

School Administrative District No. 53

293 Hartland Avenue Pittsfield, ME 04967

(207) 487-5107

Fax: (207) 487-6310

Burnham

Detroit

Pittsfield

Excellence in Education

Michael A. Gallagher
Superintendent of Schools

Board of Directors

Minutes

3/1/10

Members in attendance: R. Downs, B. Basford, P. Williams, M. Wintle, J. Bradshaw, P. Snow, B. Poirier, B. Baldwin, and R. Basford

Absent/Excused: M. Hodgins and J. Laux

Item 1. Call to Order. R. Downs called the board to order at 7:02 P.M.

Board committee appointments for R. Basford – Chair Downs appointed R. Basford to the Policy Committee and Building Committee.

Item 2. Adjustments to the Agenda. None.

Item 3. Minutes from February 1, 2010. On a motion by B. Basford, seconded by B. Poirier, the board voted unanimously to adopt the minutes as amended. Amendment to page 3 of the board minutes, second paragraph under item 7, “B.” Poirier was listed as “P.” Poirier.

Item 4. Public Commentary. None.

Item 5. Learning Results – A report on student NECAP results from grades 3-8 by Mrs. Anderson and Mr. Nevens – In accordance with goal one, objective one of the Strategic Plan Mrs. Anderson distributed a handout she had provided to Curriculum Committee members prior to the regular board meeting at a Curriculum Committee meeting. The documents contained the results of the student assessments given to students in November of 2009. Mrs. Anderson reviewed the percent of students who earned scores at or above the proficient level and measured that against the district proficiency goal. She reported on grade three, four and five since it included teaching years for grade two, three and four, grade levels for which she is responsible. Teaching year is the grade level prior to when the students were assessed. Grade three math, 41% of the students were proficient compared to the district goal of 44%. In the area of reading, student proficiency in the district was 54% compared to the district goal of 55%. In grade four math, 50% of the

students scored at or above the proficient level compared to the district goal of 44%. In the area of reading, grade four students were 54% proficient compared to the district goal of 55%. In the area of math for fifth graders, 40% were proficient compared to the district goal of 44%, and in the area of reading for fifth graders, 60% were proficient compared to the district goal of 55%.

Mr. Nevens provided the proficiency levels for Warsaw Middle School grades 6-8. The district target for Warsaw Middle School grades 6-8 was 67%. Sixty-one percent of grade six students were considered to be proficient, 72% of grade seven were considered to be proficient, and 68% of the eighth graders were considered to be proficient. In the area of math, Mr. Nevens reported that the Warsaw Middle School proficiency target was 51%. Fifty percent of the grade six students were considered to be proficient; 61% of the seventh grade students were considered to be proficient; and 41% of the eighth grade students were considered to be proficient.

Chair Downs asked how these scores compared to other districts. Mrs. Anderson indicated that those comparisons to other districts are not yet available, nor are the AYP cut scores available to know how the district stands up against the state or what the new cut score will be for proficiency regarding AYP. That information will be available in late spring. Chair Downs expressed concern that such a small percentage of the district's students in some grade levels were considered to be proficient.

Item 6. Committee Reports. The Advisory Committee report was provided by R. Downs. He indicated that the report was included in the board packet, and that he would answer any questions that board members may have. He noted that the next Advisory meeting will be on March 9 and Mrs. Basford indicated that the time should be 6:15 P.M.

The Budget/Finance Committee report was provided by B. Poirier. She reported that the committee discussed additional over expenditures as reported in the minutes of the committee meeting, as well as the month to month comparison of expenditures in comparison to previous years. She reported that the district is now much closer to the percentage of the budget that has been expended thus far through the school year in comparison to previous years. She also indicated that the committee reviewed ideas for budget reductions and suggested that the Adult Education suggestion be removed from the list of potential reductions. The committee then recommended that the remaining ideas for reductions be brought to the March 1 meeting for consideration by the full board.

The Negotiations Committee report was provided by B. Basford. She indicated that the committee has been meeting and that there would be an Executive Session later during the board meeting for discussion regarding negotiations. She also noted that the next meeting date would be March 3 and not 2nd as listed on the Agenda.

