

# FAIRFIELD PUBLIC SCHOOLS

The Enclosures referred to in the Agenda are available for inspection at each of the three Public Libraries in Fairfield, Fairfield Public Schools' website <http://www.fairfieldschools.org/> and the Education Center, 501 Kings Highway East. The public is requested to silence all devices.

Board of Education Regular Meeting Agenda  
501 Kings Highway East, 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor Board Conference Room  
November 15, 2016  
*Immediately following Organizational Meeting*

1. Call to Order of the Regular Meeting of the Board of Education and Roll Call
2. Pledge of Allegiance
3. Student Reports  
Fairfield Ludlowe High School: Ms. Catherine Behjati, Mr. Sean Oppenheimer  
Fairfield Warde High School: Ms. Ashley Agrello, Ms. Brittany Shuster
4. Public Comment  
*During this period the Board will accept public comment on items pertaining to this meeting's agenda\* from any citizen present at the meeting (\*per BOE By-Law, Article V, Section 6). Those wishing to videotape or take photographs must abide by CGS §1-226.*
5. Old Business
  - A. Approval of the Racial Imbalance Plan  
**Recommended Motion:** "that the Board of Education approve the Racial Imbalance Plan dated November 10, 2016"  
*(Enclosure No. 1)*
6. New Business
  - A. First Quarter Financial Report, Mrs. Munsell  
*(Enclosure No. 2)*
  - B. Discussion of 2017-2018 Program Initiatives and Budget Implications, Dr. Tracy  
*(Enclosure No. 3)*
  - C. First Reading of Policy 5141.3, Students - Health Assessments and Immunizations  
*(Enclosure No. 4)*
7. Approval of Minutes
  - A. Approval of Minutes of the Regular Meeting of October 18, 2016  
**Recommended Motion:** "that the Board of Education approve the minutes of the Regular Meeting of October 18, 2016"  
*(Enclosure No. 5)*
  - B. Approval of Minutes of the Special Meeting of October 24, 2016  
**Recommended Motion:** "that the Board of Education approve the minutes of the Special Meeting of October 24, 2016"  
*(Enclosure No. 6)*

- 8. Superintendent’s Report
- 9. Committee/Liaison Reports
- 10. Open Board Comment
- 11. Adjournment

**Recommended Motion:** “that this Regular Meeting of the Board of Education adjourn”

CALENDAR OF EVENTS

December 13, 2016	Board of Education Regular Meeting	501 Kings Hwy East 2 <sup>nd</sup> Floor Board Conference Room
-------------------	---------------------------------------	---

RELOCATION POLICY NOTICE

*The Fairfield Public Schools System provides services to ensure students, parents and other persons have access to meetings, programs and activities. The School System will relocate programs in order to ensure accessibility of programs and activities to disabled persons. To make arrangements please contact Pupil & Special Education Services, 501 Kings Highway East, Fairfield, CT 06825, Telephone: (203) 255-8379*



Stephen Tracy, Ed.D.  
Interim Superintendent of Schools

---

November 10, 2016

To the Board of Education:

Attached is a copy of the proposed Racial Imbalance Plan for consideration and possible adoption at the Board's November 15, 2016 Regular Meeting.

The Plan remains substantially as it was when it was first discussed with the Board at the October 18, 2016 meeting. I have provided additional language (highlighted) on pages 1 and 2 to specify the findings of the Milone & McBroom Report of February, 2016 and on pages 7 and 8 to describe the school expansion plans that should put the Board in a position to revise school attendance areas to as to more fully address the issue of racial imbalance.

Regards,



Stephen Tracy  
Interim Superintendent



# Proposed Racial Imbalance Plan

## Fairfield Public Schools

Originally presented to the Board on October 18, 2016

Revised and presented for Board adoption on November 15, 2016

Stephen Tracy  
Interim Superintendent of Schools  
November 10, 2016

### I. Background

In May of 2015, the Connecticut State Board of Education (CSBE) notified the Fairfield Public Schools that McKinley School continued to be racially imbalanced. During the 2015-2016 school year, the Fairfield Board of Education (Board) studied the possibility of redistricting the student population to remedy this issue. The district engaged the consulting firm of Milone & MacBroom to study demographic patterns within the district and to recommend possible courses of action to reduce racial imbalance among the district's elementary schools. Milone & MacBroom presented its finding to the Fairfield Board of Education on February 16, 2016. The consultants concluded that, even with redistricting, no substantial improvement to the racial imbalance problem could occur until the renovations and additions to the Holland Hill and Mill Hill schools are complete. Specifically, the consultants stated that:

1. Racial Imbalance at McKinley and overcrowding at Holland Hill, Mill Hill and Sherman cannot be solved without school construction projects.
2. Pocket redistricting can mitigate racial imbalances at McKinley after the Holland Hill Construction Project is completed. However, it would result in Holland Hill becoming impending imbalanced (between 15% and 18% higher than district).

3. Following the completion of the Holland Hill and Mill Hill Construction Projects, the district can achieve racial imbalance objectives at McKinley.

