

**Minutes of the
Litchfield Budget Committee Meeting
Held on November 17, 2016**

The Litchfield Budget Committee held a meeting on Thursday, November 17, 2016 at Campbell High School, One Highlander Court, Litchfield, NH 03052.

PRESENT: C Couture (Chair), K Douglas (Vice Chair), C Pascucci, A Cutter, R Keating, J Bourque, P Izbicki (School Board Representative), Superintendent James O'Neill, Frank Markiewicz, Business Administrator

Absent: D Miller, K Bourque

1. CALL TO ORDER

Mrs. Couture called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

● **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

2. PUBLIC INPUT

Liz MacDonald, 46 Naticook Ave, a paraprofessional at CHS, commented that an interactive and informative curriculum for the 1:1 program in Language Arts and Social Studies has been created by Mr. Scarelli and Mr. Cooper. She indicated students easily follow along in class with Chromebooks and digital assignments are handed in through Google Classroom. She noted that the need for textbooks will decrease as more students use devices. Mrs. MacDonald commented there are many students who do not have their own computers who would benefit with the Chromebook program. She indicated many districts are already using technology in the classroom. She mentioned her son participates in the 1:1 program and asked the Budget Committee to consider leaving the funding for Chromebooks in the budget.

Michael Carignan, 11 Bristol Way, commented that he has two children in the school system and one participates in the 1:1 program. He indicated the amount of teachers at CHS that work part time is growing and they are not always accessible to students. He noted the Chromebook program allows communication with the teachers and students have the capability to go back and review lectures. Mr. Carignan commented the amount of collaboration the students do is vast. He indicated technology is part of their existence and they are comfortable with it. He noted the public sector is moving toward more technology and if we do not give our children access to that technology we are doing them a disservice. He asked Budget Committee members to support the purchase of Chromebooks.

William Lonergan, CHS Principal, read a letter from Tammy Hoffman, Litchfield resident and paraprofessional at Bedford High School. Mrs. Hoffman wrote that her son participates in the 1:1 program at CHS. She commented assignments are posted in Google Classroom and Chromebooks are used daily for teaching, review of student work and assessments. She indicated that students can take notes on Chromebooks and many online apps allow for review of

work, assessments, assignments and notes. Mrs. Hoffman noted that teachers use Turn It In, a software that monitors plagiarism when checking reports, essays, etc. She expressed strong support for the 1:1 program and would like to see CHS move forward with technology.

Mr. Lonergan commented as a principal it is important when speaking of a 21st Century learning environment to provide the tools students need to move forward in technology. He indicated the learning expectations for CHS include using current technology to enhance learning, solve problems and complete tasks across disciplines. He noted students using Chromebooks at CHS are performing better than those that do not. He added he wants the students to have the best opportunities at CHS.

Colleen Gamache, Litchfield resident, indicated her daughter participates in the 1:1 program. She commented that her daughter loves the program and communicating with the teachers. She hopes the Budget Committee understands the value of the technology for the students going forward. Mrs. Gamache commented when entering college the technology helps prepare students as they go forth. She indicated a limited number of students using or having Chromebooks is a disservice to all the other students. She noted it is a valuable tool for both teachers and students. She added Bedford uses the 1:1 program in 5th through 7th grades and is moving next year to implementing it in grades 3 through 12, and we are struggling to provide it for freshmen.

3. REVIEW/ADDITIONS TO AGENDA

Mrs. Couture noted that Revenues will be added to the next meeting.

4. REVIEW/ACCEPTANCE OF MINUTES

- **November 3, 2016**

MOTION: by Mrs. Douglas

Move to approve the November 3, 2016 minutes

SECOND: by Mrs. Bourque

VOTE: 6-0-1

The motion carried.

- **November 10, 2016**

MOTION: by Mrs. Douglas

Move to approve the November 10, 2016 minutes

SECOND: by Mrs. Couture

VOTE: 5-0-2

The motion carried.

5. CORRESPONDENCE

Mrs. Couture announced that correspondence was received from several community members: Cheryl Lavoie, Amy Goldstein, Betty Vaughn, Cory Izbicki, Nathalie Hirte, Ana Taylor, Shawn Starbird, Debbie Rice, Sharon Theberg, Amy Ford, Neil Theberg, Tricia Curtis, Kathleen Robicheau and Julie Green in support of the CHS 1:1 program, the LMS music program, and

Special Services. Also received was the finance report from the district and a worksheet of budget changes.

