

**APPROVED
MINUTES
BOARD OF EDUCATION
January 26, 2016**

PLACE:

Darien Board of Education
Meeting Room
7:30 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Mr. Harman, Chair; Mesdames Hagerty-Ross, Sullivan, Stein, Zuro and McNamara; Messrs. Martens and Burke.

MEMBERS ABSENT:

Mr. Dineen.

ADMINISTRATION PRESENT:

Dr. Dan Brenner, Superintendent of Schools; Dr. Susie DaSilva, Assistant Superintendent of Curriculum and Instruction; Ms. Shirley Klein, Assistant Superintendent of Special Education and Student Services; Mr. Michael Feeney, Director of Finance and Operations; Ms. Marjorie Cion, Director of Human Resources.

VISITORS:

Approximately 35.

CALL TO ORDER.

Mr. Harman called the meeting to order at 7:32 p.m. A public hearing on the BOE budget will be held on February 2, 2016 in the Auditorium at Town Hall. The next Regular BOE meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, February 9, 2016 at 7:30 p.m. in the Board of Education Meeting Room.

PUBLIC COMMENT.

There was no one who wished to address the Board at this time.

SUPERINTENDENT'S REPORT.

Dr. Brenner gave a brief update on an incident at Middlesex Middle School when one of the science water showers was accidentally triggered, requiring an evacuation. He outlined the sequence of events and announced that the students were outside the building for a half hour while the police and fire departments cleared the building. The school was back on the normal schedule within 45 minutes of the incident.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES.

January 12, 2016 Special Meeting and Executive Session

**** MS. HAGERTY-ROSS MOVED TO APPROVE THE SPECIAL MEETING AND EXECUTIVE SESSION MINUTES OF JANUARY 12, 2016.**

Town of Darien
Darien Board of Education
Regular Meeting
January 26, 2016

**** MR. BURKE SECONDED.**

**** THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE SPECIAL MEETING AND EXECUTIVE SESSION MINUTES OF JANUARY 12, 2016 AS SUBMITTED PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

January 12, 2016 Regular Meeting

**** MS. HAGERTY-ROSS MOVED TO APPROVE THE REGULAR MEETING MINUTES OF JANUARY 12, 2016.**

**** MS. ZURO SECONDED.**

**** THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE REGULAR MEETING MINUTES OF JANUARY 12, 2016 AS SUBMITTED PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

BOARD COMMITTEE REPORTS.

There were no Board Committee Reports to present at this time.

PRESENTATIONS/DISCUSSIONS.

A. MEETING WITH RTM FINANCE AND BUDGET AND EDUCATION COMMITTEES REGARDING THE 2016-2017 PROPOSED BOARD OF EDUCATION BUDGET.

Ms. Lois Schneider, Maywood Rd., represented the RTM Education Committee. She said that copies of the RTM Education Committee questions had been sent to the Board Members and the administration. The administration has stated that they will be sending the answers to the Committee over the coming weeks. She then read the following questions into the record:

Questions and comments for the Board of Education 2016-2017 Budget.

1. IT questions regarding the Training of the teachers. Will that all be done in professional development or ongoing training. We believe teachers need to be on board and well trained to utilize the capabilities of the technology or we end up with smart boards that are glorified projectors.
2. The support for the Chrome books will that be in each school or a central IT hub?
3. The desktops in elementary schools – why not laptops and can we roll them out 2 schools per year rather than all five every four to five years?
4. The technology plan was approved as the new administration took over. Has anything changed? How do we metric success of the plan?
5. We have concerns regarding the Hindley project, we are trying to picture the project and it may be clearer once we do the tour of schools. We understand that this is for security so that visitors do not walk past classrooms to get to the office, but are we losing net classrooms?
6. Also concerns about the HS cafeteria. We struggle with why not a large increase of students do we need to spend \$1.2 million for 60 more seats? 20K per seat seems like a steep investment to us. Again maybe when we tour the schools this will be clearer.