On May 4, 2016, the Superintendent of Schools and Chairman of the Fairfield Board of Education presented this information to the State Board of Education. The CSBE, while pleased with the Board’s efforts to address the matter, requested that the Board present an amendment to its racial imbalance plan at its December 7, 2016 meeting.

## II. History of Racial Imbalance at McKinley

The CSBE has set a standard by which to judge whether or not a school district is in compliance with the statute. All schools must be within 25 percentage points of the district average of minority students at the same grade span. Chart 1 summarizes McKinley’s data for the past six years.

*Chart 1:  
History of Racial Imbalance at McKinley*

Year	McKinley % Minority	District % Minority	Absolute Imbalance
2010-11	43.47%	17.58%	25.89%
2011-12	45.70%	18.89%	26.81%
2012-13	43.41%	19.00%	24.41%
2013-14	45.85%	19.37%	26.48%
2014-15	49.10%	20.53%	28.57%
2015-16	47.90%	20.70%	27.20%

This chart indicates that McKinley School has exceeded the 25% standard in all but one of the last six years. Therefore, the Board is required to propose revisions to the district’s current Racial Imbalance Plan that will move McKinley School under the 25 percentage point differential.

### III. Current Arrangements

The following are the features of the current Plan, as approved by the CSBE in October of 2007 and amended in September of 2010:

#### 1) Opt In to McKinley:

Students from other elementary schools in Fairfield may “opt in” to attend McKinley School. Once the opt-in students complete their elementary years, they attend middle and high school based on the feeder patterns that pertain to their place of residence. Currently, 24 students from elsewhere in Fairfield attend school at McKinley under this arrangement. However, thirteen of these students are minority children. Although the Opt In program has not contributed to greater racial balance among our elementary schools, participation in the program signals the interest of these families in taking advantage of the quality instruction and the cultural diversity available at the McKinley School.

#### 2) Opt Out from McKinley:

For a few years, students who resided in the McKinley attendance zone were offered the choice of “opting out” to other Fairfield elementary schools. However, the “opt out” arrangement did not have a positive impact on racial balance and was therefore terminated following the 2012-13 academic year.

#### 3) Pre-School Options:

Students who reside in the McKinley attendance area have the option of attending pre-school at either the Burr or Dwight elementary schools. These students have the option of continuing at either Burr or Dwight for their K-5 education. Once the pre-school children reach kindergarten, their siblings are able to enroll at Burr or Dwight as well. Once they complete their elementary years, these students attend middle and high school according to the feeder patterns that pertain to their place of residence. Enrollment in the pre-school programs are as follows in 2016-17:

Chart 2:  
Pre-kindergarten Programs, 2016-17

<u>Pre-Kindergarten Program</u>	<u>Capacity</u>	<u>Enrollment</u>	<u>McKinley Minority Enrollment</u>
Burr (AM and PM)	36	30	6
Dwight (AM and PM)	36	24	1
Totals	72	54	7

- a. Tuition of \$3,500 is charged to pre-kindergarten students. However, families unable to afford the tuition have the tuition either waived or reduced to 50 percent, depending on income.
- b. Transportation is provided for families in the pre-kindergarten programs only if they qualify for the tuition waiver or the tuition reduction. Families paying full tuition must provide their own transportation for the pre-kindergartens.

As a result of the Pre-kindergarten program, 17 minority students who would otherwise have attended McKinley School are currently enrolled in grades K-5 at either Dwight School or Burr School. This includes the siblings of former McKinley preschoolers who attend Dwight or Burr as the result of the program.

4) Open Choice:

Seventy-two students who reside in Bridgeport attend the Fairfield Public Schools under the Open Choice Program, under arrangements for Cooperative Education Services (CES). Of these, 51 are minority students enrolled in grades K through 5.

## IV. Proposed Amendments

### 1) Pre-Kindergarten:

The district intends to modify the pre-kindergarten aspect of the Board's existing plan, as follows:

- a. While the pre-kindergarten programs have helped to address the racial imbalance issue, the Burr program has been the main contributor. Enrollment in the Dwight pre-kindergarten has been consistently lower than that at Burr. In addition, families electing the Dwight pre-kindergarten, and remaining there, are generally not having a positive impact on the racial imbalance issue. As a result, we propose phasing out the Dwight pre-kindergarten program beginning in 2017-2018 and offering a new location at Stratfield School. This will increase the number of pre-K slots from the current 72 to 90. We believe that, with space available at Stratfield School, we can attract more McKinley families to attend pre-kindergarten and remain at Stratfield.
- b. In an effort to further enhance the impact of the pre-K program on racial balance, McKinley students will be given priority in the enrollment process.
- c. The district will open a third pre-kindergarten at either Stratfield or Burr for the 2018-2019 school year, if demand is demonstrated and space is available. This would raise the capacity of the pre-kindergarten programs to 108 slots.
- d. Pre-kindergarten tuition has not been increased from the \$3,500 level for the past five years. Based on a market survey of comparable programs, we recommend raising the tuition to \$4,250 per year, with an annual increase of 3 percent each year thereafter. Tuition waivers would remain in place.



