

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62

Approved: 12/22/09

BROOKLINE SCHOOL BOARD

NOVEMBER 17, 2009

MEETING MINUTES

A regular meeting of the Brookline School Board was held on Tuesday, November 17, 2009 at 6:00 p.m. at the Captain Samuel Douglass Academy.

Chairman Dave Partridge presided:

Members of the Board Present: Beth Lukovits, Vice-Chair
Forrest Milkowski, Secretary
Marcia Farwell
Wanda Meagher

Members of the Board Absent:

Also in Attendance: Susan Hodgdon, SAU41 Superintendent
Mike O'Neill, Municipal Resources, Inc.
Carol Mace, Director of Curriculum
Bob Kelly, Director of Special Education
Lidia Desrochers, Principal, Richard Maghakian Memorial School
Lorraine Wenger, Principal, Captain Samuel Douglass Academy
James Doig, Assistant Principal/Special Education Coordinator, RMMS
Kristina Henry, Assistant Principal/Special Education Coordinator, CSDA
Sgt. Michael Kurland, Brookline Police Department
Mr. Ernie Pistor, Chairman, Finance Committee
Janice Tremblay, Finance Committee

AGENDA ADJUSTMENTS

Chairman Partridge informed the board the agenda would be adjusted to allow for a review of the draft policy between the school district and the Brookline Police Department outlining how incidents, which must be reported to the local policing authority under the Safe Schools Act, will be addressed. The draft policy was a collaborative effort between the Police Department and RMMS and CSDA Principals.

Chairman Partridge reviewed the draft policy. Other than grammatical changes, he stated no major issues. Ms. Meagher had reviewed the draft policy and was pleased with it.

Principal Wenger informed the board the principals brought to the discussions a template from within the state School Board Association policies. Sgt. Kurland brought templates from other towns. The state School Board Association's recommendation was for each town to design their own policy to best suit their particular needs. Sgt. Kurland prepared such a policy utilizing the templates provided and his knowledge of the law. He then conferred with the principals.

Principal Wenger will provide the board with a copy of the template from the School Board Association. A JICB-R policy will receive its first reading at the next meeting.

MOTION BY MEMBER MILKOWSKI TO ACCEPT THE MEMORANDUM AS WRITTEN

MOTION SECONDED BY MEMBER FARWELL

MOTION CARRIED

5/0

PUBLIC INPUT

Ms. Diane Whittington informed the board she met with Sgt. Kurland earlier in the day and spoke with him about the draft policy. She remarked parents are concerned because they have not received information from the administration about changing the way policies are implemented. Her understanding was that teachers have to report acts of violence and don't have discretion as to what they report. However, the administration has the discretion on what to report to the police. A lot of parents have asked for examples of what that would be.

1
2 Sgt. Kurland informed the board he had spoken with Ms. Whittington earlier in the day; however, he did not make any
3 specific reference to the memorandum, as it had not yet been adopted. He thanked the board for their confidence in his
4 work.

5
6 Ms. Whittington asked if a teacher witnessed an argument where a child says I hate you, I am going to kill you, would the
7 teacher have to report that to administration. Sgt. Kurland responded that would depend on a number of things; age, what
8 the circumstances are, the culpability of the individual(s), and what is agreed upon for the memorandum of understanding
9 with regard to discretion in that type of a situation. He added whether there is a memorandum in place or not, if it is
10 believed someone is in danger it will be handled swiftly. A little further in the process, parents will be provided with a
11 better understanding of the definition of an assault, etc.

12
13 Ms. Meagher questioned whether the Memorandum of Understanding would be posted on the web site, and was told it
14 would. Principal Wenger commented on the need to revisit the levels listed within the student handbook so that the
15 procedure in the handbook is in line with the Memorandum of Understanding. The Memorandum of Understanding and
16 the revised handbook will be posted on the web site. Sgt. Kurland is attending faculty meetings at both RMMS and CSDA
17 in December to present and review the memorandum with staff. Information will be provided in the weekly newsletter to
18 better inform parents. Sgt. Kurland commented on the fact the memorandum provides for a lot of discretion, but limits the
19 number of people with that discretion.