6. BUDGET REVIEW:

Mrs. Couture noted that the Budget Committee received requested information regarding the teachers' contract, end of year technology purchases (2016 for 2017), the superintendent's contract, cell phone information and the five year technology plan. She commented that the technology plan requested was actually for a report/list of the technology replacement costs.

Mr. Pelletier provided a report of technology replacement costs for the Budget Committee. He indicated that these replacements are essential to keep the existing infrastructure running. He noted replacements include servers, computer equipment, and mobile labs (Chromebook carts and Windows carts). The report reflects the lowest costs are in the first year and the largest are in 2020. He commented the average yearly cost is \$150,000. Mr. Pelletier reported there is \$750,000 of inventory currently in the district. He commented there are certain areas in the replacement plan where we cannot include Chromebooks because of Windows machines. He indicated the number for the 2018 replacement is for current technology.

Mr. O'Neill commented he was not aware the School Board has a policy reflecting the students in a particular grade and the number of teachers assigned to each grade. He provided a copy of the data to the Budget Committee. He indicated that the information reflects how many teachers for each grade and the number of students per grade. He noted that because of the numbers currently in grade 2, the budget will have to be corrected to include an additional teacher for grade 3 next year.

Mrs. Couture indicated that because the enrollment in grade 5 will be lower, LMS will be over by one teacher, which creates a "wash" with the additional grade 3 teacher.

Mr. O'Neill commented he wanted to bring it to the Budget Committee's attention so there would be transparency in the intention of the district.

- **Curriculum Development**

Dr. Heon presented the FY18 Curriculum Development Recommended Budget to the Budget Committee.

Mrs. Couture asked about the software budgeted in the 2210-650 account. She asked if AIMSweb and Measures of Academic Progress are recurring costs.

Dr. Heon indicated they are recurring costs as they are subscriptions we pay for that have stored data for progress monitoring. She commented that Measures of Academic Progress is a summative assessment and AIMSweb monitors student progress on a regular basis.

Mrs. Couture asked if the World Language software that is budgeted for five teachers and classes is \$600 per teacher or one inclusive cost for all.

Dr. Heon explained this is an access system where teachers can teach and listen. She commented currently the teacher does all this live and students have to respond. She indicated this system will allow teachers to record so students can listen and respond. Dr. Heon commented the teacher has more opportunity to assess and students have more opportunity to listen and speak. She indicated the direct instruction will still occur, but this will enhance the program and the cost is for three sets of technology.

Dr. Heon pointed out in preparing this budget, the total of the 640, 650 and 734 lines would be similar to just the 640 line that was significantly higher last year.

Mrs. Couture asked about the laptops budgeted for Project Lead the Way.

Dr. Heon indicated they use programs that do not run on Chromebooks. She explained that the district received a grant that helped supplement the initiation of the program for supplies and early equipment at the middle school. She commented the STEM program has 8 computers and the Science course for grades 7 and 8 will only have 9 computers. She noted it is recommended that the ratio of students to computers is 2 to 1 and this will get us closer to 3 to 1.

Mrs. Bourque asked if laptop carts can be repurposed. Dr. Heon indicated they are additional equipment and these carts have wheels so teachers can share.

Mrs. Couture asked about course reimbursement budgeted in account 2213 and why there has been a change from last year to this year.

Dr. Heon indicated the non-union courses are for administrators and the SAU. Mr. Markiewicz explained that object account 271 (union course reimbursement) is budgeted by contract and has to be fully funded. He noted that object account 270 (non-union course reimbursement) is budgeted to bring it closer to the administrators' employment contract.

Mr. Cutter asked about the price difference with the Chromebooks budgeted in the IT budget and those budgeted in the Curriculum Development budget.

Mr. Pelletier indicated that in the IT budget there is a price break for a bulk purchase, but sometimes we do not get a price break if we purchase 20 or 30. He noted the cost will be \$200 for the device plus \$25 for licensing.

Mr. Cutter commented that as he was going through the 2018 budget, the Curriculum Development budget has inflated to over \$100,000 more than in the past. He asked what has changed.