Chart 4:  
Pre-kindergarten Programs, 2017-2018 through 2018-2019

*Proposed 2017-18*

<u>Pre-K Program</u>	<u>Capacity</u>	<u>Projected McKinley Minority Enrollment</u>
Burr (AM and PM)	36	6
Dwight (AM – 4 year olds only)	18	1
Stratfield (AM and PM)	<u>36</u>	<u>8</u>
Totals:	90	15

*Proposed 2018-19*

<u>Pre-K Program</u>	<u>Capacity</u>	<u>Projected McKinley Minority Enrollment</u>
Burr (AM and PM)	36	6
Stratfield (AM and PM)	36	8
Site TBD* (AM and PM)	<u>36</u>	<u>7</u>
Totals:	108	21

*\*Based on demand – could be added to Burr or Stratfield*

2) Open Choice:

In an effort to increase the percentage of minority students in the elementary schools other than McKinley, we plan to increase the total number of Open Choice students enrolled in the Fairfield Public Schools from the current level of 72 to a total of 100 by the start of the 2018-2019 school year. This would be accomplished by adding 18 Open Choice students to the elementary grades in the fall of 2017, with an emphasis on kindergarten and grade 1. An additional 18 students would be added to the elementary grades in the fall of 2018. Assuming attrition of four Open Choice students each year, this would mean a net increase of 14 students per year, bringing the district's total Open Choice enrollment to 100 by 2018-19.

We project that 60 out of the district's 86 Open Choice students would be enrolled in the elementary grades in 2017-18, and 73 out of 100 in 2018-19. Because virtually all Open Choice students are minority students, the expansion of the Open Choice program would raise the overall minority student population at the elementary level by approximately 1/2 percent by 2018-19, thus reducing the difference between the proportion of minority students in the district and the proportion at McKinley School.

### 3) Projected Impact of Proposed Changes:

The district projects that the steps outlined above would have the following impact on racial balance among the district's elementary schools:

#### Pre-School Option:

We estimate that the number of K-5 McKinley minority students attending other schools as a result of the expanded pre-school option will increase by 25, from the current 17 to 42 (including former PK students as well as siblings) by 2019-20. All else being equal, this would reduce McKinley's minority student population by about 3% below what it would otherwise be, and increase the minority proportion of the district's remaining elementary schools slightly.

#### Expanded Open Choice:

Increasing the number of K-5 Open Choice students from the current 51 to 73 is expected to increase the percentage of minority students in the district's elementary schools by approximately 1/2 percentage point over what it would have been by 2018-19.

## V. Additional Steps

If the previous five years are a guide, we can expect the proportion of minority students at McKinley to increase at a higher rate than the proportion of minority students at the district's other ten elementary schools. Therefore, additional action will be required to address the issue of racial imbalance among our elementary schools over the long term. The following steps will be considered in that regard:

## 1. Magnet Program at McKinley School

Creation of a “magnet” program at McKinley School that would attract students from elsewhere in the district and thereby reduce the percentage of minority students at the school. Based on the building’s current capacity, a magnet program could accommodate approximately fifty additional students without new construction. We estimate that a magnet program at McKinley would reduce the school’s minority population by two to three percentage points.

## 2. Redistricting

A \$15 million renovation and expansion project is scheduled at the Holland Hill School, with completion expected by the fall of 2018. Also, a \$15 million renovation and expansion project is proposed the Mill Hill School between 2018 and 2020. These projects will expand capacity at these schools by approximately 120 students. At that point, according to the consultants, we will be able to revise school attendance areas to balance enrollments and to reduce significantly the extent of the minority student disparity between the McKinley School and our other elementary schools.

## Fairfield Public Schools

2016 – 2017

### Quarterly Financial Report as of September 30, 2016

#### **Summary**

Financial reports for the first quarter of the fiscal year (July, August, and September) are always preliminary. The beginning of the school year is typically when expenditures fluctuate as school staff assignments are finalized and salary/benefit costs stabilize. An additional 8.0 elementary classroom teachers were hired based on the distribution of students and class size guidelines. The additional staff were not necessarily added at the same grade level and schools as the 7.0 FTE's requested and cut by the Board of Selectman during the budget process. The other increases were due to course enrollment patterns at the high schools and special education needs. An additional 10 retirees and staff turnover will help offset the additional staffing, but these expenses will require close monitoring throughout the year.

Approximately 80 % of our \$163,658,561 budget appropriation has been expended or encumbered in the first quarter. A sizable amount of contractual and/or fixed costs are not encumbered i.e., utilities, general repairs and maintenance, student activity salaries, part-time salaries, and instructional materials. Also, the health insurance account reflects only first quarter premiums instead of disbursing the total health insurance budget to the medical retention fund for the payment of claims under the self-insured plan. A description of each major expense category and its dynamics is provided below along with the key factors that impact account balances.