20 21 ADMINISTRATIVE REPORTS

22 23 Principals

24
25 Principal Wenger informed the board completion of forms relating to minimum standards for public schools has to be done
26 every five years. The forms themselves change every year. CSDA and RMMS are on different schedules (CSDA is
27 scheduled for this year and RMMS was done two years ago). The two areas the school is not in compliance with new
28 requirements are signage and library requirements. With regard to the signage requirement, the school will be posting
29 required signage such as safe and drug free zone. With regard to the library requirements, what is sought is a written
30 plan for resources, assessment of resources, reflection of developing technologies and priorities, timelines, and
31 procedures. The outline will be provided to the state. Ms. Meagher asked if the outline would satisfy the requirements if
32 the items identified were not included within the budget. Principal Wenger responded it is intended to be similar to a five-
33 year plan wherein you identify goals, etc. Superintendent Hodgdon informed the board the Department of Education is
34 making visits and looking at the plans that are in place.

35
36 Ms. Meagher called attention to the line item in the budget identified as impact of SAU goals relative to data management,
37 and questioned whether it was believed there would be an impact to this year's budget. Principal Wenger responded one
38 of the pieces included in the SAU goals adopted at last week's SAU Board meeting is a data management system. They
39 would like to see that starting in FY11. It is not included in the budget, but those are things the board may want to
40 consider whether through the budget or a warrant article. Superintendent Hodgdon will review the goals and identify the
41 timing to determine budgetary implications.

42
43 Chairman Partridge questioned whether the \$1,600 outlined in the library plan was already within the budget. Ms.
44 Meagher commented the library was left with no money last year. Funding for books is within the budget for the
45 2010/2011 school year. She was unclear whether the on-line subscription would fall under books, as there is no
46 technology line within the library budget. Ms. Meagher stated some of the items were related specifically to special
47 education and perhaps should fall within those line items.

48 49 Director of Curriculum

50
51 Provided in advance of the meeting and attached hereto.

52 53 Director of Special Education

54
55 Director Kelly informed the board two families have requested the opportunity for their children to attend the Preschool 3-
56 year-old class. The population in the 3-year-old class is currently 6 typical and 1 special education. The cap is 12, which
57 allows for 6 spaces for special education at a 50/50 ratio. Additional typical students are approvable. The two requests
58 are for typical students.
59

1 Ms. Lukovits remarked the addition of two students would still provide for 3 open slots. Director Kelly suggested a letter of
2 understanding that clearly states participation would be subject to needs arising for special education placement. Ms.
3 Meagher felt progression into the 4-year-old class could pose a problem. Chairman Partridge stated, when this was set
4 up last year, the goal was to ensure there would always be openings to fill the needs that arise, but that we could go over
5 the 50/50 ratio. He did not believe it was necessary to hold 5 openings this school year. He was in favor of going forward
6 with the placement and a letter to the parents that states priority is given to the 50/50 ratio and should the district develop
7 a need for that many more special education students, adjustments would have to be made.

8
9 Ms. Lukovits questioned whether Director Kelly was aware of any additional 3-year-old children that would be looking to
10 participate in the program. Director Kelly responded he was not aware of any.

11
12 Director Kelly questioned if the assumption would be to continue providing placement in the coming year provided the
13 spots remain open. It was suggested parents be informed those children would be slot priority behind the 6 that are
14 already there, who are not guaranteed to want to continue in the 4 year old group, and would be subject to the potential
15 for the need for more slots for special education. Beyond that they would be slotted above a new four-year-old who has
16 not been in the program.

17
18 Superintendent

19
20 Superintendent Hodgdon remarked her visit to CSDA was one where she had a chance to pop into a lot of classrooms.
21 She found it exciting to be in the school to speak with students and teachers. She visited RMMS last Friday and was able
22 to do the same thing. One of the features of that visit was being able to view the Pre-school setup.

