

**ROCHESTER-STOCKBRIDGE UNIFIED DISTRICT  
BOARD OF SCHOOL DIRECTORS  
SPECIAL MEETING  
WEDNESDAY, MARCH 28, 2018  
7:15 PM  
ROCHESTER HIGH SCHOOL  
DRAFT MINUTES**

1. Call to order
  - 1.1. Attendees: Administration – Bruce Labs, David Larcombe, Bonnie Bourne. Board – Carl Groppe, Megan Payne, Janie Feinberg, Amy Wildt, Jenny Austin. Additional attendees of the public.
2. Additions / changes to the agenda
  - 2.1. School forest property added as #7.
  - 2.2. Next month – add policy regarding pre-K to the agenda.
3. FY 18/19 budget discussion (Shown below in order of budget line items)
  - 3.1. General – Following the last meeting, Bruce has met with Stockbridge teachers to discuss their needs and the budget sheets that Jenny Austin brought to the last meeting. Budget numbers have been adjusted accordingly (i.e. books, supplies, equipment for classrooms, etc).
  - 3.2. Line 15 – field trips should be moved to non-personnel. Amy asked about the winter wellness program funding and Bonnie noted that this was included in the field trips budget.
  - 3.3. Line 76 – music programming. At the last meeting it was discussed to change the music FTE from 0.2 to 0.4. Rochester music FTE is 0.6. Janie noted she has talked to the teachers about making this change. This line item to be changed such that Rochester maintains a 0.6 FTE and Stockbridge is increased from 0.2 to 0.4 FTE.
  - 3.4. Line 100 – tuition for grade 7-12 students increased significantly to correlate to a more accurate student listing.
  - 3.5. The model was changed for Rochester for SAP counselor services and guidance. It should be evaluated whether this should be modified for Stockbridge or if what is shown is the best model for SCS.
  - 3.6. The guidance FTE of 1.0 versus 0.3 for Stockbridge was questioned. Bonnie explained her rationale for the 1.0 FTE for Rochester, mainly being an additional need for student support for Rochester kids as well as “more kids – more time”. Not all present agreed with this rationale as there are also kids in Stockbridge that need additional support, as well as behavioral issues.

Jenny suggested that if this number is maintained that if there are needs that arise in Stockbridge that the Rochester guidance be available to come to Stockbridge and that in actuality the time is spent between both schools more so than what is shown on paper.

Bonnie agreed that this sharing could occur.

- 3.7. Line 176 – technology equipment in Stockbridge is needed for the IT closet.
  - 3.8. Line 203 – There was discussion regarding the administration assistant FTE of 1.5 in Rochester versus 1.0 in Stockbridge. There was a question of whether the Rochester admin conducts any tasks that are duplicate of SU admin efforts. David Larcombe noted that he did not believe there are any duplication of services. Bonnie noted that the administrative assistant is there in the summer to take in deliveries, etc. It was noted that there are also deliveries and such in Stockbridge so there was some disagreement as to the difference in FTEs between the campuses.
  - 3.9. Line 215 – the difference in the telephone for the Rochester and Stockbridge principals was questioned (\$5000 versus \$2000).
  - 3.10. Line 225 – custodian. The difference in FTE of 2.0 in Rochester and 0.63 in Stockbridge was indicated to be due to the increase in grounds coverage in Rochester.
  - 3.11. Lines 244 and 245 – Jenny Austin noted that the total of electricity and fuel oil for Rochester being over \$100,000 was going to be a concern to Stockbridge voters. As it pertains to the overall facilities plan for Rochester the overall costs for the high school need to be considered.
  - 3.12. Line 250 – It was discussed at the prior meeting to add a line item for inter-campus transportation. This needed to be added to the budget.
  - 3.13. Line 251 – A number for Stockbridge field trips needs to be included.
  - 3.14. Note: there was no revenue sheet distributed at this meeting.
  - 3.15. General – there was overall concern, mostly noted by Jenny Austin public attendee Joanne Mills, regarding the need to provide equality for the Stockbridge campus. There are many spaces in the Rochester elementary school that have specific rooms, whereas in Stockbridge these occur in mostly the multi-purpose room (i.e. OT/PT, no conference room, music and art, etc).
4. Reschedule annual meeting
    - 4.1. Bruce indicated the annual budget meeting date can be changed without needing to go through the State Board of Education. Carl to draft an announcement and send it around for comments. Amy mentioned there is a Rochester email list that the announcement can be distributed to. It was noted there is also Front Porch Forum and social media for getting the word out.