Dr. Heon commented we have not purchased textbooks in ten years. She indicated historically we see several programs of materials being replaced this year that are 10 years old. She noted that a 7 year review cycle was presented to the School Board last night. She explained not knowing the target date for going digital, we purchased textbooks, but all the resources are online. Dr. Heon commented the digital costs is just as much as the texts with the digital components. She pointed out they also provide support for the online components. She indicated those costs are going to continue if we want students to have access to these materials. Dr. Heon explained the Program Evaluation Committee and the School Board are dedicated to providing robust curriculum to students to keep up with all the changes in Science and the content areas. She indicated much of that is delivered through the digital product and the feedback we are getting is that teachers are embracing the new materials.

Mrs. Couture asked about the 7 year review cycle. Dr. Heon indicated the actual replacement are in years 5-6 as some have a 6 year bundle subscription and some have a 5 year bundle subscription. She noted at the end of those bundles we have the option of paying the digital fee if we are willing to keep the print materials.

Mrs. Couture commented we always had a 5 year cycle. She asked why stretch it out beyond the life of the materials. Dr. Heon indicated some are replaced in years 5-6 and some are staggered. She noted we took special areas that required more supplies than text materials and were able to pair those in years with higher costs, such as Math or Language Arts.

Mr. Thompson commented when we went to centralized purchasing we were able to spread those costs out to the appropriate area.

Mr. Cutter commented going forward the text purchases are being offset by technology.

Mr. Keating asked about utilizing grants. Dr. Heon indicated the district receives a Title I grant for GMS Math for two tutors; a small Title II grant for professional development to supplement the coursework for teachers on alternative certifications; and a grant for Project Lead the Way.

Mr. Keating asked if there are any grants that are being written. Dr. Heon commented that they are looking for technology grants, but finding that districts with low income and urban schools are the focus for those grants.

- **Human Resources**

Mrs. Messenger presented the FY18 Human Resources Recommended Budget. She noted the total increase is \$484.

Mr. Cutter asked what goes into staff wellness. Mrs. Messenger indicated the District Wellness Committee provides wellness activities for the staff.

- **Salaries & Benefits**

Mrs. Messenger presented the FY18 Salaries & Benefits Recommended Budget. She indicated that the budget reflects an increase of 3.94%. She noted the following highlights:

- health insurance rates were budgeted at an estimated increase of 10%, but rates just received indicate the increase is 9.5%;
- dental insurance and Workers Compensation rates have not changed;
- the funds budgeted for summer check benefit rate adjustments have been removed (\$28,000);
- NH Retirement rates equate to 17.36% for teachers and 11.38% for employees;
- no increase in teacher or support staff salaries because contracts are still in negotiations; salary increase for non-union staff;
- a decrease of \$43,900 for the Superintendent's salary.

Mr. Cutter asked if there is still an hourly maximum salary for the Superintendent. Mrs. Messenger indicated the hourly rate is listed as well as the maximum salary.

Mr. Cutter commented that he calculated the annual cost using the current year hourly rate of \$77 per hour and came to \$95,000. Mrs. Messenger indicated the hourly rate for 2017-2018 is \$78.50 per hour.

Mrs. Messenger continued with budget highlights:

- salaries for non-union staff breaks down to different increases based on administration, professional, SAU office, which totals \$57,524;
- substitute salaries are budgeted in the regular education line for each school;
- 6th period classes are contractual (LEA);
- an \$8,720 increase is expected for teacher and paraprofessional grade changes;
- severance payouts are budgeted;
- \$5,000 for the LEA prescription reimbursement;
- Vacation buyback for administrators is budgeted;
- Moved District Unit Design to Instructional Staff Training;
- Added Instructional Coach under Staff Training;
- Moved CHS Unit Design from 2210 to 2213 with an increase of \$1,000;
- New positions and expanded positions are listed on a separate spreadsheet with changes in current positions budgeted in salaries and benefits.

Mr. Cutter asked why there are 70 vacant positions in the budget. Mrs. Messenger indicated stipend positions are not all funded, but have to be listed according to the CBA, some could have been vacant at the time we prepared the budget and are filled now. Mr. Markiewicz explained that in the HR/Finance software, the system lists the positions as vacant as a default when the position is not filled at the time budget preparation.

Mrs. Douglas asked if any staff are retiring or leaving. Mrs. Messenger indicated that in order to meet severance requirements or retirement requirements, teachers/administrators have to give the district notification by November 1.