#### **Personnel Services**

Personnel services is the single largest budget classification at 64% of the budget or approximately \$104.7 million. This category includes contracted salaries, hourly wages, extra-curricular stipends and substitute pay. The largest balance in personnel services is part-time employment, primarily for substitutes and overtime which are paid as incurred and therefore are not encumbered. The other services balance will be encumbered as staff are hired for various extra-curricular activities throughout the year. There is an increase of 18.0 FTE's in staffing from 1476.8 FTE's to 1494.8 FTE's. An additional 10.7 FTE's were hired in certified positions and 7.3 FTE's in non-certified positions.

6.0 of the 8.0 FTE increase in certified staff at the elementary level were anticipated in the 16-17 Board of Education budget request. A net 7.0 positions were included in the budget based on the assumption sections within one to two students below the class size threshold would increase, and one student above the threshold would collapse. In fact, no sections collapsed, but 8.0 sections were added. The remaining certified staff increases were net of various staffing adjustments across the district. The additional non-certified positions, 2.0 Special Education Trainers and 5.3 FTE's Paraprofessionals, are the result of changes in special education student needs as specified in Individual Education Plans.

### **Fixed Charges**

Nearly 15 % of the budget is allotted for employee benefits which are categorized as fixed charges. As of 2016 – 2017, our health insurance expenses are premium based with the implementation of the CT Partnership 2.0 plan on July 1, 2016. The expenses reflected on the financial statement are for the months of July and August. The tracking and billing of monthly head counts was a major undertaking, and given the magnitude of the transition there was a lag in the billing cycle. The first quarter financial statements do not include the town pension contribution which was transmitted in October. Social security and life insurance are paid as incurred throughout the year.

### **Pupil Personnel Expenses**

Special education costs, with the exception of salaries, transportation and capital, are included in this category. This classification of expenditures is the most volatile, as expenses are determined by the special needs of individual students and state excess cost reimbursement for qualifying expenses. The initial excess cost reimbursement, received in February, is based on anticipated costs filed by Pupil Services in December. The first quarter financial report indicates a negative balance of approximately \$555,000 in pupil personnel expenses; however, excess cost reimbursement is expected to offset a large portion, if not all, of these costs. We will not have a more definitive number for excess cost reimbursement until December. The final status of this category is impossible to determine until much later in the fiscal year.

## **School Expenses**

These expenditures support instruction and activities at the building level and include supplies, materials, textbooks, copying, sports and other activities. There is a balance of approximately 55 % in this category which is reasonable with only one month of school activity in this quarter.

## **Support Expenses**

Program implementation, centrally funded instructional programs, non-special education tuition and central support operations are included here. Program implementation and instructional supplies/materials expenses are incurred in the same manner as school expenses. Professional / Technical, maintenance services (software/network maintenance), security and postage indirectly support school operations and are expended on a contractual or as-needed basis. Security expenses appear to be over budget currently but the account will be offset with high school parking revenue later in the year.

## **Maintenance/Operation/Transportation**

Maintenance, operations and transportation account for 10 % of the total budget. Preliminary encumbrances for transportation are included in this report except for special education transportation.

Approximately 26 % of the budget in this category is designated for utilities. Total utility costs are difficult to project accurately. Consequently, they are paid as incurred rather than encumbered. Electric and heating rates were budgeted at contractual rates for the entire fiscal year as they were available early in the budget process. Distribution and transportation charges for these utilities are not contracted, and remain variable as is usage.

The budget of \$ 4.2 million for maintenance services is for preventative maintenance, repairs and major maintenance projects. Maintenance projects are scheduled based on priority and accessibility to the buildings and/or grounds. Whenever possible, certain projects are held in abeyance as a budgetary precaution. Other contractual services have been encumbered but general repair and maintenance accounts are expended as needed.

## **Capital**

The capital budget totals approximately \$2.5 million and approximately 61% of the funding has been expended or encumbered. Equipment purchases are processed throughout the year as needed but the majority are purchased in the spring.

Submitted: November 10, 2016

Doreen T. Munsell

# Statement of Account - Summary by Major Classification

10/3/2016 3:46:26 PM

## Fairfield Public Schools Fiscal Year 2016-2017

Major Classification	Appropriation As Adopted	Spec Approp and Transfers	Appropriation Amended	Total Expenditures	Outstanding Encumbrance	Outstanding Requisitions	Unencumbered Balance	% Used
Personnel Services	104,758,317.00	\$500.00	104,758,817.00	\$11,658,751.91	\$89,017,502.78	\$7,500.00	\$4,075,062.31	96.11%
Fixed Charges	\$23,732,499.00	\$0.00	\$23,732,499.00	\$3,866,769.68	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$19,865,729.32	16.29%
Pupil Personnel Expense	\$7,420,619.00	\$0.00	\$7,420,619.00	\$2,326,613.83	\$5,448,713.79	\$200,754.87	(\$555,463.49)	107.49%
School Expenses	\$2,748,747.00	(\$500.00)	\$2,748,247.00	\$377,666.91	\$850,826.83	\$26,889.48	\$1,492,863.78	45.68%
Support Expenses	\$4,981,940.00	\$0.00	\$4,981,940.00	\$1,722,090.64	\$476,501.50	\$26,187.75	\$2,757,160.11	44.66%
Maint/Oper/Trans	\$17,491,578.00	\$0.00	\$17,491,578.00	\$2,048,062.84	\$2,418,663.08	\$7,465,270.47	\$5,559,581.61	68.22%
Capital	\$2,524,861.00	\$0.00	\$2,524,861.00	\$1,432,614.95	\$91,990.99	\$24,060.61	\$976,194.45	61.34%
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>\$163,658,561.00</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>	<b>163,658,561.00</b>	<b>\$23,432,570.76</b>	<b>\$98,304,198.97</b>	<b>\$7,750,663.18</b>	<b>\$34,171,128.09</b>	<b>79.12%</b>