7. We are a bit confused over the changes in Music, Art and IDEA. While we understand curriculum and IT to be run from central office, we struggle to understand why Art, Music and IDEA need control from each school? It seems to us there should be centralization of everything, technology, curriculum and specials. It seems as we will add head count in the future by taking this out of central control and how do we ensure each school will have the same standards?

8. The field replacement of the stadium turf and in the next few years the baseball diamond. We recall that those were supposedly to be replaced by a foundation that predated the Darien Athletic Foundation, is that incorrect? Can we have a workup of what the costs are for the fields being turf to what the cost would be to maintain a grass field? Also is the center oval turf field the BOE responsibility to replace or has the DAF pledged to fund?

9. Universal Screening. The mandate is for K-3, why are we going to do K-8? What do we hope to gain from everyone being tested 3 times per year? Will this help inform instruction? Who does the screening, SRBI specialists or teachers? Is this strictly for reading or will Math be implemented in the future? Will this data be shared with parents?

We would like to comment that a majority of the committee liked the one day budget session. We felt the Administration heard questions and responded to most if not all in the meeting the following Tuesday. We thank the Board and the Administration for allowing us to pose comments and questions and thank them for their efforts in creating a budget for 2016-2017.

Ms. Debra Ritchie, Stony Brook Rd., representing the RTM F & B Committee, came forward to read the following statement into the record:

RTM Finance & Budget Committee
Comments for Superintendent's Proposed Budget for 2016-17 to the
Darien Board of Education January 26, 2016

The RTM Finance & Budget Committee would like to thank the BOE for this opportunity to present our preliminary observations and questions on the Administration's proposed 2016-17 education budget and capital budget. We recognize our presentation is prior to the BOE deliberations, but perhaps our perspective can benefit those deliberations.

Our annual disclaimer – our comments reflect the considered views of several members on this budget. Not every member may agree with every comment as our Committee did not take a formal vote on each item. Some of our questions are solely presented to be thought provoking, however, we are requesting formal answers to all questions. In order to keep our public comments brief, we have provided in advance to the board and administration a memorandum containing our many questions and concerns. This statement will be a brief summary of that memorandum.

First we would like to take the opportunity to welcome Dr. Brenner, and thank him and the Administration for their seamless transition. Dr. Brenner's experience and expertise will make him a tremendous asset to lead the district through the final phase of the transition.

In our memorandum to the BOE, we detailed specific questions and concerns that we have regarding the budget. We feel the answers are necessary for an informed deliberation and decision on the budget by F&B and the entire RTM.

For the capital budget items, F&B requests more detail for the larger scale projects. We request that the answers be included in an updated Capital Projects 2016-17 Priority 1 descriptions memorandum to be distributed to the entire RTM in advance of the budget vote.

Regarding the Superintendent's Proposed Budget for 2016-17 our committee is most concerned with the level of capital projects, the estimation of Excess Cost Reimbursement, the increase to technology in the schools, and an increase to spending of over 4%, which is an overall increase of 3.85% after taking into account Grants and Revenue.

Each year Finance & Budget attempts to establish a theme for our comments. Most BOE members are familiar with our mantra theme of “things that get measured, get managed.” We continue to believe this and as such, request that an overarching strategic plan be created for the management of the district. Technology is being integrated into the classroom and some administrative modifications are occurring yet there is no comprehensive plan in place for the overall management of the district. If a plan is fully developed, presented and approved, this will help everyone understand and substantiate various management initiatives as well as understanding what new initiatives are expected in the coming years.

The Administration is proposing an increase to technology in the classroom. While many on F&B applaud this initiative, some request that the Administration consider a modification of the plan to include a more gradual rollout. Is 2016-17 a pilot year for the program? If so, perhaps the number of Chrome books slated for purchase could be reduced if not all are needed during the school year. Also we have concerns about the infrastructure required to support such a large increase to devices especially in the elementary schools that have older facilities without updated electrical systems. These devices require a robust system to operate efficiently and seamlessly yet there is not a corresponding budget request to support the rollout.

