price range would be for individual passes. If the Board of Education were interested in offering individual passes, their recommendation would be to offer a student pass at \$30 and an adult pass at \$40 as another option in addition to the family pass. The family pass was based on the recommendation of the committee of \$85 for the current school year. If the Board is not in favor of increasing the family pass, the committee would not recommend doing a separate individual pass, they would keep the family pass at \$75.

Mrs. Fischer asked if the senior citizen pass was free and asked about the age limit. Mrs. DiNello replied that was correct and she thought that the age was 62 for the senior citizen pass. Mrs. Rickard noted that last year they asked the ticket sellers to have senior citizen passes available so they don't require the senior citizens to come into the school building during the school day.

Mr. Goralski asked what athletic events they charge for that would be covered by this pass. Mrs. DiNello replied that in the fall, football is \$7.00 for adults and \$5.00 for students and girls' volleyball is \$5.00 for adults and \$3.00 for students. In the winter, the charge for boy's and girls' basketball is \$5.00 adults and \$3.00 for students. In the spring, boys' volleyball is \$5.00 / \$3.00. She was not familiar with wrestling and did not know if there was a charge.

There has been discussion about charging for baseball but, to her knowledge, they have not begun that.

Mrs. Carmody asked if the reason to increase this was to pay for referees and officials because they were not making enough money from the gate receipts. Mrs. DiNello agreed and stated that the Board supplements the cost to pay for both officials and police coverage for athletic events. Football has the largest fan base for raising revenues and it depends on how the team is doing and how the weather is on Friday nights. Unfortunately, last fall the weather was not very good and revenues were down. The CIAC has been increasing fees between 2%-3% a year for sports officials. The police recently ratified a new contract and there will be an increase in that fee as well.

Mrs. Carmody asked if the Southington High School Activity Account could be used to help defer costs for any of this. Mrs. DiNello replied that most of the money in the Student Activity Account is raised by clubs and classes. There are limited dollars within the Activity Fund for sports. Mrs. Carmody asked her to check that because she thought that it might be a way to get some of the monies that they need. Mrs. DiNello noted that the officials' line item in this year's budget was based on expenditures for the two past years. She was comfortable that they have the dollars for this year's budget.

Mr. Derynoski asked how many passes were issued each year. Mrs. DiNello replied that approximately 85 passes were sold last year. She did not want anyone to lose the perspective of what she was talking about in dollar amounts. She understood the concern about raising the price for the community; however, the overall revenue stream that this increase would generate is only approximately \$2,000.

The Board members questioned amending the motion. Mrs. DiNello shared with the Board what she considered either motion could be. 1) Make no motion and keep the family pass at \$75; or 2) have the motion to move the approved increase of the family pass from \$75 to \$85 for 2010-2011 school year and then to \$100 for the 2011-2012 school year and pricing individual passes at \$30 for students and \$40 for adults.

Mrs. Rickard commented that years ago the reason why they started the family pass was to help the families of athletes. The students are being charged \$3.00 to come to a game; she pointed out that they want to have students in the stands.

Mrs. Clark agreed that, as a parent of a football player, she does pay for her student-athlete to play. She thought that the family pass was a very good deal for those parents, even at \$85 because they have five home games. If it is a family going to the game, it is a good deal for them. The students want to go to every home football game and every home basketball game; they should be able to get a discount so that they can attend and support their friends at the games. Ms. Schroeder agreed.

Mrs. Johnson thought that, in theory, the student pass was a good idea, but she thought that teenagers do not necessarily think ahead like that and they are more inclined to go to spend \$3.00 for a game or not, depending on their mood. She thought that it was inappropriate to increase the cost of the family pass at this time.

Mrs. Fischer asked if they thought about increasing the individual tickets from \$3.00 to \$4.00 to defray some of the costs. Mrs. DiNello replied that she did not receive the recommendation from the Athletic Director to increase the ticket price to enter the game.

Mr. Goralski felt that every other cost in life was going up right now and it makes sense that the family pass would. The one thing that alarms him was that he felt that they do not advertise or promote this well in any capacity. He did not think that the Board or the athletic office does a good job promoting that Senior Citizen Passes are free. He did not think that they do a good job promoting the Family Pass. He liked the amendment to the motion. He thought that the Board and the Athletic Department need to do a better job advertising this in local papers. Mrs. DiNello agreed that they could do more advertising for the Senior Citizen Passes and to do heavy advertising for the Student Pass, if it was approved, to increase participation. However, the Family Pass was a catch-22 because it is a benefit for those parents who have athletes and know about the Family Pass, but they lose revenue when they sell more Family Passes. They do not go crazy with advertising it.

Mr. Goralski asked Mrs. Blanchard to read the amended motion.

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

“Move to approve increasing the Family Pass from \$75 to \$85 for the 2010-2011 school year and then to \$100 for the 2011-2012 school year and pricing individual passes at \$30 for students and \$40 for adults.”

ROLL CALL VOTE: YES – Mrs. Clark, Mrs. Fischer, Mrs. Notar-Francesco, Ms. Schroeder, Mr. Goralski. NO – Mrs. Carmody, Mrs. Johnson, Mrs. Rickard, Mr. Derynoski. **Motion carried with five in favor and four against.**

6. REPORT OF SUPERINTENDENT

Dr. Erardi was pleased to share with the Board that as of that evening they will start school on Monday with every certified position filled with the exception of one part-time special education position. They have gone through a series of hiring with the new teacher orientation having nearly 30 teachers. Through the hard work of Personnel, the administration, and the site-level administrators they are ready for Monday.

a. Personnel Report

MOTION: by Mrs. Notar-Francesco, seconded by Ms. Schroeder:

“Move to approve the Personnel Report as submitted.”

Mrs. Notar-Francesco questioned if the Class II Secretary to the Language Arts Coordinator was now a full-time position. Dr. Erardi replied that the position is a full-time position funded through ARRA funds. It is a one-year full-time position and they will address that in the 2011-2012 budget. She asked when it became full-time. Dr. Erardi replied it became full-time on July 1.

ROLL CALL VOTE: YES – Mrs. Clark, Mr. Derynoski, Mrs. Fischer, Ms. Schroeder, Mrs. Johnson, Mrs. Notar-Francesco, Mrs. Rickard, Mrs. Carmody, Mr. Goralski. **Motion carried unanimously.**

7. OLD BUSINESS

a. Town Council / Board of Finance Communications

Mr. Goralski stated that he did not have any communication at this time.

b. Construction Update

Mr. Cox reported that it has been a busy summer. Plantsville School received and had their playscape installed, which has been completed. Overall, the project is completed with the exception of some site work that needs planting and reseeding in the fall. The paving has been completed at South End Elementary School and the sidewalks had been completed several weeks ago. The parking spaces are lined and painted, signage is going up, and some hydro seeding will be taking place. They will be ready for Monday. The good news is that he anticipates, at the next Building Committee meeting on September 14, the Vo-Ag project will be closed out as complete.

Mrs. Notar-Francesco noted that in the minutes of June 8, it was noted that the South End School principal reported problems about the average room temperature of 78 to 82 degrees, and that the windows only opened about four inches. She asked if the Building Committee looked into that and rectified the situation. Mr. Cox replied that they have been working on that all summer. There have been some problems with the air conditioning space being too cold and the opposite issue with the classrooms being not air-conditioned and the new safety requirement of only a four-inch window opening. Initially, they were starting with the windows being closed and then they were allowed to open them to four inches. The Building Committee has been looking into codes along with the architect. The code just recently changed from six-inch to four-inch openings and the manufacturer made the opening to four inches. They are meeting on that regarding other options. They added oscillating wall fans to the classrooms over the last two weeks and have added better control devices for the air-conditioned spaces. He anticipated that next week would be much more comfortable than it was in June.

Mrs. Notar-Francesco questioned how the gas smell at Plantsville School earlier in the year worked out. Mr. Cox replied that the rooftop units were all checked by the manufacturer and all pressure valves were replaced by the Building Committee. The belief is that there was a surge of pressure in the line from the street, which caused a couple of the individual units to fail. Because of that, they felt that they might have fatigued the other ones and rather than taking a chance, they changed all the regulators in the rooftop units. When they have a need to run the heat, they will keep a close eye on the units in October. They anticipate no problems with them.

