

Mr. Adamakos came forward for the discussion. Ms. Lecaroz began to review the proposed budget.

Under Regular Education Programs, Mr. Bilby questioned what the IReady Assessment System was. Ms. Lecaroz replied the IReady system replaced the North West Education Association ('NWEA') assessment, which was previously budgeted under the District budget. The assessments were no longer an assessment of the district and were now specific to the individual schools to ensure they were achieving standards within the curriculum. Mr. Guimond questioned how Pelham's students compared to others in the State. Mr. Lecaroz replied she hadn't yet seen the results from IReady, and the results from Smarter Balance would be released November 12th.

Under Regular Education Program – Supplies, Mr. Cate questioned if the replacement of classroom rugs was a regular maintenance program. Mr. Adamakos explained they usually order ten rugs per year; however, due to the increase in cost, they plan to order six this year. Rugs are used in each of the forty classrooms.

Mr. Cate questioned why Ms. Lecaroz removed the projectors for grades 3 and 4. Ms. Lecaroz explained there were classrooms within the new addition of the high school that would use short-throw projectors mounted on the wall because of the height of the ceiling. Since the elementary school was in need of replacement projectors, they moved the high school units to the elementary school and reduced approximately \$9,000 from the budget line. Mr. Bilby wanted to know how HDMI document cameras were being used. Ms. Lecaroz replied they were used as a demonstration tool by teachers to project an image onto the wall for the classroom to view, versus having students try to crowd around a desk.

There was a brief discussion regarding the Envision supplies, which included consumables that are replaced each year because students work out of them.

Mr. Cate wanted to know how the music program was doing. Mr. Adamakos stated they were doing well. The proposed instruments and other budget items were normal wear and tear. Ms. Lecaroz noted that the program participation was increasing, which is shown in the Memorial School budget.

Under Special Education, Mr. Cate questioned if the vacant position had been filled. Ms. Lecaroz replied each school budget contained a contingency position. Currently, the position was vacant. She indicated the position may be filled given there were a handful of students that came into district since last spring that had support needs. Mr. Viger wanted to know if the instructional assistants received benefits. Ms. Mahoney explained that the special educational assistants that worked thirty hours or more were eligible to participate in health insurance. She added that a small percentage of current assistants participated, they didn't budget for contingencies.

Ms. Dube asked if the 'teachers' listed under special education were teachers or case workers. Ms. Lecaroz replied they were both case managers and special education teachers. They teach in small groups and in classrooms.

Mr. Guimond saw that the line for in-house speakers/performers had been reduced to zero and questioned if they would not have any assemblies. Mr. Adamakos replied that they had a wonderful PTA and School Council that were open to hearing teacher proposals. He told the Board that none of the programming would be cut.

Mr. Cate asked if they had hired a librarian. Ms. Lecaroz answered yes. Mr. Cate wanted to know if the salary figure was accurate. Ms. Mahoney answered no; she believed the new employee's salary was less than what was listed. She would research the figure and make appropriate adjustments.

Ms. Lecaroz spoke about the computer technology plan, which was in the district budget, unless there were things specific to a school. Their focus is to have Chromebooks available for all students in grades 7-12. The existing Chromebooks will then be shifted to the lower grades beginning with 6th grade. It was noted that the chrome books would have a three year lease.

Mr. Guimond questioned why travel and mileage was reduced. Ms. Lecaroz replied they based the budget on actuals and where a conference is located. Mr. Guimond asked what the per mile reimbursement figure was. Ms. Lecaroz stated they used the IRS rate.

Mr. Sherman questioned if the salary increase for administration was contractual. Ms. Lecaroz replied there was a salary pool in the district wide budget. She said she reviews the evaluations and an employee would receive a raise anywhere between zero to 3.5% based on their performance. The individuals listed as hourly under the administration line are non-union and have an annual contract.

Mr. Viger recalled during the school walk-through a discussion about possibly increasing the building services salary pay to keep custodial staff. Ms. Lecaroz replied they surveyed the salaries of surrounding districts and found there was one district (directly next to Pelham) that paid higher; however, all the other districts were at or below the salary paid by Pelham. Mr. Bilby questioned how much more the other district paid. Ms. Lecaroz said Pelham starts at \$11.00/hour, the district directly beside Pelham started at \$13.00. She noted most paid between \$9/- \$11/hour.

Under building services Ms. Larson told the Board she prepared a summary for repairs and maintenance to clearly see where they were at for each school. Mr. Cate questioned if the per gallon cost for heating oil would be adjusted. Mr. Guimond didn't recall the figure being adjusted given that the school prepares their budget for 1.5 years ahead of schedule. Ms. Lecaroz noted they work with an energy consultant who had done well for them. Ms. Larson pointed out the past year's figure and stated they were being conservative and monitoring their expenditures.

Ms. Lecaroz noted they kept \$.01 in the equipment replacement line for a replacement generator. She said the school had requested a generator, but in order to bring a fiscally conservative budget forward, they felt it was prudent to cut the item. Ms. Hillsgrove wanted to know the impact of not having a generator. Ms. Lecaroz replied the current generator was working. Ms. Hillsgrove asked if it was reaching the end of its life or experiencing significant repair costs. Mr. Guimond wanted to know the age of the generator. Ms. Mahoney told the Board she would make note of the question and believed the facilities director could address the status of the equipment. Ms. Hillsgrove wanted to know what was planned in the event the generator failed.