23
24 Ms. Lukovits spoke of the caution received regarding sending mailings home about influenza. She felt that was strange
25 as it is common that notes go home when there is an illness in the classroom. She asked if there was a reason we would
26 discontinue doing that. Superintendent Hodgdon informed the board she spoke with an individual at DOE and a public
27 health nurse who is representing the CDC. Both said that they did not want the district to do any kind of mass mailings
28 simply because they did not want to panic the public and make it seem as though our numbers are so dire that we need to
29 notify the public. They instead are continuing with the same line she has heard since early fall/late summer that, if we are
30 doing anything, we should be emphasizing the preventative measures. They strongly discourage sending letters home.

31
32 Ms. Lukovits understood the reasoning behind not sending mass mailings, but felt if there were a classroom situation, she
33 would like to see the notifications continue. Superintendent Hodgdon stated the district is doing very little of that. If
34 someone is ill, the preference for CDC and DOE is that we are in contact with those homes so we know what the illness
35 is. They are really holding a fairly rigid line here, they are in charge of the situation, and we are obligated to follow their
36 procedures. She remarked it is a departure for a lot of schools so it is a bit of a challenge.

37
38 Mr. Milkowski suggested the Superintendent provide a brief description of the budget strategy for the SAU.
39 Superintendent Hodgdon informed the board and the public she had presented a preliminary budget at the SAU board
40 meeting on November 12th. One of the features of her presentation was trying to update some of the lines such as
41 memberships. They will review the detail of those lines to see what the district is getting from its involvement with
42 particular organizations, as dues can be quite expensive. She and Mr. O'Neill have looked at actuals for the last few
43 years and are trying to use them to base projections for the coming year.

44
45 They are also looking at the workload within the SAU office. It is quite clear, under the present structure of three school
46 districts; it is not practical for the Superintendent not to have some kind of assistance. In this case she has proposed an
47 Associate Superintendent position. One area of concern was should something happen where she is unable to continue
48 for a period of time, she would like to be able to ensure vital operations continue. The pool of superintendents is
49 dwindling quite dramatically and is projected to continue to decrease. Succession planning would be beneficial to the
50 district. The functions in all 6 buildings have become more complex. The demands in any given day for immediate
51 attention and decision making around crucial issues makes it impossible for the superintendent to continue to function
52 effectively.

53
54 Ms. Meagher commented she did not see an increase in the budget for that position. Superintendent Hodgdon stated she
55 did not include funding for that position in the budget, but provided a handout to make board members aware of the costs
56 associated with that position. Chairman Partridge stated the cost for that particular position was approximately
57 \$25,000/yr. for the Brookline portion. There was also a technology position, which was approximately \$14,000/yr. for the
58 Brookline portion.

1 Superintendent Hodgdon stated part of the reason for the anticipated increase in the SAU draft budget (9%) was due to
2 an accounting of the full cost of the Assistant Director of Special Education position in the coming year. The cost of the
3 position had been buffered in this fiscal year by monies that were carried forward. Mr. Milkowski stated questions arose
4 concerning some of the numbers presented. Therefore, he is not confident in the amount identified as an increase.
5

6 Superintendent Hodgdon informed the board she also proposed a part-time Director of Technology. There is more
7 technology in the schools than ever before and our network administrator is stretched beyond capacity to serve the entire
8 SAU in the hardware side as well as software and applications and providing training and integration of technology into
9 the curriculum.
10

11 The condition of the SAU building was another major aspect of the SAU budget for the coming year. There is significant
12 repair work that needs to be done just to bring the building up to par. The details of that have been provided to all board
13 members.
14

15 Business Administrator

16
17 FY11 BUDGET

18
19 First Review of Draft Proposed FY11 Budget
20

21 Mr. O'Neill informed the board he is not completely comfortable with the first line, salary increases, as he has not had the
22 opportunity to complete calculations on that. He has received information on what is needed to perform that calculation.
23 Most everything else is a zero increase or slightly reduced.
24