Mr. Goralski asked Mr. Cox and Mr. Derynoski to extend the Board's thanks to the Building Committee.

c. Facility Committee Update

Dr. Erardi shared that the ad hoc committee was high yielding and everybody was willing to be part of the solution. As the facilitator, he was very impressed to watch the committee work. He updated the Board on the July 27, 2010 meeting that Mr. Cox facilitated. He stated that the ad hoc committee enthusiastically endorsed bringing to the Board of Education the two-school plan to "Renovate-to-New" DePaolo and Kennedy Middle Schools following a feasibility study. Included in their recommendation was that the funding of the study be requested through the finance of the Town Council. This would come back to the Board in more detail on September 9.

Dr. Erardi reported that, at the August 24 meeting, there was additional discussion from Attorney Mark Sciota regarding an update on the action that was brought before the Town Council about one month ago. It was the proposal to go out to local developers on the North Center School Project. The timeline on that project is for the information to be back to Town Hall on October 1. The meeting of August 24 ended with the feeling that the committee had done its work. On September 9, the committee will be asking the Board of Education for action on the recommendation.

Mr. Derynoski asked if the committee discussed that the Board of Education take action this evening regarding North Center School so that they can allow the Town Council and Board of Finance to move forward with the Request for Proposal (RFP). Dr. Erardi replied that the proposals would be sent out by Attorney Sciota's office on Monday. Dr. Erardi pointed out that Mr. Derynoski recommended, which the committee thought was terrific, that somewhere in the near future there would be a joint Board meeting between all three Boards at-large to bring everybody up-to-date on the best information possible going forward.

Mr. Goralski recalled that Mr. Derynoski also mentioned having the appropriate public hearing about the funding of the feasibility study. Dr. Erardi replied that the timing was awkward because the Board of Finance meets the second Wednesday of every month, which means their meeting is September 8. The Board of Education is meeting September 9 and it was his sense that there was not an urgency to go forward, but we do need to take action.

Mr. Derynoski knew that the feasibility study was something that they do not have to jump into because, if it does move forward, it would not hit the referendum trail until November of 2011. As far as the North Center School activity, he thought that the Board of Education still needed to take some form of action to allow any activity to move forward because the school still belongs to the Board of Education, not the Town. Mrs. Johnson interjected that was her concern as well. Dr. Erardi believed that, once the proposals are received, it would come back to the Board of Education for action in order to go forward back to the Town Council.

Mr. Goralski attended the last meeting of the Facility Committee and noted that Mrs. Johnson's concern about the property was read and shared with the committee by Dr. Erardi. He thought that the Board of Education needed to endorse something for the feasibility study so the Town could hold the appropriate public hearings about the funding of it. Mr. Goralski noted that the RFP was simply an option at this point. He did not think having that RFP done changed anything regarding North Center's future. It just gives an option for potential opportunity for how it could be renovated.

Mrs. Fischer stated that the Board of Education, as a whole, had never voted to turn any use over to the Town. She thought that they could vote now before people go through the motions of putting the RFP out. Dr. Erardi believed what took place was that the School Board sent forward to the Town Council that they have researched and understood two options. Option #1 was the \$6,000,000 RFP from Kaestle Boos Associates. Option #2 was for the Town Council to pursue for the Board of Education and they asked Attorney Sciota to follow through on that. Dr. Erardi stated that they were looking for a compare and contrast. Which was the best place to be? That is when it will come back to the Board of Education in October for the Board's endorsement and action. He thought that the piece that was confusing was that the second discussion was solely about Option #2, which was DePaolo and Kennedy Middle Schools going forward and who would pay for the architectural study. Over the past number of years, there have been a number of different plans. Dr. Erardi believed that Attorney Sciota was all set to release his Request for Proposals (RFP) on Monday that would eventually come back to the School Board for conversation and potential action. On September 9, the Board can reflect on whether they were comfortable going forward with a two-school plan with an RFP to be funded by the Town Council.

Mrs. Johnson felt that this was a two-edged sword with two separate issues. Her difficulty right now was the RFP issue. She believed that the RFP should have been brought before the Board because it was being put forward with their blessing, and it has not. She did not think that the Board should ever pass along some procedures that they don't fully understand. She thought that it would be appropriate for Attorney Sciota to come before the Board to explain the RFP to them. They are talking about the building that the Board is currently responsible for and she wanted more explanation on the RFP that was going forward to builders and developers all over the state. The Board has not even seen the RFP. Mr. Goralski replied that they have seen the RFP, but it is not on the Board of Education, it is under the Town's name because it would be a building project. The project itself would not be under the Board's name. He noted that the RFP clearly stated that the Town of Southington was seeking bids for the sale and lease with the opportunity to purchase back in 10 years. He noted that it was very clear what the RFP was seeking. Mrs. Johnson remarked that the Board had not voted to do that. Mr. Derynoski interjected that she was absolutely right, but it could not go forward without the Board's action anyway. Mrs. Johnson thought that it was misleading to other people to send this out without the Board having approved this concept.

Mrs. Clark thought that they were getting a little ahead of themselves. She noted that it was an option and did not feel that it was anything that the Board had to vote on. They were simply at the Facility Committee level looking at options. The Town and the Town Attorney put together an RFP package that was an option. The Board does not have to take it, just as they don't have to take the \$6,000,000 renovation of North Center. Once they get this RFP back, the Board may come up with something else entirely. Mrs. Johnson thought that it was misleading. Mrs. Clark continued that it was not something where they had to take the lowest bidder; they do not have to do anything. She thought that to have Attorney Sciota come before the Board was not necessary. It was not something that they had to vote on at their next meeting.

Mr. Goralski stated that he would make contact with the chairpersons of the Town Council and Board of Finance for a joint meeting. He would also like the middle school discussion to be part of that meeting. Mrs. Johnson asked if the Board of Education had voted to endorse the two-school concept. Mr. Goralski replied that the School Board had not, but it

would be brought forward at the September 9 meeting. Mr. Goralski noted that, if the Board chooses to endorse that recommendation, he thought that they would have to look into a motion to recant a previous motion that a previous Board of Education made for three middle schools. The motion to recant would have to be made by someone who sat on the original Board.

d. Regionalization – Alta

Dr. Erardi thanked Board members who attended the breakfast that took place on August 18. He was pleased that two surrounding districts were able to attend and that an additional six districts indicated that they would like additional information. Ten districts were sent information, we are engaged with eight different districts, and the plan continues to be a pilot with no more than five students at Alta. He noted that Alta would open with approximately 32 students for 2010-2011.

e. NEASC Report - Update

Mr. Thiery reported that the district received notification through the principal of the high school that on August 19 the chair of the Visiting Committee submitted her final NEASC Report to the Commission for their review. She indicated that, because it was submitted in August, it would be on the agenda of the September meeting for the Commission on Secondary Education and that Southington could anticipate the final accreditation status after that meeting. He would update the Board as information is received.

8. NEW BUSINESS

a. Superintendent's Annual Report

Dr. Erardi reported that he enclosed for the Board's review by Connecticut Statute to archive the annual educational year, the report was put together through Central Office with writing coming from all of the schools including the Central Office cabinet.

Mrs. Notar-Francesco stated that it was refreshing to see much of the work of Curriculum and Instruction in the document. She enjoyed going through it and noted areas where the committee had discussed certain issues. She asked Dr. Erardi to put the document online for the community to see. She believed that they should be aware of the work of the district.

Mr. Derynoski was happy to see that they were heading in the right direction with the report. He stated that there was much more consistency school-to-school in the way it looks. It was not quite perfect, but it was getting very close. He acknowledged the administrators from each of the schools for putting together such a well-versed, very detailed update. He thought that they all did a great job.

Mrs. Rickard wanted to know where it is distributed. She recalled that it goes to the Town Manager, Town Council, and copies are put in the library. She thought that Mrs. Notar-Francesco made a good point about putting it on the district's website. She agreed that it was a document that the Board enjoys reading. They get a first-hand look at what goes on in the schools and they get to see what is important to the principal by what is emphasized. She was

looking forward to seeing the teacher websites and the workshops on differentiation so that all the students are challenged.

MOTION: by Ms. Schroeder, seconded by Mr. Derynoski:

“Move that the Board accepts the Superintendent’s Annual Report for the 2009-2010 school year as submitted.”

Mr. Goralski liked the differentiation within the report and that each principal has their own page describing their school and what was special to them. He also liked the consistency with Curriculum and Instruction. He noted that Dr. Erardi always talks about his “Cabinet”, who are the people who help to lead the school district. At the beginning of the Annual Report, each component is written by members of that cabinet. He thought that it was a great way to showcase the cabinet to the community.