Mr. Cutter commented that there is a long term substitute position vacant and that the notes justification reflects a cost that is lower than what has been budgeted. Mrs. Messenger indicated that you will not see all the substitutes in that line and that what is budgeted is a pool of money.

Mrs. Couture commented when she was going through the background material there is a need in the projections for a 2nd grade and a 3rd grade teacher, but a reduction for a 5th grade teacher. She indicated that reducing a 5th grade teacher and adding a 3rd grade teacher is a “wash” and the only additional teacher that should be budgeted is a 2nd grade teacher.

Mr. Lecklider commented when a student gets to the middle school level the program changes significantly. It is a very complicated and different look at instruction and in all grades we have instructional specialists who are trained for specific areas. It is really important as we start to see impacts in grade 5 to consider what is done at the middle level. The per student cost at LMS is below the state cost and our budgets have always been conservative. In this case, this affects programming for grades 5-8. Grade 5 is a transition year and it is not as simple at the middle level to reduce a teacher. It is important to understand that we are moving the middle school to an elementary model if we go in this direction. The rigor at the middle level is greater than in the past and having to cut a content area will have a significant impact on the program.

Mrs. Couture asked if grade 5 is still self-contained. Mr. Lecklider indicated that grade 5 is not self-contained as they have content specialists and are included in the middle level model. He commented the way things are structured is deep instructionally and teachers have become experts in their fields.

Mrs. Couture asked how we are going to deal with the decline of 20 students in grade 5, which will continue through the grade levels. Mr. Lecklider indicated he does not have the answer. He commented it is important to maintain the philosophy of the program that includes the content specialist model, especially in the transition grade.

Mrs. Couture commented that the high school employs part time teachers for a lower load of students.

Mr. O’Neill commented that he is aware that the cohort of students coming through middle and high school years is lower and that there will have to be changes. He indicated that no one likes them, but it would not be fair to say we will we will not respond to a significant student decline in 8 years. He expressed support for Mr. Lecklider’s argument, but is aware that the issue must be addressed.

Mrs. Douglas commented that LMS has a grade 7/8 teacher. She asked if we can have a grade 5/6 teacher. Mr. Lecklider commented if the numbers stay the way they are projected we can look at some of those things, but he would rather keep the content specialist model.

Mr. Lonergan commented that he is concerned about part time teachers being used as a solution. He noted there are challenges with it and transition and turn over becomes a problem. He indicated it becomes difficult to ensure you have the curriculum moving forward.

Mr. Keating commented he is not a fan of using part time teachers. He suggested looking at teachers who want to work those part time hours and stay in the district (i.e. retired teachers). He indicated we have high end teachers here now that may be looking to work part time so they can stay in district.

Mrs. Izbicki commented that the pool of teachers is very young and they want full time positions. She indicated we need to look at ways to consolidate part time areas in one full time position.

Mr. O'Neill indicated that we have to take a look at this internally. He agreed with much that has been said. He commented that he spoke about Litchfield's capacity to pay and the low cost per pupil compared to other communities. He noted the community may respond with a little more support as we bring them to you if we think they are critical. Mr. O'Neill commented we will have to make some tough decisions internally.

Mrs. Couture indicated some emails we received from parents reference a part time music teacher position at LMS. She commented that she did not see it in the budget.

Mr. O'Neill commented that in the past there was a part time music teacher at LMS that was cut from the budget four years ago. He indicated currently we have after school chorus. He noted the rationale was that the music program was suffering because we do not have a music class. Mr. O'Neill commented that a part time music teacher was budgeted for LMS for 2017-2018, but the School Board made a motion to cut it from the budget. He noted part of their rationale was due to numbers in the middle school and that the actual program is offering students that content. He indicated there is strong support for the position from the community.

Mr. Lecklider commented that chorus is currently a co-curricular program, but by bringing in the part time teacher it will alleviate the two stipends she receives and allow for the music program.

Mrs. Bourque commented about the resignation of a science teacher at CHS. She asked if the district will replace that teacher.

Mr. O'Neill commented the district is advertising for a replacement. He indicated currently the science department has made extraordinary efforts to teach his classes. He noted we have reached out to local colleges and other districts looking to find a physics teacher. He commented maintaining the effort of the other teachers covering is challenging for the remainder of the year.

Mrs. Douglas asked if the special education teacher requested to be expanded to full time is IEP driven. Mrs. Bandurski indicated the part time position is grant funded and if we had the funds it would be full time. She commented the grant will be discontinued for next year.