Over the past several years the district has under budgeted the amount to be received from the State of Connecticut in the form of Excess Cost Reimbursement or Grant. By our calculation, the district has received each year on average at least \$100,000 more than originally budgeted and in some years, substantially more than what was budgeted. We request that the Administration take a closer look at the proposed ECR for 2016-17 and consider an upward revision.

Since fiscal year 2012-13, non public tuition has increased from \$3,210,504 to \$6,386,000 in the Superintendent's Proposed Budget for 2016-17. We would like additional details on what resources are in place to create in district solutions to reduce the potential for additional out of district placements. F&B has requested an addendum be provided showing the full cost of SPED including ELP and benefits less federal grants. Also an updated organization chart will help to clarify for members the current structure for SPED.

Under the proposed capital plan, the Administration is requesting funding for several large scale projects for our schools including nearly \$2,000,000 in projects at DHS alone. The highest cost projects are the cafeteria expansion at DHS for \$1,025,000, replacement of existing turf at DHS stadium for \$550,000, new storage facility at DHS for \$250,000, relocation of the main and nurse's office at Hindley for \$230,000 and replacement of the roof at the Central Office for \$500,000. We are requesting additional information regarding these projects. F&B hopes that the Administration will consider lower cost alternatives or possible delay of some less urgent projects.

Some members of F&B are disappointed with the facilities presentation and recommendations by M&M. Ongoing maintenance issues continue with our aging and inadequate buildings. A longer term plan will assist the district to budget priorities while planning for the future upgrading or replacement of buildings. Our hope is that a plan will be formulated quickly.

Again, we would like to thank the Administration, the BOE and the parents for this opportunity to present our thoughts on the Superintendent's Proposed BOE budget for 2016-17. We look forward to working with all constituents during the coming months.

Respectfully submitted,

Debra M. Ritchie
Co-Vice Chairman
RTM Finance and Budget Committee

Town of Darien
Darien Board of Education
Regular Meeting
January 26, 2016

B. UPDATE ON 200/400 LEVEL HIGH SCHOOL COURSES (File #2458)

Principal Dunn narrated a PowerPoint Presentation regarding Restructuring the Academic Support at Darien High School. Dr. Brenner said that both the administration and the high school staff have worked comprehensively on this project. He said that there may be minor staffing implications simply because the students have a range of course choices available. However, the staff believes that it will be possible to staff this program.

Board comments and questions and Administration's responses: a) **Would you talk about the placement of students in the classes? Some seem to be determined by PPT and others by SRBI.** (Principal Dunn said that the focus will be on the students who are currently not doing well in the course, such as Western Civilization. The staff will set up the support for students who need them.) b) **For the 8th grade students who are coming into the 9th grade, I would imagine there would be some movement, also, because their initial placement might not work. Can they move between these levels?** (Principal Dunn said that the staff will make adjustments. Just like any other major change, there may be disruptions to the schedule, but the staff is excited about having new supports available and offer a more appropriate setting. Dr. Brenner said that the lab classes present scheduling challenges because the students will be taking it every other day and that takes up space. The model of placement is the same placement model that currently exists in co-teaching. There needs to be a metric for admitting students, both special education and regular students or every class will have two teachers. That is not the purpose of this and it is not sustainable.) c) **The student may not be struggling with the academic material but the accommodations. How will that be managed?** (Dr. Brenner said that there would be a mix ratio of no more than 2/3rds general education and 1/3 special education. He went on to say that the number of special needs students will be monitored to keep the mix stable.) d) **Where do the SRBI students fit in?** (Dr. Brenner said that the gate keepers would be the SIT team. Maintaining the proper mix has been extensively discussed because it is not something that can be programmed into the computer.) e) **Are we getting rid of the 200 level classes?** (Dr. Brenner said no. There will be a shift and the students who are there will be determined by their PPT.) f) **Our conversation started with the issue that the 200 level were not NCAA approved. Will the comprehensive class address this?** (Dr. Brenner said that it was likely that the NCAA would support this. The District will have to go through the application process, however, if the NCAA is consistent with the process as they have been in the past, the likelihood is that the answer will be yes.) g) **When students go into a class with a lab, what is the delineation between the content area support vs. the pedagogical support? How will the content area teacher handle the student with not only content area weaknesses but also issues of executive functioning or reading comprehension issues?** (Principal Dunn said that the teachers should become aware of the issues such as reading comprehension because they are working with smaller groups. The SIT team will provide additional support as well. There will also be learning centers available.) h) **In terms of staffing, would this require an additional FTE since the students may choose various options?** (Dr. Brenner said that would be the worse case scenario. He said that there were unpredictable factors involved.) i) **What would a current co-taught class look like in the current model? How do you know if it's just not working?** (Dr. Brenner said that these teachers should be able to address learning needs at the same time as supporting content. It's not easy for a special education teacher to do in a math class or biology class who may not have the content background. There are some students that you don't need to provide much support. He gave some examples of how this might happen.) j) **How will this specifically be measured? How do we measure this?** (Dr. Brenner said that there were several kinds of metrics. One is how the student does. The other question may be if the student needs less support outside of school.) k) **Getting back to the 2/3rd to 1/3rd composition of these courses. If I understand this correctly, there will be SRBI students and general students in all four of these classes?** (Dr. Brenner said yes.) l) **And**