5. Annual meeting warning – see 4.1 above
6. Rochester campus building plan
  - 6.1. Bonnie noted there is a conference call tomorrow morning, 8am, to discuss facility related items with Plouf (heating, sprinklers, other facility related items).
  - 6.2. Proposed classrooms in Rochester for next year include preK, 1, 2/3, 4/5, and 5/6.
  - 6.3. Bonnie Bourne distributed layouts of the Rochester elementary school and high school facility. She noted that she believes there are a number of items that need to be utilized in the high school building if the elementary school is used as the primary facility. These include art, music, tech support, maintenance, administration, one planet, and guidance – small group. It was noted that Stockbridge Central School is a smaller campus without a number of rooms that the Rochester elementary school has, including a nurse' office, SPED rooms, conference room, a much smaller gym, locker room, and athletic director's office. Joanne Mills asked if there has been any discussion about getting rid of the high school. There is the potential issue of space being tied to programming and Rochester not wanting to lose resources they have now. There is an understanding of more students with more space, but there is the concern in Stockbridge regarding inequality in facilities.
  - 6.4. Carl noted Stockbridge has in the past researched the potential cost of bringing in a modular unit to gain space at Stockbridge.
  - 6.5. The question was raised whether Stockbridge concerns regarding whether utilizing the high school is an issue of cost or equity. It was noted by Stockbridge board members that it is both. Jenny Austin noted that there are going to be concerns from Stockbridge voters if the plan moving forward is to retain, in large part, both schools. The areas of the high school being shown as keeping open (as desired by Rochester principal Bonnie Bourne) are sporadic within the high school, and it was noted it would make sense that if areas of the high school are kept open that those should be limited to one area (i.e. wing with the auditorium).
7. Bingo Road Forest Road property
  - 7.1. It was recently discovered by the Rochester board that the forest property is actually a trust and is not owned by the district. It is owned by the Rochester Principal and high school students (not elementary students). If the RSUD wants to bring it into the new district the board would need to go to probate court. If district does not want it they can release the property back to the Town. If desired, the board could attempt to turn this over to the Forest Service and have an easement for educational purposes, etc. It was noted that this is not an easily accessible piece of land. Mason Wade noted that high school students used to use the area years ago.

There are currently students living in Rochester, but not going to school in Rochester. Carl asked if these students qualify as “owning” the property, even though there is no high school. This would need to be researched, though the way the deed is worded it appears that because there is no high school that these students do not qualify as “owning” the property, that instead it is the students of the high school that own the property. Megan mentioned this property has been brought up at selectboard meetings, and there may be interest by both the Town and Forest Service to own this parcel, which is approximately 15 acres. Amy is going to look into what the process is for probate court, and to see if the lawyer can be on the phone at the next meeting on April 3<sup>rd</sup>. Frank Russell noted that the decision of what happens with this land is the responsibility of the “current” board of Rochester.

8. Public comment

8.1. There was public comment from Joanne Mills regarding questions of equality for Stockbridge students, especially if Rochester keeps both buildings open moving forward.

9. Other

9.1. Carl recommends that new members attend a School Board Professional Development session or webinar.

9.2. Next Meetings

9.2.1. Wednesday, April 3<sup>rd</sup>, 6:15 pm at Rochester School (starting with a tour of the elementary school)

9.2.2. Tuesday, April 10<sup>th</sup> – No meeting, but the deadline for SU to provide revised 2018-2019 RSUD school budget to the board.

9.2.3. Thursday, April 12<sup>th</sup>, 7:15 pm at Stockbridge Central School

\* Note this is a different time than originally scheduled

10. Adjourn – 10:20 pm