ROLL CALL VOTE: YES – Mrs. Fischer, Mrs. Notar-Francesco, Mrs. Johnson, Ms. Schroeder, Mrs. Rickard, Mrs. Carmody, Mrs. Clark, Mr. Derynoski, Mr. Goralski. **Motion carried unanimously.**

b. Closeout of 2009-2010 Budget

Mrs. DiNello reported that annually they ask the Board of Education to approve the year-end closeout. All of her reports are due to the State of Connecticut on September 1. This shares with them how the Board of Education expended the operating budget and all the grant funds.

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

“Move to approve the fiscal year closeout for 2009-2010.”

Mr. Derynoski asked if Mrs. DiNello was planning to write a check to the Town for the \$28,000 balance. Mrs. DiNello replied that the \$28,000 was actually in the Town’s checkbook because they control the checkbook and she just draws checks down on it all year. They actually have the money. Mr. Derynoski asked if they have access to the checkbook. Mrs. DiNello replied that was correct. She closed out the books and expenditures and the remaining balance was \$28,135. Mr. Derynoski asked if this money accumulated after the closeout of the school year. Mrs. DiNello replied that, after paying all of the year-end bills, that was the remaining balance.

Mr. Goralski summarized that, to be specific, the number was \$28,135.03 and that they are a fiduciary board and required by state law to balance their books. If that number was a negative, they would be in violation of those rules and they would have to ask for an appropriation. Because they did a good job, and Mrs. DiNello accurately reported the numbers, \$28,135.03 is the number that remains from last year’s budget.

ROLL CALL VOTE: YES – Mrs. Johnson, Ms. Schroeder, Mrs. Rickard, Mrs. Carmody, Mrs. Clark, Mr. Derynoski, Mrs. Fischer, Mrs. Notar-Francesco, Mr. Goralski. **Motion carried unanimously.**

c. Appointment of Cable TV Committee Representative

Mr. Goralski explained that he spoke to Mr. Rit Campbell who served in this capacity for 12 years. Mr. Campbell told Mr. Goralski that no Board has ever asked him if he wanted to serve as the representative and that it was automatically assigned every year. Mr. Campbell told him that the committee does not meet that often and that he felt it was a valuable partnership. Mr. Goralski pointed out that, through a grant last year, Mr. Campbell was able to obtain the recording equipment that is used at the Board of Education meetings, which Mr. Campbell learned about through serving on this committee. Mr. Goralski noted that serving on this committee does not in any way impact on Mr. Campbell's job in the school district.

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

“Move to appoint Richard Campbell to serve as a representative to the Cable TV Committee for a two-year term through July 2012.”

ROLL CALL VOTE: YES – Ms. Schroeder, Mrs. Rickard, Mrs. Carmody, Mrs. Clark, Mr. Derynoski, Mrs. Fischer, Mrs. Notar-Francesco, Mrs. Johnson, Mr. Goralski. **Motion carried unanimously.**

d. Superintendent's Proposed Goals for 2010-2011

Dr. Erardi stated that the goals represent the foresight of the Board of Education and the collective work of the Central Office cabinet, administrative team, and all staff. The goals were being presented as a first read with action taking place on September 9.

Mr. Derynoski acknowledged that Dr. Erardi was going to keep himself very busy with these goals. He questioned about the goal to obtain the services of a grant writer on or before November 1, 2010 and if that date would give Dr. Erardi enough time. Dr. Erardi felt that it would. At the first meeting in October, he planned to share an opportunity with the School Board and to take action shortly thereafter. Dr. Erardi noted that it would be the starting point of conversation on how they could go about doing this in a fiscally responsible way and maximize the opportunity.

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

“Move that the Board approve the Superintendent's Goals for 2010-2011.”

ROLL CALL VOTE: YES – Mr. Derynoski, Mrs. Fischer, Mrs. Notar-Francesco, Mrs. Carmody, Mrs. Clark, Mrs. Johnson, Ms. Schroeder, Mrs. Rickard, Mr. Goralski. **Motion carried unanimously.**

Mr. Goralski stated that the Board looked forward to working with Dr. Erardi on these ambitious goals.

e. Review of Elementary Staff and Class Size Report for 2010-2011

Dr. Erardi distributed the Enrollment Projections for 2010-2011 (*Attachment #2*). He thanked the district's elementary school administrative team, along with the coordinators, and gave a special thank you to Mrs. Michelle Passamano who acts as the Registrar and still has her full-time job with Mr. Thiery as Executive Secretary to the Assistant Superintendent. He noted that their work was extraordinary to prepare this document for the Board this evening. He pointed out that the first page represented the numbers that were presented to the Board in July. They spoke about a maximum number of 20 students in Kindergarten, 22 students in Grades 1 and 2, and a maximum number of students in Grades 3, 4 and 5. He noted that a number of things had changed since July. The biggest change was that they were two months into the Operational Plan for 2010-2011 and they did not know at that time that there would be \$1.1 million coming their way.

Dr. Erardi explained that the second page represented the work of the School Board in the past. These were numbers that they were much more comfortable with and worked hard to endorse and to keep. He noted that in underfunded budgets it becomes nearly impossible to maintain class size. The second page dated August 25, 2010 showed a consistency in Kindergarten, Grade 1, Grade 2 and Grade 3. The Board has endorsed those numbers in the past. In Grades 4 and 5, those numbers are bigger than what was expected and what the Board was comfortable with. However, the recommendation would be that they leave Grade 4 and 5 as they are and that they would support Grade 5 with a full-time literacy tutor at Derynoski, and a tutor that would be split at Flanders and Kelley Schools.

Dr. Erardi explained that on page three they have continued to pull apart the August 25 document and what they have done to try to equalize all eight of the elementary schools was to collapse one section in Grade 5 at Flanders Elementary School. That would align Flanders Grade 5 with all other Grade 5's throughout the district. He believed that they have the numbers now to reduce one section at Flanders. They have also reduced one Kindergarten section at Hatton Elementary School. In essence, they have taken away 1.5 FTEs. To balance Grades 1, 2 and 3 along with Kindergarten, they have infused six FTEs for a net increase of 4.5 teaching positions.

Dr. Erardi explained that on page four it showed the work that comes out of the Business and Finance Office regarding the Operational Plan 2010-2011. They were confident that, if the Board adds any staff, the \$42,000 mark was a number that would be a real number regarding contract signing. The August 25 grid represents an increase of \$188,000. He spoke to the two literacy tutors, the two FTEs and the large classes in three schools in Grade 5. If they add the \$28,000, they would be looking at the potential add-on of \$216,000.

Dr. Erardi explained that on page five, through some outstanding work that was taking place in Personnel, the Business and Finance Office and the Purchasing Office, the information on the last page represents today's numbers in the larger plan going forward.

Mrs. Carmody thanked the staff for their work on the August 25 grid. She thought that Grades 2 and 3 were pivotal years for the students developmentally and she was all for reducing these classes and adding the staff. She thanked Mrs. DiNello for all her work.

Mrs. Rickard questioned the projected savings in the oil heat for 2010-2011. Mrs. DiNello replied that the oil was not locked in when they did their budget deliberations through reallocation. This week, she asked Mr. Goodwin to go back through that account of where they are with gallons after topping off the tanks from what remained in them from last year. He assured her that he anticipated a surplus of \$41,000 in that account with the lock-in price that has been set beginning in September. They also benefited from the fact that the Town had gallons left and the school district was able to purchase gallons from them at a reduced rate so the Town would not be penalized. The school system is working with the Town's available oil and the school system's new oil purchase. Mrs. Rickard summarized that the school system's tanks were full right now and they have access to the Town's tanks at a reduced rate. Mrs. DiNello replied that they did not commit on the price during budget time. When the price came in, it was similar to the price as last year and they are using less oil now because of the conversion to gas at many of the schools. In addition, they are purchasing oil from the Town at a reduced rate.

Mrs. Carmody questioned if they still had to hire one special education teacher. Dr. Erardi replied that it was a part-time teacher, which was already in the Operational Plan. It was filling a resignation.