in all but the lab, they could be randomly placed? (Dr. Brenner said yes. The lab is fluid. He went on to give the details.) m) **Looking at the next steps, is it worthwhile to speak to the general education audience, because they are not on the list?** (Dr. Brenner said that answer was probably yes and that these solutions are going to be partial. There will be a bit of a problem because students will fall in via the computer. However, the administration will speak to the PTA and PTOs.) n) **How many sections of pilots do we have? At what point will this no longer be a pilot but a part of how we deliver instruction?** (Principal Dunn said that the word “pilot” may be misleading and that the administration doesn't expect too many more sections. Certain disciplines may match up more readily with a lab model rather than a team taught model. It will be important to create the various options for next year for the students and what is best for them. We need to have the flexibility for next year and there may be shuffling of these the following year.) o) **There was no essay portion on the English for the team taught midterm. In order for me to be more comfortable with this model, I would like to hear from the parents on this. Having the students all get B-'s on the mid-term doesn't mean that the class was working. It just means that they did well on test because there are so many variables without the feedback. Are the two teachers working together? Is the co-taught teacher helping the students who have IEPs that indicate they need support? How is it working? Are the students getting their accommodations in the class? Are there other students in the class identified randomly that are doing well because they now have extra support? We need more information and more metrics here to make sure that this is actually working for all the students. You're asking us to look at it now and include it in the budget, but I'm struggling with how the students are placed in co-taught classes versus a team taught class. Maybe there's a hybrid. Maybe there is a student who will need both. I'm struggling with how the students are placed.** (Dr. Brenner said that there are multiple answers to this. First of all, there is an expectation that most of these students are going to be in the learning center. These are not special education services, these are mainstream services.) p) **The learning center will help them with their goals and objectives not their curriculum.** (Dr. Brenner explained that learning centers will help the student to manage their goals. That's the objective of the learning center. If a student needs a co-teaching model and it is in the IEP, then the administration has no choice. Those students will have a co-teaching model. That's a PPT decision, not an administration decision.) q) **How do we get the parents to understand whether their student is being in a team taught class or a co-taught class?** (Dr. Brenner said that this was a good question. The issue is that these will be individual decisions made by the individual's parents. There is no perfect answer for this. This is a way to provide service that will give the parents a choice. This is something that has not existed up to this point. Dr. Brenner then gave some examples of how the PPT decision process might work with the various options. A team taught class will not address special education goals specifically. A special educator will not be in the room to monitor the student's needs like they would be in the learning center or the co-taught model.) r) **How will a parent know what questions to ask?** (Dr. Brenner said that there was a commitment that the staff would be meeting with the parents whose children are in co-teaching to talk about what the student needs. This not something that is being taken away, the staff is adding the services. This is an important fact. The staff is adding options that are measured against special education and general education. The conversations have to be sensitively done and address the need of the student.) s) **I don't have enough information to make a decision in terms of team-taught or co-taught. The lab scenario seems obvious, but the concept of the team teaching or co-teaching is confusing. How will this be presented to the parents?** (Dr. Brenner said that if a student needs support with the content, the best placement for the student would be in with the two content teachers. If there are issues with learning styles, the co-taught classes would be the better choice, because the specialist would be the Special Education teacher. It's not quite there yet, so the parents are grasping at a concept. There won't be any way to know until after the first year. I've seen the models work in other places. But it is a leap of faith in the first year.) t) **You are giving us information about this but my fear is that we will need more resources, particularly as we are working on the budget.** (Dr. Brenner said that there would not be a team taught class and a lab class at every level this year. There are the