The Policy Committee report was provided by M. Wintle and Superintendent Gallagher. Mr. Wintle indicated that there were very few changes to the policies being reviewed by the committee. The changes most notable were changing the wording to indicate that the policy is an "MSAD #53 Board of Directors" policy. Superintendent Gallagher indicated

that the committee had also recommended that policy 3.02, Job Description for Superintendent of Schools, was recommended for deletion from the policy manual, and that it be added along with all other job descriptions to the web site. The next Policy Committee meeting is scheduled for March 8 at 5:00 P.M.

Item 7. Old Business. Presentation of school consolidation/reorganization update - Superintendent Gallagher provided an update indicating that a new date for a meeting with the Commissioner had been established, that being March 11 at 8:00 A.M.

Presentation of budget summary page with estimated revenues and expenditures - Superintendent Gallagher distributed and explained four budget summary pages beginning with a budget summary page that included \$100,000 more in carry forward funds than had originally been reported to the Budget/Finance Committee and others. This amount was made possible through back payments of Medicaid revenues for the day treatment program implemented a year and a half ago in the district for which no funds had previously been received. This increases the carry forward undesignated fund balance from \$350,000 to \$450,000 which is still \$100,000 less than the undesignated fund balance that was carried forward in this current year's budget.

Superintendent Gallagher then provided an explanation about how to read the budget summary page explaining that the state subsidy of \$5.5 million is \$526,000 less than what the district received for this current year in state subsidy, and included the penalty reduction. The "local assessment" is the amount that needs to be raised in order to gain the state subsidy, and that amount of \$2.9 million is \$509,000 more than what the district needed to raise for this current year's budget. The "local debt service" assessment is for construction projects that the district has completed in the past; that is an amount of \$249,000, \$3,000 less than this current year. The additional revenues are an estimate; these revenues are anticipated although the exact amount of these revenues is not known. They are usually made up of interest income, Medicaid revenues, state agency client revenues, and other revenues such as tax reimbursements.

Superintendent Gallagher then provided an explanation for fund balance designated and undesignated carry forward funds. Twenty thousand dollars is being carried forward under the designated heading. These were funds that were designated for building projects that were unexpended from previous construction projects in the district. We are paying back a ten year loan; this \$20,000 will go toward the repayment of that loan, and we will have one additional year of repayment on that loan using funds available to the district in our designated fund balance. The undesignated fund balance is made up of unexpended funds from previous years' budgets which are also used to directly reduce taxes. He then explained that with an expenditure budget of \$10.3 million that there would be the need to raise \$1,000,000 more of "additional local funds" to support the expenditure budget. The expenditure budget of \$10.3 million is \$190,000 more than what the expenditure budget was in this current school year.

He then pointed out that the state valuations are listed next on the budget summary page. Those are taken directly from the fiscal printout received by school districts, and allow the

district the opportunity to figure out the valuation percentage that each community would have for local taxes to support the school budget.

The last section on the budget summary page lists the total local assessment and the individual town assessments. He explained that the total local assessment was determined by adding together the “local assessment”, the “local debt service assessment”, and the “additional local funds”. Each community’s local assessment is determined by their valuation percentage. He explained that Burnham’s share was 23.81% of \$4.1 million or \$997,000; Detroit’s was 13.14% of the \$4.1 million or \$550,000; and that Pittsfield’s would represent 63.04% of \$4.1 million or \$2.6 million. The expenditure budget as it has been devised it would represent and \$878,000 increase in taxes for a 26.53% increase.

He then provided an explanation about the budget summary page on the back side of the first handout labeled “without penalty of \$182,425”. The difference between this budget summary page and first budget summary reviewed was that the state subsidy increased by \$182, 425 thus changing the amount that would need to be raised locally to \$4,007,000. This reduction in local taxes because of the increase in state subsidy would mean that the difference in local taxation for the FY2010-11 budget in comparison to this current year would be \$696,000 more or a 21.02% increase.