The Board concluded review of the elementary school budget.

Pelham Memorial School

FY2016 Adjusted Budget - \$4,537,961

FY2017 Proposed Budget - \$4,515,237 (*decrease of \$22,724*)

Pelham Memorial School Principal John Safina came forward for the budget review.

Salaries was reduced solely from hiring/turnover, there was no reduction in teaching staff. There was an increase for benefits based on what people chose.

It was noted that textbook replacements have been moved into the specific subjects to help teachers know what they have. A textbook replacement schedule was provided to the Board for review. The additional furniture line was reduced based on what had been requested. Mr. Guimond asked if they were able to repurpose the science lab items from the high school into Memorial School. Ms. Lecaroz replied those items remained at the high school. Mr. Cate asked about the lockers and if they needed to be replaced anytime soon. Mr. Safina believed they needed some repair at this point, rather than being replaced.

Under Health Education Mr. Cate wanted to know if the ready or not baby simulators were used for a babysitting course. Ms. Lecaroz answered no. Students will be assigned a doll that needs to be cared for like a real baby. The simulators are a new item.

Mr. Bilby questioned if the instrument lockers were a new or replacement item. Mr. Safina replied they were new. He said they currently had instrument lockers but were in need of more. Ms. Lecaroz called attention to the band enrollment; in 2015 there were 68 students, 2016 would have 96 students and they anticipated 108 in 2017 based on the numbers seen at the elementary school.

Mr. Cate wanted to know why the budget line for classroom maps was taken away. Ms. Lecaroz explained she took the line away because maps changed constantly. She said as soon as they purchased maps they seemed to become outdate. She pointed out they will have one-to-one (with use of Chromebooks) in the middle school which gave them the ability to access any (up to date) map.

There was a reduction in reading testing protocols because last year was the first year of the reading program at the middle school so they purchased a large number. They've assessed how many more were needed to fill in and budgeted accordingly.

Under Special Education, Mr. Guimond questioned the increase in salaries. Ms. Lecaroz replied it was a change in salary; an adjustment was made in part due to a teacher being misplaced a number of years ago.

With regard to co-curricular programs, Ms. Dube questioned if there was a requirement to have a minimum number of students enrolled before a club could be implemented. Ms. Lecaroz replied the co-curricular programs usually started as a Pelham Compensation Model ('PCM') as defined in the collective bargaining agreement. Under the PCM it is expected to have a minimum of ten students per teacher. Once a program is successful for three years, it is recommended for placement in the collective bargaining. If a club loses enrollment and a new club evolves, they would have to petition the School Board to use the co-curricular money for the new club. They adjust to the interest of the students. There was a brief discussion regarding the athletic programs and their enrollment. Mr. Guimond asked for the student body enrollment percentage in athletics. Mr. Bilby asked if there was a football team. Ms. Lecaroz replied the middle school didn't have a football team. The Town's football program (Razorbacks) was very active and serviced more children than the school would be able to.

The Board discussed the budget line for Site Improvement – parking lot resurface and restripe. Ms. Lecaroz stated they had presented the improvement project to the Capital Improvement

Committee as being an item funded from the budget versus a warrant article. Mr. Guimond asked how the Board felt having the parking lot included in the budget. Mr. Viger felt the parking lot project maintained a level of service and because of also being a safety issue should remain in the budget. Ms. Lecaroz was concerned about it being in a warrant article. She said if it was in a warrant article and it was turned down the no means no law would prohibit them from doing repairs. Ms. Hillsgrove agreed with Mr. Viger. She said without repairs, the situation would continue to get worse. Mr. Cate agreed. He said if something wasn't done now it would cost more at a later time. Ms. Larson noted they were trying to balance/maintain the budget by spreading out known maintenance/repairs. Mr. Rush would like to see the item as a warrant article to gauge the feeling of the Town. Ms. Hillsgrove commented she would feel differently about having the item in the budget if they were creating a new parking lot, but the proposal was to take care of what already existed. Mr. Safina noted they had a small sink hole in the parking lot at the beginning of the year. Ms. Dube was fine with the budget item since it would repair something existing. She said if they were adding something it should go to a warrant article. Mr. Bilby asked what the Board's By Laws stated. Mr. Viger replied if an item was more than double the cost of the State bid price of a cruiser and have a life expectancy of more than ten years. He believed the current State bid was approximately \$15,000. Ms. Hillsgrove reiterated that there was a level of service approved by the voters and now it was time to do necessary maintenance to keep the standard up.

Ms. Larson pointed out the School was being conscious of the proposals.

Ms. Dube questioned what happened to money appropriated to a certain item that wasn't spent. Ms. Lecaroz explained how they built the budget using their best estimate given the fact that they were assigning costs 1.5 years ahead of when the budget would be implemented. Generally unspent money is returned to the taxpayers, unless there is an area in need. The exception is Special Education; if the lines are not spent they are returned to the taxpayers and not used in other areas of the budget.

ADJOURNMENT

MOTION: (Sherman/Hillsgrove) To adjourn the meeting.

VOTE: (9-0-0) The motion carried.

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 9:22pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Charity A. Landry
Recording Secretary