Mrs. Notar-Francesco understood that the grid Dr. Erardi proposed did not at all tap into the Jobs Bill money. She asked what the rationale was for leaving that alone. Dr. Erardi replied that the comments he made at the beginning of the meeting would be his rationale. He explained that the Superintendents have been told that the local Board of Education would have flexibility regarding operational plan Jobs funding concerning personnel. It was his recommendation at this time, through the scrutiny of where they are within their plan, to hold onto the \$1.1 million, and watch what happens after November with the legislators regarding the funding level of ECS. He stated that would be his recommendation at this particular time.

Dr. Erardi shared that the August 25 recommendation did not come solely out of his office; it was a consensus endorsement of every elementary school administrator in the district.

Mrs. Notar-Francesco continued that she absolutely endorsed this grid and was very happy to see the smaller numbers in Grades 2 and 3. She would like to see the Grade 5 class sizes in a better position, but she could live with adding the tutors.

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

"Move to accept the Superintendent's recommendation on the grid submitted on the August 25 matrix, resulting in the cost of \$216,540 for additional staff."

Mrs. Fischer stated that she was uncomfortable with the class sizes in the fifth grade, but she recognized the fiscal constraints that they have. Ms. Schroeder asked if they were sure that the fifth grade numbers were not going to change. She was concerned with numbers hitting 26 and 27 in the fifth grade. Dr. Erardi replied that he would bring the best numbers that they have on September 9 for fifth grade for further review.

Mrs. Rickard pointed out that in the past they had numbers very similar to this and what the School Board did was hire one teacher who spent half the time at Plantsville and half the time at South End School, to pull out for math and literacy. She noted that this had to be done when

dealing with budget constraints. They would all love to hire as many teachers as possible, but they cannot because of the budget constraints.

Mrs. Johnson stated that everyone was appalled at the August 23 numbers and noted that the third grade in Southington was an anomaly and they have not seen those kinds of numbers in a long time. If they did not have some money in the line item update, she thought that they might have done things piecemeal. She was pleased to see that, with this line item update, to be able to project a savings and be able to afford the 4.5 FTEs.

Mrs. Clark thanked all the building principals, staff and administration who were able to do the hard work to get these numbers down to something where they were more comfortable.

Mrs. Johnson asked how hiring 4.5 teachers was going to happen before the children go to school on Monday. Dr. Erardi replied that they had a contingency in place. They anticipated as many outcomes as possible and, over the past two days, the goal of every building administrator who may have had the opportunity to hire new staff was that it be seamless on Monday. They made contact with the candidate of choice as the grid presented itself on August 25 and building administrators are prepared this evening to offer that job to the top-flight educators waiting for their call. They have cooperation from the custodial staff. In every building, they are adding a classroom and on Monday, it will be seamless for children entering any new classroom. The classroom will look the same with a qualified, certified educator that the Board would be proud to employ. He noted that the Personnel Office would be open on Saturday morning to complete the hiring process.

Up until yesterday, Mr. Goralski stated that he was hesitant to endorse it because he was absolutely opposed to using the Jobs Bill money. He was very pleased that they were staying within the budget with this action. He noted that they are not always going to get a lower oil price and next year they have \$1.1 million, but they are short \$2.8 million and the budget process did not even start. He questioned whether to make all of these interim one-year teaching positions because without funding they are not going to have these positions next year. He stated that there was no money for these positions next year. Dr. Erardi agreed with everything Mr. Goralski said; however, he suggested that the Board goes forward and hire the positions and they have the opportunity to offer them the sad news in January of non-renewal due to funding.

Mr. Goralski noted that one principal has the unfortunate task of telling a group of parents that their classes are going to be bigger. He wanted the support in place to help that principal and group of parents understand. He noted what they will have is balance and equity. He stated that Flanders Grade 5 had a small class size compared to the other schools. He wanted administration to support Mrs. Mazzarella in helping the families of the 49 students understand why. He stated that the Board and administration needed to take responsibility for that.

ROLL CALL VOTE: YES – Mrs. Carmody, Mrs. Clark, Mr. Derynoski, Mrs. Fischer, Mrs. Notar-Francesco, Mrs. Johnson, Ms. Schroeder, Mrs. Rickard, Mr. Goralski. **Motion carried unanimously.**

9. Executive Session for Student Matters, Contract Negotiations and Personnel Matters

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

“Move to go into Executive Session, excluding the public and the press, for the purpose of discussing Student Matters, Contract Negotiations and Personnel Matters, and upon conclusion reconvene to open session to complete the agenda.”

Motion carried unanimously by voice vote.

The meeting adjourned at 9:25 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Linda Blanchard

Recording Secretary

**SOUTHINGTON BOARD OF EDUCATION
SOUTHINGTON, CONNECTICUT**

**EXECUTIVE SESSION
AUGUST 26, 2010**

Mr. Brian Goralski, Board Chairperson, called the Executive Session to order at 9:30 p.m.

Members Present:

Mrs. Colleen Clark, Mrs. Terri Carmody, Mr. David Derynoski, Mrs. Rosemarie Fischer, Mrs. Patricia Johnson, Mrs. Jill Notar-Francesco, Ms. Michelle Schroeder, Mrs. Kathleen Rickard, Mr. Brian Goralski.

Administration Present:

Dr. Joseph V. Erardi, Jr., Superintendent of Schools; Mrs. Sherri DiNello, Director of Business and Finance.

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

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

Motion carried by voice vote.

Mrs. DiNello left the meeting at 9:50 p.m.

MOTION: by Mr. Derynoski, seconded by Ms. Schroeder:

“Move that the Board return to public session.”

Motion carried unanimously by voice vote.

The board reconvened public session at 10:25 p.m.

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

“Move to add student expulsions to the agenda.”

Motion carried unanimously by voice vote.

MOTION: by Mrs. Fischer, seconded by Mrs. Clark:

“Move to expel students 2010-2011-02 and 2010-2011-03 as recommended by the Superintendent of Schools.”

Motion carried unanimously by voice vote.

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

“Move to adjourn.”

Motion carried unanimously by voice vote.

The Board adjourned at 10:26 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Jill Notar-Francesco". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style with a long horizontal stroke at the end.

Jill Notar-Francesco, Secretary
Southington Board of Education

Administration: Board of Education Update August 26, 2010

- 1. Administrative Institute – 2010**
- 2. Federal Funding: Jobs Legislation (Attachment #1)**
- 3. BOE / School Liaison: 2010-2011 (Attachment #2)**
- 4. Building Tour – Opening Day: Monday, August 30th**
- 5. Breakfast Program**
- 6. PA 10-167 (Attachment #3)**
 - a. Shared Service Agreement (Transportation)**
- 7. PA 10-91**
 - a. PD – Staff: Domestic / Teen Dating Violence**
- 8. PA 10-111**
 - a. Graduation Requirements**
 - b. Online Coursework**
 - c. Parent – Teacher Conferences**
 - d. Advanced Placement Courses**
 - e. Student Discipline**

J. Everett
8/26/10

JOSEPH ERARDI

From: JOSEPH ERARDI
Sent: Thursday, August 19, 2010 8:06 AM
To: JOSEPH ERARDI
Subject: ECS - JOB Fund - Southington
Importance: High

Board Members and Administrators:

The dollar appropriation for Southington:

Southington	\$1,160,007
-------------	-------------

Joe Erardi

**BOARD REPRESENTATIVE
ADOPT-A-SCHOOL
2009**

SCHOOL	SCHOOL BOARD REPRESENTATIVE
ALTA @ Pyne Center	Terri Carmody Colleen Clark
DePaolo Middle School	Rosemarie Fischer Michelle Schroeder
Derynoski Elementary School	Brian Goralski Dave Derynoski Pat Johnson Michelle Schroeder
Flanders Elementary School	Rosemarie Fischer
Hatton Elementary School	Jill Notar-Francesco
Kelley Elementary School	Kathy Rickard
Kennedy Middle School	Colleen Clark Kathy Rickard
Plantville @ North Center Elementary School	Jill Notar-Francesco Dave Derynoski
South End Elementary School	Colleen Clark
Southington High School	Brian Goralski Terri Carmody Pat Johnson Kathy Rickard
Strong Elementary School	Brian Goralski Jill Notar-Francesco
Thalberg Elementary School	Dave Derynoski



2010 SESSION

CONNECTICUT GENERAL ASSEMBLY

In its 2010 session, the General Assembly passed a number of new laws affecting boards of education and school districts. The following is a general summary of these new laws. Application of a specific law to a particular set of facts or particular situation may require a more detailed analysis of the law's provisions. These new laws are available online through the General Assembly website at [ftp://ftp.cga.ct.gov/2010/act/PA/pdf](http://ftp.cga.ct.gov/2010/act/PA/pdf) ([ftp://ftp.cga.ct.gov/2010/act/Sa/pdf](http://ftp.cga.ct.gov/2010/act/Sa/pdf) for special acts).