three pieces -- the co-teaching model, the team teaching model or the lab model. The co-teaching model is underway and is going to stay. The team teaching model is the most intensive content, the lab class will provide an extra half period on the material. He gave an example of how this would work with the Western Civilization course and the math classes. The lab class will add an extra half period to the student's learning time.) u) **You are going to have a conversation with the parents about the PPTs and the student is in one model of class and want to move into the other model. Have we figured out what all the iterations are so we have enough teachers to do these things?** (Dr. Brenner said that there are co-taught classes primarily in math and English and that they were adding team taught classes. The 200 level classes will shrink in size because the general education students are moving up to the 300 level. This will also result in a shift in staff moving to provide the support. Ms. Klein said that the PPT process is not as much about choice as it is about what the student needs. She said that the staff member that would be most aware of what the student needs would be part of that meeting. That is help in making informed decisions.) v) **From a logistical perspective, if a student needs a lab class, will it be available in all four major subject areas?** (Principal Dunn said that the lab setting would not be available for all four subjects for a student with a full schedule. There would be options for secondary supports. Many students who have IEPs are not in co-taught setting and are successful in the 300 level without that support. Individual discussions are critical for providing support for those who need it.) w) **Assuming it works, and the student makes great gains in all the levels of 300 classes, would the door be open for a 400 level course?** (Principal Dunn said it would absolutely be open for the student. She added that currently, there is a pattern of students needing less support in grades 9 through 12, which is what everyone hopes will happen.) x) **From a budgeting perspective, to clarify, you are expecting to pick up the FTEs from the 200 level?** (Dr. Brenner said that there would be a juggling of staff.) y) **Back on the comprehensive for the 200, as I understand it, those will be special education teachers?** (Dr. Brenner said they will be content area special education teachers.) z) **So, they are dual certified?** (Yes.) aa) **My biggest concern gets back to the regular education teachers. Do they understand what the accommodations and modifications are? I worry about the mix in the classroom. We need to be careful about the number of SRBI and 504 students in a class. We need to make sure that the teachers can get to each of the students regardless of whether or not they are regular education or special education. I'm still struggling with these things because they haven't been addressed and now we're adding a layer. I'm comfortable with four different options, but there are a lot of things going on. Having the options for IEP students to go to the 400 level is wonderful because in the past, there were times that the parents were told that if the student went to the 400 level, their accommodations would be taken away. However, to move this forward, last year when this was initially presented, there were 200 parents who were concerned because you can only do one lab class without interfering with other aspects of the electives. There are a lot of questions that need to be answered for the 200 level classes.** (Dr. Brenner said that the easiest thing to change is the structure. The administration can make sure that the composition of the classes remains at the right level is the easiest part. That is the part that we can maintain. Sometimes that when you do that, it is where you have the potential need to add staff to keep the 1/3 to the 2/3rd composition of the class. If you want to keep the level of rigor up, then you must maintain the mix. If the mix shifts, then the class will have problems. The randomly selected general education student must receive the very same or better instruction they would if they had not been selected for the class. This is done through maintaining the level of the class composition.)

Mr. Harman asked if the administration was requesting a vote on this. Dr. Brenner said that he felt that a vote was needed because the curriculum was changing.

C. ACTION ON PROPOSED NEW COURSES FOR DARIEN HIGH SCHOOL FOR THE 2016-2017 SCHOOL YEAR. (File #s 2449, 2450, 2451)

Dr. DaSilva then listed the proposed new courses: Latin 4; Marketing Essentials and Digital Photography.