Superintendent Gallagher then distributed another two sided spreadsheet. He explained the first side labeled “reduction of \$316,000” since it represented what the board would be acting upon for cost reduction measures in the next agenda item. If the board approved all of the ideas for reductions in costs, it would total an estimated \$316,000. This amount of \$316,000 was taken off the total of the expenditure budget reducing the expenditure budget to \$10,051,000. This means that the expenditure budget would be \$125,000 less than the current year’s expenditure budget or a 1.22% decrease. This scenario, if the board chose to approve all of the budget reduction ideas, would lower the local tax burden to \$3.6 million representing a \$380,000 taxation increase, still an 11.48% increase district wide. He then provided an explanation about the spreadsheet that was labeled “reduction of \$316,000 plus reduction of \$247,596 to obtain a 4% increase to taxes”. He explained that the Budget/Finance Committee had discussed the possible necessity of increasing taxes by as much as 4%, and if so, this is what the budget summary page would look like. By reducing the expenditure budget by an additional \$247,596, the expenditure budget would be \$9.8 million, a \$373,000 decrease from the current year’s expenditure budget, or 3.62% less than the current fiscal year budget. This translates into a local tax assessment of \$3.4 million representing a \$132,000 increase districtwide or a 4% increase. Chair Downs asked the Budget/Finance Committee chair why the committee had selected the 4% target. Budget/Finance Committee chair, B. Poirier, indicated that other cost reduction ideas discussed at the budget meeting brought the increase in taxes down to approximately 8%, and that the committee felt that by taking half of that amount and balancing the tax increase with the needs of the district, an a 4% increase to taxes could be considered.

Since there were no additional questions, Chair Downs asked Superintendent Gallagher to continue with the next item on the agenda, consideration of individual cost reduction ideas. He explained that he would make recommendations of each individual item on the

spreadsheet contained in the board packet, or as listed on the board agenda. The first item was the closing of the Central Office. He recommended the board approve the closure of the Central Office building. J. Bradshaw made the motion, the motion was seconded by B. Baldwin and discussion regarding the motion occurred. P. Williams asked about revenues generated by the sale of the building. Superintendent Gallagher explained that the revenues made from the sale of the building could not be used by the district, but needed to be returned to the town from which the district obtained the building at the formation of the district. Therefore, Pittsfield would be the recipient of any sale revenues and those revenues were to be used specifically for payment of the school district's assessment to the town of Pittsfield. He further explained that if the district had completed major renovation to the building while the district owned the building, the revenues could be separated to recoup those renovation expenditures that are specified in law. Otherwise, all revenues from the proceeds of the sale would be returned to the town. In the case of the Central Office there were no renovations that would be considered above and beyond regular maintenance, and that all revenue generated from the sale would be returned to the community of Pittsfield.

Chair Downs then called for a vote. Seven members voted in the affirmative to close the Central Office building, two opposed B. Basford and R. Basford.

Closure of the Burnham Village School - Superintendent Gallagher recommended the board vote to close the Burnham Village School. P. Williams asked a question about the disposition of the Burnham Village School should the board vote to close it. He indicated that he thought it might change how someone would vote if they knew the disposition of the school. Chair Downs indicated that to combine the two ideas would not be prudent and Superintendent Gallagher further answered Mr. Williams by indicating that the board had approximately two months to decide the disposition of the school if the voters of the district approved the closing. Chair Downs read the following motion provided by legal counsel: "That the School Board of Maine School Administrative District No. 53 hereby finds that the **Burnham Village School** is unnecessary or unprofitable to maintain within the meaning of 20-A M.R.S.A. § 4102(3), authorizes and directs the Superintendent of Schools to file a school closing report with the Commissioner of Education pursuant to 20-A M.R.S.A. § 4102(3), and establishes **June 30, 2010** as the effective date of the proposed school closing subject to approval of the voters at a referendum to be held pursuant to 20-A M.R.S.A. §§ 1512 and 4102(4)." B. Poirier moved the motion as read by Chair Downs, the motion was seconded by P. Snow, the board voted seven in the affirmative, two opposed, B. Basford and R. Basford.