25 Chairman Partridge stated the board had been provided with a summary of the special education line items, which
26 indicate a net decrease in special education and do not line up with the numbers listed on the draft budget. The
27 explanation provided was that the numbers used for the draft proposal were system generated and believed to be the final
28 numbers for the 09/10 district wide budget. Ms. Meagher stated the system was not updated with the final budget
29 numbers.
30

31 Mr. Milkowski questioned if reallocations were made to budget line items after acceptance of the budget at town meeting.
32 Mr. O'Neill responded the allocation should remain as accepted unless the board reallocates funding. Ms. Meagher
33 stated the board did approve reallocations, as the proposed budget did not pass, which meant the budget had to be
34 changed to match the appropriations. Mr. O'Neill felt the numbers in the system would have been inputted after all
35 adjustments had been made. Mr. Milkowski remarked the MS22 form is completed after the district meeting and identifies
36 allocations at the conclusion of the district meeting. He believed those allocations were made to major functional items as
37 opposed to individual line items. Mr. O'Neill believed the information is put into the system line item by line item as that is
38 how tracking will occur throughout the year to identify where we are with the budget line item by line item. The total 09/10
39 system generated budget was \$8,125,521.88. In preparing the draft proposal, Mr. O'Neill added to those numbers the
40 proposed budget amounts provided to him by the principals and Director Kelly. He also included the guaranteed
41 maximum increases associated with health and dental benefits.
42

43 Chairman Partridge remarked page 2, 1200-114 lines, salaries for individual aids, has a \$40,000+ discrepancy between
44 the numbers listed on the proposed budget and those provided by Director Kelly. The numbers listed on Mr. Kelly's
45 spreadsheets show a proposed budget for 114-1 as \$142,900 and those listed on the spreadsheets provided by Mr.
46 O'Neill show \$151,600. On line 114-2 Mr. Kelly's spreadsheets show \$100,000 and Mr. O'Neill's shows \$137,000. That
47 discrepancy would account for a large portion of the 10% increase. Chairman Partridge requested Mr. O'Neill and Mr.
48 Kelly reconcile their numbers. Mr. Kelly remarked the 10% increase is not all related to special education. Chairman
49 Partridge agreed, but stated the amount within that area is a large portion of the discrepancy.
50

51 Chairman Partridge clarified how the spreadsheets identify what occurred last year when teachers gave back the funding
52 associated with a portion of their raises (the contract called for a 3% across the board COLA adjustment and step raises.
53 Teachers gave up a step and took only 2% COLA for one year). The charts in the contract for this coming year show all
54 of the teachers on the charts just as they would have been had that not occurred. He explained, they were given the
55 raise, they moved forward on the chart just the way the contract said, and they handed back the money for one year. The
56 budget numbers are exactly what the table said they would be for this year.
57

58 Mr. Milkowski questioned how that would be indicated within the budget. Chairman Partridge explained after the district
59 meeting, the proposed budget and actual funds did not align. They did not have sufficient funds. They went through the

1 budget to determine how they were going to align what was allocated and how it would be expended. One of the ways
2 that was achieved was by not paying out \$100,000+ to teachers and \$30,000+ to support staff as they gave those funds
3 back. Ms. Lukovits remarked the school board and the treasurer also gave back their salaries.

4
5 Mr. O'Neill questioned if those were all reflected within the budget. Chairman Partridge stated he would check back with
6 the Treasurer, as his salary give back was a one-time event. Ms. Meagher remarked the FY10 budget was not adjusted
7 and still indicates a salary for the school board although it was never paid out.

8
9 Mr. O'Neill stated there would be a paper trail that will reconcile the MS22 back to what was approved. Mr. Milkowski had
10 been assured the paperwork was submitted. Whether the budget was adjusted to match the MS22 he was unsure.

11
12 Ms. Meagher commented some adjustments have occurred, i.e., what was proposed (\$8,680,519) does not agree with
13 the final number listed on the spreadsheet (\$8,791,685). Chairman Partridge pointed out page 1 professional salaries
14 shows a decrease between the FY09 and FY10 budgets. He believes the salary lines were adjusted.