**** MS. HAGERTY-ROSS MOVED THE PROPOSED NEW COURSES FOR DARIEN HIGH SCHOOL FOR THE 2016-2017 SCHOOL YEAR.**

**** MS. SULLIVAN SECONDED.**

**** THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

D. UPDATE ON STANDARDIZED TESTING - SMARTER BALANCE ASSESSMENT (SBAC) AND CMT SCIENCE - ELEMENTARY AND MIDDLE SCHOOL. (File #2459)

Mr. Marc Marin, the Director on Instructional Technology, came forward to speak about the State Assessments and the testing process.

Board comments and questions and Administration's responses: a) **Sticking to the Smarter Balance, is it the same format as last year in that it is adaptive and timed?** (Mr. Marin said that it was.) b) **Will we get more detailed feedback this year? The SBAC feedback was very minimal.** (Mr. Marin said that the information from the State was pretty limited and general. The State is looking at it as a baseline and still trying to figure out how this will work.)

E. REVIEW, DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON REVISIONS TO THE STADIUM EAST FIELD PLAN. (File #2460)

Dr. Brenner then reviewed the proposed amendment regarding the upper right hand field next to the oval. The field will have multiple lines on it for different sports. The baseball diamond is now free of distracting sports lines. As this change in the plan was not part of the original proposal, it is being presented to the Board for approval. He also pointed out that the small parking strip had been modified to provide better safety flow for the vehicles. The plan will have to be presented to Planning and Zoning for the modifications.

Board comments and questions and Administration's responses: a) **Could they tilt the soccer field a bit?** (Dr. Brenner said he would ask, but that he believed that there was an access road. There may be wetlands next to the eastern property line.) b) **We are approving this to move it to Planning and Zoning. Where are they on getting us the costs for this and how is the fund raising for this project going? When we will know if they can move forward on this?** (Dr. Brenner said that all those details have been embedded in the contract.) c) **Is the approval contingent upon them raising the appropriate funding?** (Dr. Brenner said that the Board was approving this as a concept, and the contract covers the financing. They can't move forward on this unless they have the financing.) d) **But when this proposal started, the Board indicated we weren't comfortable with this until they had raised the funds, the money was in the bank and the Board had evidence of this.** (Dr. Brenner said the project can't move forward unless they produce the evidence of funding.) e) **Have they put together a replacement fund for the field in the front? Do we need to have a conversation with the Board of Finance about this? There is no one who is going to replace the stadium field, or any of the other ones. Has this field been included in that conversation?** (Dr. Brenner said that he would check.)

**** MS. STEIN MOVED THAT THE CONDITIONS FOR THE ACCEPTANCE OF THE GENEROUS GIFT OF THE DARIEN ATHLETIC FOUNDATION OF THE ARTIFICIAL TURF FIELDS AT DARIEN HIGH SCHOOL AS SET FORTH IN THE RELATED MOTION OF APRIL 22, 2014 IS HEREBY AMENDED SO THAT THE ACCEPTANCE OF THE GIFT IS FURTHER SUBJECT TO**

COMPLIANCE OF THE DARIEN ATHLETIC FOUNDATION AND ITS CONTRACTORS AND AGENTS WITH THE CONDITION THAT SUCH CONVERSIONS AS SUPPORTED IN THE RESOLUTION OF THE DARIEN PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION ADOPTED APRIL 8TH, 2014 CONCERNING THE LAND FILING APPLICATION NUMBER 53-B, AMENDMENT OF SITE PLAN DARIEN ATHLETIC FOUNDATION, 80 HIGH SCHOOL LANE, AS SUCH APPLICATION MAY BE AMENDED AND APPROVED BY THE DARIEN PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION TO MODIFY THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE STADIUM EAST FIELD AND TO PROVIDE FOR TURN AROUND IN THE ADJACENT PARKING LOT.