General Assembly Enacts Major Educational Reform Bill

In an effort to support Connecticut's application for Race to the Top funding, the Connecticut legislature passed Public Act ("P.A.") 10-111, "An Act Concerning Education Reform in Connecticut," which makes substantial changes to the laws regarding public schools in Connecticut in areas such as curriculum, teacher tenure, charter schools, and other areas. Some of the more significant changes are outlined below.

Graduation Requirements. P.A. 10-111, Section 16, increases the number of credits required for students to graduate from 20 to 25, beginning with classes graduating in 2018. Under this new law, students graduating in 2018 and thereafter will be required to complete not fewer than 9 credits in humanities; 8 credits in science, technology, engineering and mathematics; 3 ½ credits in career and life skills; 2 credits in world languages; and 1 credit in a senior demonstration project or its equivalent. The law also requires, beginning with the Class of 2018, end of the school year examinations in certain "core courses"

such as Algebra I, geometry, biology, American history and grade 10 English. These examinations are to be developed by the State Department of Education ("SDE") beginning on and after July 1, 2012.

Online Coursework. Section 16 of P.A. 10-111 provides that certain courses may be taken online, provided a board of education has adopted a policy for granting credit for online coursework and other specified conditions are satisfied, such as ensuring that the online course workload is equivalent to that of a course taught in a traditional classroom setting.

Student Support and Remedial Services. Beginning with classes graduating in 2018, Section 16 also requires boards of education to provide adequate student support and remedial services for students beginning in grade seven. These supports are intended to provide an alternate means for students to satisfy graduation requirements and may include such things as allowing

the student to retake courses in summer school or through online courses, allowing a student to enroll in a course through approved colleges and/or universities; or providing for alternate forms of an exam if the student fails an end-of-year exam. For the fiscal years ending June 30, 2013 to June 30, 2018, the SDE is required to, within available appropriations, provide grants to assist boards in meeting the new curriculum standards. On or before November 1, 2012, and biennially thereafter, boards of education seeking such grant assistance from the SDE must report on the status of their educational reform efforts, and explain why additional funding is necessary. Section 18, P.A. 10-111.

Employment of Teachers. Prior law required that teacher evaluations include a teacher's strengths, areas needing improvement, and strategies for improvement. Effective July 1, 2010, Public Act 10-111, Section 4, requires that teacher evaluations also include "multiple indicators of student academic growth." On or before July 1, 2013, the State Board of Education ("SBE") is required to adopt guidelines for a model teacher evaluation program to include guidance on how to use multiple indicators of student academic growth in such evaluations. Section 8 of the law also expands opportunities for school districts to reemploy retired teachers collecting pensions from the Teachers' Retirement System. Among other changes, it eliminates the reference to "temporary employment," and clarifies the limitations on reemployment of teachers receiving retirement benefits. In addition, it expands to retired teachers employed by priority school districts the special rules that apply to teachers in shortage areas.

The law also changes the way in which some teachers in Connecticut achieve tenure. Current law allows for certain teachers who previously have received tenure in Connecticut to achieve "fast track tenure" in twenty school months. P.A. 10-111, Section 9 allows teachers who have previously attained tenure in another district to achieve tenure after only ten school months if the new district is a "priority" school district, as that term is defined under the law. Notably, such teachers do not

need to have been employed by a board of education within the last five years, and need not ever have been employed by a board of education in Connecticut before being employed in the "priority" district.

Charter Schools. Effective from passage, Section 13 of P.A. 10-111 requires the SBE to waive enrollment limits for charter schools that it determines to have a demonstrated record of achievement. The law also eliminates the requirement that, when the SBE issues charters for state and local charter schools, it does so only within available appropriations. In addition, this new law makes permanent the charter school facility grant program, which was scheduled to end as of June 30, 2009. Finally, P.A. 10-111 expands opportunities for charter school teachers to participate in the Teachers' Retirement System.

"Innovation Schools" and Schools in Need of Improvement. Effective July 1, 2010, P.A. 10-111, Section 6, allows the board of education of a priority school district, through agreement with the teacher and administrator unions, to convert an existing school into an "innovation school" or establish a new school as such. An "innovation school" operates under an innovation plan that articulates areas of autonomy and flexibility in the curriculum, budget, school schedule and calendar, school district policies and procedures, professional development, and staffing policies and procedures, including waivers from or modifications to collective bargaining agreements. In an innovation school, either (1) the faculty and district leadership, or (2) an external partner is responsible for developing the innovation plan. The law requires the superintendent of schools to annually evaluate innovation schools, and submit the evaluation to the board of education and the Commissioner of Education. The board of education may take certain action specified in the statute if the superintendent determines that the school has substantially failed to meet the goals outlined in the innovation plan.

Under current law schools and districts identified as being "in need of improvement" must take certain steps aimed at remediation. Effective July 1, 2010,

Section 21 of P.A. 10-111 provides for the creation of school governance councils for schools that are identified as being in need of improvement and that require corrective action under the No Child Left Behind Act ("NCLB"). Whether a board of education is either (1) authorized or (2) required to establish a governance council depends on a particular school district's degree of academic underperformance. This law also provides that, by affirmative vote, a school governance council may vote to reconstitute the school into one of several models for a period of up to five years. The board of education is required to hold a public hearing to vote on the governance council's vote to reconstitute the school. The board of education then votes on whether to accept that recommendation or to adopt an alternative reform model, and in cases of disagreement, the Commissioner decides which model to implement. In any event, the SDE may not allow more than twenty-five schools to reconstitute each year. Finally, Section 21 permits the SBE to authorize the Commissioner to reconstitute local or regional boards of education in low-achieving school districts if the board receives training and the district fails to make satisfactory progress against benchmarks established by the SBE and fails to make adequate yearly progress in accordance with NCLB.

Parent-Teacher Conferences. Beginning with the 2010-2011 school year, boards of education must adopt policies that require the district to conduct two "flexible parent-teacher conferences" per school year. There is no statutory definition of "flexible parent-teacher conferences," and thus local and regional boards of education appear to have some "flexibility" in complying with the statute. Possibilities include parent-teacher conferences that are scheduled at other than a set time, or that are scheduled outside the regular school day. Section 29.

Advanced Placement Courses. Beginning July 1, 2011, boards of education will be required to provide an "advanced placement course program," which is defined as a program that "provides courses at the high school level for which an advanced placement examination is available through the College Board."

The SBE is required to develop guidelines to aid in the training of teachers for the teaching of advanced placement courses "to a diverse student body." Section 31.

Student Discipline and In-School Suspensions. Prior law required that, on and after July 1, 2010, all student suspensions shall be in-school suspensions unless the administration determines at a hearing that the student poses such a danger to persons or property, or such a disruption of the educational process, that the student should be excluded from school. Section 20 of P.A. 10-111 further refines existing state law by allowing out-of-school suspensions only if the administration determines that an out-of-school suspension is appropriate based on (1) the student's previous disciplinary problems that have led to suspensions or expulsions, and (2) efforts by the administration to address the student's disciplinary problems through means other than out-of-school suspensions or expulsion, including positive behavioral support strategies. Districts are well advised to identify such "positive behavioral support strategies" in advance, including curriculum elements and/or conferences with students before and after disciplinary action is taken. Boards of education must also ensure that student discipline policies are updated prior to the start of the 2010-2011 school year to reflect these important legislative changes regarding the imposition of student suspensions.

Other Important Changes: P.A. 10-111 also makes a number of other significant changes, some of which are detailed below:

- Effective July 1, 2010, this law establishes a nine-member task force to study, monitor and consider effective ways to close the achievement gap between racial and socioeconomic groups in Connecticut. The task force is required to submit a report on its findings by January 1, 2011. Section 30.
- Beginning with the 2012-2013 school year, for students, beginning in grade six, boards of

education must collect information that records students' career and academic choices in grades six through twelve. Section 16.