15
16 Chairman Partridge stated his surprise the proposed increase could be as low as 6% especially since the teacher salaries
17 will include a regular raise plus the extra step they did not receive last year along with the increase in health insurance.

18
19 When asked, Mr. Pistor stated their primary goal was to understand where the process is, where it is going, and how it is
20 going to work in this particular year.

21
22 Chairman Partridge remarked the district is in the 5th year of a five-year teachers' contract. Support staff salary presently
23 indicates a 0% increase going forward as the contract is currently in negotiation. Ms. Tremblay questioned whether the
24 costs associated with the support staff contract would be presented at the March meeting as a Warrant Article, and was
25 informed they would.

26
27 Mr. O'Neill stated there is no increase included in the proposal for professional staff. He questioned the percentage the
28 board wished to utilize for budgeting purposes. Mr. Pistor informed the board the Brookline town employees were likely to
29 receive a 0% increase with the exception of a unionized police department, which has an increase, built into the contract.
30 He believed it to be in the 3% range.

31
32 Principal Wenger was asked for the rationale behind her budget proposal. She responded staff was consulted on material
33 replacement and the requests were considered on an as needed basis. Some line items remain flat. Relative to the 2600
34 account both she and Principal Desrochers kept items at 0% and assumed any changes would be subject to the business
35 office relative to negotiated contracts for field maintenance.

36
37 Chairman Partridge questioned whether refinishing the gym floor could be put off for a year. Principal Wenger felt that
38 could be postponed if it was the desire of the board. She offered to provide the board with accurate figures for the cost of
39 refinishing the floor as they have changed contractors and it is something they are considering performing with in-house
40 staff.

41
42 Ms. Meagher stated her desire to receive additional details on the 2600 account. She commented there have been years
43 when a line item may have indicated a 0% increase from the previous year, however, it was a line funded in the previous
44 year for a specific project, the project had been completed, and the line continued to be funded. An example could be the
45 fire alarm account where funds (\$10,000) were allocated to magnetize the fire doors in the buildings.

46
47 Principal Wenger stated a large amount of the maintenance numbers are determined by the SAU business office. She
48 does not receive invoices for field maintenance, snow plowing, etc. They go directly to the business office. Mr. O'Neill
49 was asked to provide detail for the 2600 account.

50
51 Ms. Lukovits questioned whether the cost of the yearly maintenance of the generator could be passed on to the town
52 given it is necessary due to the building being an emergency shelters for the town. Chairman Partridge questioned
53 whether school would be conducted if the building were running on generator power and was told the generator is
54 necessary for emergency situations. Superintendent Hodgdon remarked the costs are typically born by the school. That
55 is the case at the high school as well.

56
57 Chairman Partridge questioned page 2, line 17, \$2,000 – \$17,000 increase for computer expenses. Principal Wenger
58 explained the purchase of computer equipment is in alignment with the technology plan adopted a few years ago. Mr.
59 O'Neill stated there were also additional software programs (AlertNow, PowerSchool, and Destiny) purchased. He

1 received an allocation from the I.T. Manager on the amount each district will share. Mr. Pistor questioned when the
2 current computers were purchased. Principal Wenger was unsure, but believed it to be approximately 5 years ago.

3
4 Chairman Partridge added the special education numbers, which he understood would be reconciled, the negotiated
5 salary increases for the teachers, and the health benefit increases and came out at approximately \$50,000 less
6 (\$455,000) than the total increase in the proposed budget (\$511,000).

7
8 Chairman Partridge questioned why 1111-612 – workbooks/math/RMMS doubled from last year. Principal Desrochers
9 explained the last report received listed the increase as \$3,000 and the previous one listed the increase as \$9,000. She is
10 unsure where the discrepancy is. Ms. Meagher remarked \$9,000 had been budgeted in the previous year, but the line
11 was cut.

12
13 Chairman Partridge asked if the \$39,600 across the district cost for Internet is accurate according to the contract. Ms.
14 Meagher remarked it is allocated per bill. It is spread evenly across 7 buildings. Chairman Partridge remarked when the
15 discussion took place at the SAU meeting, Mr. Peterson felt \$39,600 was high. Mr. O'Neill will check the contract
16 language.