**** MR. BURKE SECONDED.**

**** THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

F. DISCUSSION AND ACTION ON ANNUAL REPORT ON HIGH SCHOOL TEMPORARY STADIUM LIGHTS TO THE PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION. (File #2461)

Mr. Manfredonia said that this was an annual report that the staff was obligated to submit to the Planning and Zoning Commission. He gave a summary of the hours of use and the fact that there were no complaints of light spillage onto neighboring properties.

**** MS. HAGERTY-ROSS MOVED TO APPROVE THE ANNUAL REPORT ON HIGH SCHOOL TEMPORARY STADIUM LIGHTS TO THE PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION.**

**** MS. ZURO SECONDED.**

**** THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

G. PRESENTATION OF BOARD MASTER AGENDA - FEBRUARY THROUGH AUGUST 2016. (File #2462)

Dr. Brenner said that the updated Master Agenda had been distributed to the Board for their review.

Board question and Administration's response: a) **Can we just add an update on the scheduling for the High School?** (Dr. Brenner pointed out that this was listed as an action item in February.)

H. FOLLOW UP DISCUSSION ON UNFINISHED BUSINESS AND POSSIBLE MODIFICATIONS TO 2016-2017 PROPOSED BOARD OF EDUCATION BUDGET.

Dr. Brenner said that this was a follow-up on information that had been asked by the public. He noted that there was an error about a Grade 2 teacher. There was also an approved technology gift that was not included. This reduces the budget increase request of 3.85% to 3.76%.

He then updated everyone with the answers to questions that were asked and gave the updated information to the Board Members. This information has also been posted to the website.

Board comments and questions and Administration's responses: a) **On the uniform cost breakdown, there was no cost entered into the report.** (Dr. Brenner said that a number value could be provided for the uniforms that the school purchases. It's not easy to know what the cost is for the activity fund or what the parents purchase. The accounting isn't from us.) b) **Is it possible to know what the cost is for the District purchased uniforms?** c) **One thing we need to know is what inventory we currently have and what is the condition of it for each of the teams including the freshman and JV teams.** (Dr. Brenner said that this was easy

enough because we have that list. It would be on a spread sheet for the Varsity teams. What the administration does not have is an accurate reflection of what the freshmen and JV teams have because it was a hand me down program.) d) **How do we know what each team gets, so we can be sure that everybody gets the same thing.** (Dr. Brenner pointed out that what has been historically done is that the program purchases for the varsity teams. If the board is asking for the administration to do an inventory of the uniforms for the JV and freshman teams, that's okay. The current plan isn't to purchase for them. If you are giving direction that you want to change that, then that's different. The information I have is what you have got now. For anything else, you are looking forward.) e) **For the purposes of discussion, I want to look at our athletic program and what is being spent, whether it is coming from the District or from the parents so that you have those comprehensive numbers so you can look at each program and see what they're getting from other sources.** (Dr. Brenner said that this is what the information was. The information did not include whose buying what and when it was purchased. Historically what is being done with the uniforms is there. Also, the information includes the inventory of the teams that have to pay for space as well because that is a parent expense you had asked for. I just want to make sure I'm giving you what you are looking for beyond that. You are asking us to look at the freshman and JV uniforms to see where they fall in the context of what we're doing.)

RC-1 – Darien High School.

- Need more information and clarification on the special education teachers for the 200 and 300 level co-taught classes.

RC-3 - Middlesex

- Line 118- 23004 – Clarification on Resource Material as to what amount is being paid for by the parents.
- Line 114 - 22002 - Textbook Replacements – reduce by \$2,000.
- Line 116 - 23002 – Classroom Reference – reduce by \$1,500.
- Line 121- 24009 – Science Teaching supplies -- reduce by \$1,000.
- Line 123 – 25001 – Misc. Office Supplies – reduce by \$1,000.

RC-5 – Hindley, RC-7 Holmes, RC-8 Royle, RC-9 Ox Ridge, RC-10 Tokeneke

- Need more conversation and more information about sections and more budget controls for each of the elementary schools.

RC- 9 Royle

- Line 312 – 21302 - Clarification on substitute teachers and the relationship to interns.