Mrs. Douglas asked if this position has to go before the voters because it is grant funded and will be going into the budget. Mrs. Couture commented that special education falls into a different category.

Mrs. Douglas asked about the expanded hours for the curriculum director. Mr. O'Neill indicated the position was full time in the past and is not a new position.

Mrs. Douglas commented we need to take a look at the direction of what the town wants.

Mr. Keating commented this is very important. He indicated having a part time training staff for full time people is not logical. He noted full time curriculum directors write grants, drive education, and get curriculum up to the point with technology.

Mrs. Douglas commented we cannot pick and choose when to apply that recommendation.

Mr. Keating commented the fact is last year people were debating it. He noted the people here tonight are professionals and they are saying it was a full time position in the past.

Mrs. Couture mentioned that she believes it is time the Budget Committee reviews the two warrant articles from 2003 and 2004.

Mrs. Izbicki pointed out it is an increase vs a whole new line item.

Mrs. Couture commented in 2011 we reduced the GMS Assistant Principal to part time because of enrollment. She noted the middle school has been at the same level for four years and the Assistant Principal continues to be full time. She indicated there will be a significant drop in enrollment at the middle school. She asked if the district has considered job sharing for the Assistant Principal between GMS and LMS.

Mr. Lecklider commented the role of the administrator in the building has changed drastically. He indicated administrators are expected to be instructional leaders and involved in curriculum. He noted we do over 200 observations each year, manage the behaviors of adolescents, and manage the professional development for all staff. Mr. Lecklider commented the demands are unbelievable and the amount of expectation at the building level is very high in this small district. He indicated he cannot imagine doing this job with a part time assistant principal as there is much overlap of observations, evaluations, emergency management and meetings.

Mr. O'Neill concurred with Mr. Lecklider. He commented when looking at the expectations of managing public school today it has dramatically changed over the last five or six years. The number of mandates we receive in training has increased. He noted there are issues we have to deal with for students with exceptionalities. He indicated we are the institution of last resort when taking children of challenges and making them as normal as we can. He added 504 students have to have a plan. Mr. O'Neill commented learning has changed dramatically as has testing. He indicated we need actionable data and we need to give teachers the opportunity to

use that data in classroom. Students are in a challenging environment with more diversity, which creates more management conflicts in the buildings. Mr. O'Neill commented managing student behavior has grown over the last 15 years and the complexity of the public school building requires two people full time to manage the building and issues going forward. He indicated the mentality that one and one half people can manage a building with a population of 300 or 400 students is fundamentally wrong. He noted if you want an exceptional district you need two people managing each building.

Mrs. Couture clarified that the reason this issue is raised is because the state standard is two administrators for 500 students. She commented 430 students are projected next year and the discussion needs to happen.

Mrs. Izbicki commented administrators look at every report card, building maintenance, security issues, and principals need to have an administrator in the building when they cannot be (i.e. workshops, meetings, conferences, etc.). She indicated that they share the work of preparing budgets, grants, creating classes, schedules and professional development.

Mrs. Couture commented that she was under the impression the curriculum director kept track of staff professional development.

Mr. Lecklider indicated that has been moved to the building level. He indicated that administrators manage assessments, special education, scheduling, special education meetings, after school programs, transportation, emergency management and many committees. He noted there are over 40 identified students in grade five. Mr. Lecklider commented that we meet with instructional teams each week and facilitate parent/teacher conferences. He indicated he has heard that we are proud of being a high achieving district in the community and by the School Board.

Mrs. Couture explained we bring this up every year to have this discussion.

Mrs. Douglas suggested placing the full time assistant principal position on the warrant. Mrs. Izbicki commented this is what the professionals proposed and it is up to the voters if they want to approve the budget.

Mrs. Douglas commented she appreciates the budget is developed by professionals. Mrs. Couture commented the ultimate goal is for the budget to be approved.

Mr. O'Neill indicated these positions existed and should be funded in the budget and not on the warrant. He commented it is not good community practice to put these positions that existed, were reduced and now need to be reinstated on the warrant.