17
18 Establish Budgetary Guidelines

19
20 Ms. Farwell asked if the board had a philosophy for guidelines. Chairman Partridge remarked the board is where they
21 were last meaning the idea of a 0% increase means staff reduction. Ms. Farwell questioned enrollment numbers.
22 Superintendent Hodgdon stated numbers went down in some districts and up in others. Ms. Meagher commented
23 Brookline numbers went up. Superintendent Hodgdon referred to the Principal's Report of October 27, 2009 where
24 enrollment numbers were listed as 375.5 at RMMS and 280 at CSDA for a total of 655.5. Ms. Meagher stated last year's
25 enrollment numbers as 311 for CSDA and 348 for a total of 659. Mr. Milkowski remarked the pre-school numbers were
26 not counted. That would bring the total down to 644.

27
28 Mr. Milkowski asked if the Finance Committee has any direction they would like to see the school go in. Mr. Pistor
29 responded given the town's reaction last year small is good, but they haven't tried to recommend a 0% budget increase or
30 flat budgeting ... **audio inaudible, tape ended....** Mr. Milkowski remarked contracts are being negotiated and Warrant
31 Articles will be forthcoming. He asked if Mr. Pistor had any thoughts on that. Mr. Pistor's responses was "Given the CPI
32 numbers and beyond that the general economic conditions, we are still in a position where most are lucky to have
33 employment, he would recommend slim to none."

34
35 Ms. Tremblay stated if the board is not careful about what is placed within the budget they will mostly likely face the same
36 kind of situation they had last year. Ms. Lukovits commented last year the budget did not pass, but it failed by only 11
37 votes. Ms. Tremblay felt allowing routine infrastructure maintenance to slip would be costly in the long run. She touched
38 on the importance of being able to educate the public on the rationale behind each budgeted item.

39
40 Ms. Lukovits commented there are 110 children in 1st grade going into 2nd grade with 4 teachers. The state requirements
41 are for a class size of 25 for 3rd grade and above. She stated the need to be mindful of state regulations. Ms. Farwell
42 believed classroom sizes identified by the state were recommendations not mandates. Chairman Partridge felt re-
43 alignment would have to take place.

44
45 Ms. Meagher questioned what was done with food service staff as that was a budgeted item last year and should not be
46 budgeted this coming year. Mr. O'Neill stated the food service fund would have housed those employees in the original
47 budget. Café Services was not carried forward as it was assumed it would be carried forward with a single line item for
48 transfer to food service to cover shortfall. He will look at the account. Ms. Meagher stated her desire to view other
49 revenue fund budgets.

50
51 Ms. Meagher commented last year's budget included a transfer to food services to be offset by revenue, but they also
52 budgeted an operating expense for transfer to food services (\$5,000). It is predicted to be at \$15,000. She was unsure
53 how much should be budgeted for next year. Mr. O'Neill stated the \$5,000 listed in the budget was a carry over from last
54 year.

55
56 Ms. Meagher remarked two months ago the board provided guidance of 0% on everything not contracted. The
57 administrators took that advice and prepared their proposed budget. Chairman Partridge questioned if the \$15,000
58 proposed for new equipment could be reviewed to determine necessity. Ms. Meagher questioned the use of REEP funds.
59 Principal Wenger stated REEP funds are meant to enrich programs not supplant the budget. Ms. Meagher stated the

1 funding has been used for computer equipment in the past. She questioned what the funding would be utilized for.
2 Principal Wenger responded a good portion of it would be used for professional development. The professional
3 development monies identified within the budget would not cover any of the professional development done in house.
4 She added, we have used it for some elements of technology, but have always been told it really needs to be for
5 something other than what the district should be supporting in their technology plan.