RC - 11 - Athletics

- Line 398 – 21220 –More information on the Curriculum Supervision.
- Line 402 – 101002 - Discussion on Interscholastic Darien HS, additional coaches.

RC-12 – Maintenance.

- Line 479 – 72048 – More information on air conditioning repairs.
- Line 490 – 122000 –What is the \$7,500?
- Line 476 – 72021 – Regarding security.

- Line 497 – 73020 – Replace Classroom Furniture.

RC 13 -- Music

- No comments or questions.

RC 14 – Art

- No comments or questions.

RC 15 - Technology

- Line 582 – 12001 – Consulting services.
- Line 584 – 13025 – Software Maintenance.
- Line 597 – 123021 – New computer equipment & update on pilot.
- Line 588 – 25029 – Staff Development.

RC 16 - Administration

- Line 619 – 12004 - Legal services – reduce by \$50,000 & update.
- Line 618 – 12001 - Consulting services – reduction.

RC 17 - Health

- Line 656 – 42001 - Health Supplies.
- Line 645 – 41004 - Substitute Nurses – why the increase?

RC-18 - Personnel

- Line 677 – 11027 - Contract support, additional information.
- Line 683 – 31000 - Budget control.
- Line 680 – 23100 -- Long term substitutes.

RC-19 Curriculum

- Line 722 – 25003 – Professional Development, more discussion.
- Line 708 – 21405 - ESL Instruction.
- Line 716 – 12001 - Consultant services.
- Line 707 – 21312 Curriculum Development.

RC 20 - Finance

- No comments or questions.

RC 21 - Library Media

- No comments or questions.

RC 22 - Tech Ed

- No comments or questions.

RC 23 - Summer School

- No comments or questions.

RC 24 - Special Ed

- Line 917 – 143002 - Excess Costs Reimbursement, discussion.

- Line 865 – 21303 - Personnel discussion.
- Line 883 – 12004 - Legal services, update.
- Line 902 – 143001 – Tuition.
- Line 898 – 52003- O-O-D SPED Transportation.
- Line 889 – 24013 - Special Education testing.

RC 25 - Fixed expenses

- Line 64004 - Sewer service.

RC 26 - Early Learning

- Line 1022 – 20003 – Professional Development, number of staff, more information.

Mr. Harman said that traditionally the Capital list included all the Priority 1 items.

Darien High School

- More information on Cafeteria, storage area and the replacement turf.
- More information on the sound system in the auditorium.

Middlesex

- More detail about the clocks.

Hindley -

- More details on the moving of the offices.

Holmes -

- No comments or questions.

Ox Ridge -

- Clarification on who uses the gym, the condition of the floor and how much use it does get.

Royle -

This is the fifth and final generator for the schools.

Central Office

- Write up about the slate roof was good, but need a cost break out between the roof and windows.

District Wide

- No comments or questions.

ACTION ITEMS.

Ms. Cion presented the Personnel Action Report. (File #2463)

Resignations/Retirement

Leave of Absence

**** MS. STEIN MOVED TO APPROVE THE JANUARY 26, 2016 PERSONNEL ACTION REPORT AS PRESENTED.**

**** MR. MARTENS SECONDED.**

**** THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

PUBLIC COMMENT.

Mr. Jack Davis, Greenwood Ave., RTM F&B, asked whether the \$69,000 was a base salary or included salary benefits. He requested that in the future, the 20% benefits be added to the budget list break out.

Ms. Karen Wilbur, Birch Rd., spoke as a representative of the Ox Ridge PTO. She said that they want to know about the budget control and class size and section size for the 5th grade teachers, particularly Line Item 261 – 810805. The current 4th grade, which has 4 sections this year will be going into 3 sections next year. Typically, the same class sizes follow the student throughout their elementary school years. This has been a great year for the 4th graders because they had four sections, but next year they will be going back to 3 sections.

ADJOURNMENT.

**** MS. ZURO MOVED TO ADJOURN.**

**** MR. MARTENS SECONDED.**

**** THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

The meeting adjourned at 10:22 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sarah Schneider Zuro
Secretary