**Statement of Account - Summary by  
Major Classification and Summary Object**

10/3/2016 3:46:46 PM

Fairfield Public Schools  
Fiscal Year 2016-2017

Major Classification Summary Object	Appropriation As Adopted	Spec Approp and Transfers	Appropriation Amended	Total Expenditures	Outstanding Encumbrance	Outstanding Requisitions	Unencumbered Balance	% Used
<b>Personnel Services</b>								
101 TEACHING STAFF	\$71,065,784.00	(\$632,051.00)	\$70,433,733.00	\$5,603,093.47	\$64,830,627.91	\$0.00	\$11.62	100.00%
103 CERTIFIED SUPPORT STAFF	\$6,807,978.00	(\$155,479.00)	\$6,652,499.00	\$544,848.84	\$6,107,645.55	\$0.00	\$4.61	100.00%
105 SCHOOL ADMIN STAFF	\$6,024,575.00	(\$62,707.00)	\$5,961,868.00	\$1,574,391.36	\$4,387,476.44	\$0.00	\$0.20	100.00%
107 CENTRAL ADMINISTRATION STAFF	\$1,098,312.00	(\$191,499.00)	\$906,813.00	\$253,861.56	\$652,951.26	\$0.00	\$0.18	100.00%
109 DIRECTOR/SUPERVISOR/MGR	\$649,884.00	\$26,056.00	\$675,940.00	\$177,080.35	\$498,859.49	\$0.00	\$0.16	100.00%
111 SECRETARIAL/CLERCL STAFF	\$3,494,098.00	(\$193,797.00)	\$3,300,301.00	\$605,803.81	\$2,695,118.68	\$0.00	(\$621.49)	100.02%
113 PARAPROFESSIONAL STAFF	\$3,572,366.00	\$31,776.00	\$3,604,142.00	\$310,037.60	\$3,294,109.95	\$0.00	(\$5.55)	100.00%
115 CUSTODIAN STAFF	\$4,030,827.00	(\$171,586.00)	\$3,859,241.00	\$1,019,285.20	\$2,839,975.32	\$0.00	(\$19.52)	100.00%
117 MAINTENANCE STAFF	\$1,004,173.00	(\$2,169.00)	\$1,002,004.00	\$264,967.53	\$737,034.87	\$0.00	\$1.60	100.00%
121 SUPPORT STAFF	\$2,327,164.00	\$28,995.00	\$2,356,159.00	\$545,154.41	\$1,811,005.63	\$0.00	(\$1.04)	100.00%
125 SE TRAINER STAFF	\$834,637.00	\$95,424.00	\$930,061.00	\$224,381.28	\$705,680.04	\$0.00	(\$0.32)	100.00%
129 PART-TIME EMPLOYMENT	\$2,676,593.00	\$500.00	\$2,677,093.00	\$535,039.93	\$311,598.14	\$7,500.00	\$1,822,954.93	31.91%
131 WAGE/BENEFIT RESERVE	\$634,454.00	(\$129,150.00)	\$505,304.00	\$520.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$504,784.00	0.10%
133 STAFF REPLACEMENT	(\$1,108,000.00)	\$1,537,419.00	\$429,419.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$429,419.00	0.00%
135 DEGREE CHANGES	\$270,782.00	(\$181,232.00)	\$89,550.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$89,550.00	0.00%
307 OTHER SERVICES	\$1,374,690.00	\$0.00	\$1,374,690.00	\$286.57	\$145,419.50	\$0.00	\$1,228,983.93	10.60%
<b>Total for Personnel Services</b>	<b>104,758,317.00</b>	<b>\$500.00</b>	<b>104,758,817.00</b>	<b>\$11,658,751.91</b>	<b>\$89,017,502.78</b>	<b>\$7,500.00</b>	<b>\$4,075,062.31</b>	<b>96.11%</b>
<b>Fixed Charges</b>								
201 HEALTH INSURANCE	\$19,316,039.00	\$0.00	\$19,316,039.00	\$3,418,141.24	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$15,897,897.76	17.70%
203 LIFE/DISABILITY INSURANCE	\$267,709.00	\$0.00	\$267,709.00	\$64,178.06	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$203,530.94	23.97%
205 SOCIAL SECURITY	\$2,298,356.00	\$0.00	\$2,298,356.00	\$368,952.96	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$1,929,403.04	16.05%
207 PENSION/RETIREMENT	\$1,850,395.00	\$0.00	\$1,850,395.00	\$15,497.42	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$1,834,897.58	0.84%
<b>Total for Fixed Charges</b>	<b>\$23,732,499.00</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>	<b>\$23,732,499.00</b>	<b>\$3,866,769.68</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>	<b>\$19,865,729.32</b>	<b>16.29%</b>
<b>Pupil Personnel Expense</b>								
301 INSTRUCTIONAL SERVICES	\$50,500.00	\$0.00	\$50,500.00	\$6,004.33	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$44,495.67	11.89%
303 PUPIL PERSONNEL SERVICES	\$1,930,911.00	\$0.00	\$1,930,911.00	\$358,690.00	\$1,205,756.73	\$0.00	\$366,464.27	81.02%
307 OTHER SERVICES	\$473,000.00	\$0.00	\$473,000.00	\$64,448.48	\$200,805.21	\$0.00	\$207,746.31	56.08%
315 RENTALS	\$23,842.00	\$0.00	\$23,842.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$23,842.00	0.00%
317 STUDENT TRANSPORTATION	\$181,560.00	\$0.00	\$181,560.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$200,754.87	(\$19,194.87)	110.57%
319 CONFERENCE & TRAVEL	\$169,796.00	\$0.00	\$169,796.00	\$18,583.40	\$30,152.51	\$0.00	\$121,060.09	28.70%
327 PRINTING/COPYING	\$6,800.00	\$0.00	\$6,800.00	\$795.99	\$9,071.21	\$0.00	(\$3,067.20)	145.11%
329 TUITION	\$4,490,710.00	\$0.00	\$4,490,710.00	\$1,798,624.75	\$4,000,473.56	\$0.00	(\$1,308,388.31)	129.14%
401 INSTRUCTIONAL SUPLS/MATLS	\$62,500.00	\$0.00	\$62,500.00	\$70,342.80	\$1,200.00	\$0.00	(\$9,042.80)	114.47%
404 SPLS, BKS, MATLS-DIST SUPPORT	\$16,000.00	\$0.00	\$16,000.00	\$2,868.55	\$1,254.57	\$0.00	\$11,876.88	25.77%
411 TEXTBOOKS	\$12,000.00	\$0.00	\$12,000.00	\$4,963.65	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$7,036.35	41.36%
415 OTHER SUPPLIES/MATERIALS	\$1,250.00	\$0.00	\$1,250.00	\$683.88	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$566.12	54.71%
601 DUES AND FEES	\$1,750.00	\$0.00	\$1,750.00	\$608.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$1,142.00	34.74%
<b>Total for Pupil Personnel Expense</b>	<b>\$7,420,619.00</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>	<b>\$7,420,619.00</b>	<b>\$2,326,613.83</b>	<b>\$5,448,713.79</b>	<b>\$200,754.87</b>	<b>(\$555,463.49)</b>	<b>107.49%</b>