6
7 Superintendent Hodgdon remarked if we were to have a site visit we would have to be able to show a direct line to student
8 achievement with equipment funding was used to purchase and have a plan for what data we are going to use to show
9 the increase in student achievement. She stated REEP funding is Title 6 money and has most of the features of titles 1-5;
10 remediation of students, teacher quality, which gets to the professional development, ESL, safe and drug free schools,
11 and innovative projects. Title 5 funding is gone, and this is the last year of Title 4 funding.

12
13 Mr. Milkowski remarked the board is looking at an approximate 6% budget increase prior to contract negotiations.
14 Superintendent Hodgdon believed there to be more work to be done before drawing that conclusion from the proposed
15 budget. Preparation was rushed to allow the discussion to take place. Mr. Milkowski requested electronic copies be
16 provided.

17
18 Mr. O'Neill informed the board of additional anticipated needs for CSDA and RMMS; For CSDA a .5 nurse's aid position,
19 roof repair, classroom building, driveway and parking lot sealed, phone intercom system, data warehouse and curriculum
20 mapping tool. He is working on an estimate for overall building repairs. It appears the shingles have been recalled. The
21 school may be able to acquire new shingles and only absorb the cost to put them on. Ms. Farwell remarked the same
22 thing happened 20 years ago and the district never collected a dime. Chairman Partridge stated there should be \$10,000
23 in the maintenance fund. Ms. Meagher commented they would likely want to put a warrant article forward to increase the
24 maintenance line. Chairman Partridge pointed out the proposed budget has an additional \$10,000 for maintenance. That
25 would bring the maintenance fund up to \$20,000. As there were other opinions about the amount of funding available, Mr.
26 O'Neill will verify.

27
28 Ms. Meagher felt the board would have to decline adding the additional items into the proposed budget. Chairman
29 Partridge questioned if the .5 nurses aid position is necessary. Principal Wenger responded there are significant needs at
30 CSDA for additional support for the nurse. Further discussion of the situation would have to take place in non-public
31 session. Ms. Meagher asked if it would fall under 504.

32
33 Water is getting into the building from behind the flashing. Re-flashing would likely be at a cost of \$7,000-\$8,000.
34 Sealing of the driveway and parking lot seal is another maintenance item that should be done every 10 years. He does
35 not believe it has been done since the school was built. Phone intercom system - the phone system is antiquated. Data
36 Warehouse and Curriculum Mapping Tool – Chairman Partridge had believed most of work for this year would be
37 research and the expense would occur in the following year. He will look into that.

38
39 For RMMS; security system, lunch tables, folding chairs, driveway, paint exterior building, fence, replace tiles in
40 classroom, handicapped lift, boilers (2 within 5 years), gym floor (within 4 years), primary bathrooms revised, primary
41 sinks revised, gym divider curtain, AC in computer room, library, copy room, and office area.

42
43 When asked, Principal Desrochers stated the ACs would be installed units opposed to the window units. Ms. Lukovits
44 questioned where the fencing was intended for and was told it would be around the playground. Chairman Partridge
45 remarked paving has to be done next year. Chairman Partridge appreciated the ability to utilize the basement if a
46 handicapped lift was purchased, but did not believe that funding would come from the general fund (\$30,000). When
47 asked about the primary sinks, Principal Desrochers informed the board the primary children are in a wing that was
48 originally designated for 6th grade so they are working with sinks and bathroom fixtures that are a lot bigger than they
49 need to be. They presently have stools in the restrooms and classrooms. Chairman Partridge questioned the gym divider
50 curtain. Ms. Meagher stated that would allow them to conduct a gym class while another activity was going on in the gym.
51 Ms. Meagher felt \$13,000 was too high of a number, and if something half that cost were proposed she would be able to
52 support it. Principal Desrochers was not sure other quotes could be acquired, as it is a specialty item in that it has to be a
53 fireproof material, etc. Chairman Partridge questioned whether the proposed \$18,000 represents painting the entire
54 building and was told it does.

55
56 Budget Preparation Timeline – Key Dates

57
58 Superintendent Hodgdon remarked the board has set the date of March 4th for the district meeting. Doris reviewed the
59 statutory requirements and determined the budget hearing has to be held no later than February 7th, which is a Sunday.