- Effective July 1, 2010, school districts with a dropout rate of 8% or higher in the prior school year will be required to establish an online credit recovery program to allow students in danger of failing to graduate to complete online coursework for credit towards graduation requirements. The law requires each such school to designate, from among existing staff, an online learning coordinator. Section 28.
- P.A. 10-111 allows the State Department of Education to establish a board examination series pilot program that would allow boards of education to permit students in grades nine through twelve to graduate from high school if they achieve a passing score on a series of examinations approved by the State Board of Education, in lieu of meeting the graduation requirements set forth under state law. Beginning with the school year commencing July 1, 2011, boards of education will be required to allow students in grades nine through twelve to graduate from high school if they successfully pass the board examination series. Section 17.
- Beginning July 1, 2013, this new law expands the existing state-wide public school information system. Section 3.
- Effective July 1, 2010, at the request of an employing board of education, the Commissioner may waive superintendent certification requirements for a person "who has successfully completed at least three years of experience as a certified administrator with a superintendent certificate issued by another state in a public school in another state" within the past ten years. Section 2.
- Effective July 1, 2010, the SDE is required to review and approve an alternate route to certification program for school administrators. Section 1.
- Effective July 1, 2010, Section 5 of P.A. 10-111 creates a Performance Evaluation Advisory Council within the SDE, which is required to meet at least quarterly. This council is responsible for (1) assisting the SBE in the development and implementation of teacher evaluation guidelines, and (2) the data collection and evaluation support system required under the law.
- Effective July 1, 2010, this law expands the entities eligible to receive funding from the Commissioner to provide professional development services, technical assistance and evaluation activities to boards of education and other educational entities in Connecticut. Under prior law, only regional educational service centers ("RESCs") were permitted to receive funds to provide such services. Section 10.

Other New Laws Affecting Education

Appropriations and Special Education Excess Cost Grants. Under Public Act 10-179, the Connecticut legislature made adjustments to the appropriations to a number of state agencies for the 2011 fiscal year. Among other things, the law increases the amounts to be paid to towns under special education excess cost grants and grants the Commissioner the authority to provide supplemental grants to the Hartford Public School District and Capitol Region Education Council ("CREC") for transporting students who are not residents of Hartford to their interdistrict magnet schools.

Children Placed by the Department of Children and Families. Effective July 1, 2010, Public Act 10-160 provides that whenever a child is placed in out-of-home care pursuant to 1) an emergency order by the Department of Children and Families ("DCF"); or 2) an order of temporary custody or commitment order, DCF must immediately determine whether it is in the best interests to have the child remain in the school

of origin. As is the case with the federal McKinney Vento law regarding homeless students, this new law creates a presumption that it is in the best interest of such child that he or she continue to attend the school he or she attended before the DCF placement, with such presumption to continue for the duration of the out-of-home placement. In such cases, the board of education where the child previously attended school continues to be responsible for providing the student with free school privileges, for as long as the student continues to attend the school of origin. DCF must collaborate with the school of origin to develop a transportation plan for the student, and DCF will be responsible for any additional or extraordinary transportation costs incurred as a result of the need to transport the child to and from his/her school of origin. If the child continues to attend his/her school of origin, the board of education of the school of origin will not be eligible for the special education excess cost grant otherwise available for state agency placements (which limit financial responsibility to the lesser of 100% of the reasonable costs of such special education or the average per pupil costs for the prior fiscal year). However, for special education students whose program costs are considered "catastrophic" (e.g. they exceed four and one-half times the per pupil expenditure), excess costs reimbursement continues to be available.

IEP Task Force Established. Special Act 10-9, "An Act Concerning Individualized Educational Programs," establishes a task force to study individualized education programs ("IEPs"), including a review of existing procedures for the development of IEPs, and examination of relevant laws and ways to address noncompliance. The task force must submit a report on its findings to the General Assembly by February 1, 2011.

Autistic Students. Starting July 1, 2012, school districts providing applied behavior analysis ("ABA") services to students with autism are limited in who may be permitted to provide such services. P.A. 10-175 requires that ABA services may only be provided by: (1) an individual licensed by the Department of Public

Health or certified by the Department of Education, provided such services are within the scope of practice of such license or certification; (2) a behavior analyst certified by the Behavior Analyst Certification Board; ("BCBA") or (3) an assistant behavior analyst working under the supervision of a certified behavior analyst. A teacher or paraprofessional will be permitted to provide ABA if he/she is working under the supervision of one of these licensed or certified persons. Should the Commissioner determine that there are insufficient certified or licensed personnel available to provide ABA services after July 1, 2012, this law further provides that other individuals may be permitted to provide ABA services as long as they have met certain minimum educational standards and are working under the supervision of a BCBA.

Boards of Education Not Required to Post Meeting Minutes on Website. Current law requires the minutes of all meetings of public agencies to be made available for public inspection and posted on the public agency's website, if available. Section 4 of Public Act 10-171 provides that, effective October 1, 2010, public agencies (including boards of education) will not be required to post such meeting minutes on the website, even if a website is available.

Student Athletes and Concussions. Under new law, Public Act 10-62, anyone who holds a coaching permit issued by the SBE must be trained periodically in how to recognize and respond to head injuries and concussions. The law requires initial training to be completed prior to the start of coaching, with annual review of information regarding concussions starting July 1, 2011, and a refresher course every five years. Beginning in July 1, 2010, coaches are not required to conduct an annual review in a year when they must complete a refresher course. The training course, review materials and refresher course are to be developed by the SBE in consultation with the Connecticut Interscholastic Athletic Conference ("CIAC") and organizations representing licensed athletic trainers and medical associations. Finally, effective July 1, 2010, coaches will be required to remove from competition or practice any student

athlete who (1) shows signs of having suffered a concussion after an observed or suspected blow to the head or body, or (2) is diagnosed with a concussion. The athlete must remain out of the game or practice until a licensed medical professional provides written clearance allowing the student to return to participation.

Vocational-Technical Schools. The legislature has passed two new laws affecting vocational-technical schools. The first, Section 29 of Public Act 10-3, requires that, by January 1, 2011, the Commissioner and the superintendent of the vocational-technical school system must establish and administer licensed practical nurse ("LPN") programs at various vocational-technical schools throughout the state unless the Commissioner gives notice by November 1, 2010 of the inability to do so, and the reasons why these programs can't be established. The new law further provides that if the appropriate funds are insufficient to cover the program's costs, student tuition may be used to cover any shortfall in funding.

P.A. 10-76 also contains a number of changes to the operation of vocational-technical schools. Specifically, this law changes the process required before the SBE can close or suspend operations of a vocational-technical school for more than six months. Under the new law, a vocational-technical school may not be closed or have its operations suspended without first having a public hearing, a formal vote, and the submission of a comprehensive plan for the target school by the SBE. Should a school be closed or have its operations suspended, the SBE is now responsible for transporting students to another vocational-technical school during any period of suspension or closure.

Among other changes, Public Act 10-76 also 1) increases the membership of the SBE from 11 to 13 members; 2) immediately requires that at least two members of the SBE have either manufacturing or trade experience, be alumni or have been educators at a vocational-technical school; and after April 1, 2011, 3) requires at least one board member have experience

in agriculture, be an alumnus or have served as an educator at a regional agricultural science and technology education center.

Other immediate changes (effective July 1, 2010) include: 1) the abolishment of the existing statewide advisory committee on regional vocational technical schools; 2) requiring an annual meeting between various individuals (including the superintendent of the vocational-technical system) and the respective legislative committee to review updated information regarding the operation and curriculum of vocational-technical schools; 3) a mandate for the SBE to replace any school bus that is twelve years or older and that is either in service or has been subject to an out-of-service order for two consecutive years for the same reason; and 4) a requirement that the SBE inspect all school buses on or before July 15, 2010, with annual inspections to continue thereafter. The superintendent of the regional vocational-technical school system must also submit a report on bus replacements in the vocational-technical school system on an annual basis. Finally, this law provides that, starting in the fiscal year ending June 30, 2011, the budget for the regional vocational-technical school system shall be a separate budgeted agency from the SDE and effective immediately, the superintendent of the regional vocational-technical school system must make biannually submit the operating budget and expenses for each individual regional vocational-technical school and make such update available on the school system website.