BUDGET VOTING:

- **Technology**

Frank – question about the reduction of \$160K – it was during that process of bringing the requested budget down to the approved budget to the level of the \$160K – it was never there to begin with –

Cindy – this was mostly my struggle – showed \$160K less than the BC’s budget – end of year fund usage in my opinion is for those projects of lower priority and haven’t be able to get to them because of funding – do not like seeing paying forward – would have wished used it for 1:1 program – or for projects that suddenly occur – appreciate the work to illustrate it and understand why did it and where it went

MOTION: by Mr. Cutter

Move to reduce Account 1011222500-734, GMS Computer Instruction, Equipment Additional, by \$370

SECOND: by Mrs. Douglas

VOTE: 6-1-0

The motion carried.

MOTION: by Mr. Cutter

Move to reduce Account 1021222500-734, LMS Computer Instruction, Equipment Additional, by \$370

SECOND: by Mrs. Douglas

VOTE: 6-1-0

The motion carried.

Mrs. Douglas commented she did some research regarding the level of technology at the classroom level. She indicated she is struggling with providing Chromebooks for students.

Mrs. Couture indicated that is a question for the School Board.

Mrs. Douglas commented we are asking taxpayers to fund something we have not truly discussed.

Mr. Cutter commented he fully supports the Superintendent’s position and the IT Director’s position. He indicated last week it was stated that was top priority and I am behind it.

MOTION: by Mr. Cutter

Move to reduce Account 1000284000-430, District Technology, Repairs and Maintenance, by \$2,500

SECOND: by Mrs. Douglas

Mr. Cutter commented the overall increase in telephone costs is significant. He asked if an increase of \$1,000-\$1,500 is reasonable.

Mr. Pelletier commented that is reflective of data plans that come with the smart phones.

Mrs. Bourque asked who has smart phones that the district is paying.

Mr. Pelletier indicated the facility managers and custodial supervisors have smart phones.

VOTE: 7-0-0

The motion carried.

- **Special Services**

Mrs. Izbicki commented regarding clarification of purpose. She indicated this committee makes recommendations to the School Board. She noted the Budget Committee should not be blamed that they took money out of a line, it is just that the School Board is forced to make a decision on where to allocate the reductions.

Mr. O'Neill commented the Superintendent has supported this committee, but he expressed he did not agree with some of the reductions that were made.

MOTION: by Mr. Cutter

Move to reduce Account 1000120100-330, Special Services, Professional Services, by \$38,000

SECOND: by Mrs. Douglas

Mr. Cutter commented that he understands it is difficult to budget far out in the future. He indicated he looked at the actuals over five years and took 80% of what is budgeted to use as a baseline number to get to his number.

Mrs. Izbicki commented this line will get refilled when it goes back to the School Board. She disagreed with the reduction as it will leave the students unfunded for IEPs.

Mrs. Couture commented that the Budget Committee applauds **how the budget is created**, but the reality is every single year it changes up and down. She indicated historically only 75% of those line items have been used since 2013. **She believes a larger reduction of \$50,000 is appropriate and would still leave adequate funds..**

Mrs. Bandurski commented that some costs are recurring each year and some are new. She indicated if everything falls into place, those are services that have to be provided.

Mrs. Couture commented this is how you should budget, but it is our job to look at the bottom line and draw historical conclusions. She indicated these reductions are not directed at children because they are taken every year. She noted we never had to go back and ask for more money. She added the Budget Committee is not reducing services for children.

Mr. Markiewicz indicated that we do compartmentalize special services appropriations and that money is always separate and year end funds returned.

Mr. Cutter commented the Superintendent mentioned a warrant article adding to the reserve fund.

Mr. O'Neill indicated there is currently \$100,000 in the reserve fund. He commented Mrs. Bandurski has done a good job at budgeting services and managing special services. He strongly urged another request to use funds out of the fund balance with no new taxation.

Mrs. Bourque commented this money is budgeted on real needs for real students today.

Mr. Pascucci asked how it is justified if it is budgeted with actual services every year.

Mrs. Bandurski explained every year we prepare the budget and there could be a new service or services added that were not in the budget the prior year.

Mrs. Douglas commented you are funding for the services now and those services could be less needed in two years. She noted the reduction is historically based. **Mrs. Couture noted that based on historical usage a reduction of up to \$230,000 would still meet the needs of all the students.**

Mr. O'Neill commented we are mandated to budget for what we know we have. He indicated Mrs. Bandurski looked at the current services for students we have currently and that is what was budgeted. He noted he cannot explain why we have not spent the account over the years. He encouraged setting aside a pool of money in the event of an off year.