**Statement of Account - Summary by  
Major Classification and Summary Object**

10/3/2016 3:46:47 PM

Fairfield Public Schools  
Fiscal Year 2016-2017

Major Classification Summary Object	Appropriation As Adopted	Spec Approp and Transfers	Appropriation Amended	Total Expenditures	Outstanding Encumbrance	Outstanding Requisitions	Unencumbered Balance	% Used
<b>School Expenses</b>								
129 PART-TIME EMPLOYMENT	\$13,000.00	(\$2,400.00)	\$10,600.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$10,600.00	0.00%
301 INSTRUCTIONAL SERVICES	\$18,300.00	\$0.00	\$18,300.00	\$1,598.00	\$663.00	\$0.00	\$16,039.00	12.36%
307 OTHER SERVICES	\$67,275.00	\$0.00	\$67,275.00	\$844.50	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$66,430.50	1.26%
315 RENTALS	\$126,597.00	\$0.00	\$126,597.00	\$390.00	\$32,470.00	\$0.00	\$93,737.00	25.96%
317 STUDENT TRANSPORTATION	\$42,250.00	\$0.00	\$42,250.00	\$0.00	\$7,900.00	\$0.00	\$34,350.00	18.70%
319 CONFERENCE & TRAVEL	\$65,645.00	\$49.00	\$65,694.00	\$2,263.00	\$3,785.00	\$2,800.00	\$56,846.00	13.47%
327 PRINTING/COPYING	\$256,179.00	\$0.00	\$256,179.00	\$31,669.74	\$194,832.87	\$3,000.00	\$26,676.39	89.59%
400 SUPPLIES, BOOKS & MATERIALS	\$1,481,319.00	\$2,351.00	\$1,483,670.00	\$264,219.67	\$396,250.33	\$18,057.78	\$805,142.22	45.73%
402 INSTRUCTIONAL SPLS-DIST SUPPRT	\$38,000.00	\$0.00	\$38,000.00	\$5,965.83	\$21,479.28	\$0.00	\$10,554.89	72.22%
409 STUDENT ACTIVITY EXPENSES	\$595,972.00	\$0.00	\$595,972.00	\$48,950.04	\$190,830.50	\$2,600.00	\$353,591.46	40.67%
415 OTHER SUPPLIES/MATERIALS	\$18,375.00	(\$500.00)	\$17,875.00	\$1,548.22	\$2,615.85	\$431.70	\$13,279.23	25.71%
601 DUES AND FEES	\$25,835.00	\$0.00	\$25,835.00	\$20,217.91	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$5,617.09	78.26%
<b>Total for School Expenses</b>	<b>\$2,748,747.00</b>	<b>(\$500.00)</b>	<b>\$2,748,247.00</b>	<b>\$377,666.91</b>	<b>\$850,826.83</b>	<b>\$26,889.48</b>	<b>\$1,492,863.78</b>	<b>45.68%</b>
<b>Support Expenses</b>								
301 INSTRUCTIONAL SERVICES	\$184,570.00	(\$5,400.00)	\$179,170.00	\$106,708.60	\$1,963.65	\$0.00	\$70,497.75	60.65%
305 PROFESSIONAL/TECHNICAL SVCS	\$715,040.00	\$0.00	\$715,040.00	\$29,484.34	\$4,606.96	\$0.00	\$680,948.70	4.77%
307 OTHER SERVICES	\$21,060.00	\$0.00	\$21,060.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$21,060.00	0.00%
309 SECURITY SVCS/EXPENSES	\$160,000.00	\$0.00	\$160,000.00	\$51,511.34	\$142,582.01	\$6,599.41	(\$40,692.76)	125.43%
313 MAINTENANCE SERVICES	\$664,799.00	\$0.00	\$664,799.00	\$238,719.69	\$88,878.00	\$0.00	\$337,201.31	49.28%
319 CONFERENCE & TRAVEL	\$48,900.00	\$0.00	\$48,900.00	\$2,671.93	\$27,676.73	\$0.00	\$18,551.34	62.06%
321 PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT	\$591,117.00	\$30.00	\$591,147.00	\$211,772.89	\$36,622.24	\$10,050.00	\$332,701.87	43.72%
323 POSTAGE	\$68,000.00	\$0.00	\$68,000.00	\$27,237.81	\$12,762.19	\$0.00	\$28,000.00	58.82%
325 PERSONNEL/RECRUITMENT EXP	\$25,690.00	\$0.00	\$25,690.00	\$2,980.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$22,710.00	11.60%
327 PRINTING/COPYING	\$67,350.00	\$0.00	\$67,350.00	\$7,300.09	\$49,257.96	\$0.00	\$10,791.95	83.98%