Seatbelts on School Buses. In an effort to encourage districts to provide buses with seatbelts, Public Act 10-83 requires the Department of Motor Vehicles ("DMV") to administer a program to help pay for school buses equipped with 3-point lap/shoulder seat belts. School districts may apply to participate in the program by submitting an application to the DMV between July 1, 2011 and December 31, 2017 which includes a proposed agreement between the district and the school bus company. The proposed agreement must require each bus company to provide the district with between one and fifty school buses equipped with

3-point lap/shoulder seat belts. The application also must include a request by the bus operator for funds in an amount equal to 50% of the sales tax paid by the bus company for the purchase of a school bus so equipped that is purchased on or after July 1, 2011. School districts participating in the program are required to provide parents/guardians of students transported on such school buses with written notice concerning the availability and proper use of seat belts and the district must instruct students on the proper use of such seat belts. The law also exempts school districts, bus companies and bus operators from liability for damages for injury resulting solely from a student's use, misuse or failure to use a seat belt installed on a school bus in the program.

In-service Training in Teen Dating Violence and Domestic Violence. Current law requires boards of education to provide teachers, administrators and pupil personnel with in-service training on certain topics. Effective July 1, 2010, Public Act 10-91 adds teen dating violence and domestic violence to the long list of topics to be covered under the in-service training requirements set forth in Conn. Gen. Stat. §10-220a(a). The law also expressly permits boards of education to allow noncertified employees to participate in in-service programs on a voluntary basis.

Changes to Minimum Budget Requirement and Various Educational Grants. Effective from passage, Public Act 10-151 provides that, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 2010, towns whose school districts had fewer students enrolled in the 2009-2010 school year than in the 2008-2009 school year may reduce their minimum budgeted appropriation by the difference in number of resident students multiplied by 3,000.

This new law further provides that, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 2011, and each fiscal year thereafter, certain towns that no longer meet the qualifications for school readiness grants may continue to receive such grants. Among other changes to educational grants, Public Act 10-151 also authorizes the Commissioner to deposit unspent school readiness funds in a new "competitive district grant account," and use the funds

to provide grants to competitive school districts to make slots available in preschool school readiness programs. The term "competitive school district" is defined to include school districts with more than 9,000 students in certain low-income communities throughout the state.

Tax Credit for Computer Donation to be Eliminated.

Current law allows for a tax credit for the donation of certain new or used computers to a board of education. Effective July 1, 2010, Section 25 of Public Act 10-75 discontinues this tax credit as of the 2014 tax year.

Definitional Changes to Laws Regarding Student Transportation Vehicles. Public Act 10-110 makes changes to a number of the laws regulating motor vehicles in Connecticut. Effective July 1, 2011, the term "student transportation vehicle" will be defined more narrowly as follows: "any motor vehicle other than a registered school bus used by a carrier for the transportation of students to or from school, school programs or school sponsored events." Student transportation vehicles and drivers of such vehicles are subject to certain regulatory requirements, as defined in state and federal law. In addition, effective July 1, 2011, the law eliminates the subcategory of, and corresponding operator's license endorsement for, an activity vehicle, which is currently defined as a vehicle used to transport students to school-sponsored events and activities but not to and from school. Finally, effective July 1, 2010, the law imposes specific penalties on school districts, school bus operators and other individuals and organizations that transport students for falsely reporting and/or documenting to the DMV issues relating to vehicle operation and maintenance.

Insurance Reimbursement Payments for School-Based Health Centers. School-based health centers ("SBHCs") are free-standing medical clinics located within or on school grounds. Public Act 10-118 now requires each Connecticut licensed health insurer, at the request of a SBHC, to offer to contract with the center or centers to reimburse enrollees for covered

health services. This offer must be made on terms and conditions similar to contracts offered to other health care service providers.

"Teacup Raffles." Effective October 1, 2010, P.A. 10-132 increases, from \$100 to \$250, the maximum value of each prize that qualified organizations may award at teacup raffles. This law also authorizes organizations to offer prizes of gift certificates in addition to merchandise.

Emergency Response to Children Affected by Recession. Effective from passage, Public Act 10-133 creates new state agency responsibilities and reporting requirements aimed at providing assistance to families and children affected by the recession. Effective July 1, 2010, this new law requires the SDE to administer (within available appropriations) a child nutrition outreach program to increase participation in the federal School Breakfast Program, federal Summer Food Service Program and federal Child and Adult Care Food Program; and to increase federal reimbursement for such programs. Section 6. Under this new law, the SDE is also required to participate in efforts to seek full utilization of the federal McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act to protect homeless students from dropping out of school and improve their access to higher education. Section 4.

"Sexting"

Public Act 10-191 was passed in an effort to protect minors from being prosecuted for felony possession of child pornography in connection with "sexting," which is generally understood to refer to the sending or posting of sexually suggestive text messages and images -- including nude or semi-nude photographs -- via cell phone or over the Internet. Under this new law, which goes into effect October 1, 2010, certain teenagers who would have previously faced felony child pornography charges will be able to assert a defense that they are instead guilty of a lesser misdemeanor offense in connection with the sending or receipt of images which constitute child pornography under state criminal statutes.

Shared Service Agreements

Effective October 1, 2010, Public Act 10-167 allows two or more boards of education to establish, through written agreement, a shared services agreement. Presumably, such agreements may be established with more flexibility than is permitted for cooperative arrangements authorized under Conn. Gen. Stat. § 10-158a. This new law also amends Conn. Gen. Stat. § 10-266m to establish a grant in fiscal year 2012 to any municipality whose board of education makes a cooperative arrangement with another board of education to provide school transportation for the 2010-2011 school year, provided such arrangement results in a savings as compared to transportation costs incurred by the boards of education during the fiscal year ending June 30, 2010.

"Green Industry" and Educational Programs

Under Public Act 10-156, which becomes effective October 1, 2010, regional vocational-technical schools are required to collaborate with public institutions of higher education to develop agreements to share equipment required for students participating in certain programs relating to green jobs. In addition, this law requires institutions of higher education to publicize green technology initiatives in higher education and to collaborate in furthering these initiatives. Under this law, "green technology" is defined to mean technology that (A) promotes clean energy, renewable energy or energy efficiency, (B) reduces greenhouse gases or carbon emissions, or (C) involves the invention, design and application of chemical products and processes to eliminate the use and generation of hazardous substances.

Prior Legislation to Become Effective in 2010

In case you have forgotten, certain legislative enactments in 2009 or prior become effective in 2010. To review these requirements, visit <http://www.shipmangoodwin.com/files/upload/LegislationEffective2010.pdf>

ATTACHMENT #2 Enrollment Projection 2010-2011

Numbers as of August 23, 2010

SCHOOL	KG		Gr. 1		Gr. 2		Gr.3		Gr. 4		Gr. 5		FTE Totals		School Totals	
	09-10	10-11	09-10	10-11	09-10	10-11	09-10	10-11	09-10	10-11	09-10	10-11	09-10	10-11	09-10	10-11
Derynoski	am 20	am 17	19	19	19	18	20	23	25	20	23	24				
	am 19	am 18	19	19	19	19	21	23	25	21	23	25				
	am 19	am 18	19	19	20	19	21	24	25	21	23	25				
	pm 19	pm 18	20	19	20	19	21	24	26	21	24	25				
	pm 19	pm 18	20	19	20	19	21	24	26	22	24	26				
	pm 19	pm 19	20	20	20	19										
TOTALS	115	108	117	115	118	113	104	118	127	105	117	125	0		698	684
FTE's	3	3	6	6	6	6	5	5	5	5	5	5	30	30		
Flanders	am 15	am 14	17	15	16	18	22	16	18	23	18	16				
	am 15	am 14	18	16	16	18	23	17	19	24	19	16				
	pm 15	pm 14	18	17	16	18		17	19		19	17				
	pm 15	pm 14	18	17	16	18		17	19		19	17				
TOTALS	45	42	53	48	48	54	45	50	56	47	56	49	0		303	290
FTE's	1.5	1.5	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	2	3	3	15.5	15.5		
Hatton	am 18	am 20	18	16	17	17	15	23	20	23	21	19				
	am 18	am 20	18	17	17	18	16	26	21	24	21	21				
	pm 19	pm 19	19	18	17	18	16		21		21	21				
	pm 19	pm 19	19	18	17	18	16		21		21	21				
TOTALS	55	59	74	51	51	72	47	49	62	47	63	61	-2.0		352	339
FTE's	1.5	1.5	4	3	3	4	3	2	3	2	3	3	17.5	15.5		
Kelley	am 15	am 16	16	15	17	22	22	23	25	22	24	25				
	am 15	am 16	16	15	17	22	22	24	25	22	24	26				
	pm 15	pm 15	16	15	18	23	23	25	25	23	25	26				
	pm 15	pm 15	16	16	18											
TOTALS	60	62	64	61	70	67	67	72	75	67	73	77	-1		409	406
FTE's	2	2	4	4	4	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	19	18		
Plantsville	am 15	am 19	16	17	19	20	19	25	19	23	20	22				
	pm 14	am 18	17	18	19	20	20	26	20	24	21	22				
	pm 14	pm 16		18												
	pm 14	pm 16		18												
TOTALS	29	53	33	53	38	40	39	51	39	47	41	44	+1.5		219	288
FTE's	1	1.5	2	3	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	11	12.5		
S. End	am 14	am 19	22	17	13	16	20	16	17	23	16	18				
	am 14	pm 20	22	17	14	16	21	16	17	23	17	18				
	pm 15			18		17										
	pm 15			18		17										
TOTALS	43	39	44	52	27	49	41	32	34	46	33	36	+1.5		222	254
FTE's	1.5	1	2	3	2	3	2	2	2	2	2	2	11.5	13		
Strong	am 16	am 18	19	16	17	22	22	20	22	18	20	21				
	am 15	am 18	19	17	18	22	22	20	22	19	20	21				
	pm 15	pm 17	19	18	18	22	23	21	22	19	20	22				
	pm 15		20		18			21	23		20	22				
TOTALS	61	53	77	51	89	66	67	82	89	56	80	86	3.5		463	394
FTE's	2	1.5	4	3	5	3	3	4	4	3	4	4	22	18.5		
Thalberg	am 16	am 19	22	18	21	17	18	21	19	23	19	20				
	am 15	am 19	22	18	21	17	18	21	19	23	20	20				
	pm 16	pm 16	22	19	21	17	18	22	20	23	20	21				
	pm 16	pm 15		19	22	17	18	22	20			21				
TOTALS	63	69	66	74	85	68	72	86	78	69	59	82	+1		423	448
FTE's	2	2	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	3	4	20	21		
TOTALS	471	485	528	505	526	529	482	540	560	484	522	560	2.5		3103	