Mrs. Izbicki commented this is unusual in the districts where she has worked. She indicated placeholders are always requested.

Mr. Keating commented we had chance to have more money in the reserve, but it was taken away by a \$1 dollar vote. He indicated this is the one part of the school budget we should not be looking at because it is one budget that reflects real children and not percentages. He noted a professional and Superintendent with experience has gone through this budget.

Mrs. Izbicki indicated there are 245 identified students in the district. Mrs. Couture indicated that is how the district should budget and our job is to look at the percentages.

VOTE: 3-4-0

The motion failed.

MOTION: by Mrs. Douglas

Move to reduce Account 1031120100-734, CHS Special Education, Additional Equipment, by \$970

SECOND: Mr. Keating

VOTE: 7-0-0.

MOTION: by Mr. Cutter

Move to reduce Account 1000272200-519, Special Education Transportation, by \$40,000

SECOND: by Mrs. Douglas

Mr. Cutter commented this area is commonly over-budgeted. He indicated that the account averages 86% usage.

Mrs. Couture commented based on today, it is assumed every individual student will need transportation.

Mrs. Bandurski indicated that the transportation budget was over-expended in 2016.

Mrs. Couture commented the original request was over \$400,000.

Mrs. Bandurski commented that we cannot always count on cost sharing. She indicated some students go to different schools and transportation may be less costly.

VOTE: 3-4-0

The motion failed.

- **Business and Finance**

MOTION: by Mr. Cutter

Move to reduce Account 1090251000-330, Business and Finance Professional Services, by \$1,000

SECOND: by Mrs. Douglas

Mr. Cutter commented the district has never spent what is budgeted according to averages.

VOTE: 5-1-1

The motion carried.

- **Transportation**

Mr. Cutter commented that it was mentioned that transportation increases 5% each year. He indicated the numbers do not add up.

Mr. Markiewicz indicated the numbers are correct.

7. **REPORTS**

- **Town**

There was no report from the town.

- **RSA 32:22; Review of Expenditures**

8. **MEMBER INPUT/NEW BUSINESS**

Mrs. Bourque commented if people feel strongly about individual items they need to let the Budget Committee know. She encouraged voters to come out and vote in March.

Mrs. Douglas asked about the default budget. Mr. Markiewicz indicated it is not completed. He commented it will be presented to the School Board at their next meeting.

Mrs. Douglas was concerned about the total of the default budget because the district may not have the money for what is needed.

9. PUBLIC INPUT

Mrs. MacDonald asked if the public can have an agenda for the next meeting.

Robin Corbeil, 4 Nesmith Court, commented she is frustrated at Deliberative Session that we start with warrant articles and they get reduced or unsupported by the Budget Committee. She indicated that the Special Services Capital Reserve Fund warrant article is important as we have to provide for those students. She noted the money that is not spent goes back to the town. She commented if the Budget Committee does not support it then the town does not support it. Mrs. Corbeil indicated if you are asking them to bring the warrant article forward let the people vote on it and do not let it get changed by a member of the Budget Committee at Deliberative Session.

Mrs. Couture commented this committee acts as a whole and cannot control the individual.

Mr. Keating commented that people know we go line by line through the budget. He indicated they see our recommendation or if we support it or not and if a member of this committee changes an article the voter perceive it as this committee is represented by that person. He noted they listen to us and Mrs. Corbeil wants us to understand that it makes it to the warrant.

Mrs. Corbeil commented she is frustrated that the voters did not get to vote because 22 people got to vote on a changed article at Deliberative Session. She expressed that she would like to see the articles go to all the voters. She indicated the district can budget tighter if we have money in reserve. Mrs. Corbeil commented on the expansion of the Curriculum Director to full time. She indicated we teach process and a whole other arena and that needs curriculum development. She noted we need to get the students to think a lot deeper than what they are doing.

Mrs. Corbeil commented we need the resources and professional development and this professional does all the research to find these resources. With reference to the assistant principal position, she indicated that teachers have access to the administrators with the assistant principal.

10. ADJOURN

MOTION: by Mrs. Douglas
Move to adjourn the meeting

SECOND: by Mr. Pascuci

VOTE: 7-0-0

The motion carried.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:30 pm

DRAFT

16

Next Meeting: Thursday, December 1, 2016

Recorded by: Michele E. Flynn, Recording Secretary