329 TUITION	\$319,927.00	\$0.00	\$319,927.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$319,927.00	0.00%
401 INSTRUCTIONAL SUPLS/MATLS	\$1,879,573.00	\$2,420.00	\$1,881,993.00	\$982,398.82	\$88,032.58	\$0.00	\$811,561.60	56.88%
403 OFFICE/GENERAL SUPPLIES	\$15,250.00	\$0.00	\$15,250.00	\$2,129.84	\$7,698.99	\$207.00	\$5,214.17	65.81%
404 SPLS, BKS, MATLS-DIST SUPPORT	\$9,000.00	\$2,950.00	\$11,950.00	\$4,242.55	\$7,706.91	\$0.00	\$0.54	100.00%
411 TEXTBOOKS	\$2,933.00	\$0.00	\$2,933.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$2,933.00	0.00%
415 OTHER SUPPLIES/MATERIALS	\$148,465.00	\$0.00	\$148,465.00	\$13,628.97	\$8,328.28	\$254.90	\$126,252.85	14.96%
424 OTHER SUPPLIES	\$6,000.00	\$0.00	\$6,000.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$6,000.00	0.00%
601 DUES AND FEES	\$54,266.00	\$0.00	\$54,266.00	\$41,303.77	\$385.00	\$9,076.44	\$3,500.79	93.55%
<b>Total for Support Expenses</b>	<b>\$4,981,940.00</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>	<b>\$4,981,940.00</b>	<b>\$1,722,090.64</b>	<b>\$476,501.50</b>	<b>\$26,187.75</b>	<b>\$2,757,160.11</b>	<b>44.66%</b>
<b>Maint/Oper/Trans</b>								
305 PROFESSIONAL/TECHNICAL SVCS	\$100,000.00	\$0.00	\$100,000.00	\$14,420.00	\$8,000.00	\$1,085.00	\$76,495.00	23.51%
311 UTILITY SERVICES	\$4,564,632.00	\$0.00	\$4,564,632.00	\$892,616.72	\$208,160.76	\$0.00	\$3,463,854.52	24.12%
313 MAINTENANCE SERVICES	\$4,167,923.00	\$0.00	\$4,167,923.00	\$987,952.34	\$1,847,980.53	\$37,777.67	\$1,294,212.46	68.95%
317 STUDENT TRANSPORTATION	\$7,797,817.00	\$0.00	\$7,797,817.00	\$0.00	\$1,500.00	\$7,374,907.80	\$421,409.20	94.60%
319 CONFERENCE & TRAVEL	\$34,100.00	\$0.00	\$34,100.00	\$2,633.79	\$25,361.77	\$0.00	\$6,104.44	82.10%
321 PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT	\$55,395.00	\$0.00	\$55,395.00	\$3,855.05	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$51,539.95	6.96%
424 OTHER SUPPLIES	\$315,211.00	\$0.00	\$315,211.00	\$29,897.49	\$102,302.44	\$50,000.00	\$133,011.07	57.80%
429 MAINTENANCE/REPAIR SUPPLIES	\$456,500.00	\$0.00	\$456,500.00	\$116,687.45	\$225,357.58	\$1,500.00	\$112,954.97	75.26%
<b>Total for Maint/Oper/Trans</b>	<b>\$17,491,578.00</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>	<b>\$17,491,578.00</b>	<b>\$2,048,062.84</b>	<b>\$2,418,663.08</b>	<b>\$7,465,270.47</b>	<b>\$5,559,581.61</b>	<b>68.22%</b>
<b>Capital</b>								
501 CAPITAL OUTLAY	\$482,146.00	\$0.00	\$482,146.00	\$69,002.07	\$63,412.91	\$23,822.61	\$325,908.41	32.40%
503 TECHNOLOGY	\$2,042,715.00	\$0.00	\$2,042,715.00	\$1,363,612.88	\$28,578.08	\$238.00	\$650,286.04	68.17%
<b>Total for Capital</b>	<b>\$2,524,861.00</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>	<b>\$2,524,861.00</b>	<b>\$1,432,614.95</b>	<b>\$91,990.99</b>	<b>\$24,060.61</b>	<b>\$976,194.45</b>	<b>61.34%</b>
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>163,658,561.00</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>	<b>163,658,561.00</b>	<b>\$23,432,570.76</b>	<b>\$98,304,198.97</b>	<b>\$7,750,663.18</b>	<b>\$34,171,128.09</b>	<b>79.12%</b>