The 2010-2011 new registrations, student withdrawals, and approved/denied out of district requests.

Enrollment Projection 2010-2011

Numbers as of August 25, 2010

SCHOOL	KG				Gr. 1		Gr. 2		Gr.3		Gr. 4		Gr. 5		FTE Totals		School Totals	
	09-10		10-11		09-10	10-11	09-10	10-11	09-10	10-11	09-10	10-11	09-10	10-11	09-10	10-11	09-10	10-11
	am	pm	am	pm														
Derynoski	am	20	am	17	19	19	19	18	20	19	25	20	23	24				
	am	19	am	18	19	19	19	19	21	19	25	21	23	25				
	am	19	am	18	19	19	20	19	21	20	25	21	23	25				
	pm	19	pm	18	20	19	20	19	21	20	26	21	24	25				
	pm	19	pm	18	20	19	20	19	21	20	26	22	24	26				
	pm	19	pm	19	20	20	20	19		20								
TOTALS		115		108	117	115	118	113	104	118	127	105	117	125		+1	698	684
FTE's		3		3	6	6	6	6	5	6	5	5	5	5		30	31	
Flanders	am	15	am	14	17	15	16	18	22	16	18	23	18	24				
	am	15	am	14	18	16	16	18	23	17	19	24	19	25				
	pm	15	pm	14	18	17	16	18		17	19		19					
TOTALS		45		42	53	48	48	54	45	50	56	47	56	49		-1	303	290
FTE's		1.5		1.5	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	2	3	2		15.5	14.5	
Hatton	am	18	am	20	18	16	17	17	15	16	20	23	21	19				
	am	18	am	20	18	17	17	18	16	16	21	24	21	21				
	pm	19	pm	19	19	18	17	18	16	17	21		21	21				
	pm				19			19										
TOTALS		55		59	74	51	51	72	47	49	62	47	63	61		-1	352	339
FTE's		1.5		1.5	4	3	3	4	3	3	3	2	3	3		17.5	16.5	
Kelley	am	15	am	16	16	15	17	16	22	18	25	22	24	25				
	am	15	am	16	16	15	17	17	22	18	25	22	24	26				
	pm	15	pm	15	16	15	18	17	23	18	25	23	25	26				
	pm	15	pm	15	16	16	18	17		18								
TOTALS		60		62	64	61	70	67	67	72	75	67	73	77		+1	409	406
FTE's		2		2	4	4	4	4	3	4	3	3	3	3		19	20	
Plantsville	am	15	am	19	16	17	19	20	19	17	19	23	20	22				
	pm	14	am	18	17	18	19	20	20	17	20	24	21	22				
			pm	16	18					17								
TOTALS		29		53	33	53	38	40	39	51	39	47	41	44		+2.5	219	288
FTE's		1		1.5	2	3	2	2	2	3	2	2	2	2		11	13.5	
S. End	am	14	am	19	22	17	13	15	20	16	17	23	16	18				
	am	14	pm	20	22	17	14	16	21	16	17	23	17	18				
	pm	15				17		16										
TOTALS		43		39	44	51	27	47	41	32	34	46	33	36		+1.5	222	251
FTE's		1.5		1	2	3	2	3	2	2	2	2	2	2		11.5	13	
Strong	am	16	am	18	19	16	17	16	22	20	22	18	20	21				
	am	15	am	18	19	17	18	16	22	20	22	19	20	21				
	pm	15	pm	17	19	18	18	17	23	21	22	19	20	22				
	pm	15			20		18	17		21	23		20	22				
TOTALS		61		53	77	51	89	66	67	82	89	56	80	86		-2.5	463	394
FTE's		2		1.5	4	3	5	4	3	4	4	3	4	4		22	19.5	
Thalberg	am	16	am	19	22	18	21	17	18	21	19	23	19	20				
	am	15	am	19	22	18	21	17	18	21	19	23	20	20				
	pm	16	pm	16	22	19	21	17	18	22	20	23	20	21				
	pm	16	pm	15		19	22	17	18	22	20			21				
TOTALS		63		69	66	74	85	68	72	86	78	69	59	82		+1	423	448
FTE's		2		2	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	3	4		20	21	
		471		485	528	504	526	527	482	540	560	484	522	560		+2.5		3100

The 2010-2011 new registrations, student withdrawals, and approved/denied out of district requests.

Board Members:

The attached chart has been developed as an additional talking point for tomorrow night. This document reflects equity and balance throughout all primary grades and offers the same end result in grades 4 and 5 (although with bigger numbers). This attachment mirrors the consensus recommendation of our elementary school instructional leaders.

Earlier today you should have received a fiscal update on black ink operational line items.

Thanks to so many board members who have spent a considerable amount of time preparing for tomorrow's agenda item.

- DES ~ additional grade 3 (from 5 sections to 6)
- FES ~ reduction in grade 5 (from 3 sections to 2)
- HES ~ additional grade 3 (from 2 sections to 3)
- KES ~ additional grade 2 (from 3 sections to 4)
- KES ~ additional grade 3 (from 2 sections to 3)
- PES ~ additional grade 3 (from 2 sections to 3)
- SES ~ additional grade 2 (from 3 sections to 4)

Thanks

JE

Cost of Staff Changes being Considered

Teacher Salaries

reductions	-0.5 FTE Kindergarten
	-1.0 FTE FES grade 5
additions	1.0 FTE DES grade 3
	1.0 FTE HES grade 3
	2.0 FTE KES grade 2 & 3
	1.0 FTE PES grade 3
	1.0 FTE SES grade 2
	<u>4.5</u> Increase in FTE's over bugeted staff

Note: the actually increase of FTE's over 09-10 is 2.5 due to reductions taken during budget reallocation

Cost of additional 4.5 teacher FTE's	<u>\$188,258</u>
--------------------------------------	------------------

Literacy Tutors

additions	2.0 FTE's
-----------	-----------

Cost of additional 2 literacy tutors	<u>\$28,282</u>
--------------------------------------	-----------------

Total salaries of additional staff	<u><u>\$216,540</u></u>
------------------------------------	-------------------------

Budget 2010-2011
Line Item Update

Turnover from retirements and resignations	138,826.00
Athletic Training contract savings	14,900.00
Natural gas-contract projected savings	20,000.00
Telephone- carrier change	5,000.00
Oil heat- projected savings	<u>41,000.00</u>
Sub-total	219,726.00
25% of supplies - holdback	<u>217,000.00</u>
Total	<u><u>436,726.00</u></u>