

**ROCHESTER-STOCKBRIDGE UNIFIED DISTRICT
BOARD OF SCHOOL DIRECTORS
SPECIAL MEETING
THURSDAY, MARCH 22, 2018
5:30 PM
ROCHESTER HIGH SCHOOL
DRAFT MINUTES**

1. CALL TO ORDER

- a. Attendees: Administration – Bonnie Bourne, Bruce Labs. Board – Carl Groppe, Megan Payne, Janie Feinberg, Ethan Bowen, Amy Wildt, Jenny Austin. Additional attendees of the public.

2. ADDITIONS/CHANGES TO THE AGENDA – none

3. BUDGET DISCUSSION

- a. SCS 2018-2019 populations: pre-K=4 3 yr olds, 9 4 yr olds, K=9, 1=8, 2=11, 3=2?, 4=5, 5=5, 6=8 (pre-K, K-1, 2-4, 5-6). Classrooms to be pre-K, K-1, 2-4, and 5-6.
- b. Rochester 2018-2019 populations: pre-K=10 + the 3 year olds, K=15, 1=13, 2=7, 3=14, 4=10, 5=6, 5=6, 6=11. Classrooms to be pre-K, K, 1, 2-3, 4-5, and 5-6.
- c. Do we have an engineering study of the school regarding heating, etc? No.
- d. The overall SU meeting is March 29. Hope to get an update on merger grants, how much is remaining, and how this is divided up between districts. Our money can help go towards this transition of the building(s), analyzing facilities, etc. Likely to be dependent on the size of the school. Some schools / districts have used more than others of the total grant money. It is estimated that there is approximately \$100,000 to be distributed amongst the WRVSU districts. Each district was available for up to \$5000 initial grant, followed by the potential for an additional \$20,000 grant. Stockbridge was part of a group that received a \$20,000 analysis grant.
- e. Does proposed budget currently assume ongoing operation of keeping both buildings? Need to know up-front costs of the building. Amy recalls seeing plans of the buildings. What is the next step for moving forward in regards to the Rochester facilities? Bonnie is to call Pluff to get input and what they know about the building. There is asbestos in the high school.
- f. Date for public meeting and can we change it? The board would like to move the

budget meeting date to Tuesday May 15. The meeting will need to be warned by Friday, April 13. There is concern of the board that there has been minimal time to provide input on the budget developed by the SU, as well as the timeliness of receiving budget information. More time is needed to refine the budget as well as come up with a plan for the facilities in Rochester.

- g. Next meetings:
 - i. Stockbridge board meeting Wednesday, March 28 at Rochester, 6:15pm.
 - ii. RSUD special board meeting Wednesday, March 28 at Rochester, 7:15pm to discuss budget only.
 - iii. RSUD regular board meeting April 3 at Stockbridge, 6:30pm. The RSUD board meetings are incorrect in the WRVSVU calendar, they are currently shown to be on Wednesdays.
 - iv. RSUD special board meeting Thursday, April 12 at Rochester, 6:00 pm. The deadline for the SU to get the budget to the RSUD board is Tuesday, April 10.
 - v. RSUD regular board meeting May 1.
- h. Rochester – need to begin preventative maintenance measures for facility upkeep.
- i. Budget comments beginning with arrival of business manager David Larcombe @ 7:00pm. (Shown below in order of budget line items)
 - i. There was a comment at the last meeting that salaries shown would be increased to account for pay increases (last year pay salaries were flat). David indicated these already included an assumption for pay increases.
 - ii. SCS PE teacher is shown as a .22 FTE although there is PE at school two days a week. Bruce noted this is due to the PE scheduling; the PE teacher is not at school for full days.
 - iii. The SCS music FTE amount is not shown on the budget but assumed to be 0.2. The Rochester music FTE is shown as 0.6. There is the desire to make the SCS music teacher a 0.4. It was reiterated that both schools should have equal opportunities.
 - iv. The tuition for preschool students is listed twice, and one of the line items needs to be delete.
 - v. In relation to the line item for tuition grades 7-12 the business manager handed out a tuition sheet. It was determined that for at least Stockbridge this list is incorrect.

- vi. There was the question as to why the paraeducator is different than 504 services. It was explained that the 504 services are for specific services such as OT, PT, etc and the paraeducator is for a paraeducator that is in the classroom.
- vii. It was noted that there still needs to be the discussion of what administration model the RSUD school district should have.
- viii. For the line item for transportation – field trips there is \$8K listed for Rochester but \$0 for Stockbridge. This \$0 needs to be fixed.
- ix. It was noted that money for inter campus travel should be added to the student transportation section.
- x. There was concern regarding the lack of input from SCS teachers in development of the proposed budget, especially since there is currently no principal at SCS. Jenny Austin provided a summary of budget sheets obtained from the teachers created in the fall of 2017 to the board as a first step in developing some of these figures. It was reiterated that there needs to be a voice in development of the budget numbers to advocate for students in both Towns.
- xi. In the Revenue Budget spreadsheet it was noted that the education spending per equalized pupil is \$17K for Rochester and \$13K for Stockbridge. There was the concern that this will be a concern for the Stockbridge community. It was explained that this has to do with the number of equalized pupils ratios being quite a bit differently than the actual number of students at each school.
- xii. It was noted that the communities will need to see the education spending per equalized pupil for each Town for this years' budget vote meeting (as currently shown). This was part of the merger document.
- xiii. David Larcombe noted that current legislation is such that from one year to the next there cannot be more OR less than a 5% difference in the education tax rate. As such, both the Rochester and Stockbridge tax rates resulting from the current budget proposal decrease by more than 5%. Therefore, there is the potential opportunity to add to the budget without having an impact to the tax rate. It was recommended that if any additions are made that these be up-front one-time costs that will not be needed in subsequent years (e.g. generator, facility improvements, etc.).

xiv. There is a limited amount of investigations that have been made regarding the two facilities at Rochester. There needs to be further discussion and decisions made regarding what will happen at those facilities moving forward. It was noted that the communities will expect to have answers regarding what the plan is.

4. PUBLIC COMMENT
5. OTHER
6. ADJOURN – 7:40 pm