Reduction of one teacher position - Superintendent Gallagher recommended that the board approve the reduction of one teaching position at the K-4 level. He further went on to explain that the reduction would likely be one probationary teacher from the K-8 level as a pool from which to choose. Mrs. R. Basford asked how that person would be selected, and Superintendent Gallagher indicated that it would be through the evaluation process. On a motion by J. Bradshaw, seconded by B. Baldwin, the board voted eight in favor, with one in opposition, B. Basford.

Superintendent Gallagher then recommended that the board approve the creation of one multi-age grade1/2 teacher position. Chair Downs asked why the board would be approving particular positions. Superintendent Gallagher indicated that the board doesn't always approve particular positions, but felt that it was important to do so in this particular situation. On a motion by B. Poirier, seconded by B. Baldwin, the board voted eight in favor, with one in opposition, B. Basford.

Superintendent Gallagher then recommended that the board eliminate one assistant principal position. On a motion by B. Poirier, seconded by J. Bradshaw, the board voted eight in the affirmative, with one opposed, B. Basford.

Item 8. New Business. Presentation of Policy 3.01, School Superintendent; 3.02, Job Description for Superintendent of Schools; 3.03, Acting Superintendent; 4.03, School Property Disposition; and 9.13, Student Insurance Program. Superintendent Gallagher indicated that he provided most of the explanation under the Policy Committee report, and asked that any board members having other ideas regarding modifications to the policies contact him.

Presentation of Job Description for RTI Coach - Superintendent Gallagher indicated that the RTI Coach position would be for one year. Chair Downs asked why the board would be approving a job description. Superintendent Gallagher indicated that the board always approves job descriptions, although not many have been approved in recent memory. Chair Downs then asked if this was a needed position. Superintendent Gallagher indicated that it would be paid for through ARRA funds, and that it would save a district position, and that it was considered to be a necessary position for one year to lead our process for RTI implementation. B. Basford then asked how it would save a position given the fact that the elimination of a teaching position and the level of previous experience would not likely fit for any of the probationary teachers. Superintendent Gallagher indicated that the position could be assumed by a current administrator whose position had been eliminated, and that it would be a teacher salary schedule position, not administrative. He further explained that the job description for the RTI Coach was provided to the board for its first reading, and would be returned to the board for adoption at the April board meeting.

Item 9. Superintendent's Report. Under the headmaster report Chris Hopkins had asked that Roberta McGuire attend the meeting and share with the board information about her role as Chair of the MCI Community Relations Strategic Plan area. Ms. McGuire asked that the board provide her with feedback about areas that MCI could integrate itself more with the communities of the district, whether that be community involvement with and at MCI or MCI's outreach to the greater community. She shared examples of how that could be done and provided the board with her email address to gain direct feedback. Superintendent Gallagher indicated that he would send a reminder to the board with Mrs. McGuire's email address so that they could contact her directly or provide him with suggestions that could be provided to Mrs. McGuire. Superintendent Gallagher indicated that he had ideas that he would share with Mrs. McGuire.

Superintendent Gallagher then indicated that the district administrators were available to answer any questions regarding their board reports that were included in the board packets. Chair Downs asked Administrator Shorey about the three dropouts mentioned in her report. She indicated that one was an expulsion and that she was working hard to get the other two back into school.

Item 10. Communications. None.

Item 11. Future Agenda Items. None.

Item 12. Executive Session. Chair Downs asked for a motion to enter executive session for the purpose of discussing labor contract proposal discussions between the MSAD #53 Education Association and the MSAD #53 Board of Directors pursuant to 1 M.R.S.A. § 405 (6) (D). On a motion by B. Poirier, seconded by M. Wintle, the board voted unanimously to go into executive session at 8:26 P.M. The board came out of executive session at 8:39 P.M. and took no action.

Chair Downs then asked for a motion to enter executive session for the purpose of discussing superintendent goals pursuant to 1 M.R.S.A. § 405 (6) (A). On a motion by B. Basford, seconded by B. Baldwin, the board voted unanimously to go into executive session at 8:39 P.M. The board came out of executive session at 8:45 P.M., and on a motion by B. Poirier, seconded by B. Baldwin, the board voted unanimously to adjourn at 8:45 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Michael A. Gallagher