Fairfield Public Schools  
2017-2018 Budget Development

Program Improvements under Consideration

**Textbooks/Instructional Materials**

**District Improvement Plan Specific Action 1-6**

**Total cost: \$542,950**

Science: Purchase textbooks and resource materials to support the newly revised science curriculum for all courses grades 6-12. The curriculum will be presented to the Board in May 2016: \$509,500

Social Studies: Purchase non-fiction texts and resource materials to support the revised social studies curriculum for grades 3-5, develop assured experiences for students in grades 3-5: \$33,450

**Rationale**

Science: The textbooks that we propose to purchase will align with the Next Generation Science Standards (NGSS) adopted by the State of Connecticut and the basis for our new curriculum documents. Our existing science texts do not align with the standards. In addition, the age of our current books varies from 14 years for Chemistry to 7 years for the middle school program. Science teachers are just beginning the process of looking at possible resources. While publishers have been very slow to create or adjust their current products to align with NGSS, we will continue to search for the best possible resource for our students.

Social Studies: The Social Studies curriculum was approved by the Board of Education in May, 2016. Implementation of the new curriculum occurred this year in grades 6-12 but was postponed in K-5 until 2017-18 due to the acquisition of a math text and resources. At this time, our recommendation is to implement the Social Studies curriculum changes in grades 3-5 and schedule the K-2 implementation for 2019-20. This would allow us to concentrate professional development and resources in fewer grades and provide sustainability to the changes we are making in instruction and content. We would implement the new Science curriculum changes in grades 3-5 in 2018-19 and implement both the Social Studies and Science changes in 2019-2020 for grades K-2.

Our moderate approach is based on several factors whose common elements are the limits of instructional time and the professional learning needed for our staff to provide the best instruction.

- Our current implementation guides in literacy need revision. They were written for the onset of the Common Core standards when the assumption was that students would lack previous exposure to skills in earlier grades. That is no longer the case. Our staff is struggling to use instructional time well given the amount of material in these units. Our literacy implementation guides need to be revised and we need to provide professional learning to our staff on how to best make instructional decisions for the students in their classrooms.
- The addition of *Bridges* as a resource has increased the instructional time needed for math. These are strong resources and are welcomed by the teachers. Our work is to integrate the *Bridges* resources with our curriculum units. This work will continue into next year.
- For the Social Studies and Science curriculum to be successful in grades 3-5, we need to streamline literacy and math implementation guides and build new implementation guides in Social Studies and Science which engage students in high quality inquiry-based instruction, common and enriching experiences, and align teacher learning expectations to grades 6-12. We are seeking to build implementation guides that unite Social Studies and Science with Language Arts and Library/Media. The common instructional focus in all content areas is inquiry. This is the essence of our curriculum revisions and materials/resource budgeting for the next two years.
- The urgency for strong early literacy instruction compels us to place that professional learning need first in grades K-2. An attempt to implement Social Studies or Science curriculum changes prior to 2019-2020 will undermine our ability to improve literacy instruction as well as result in uneven implementation of those new curricular changes.

## **World Language Program**

### **District Improvement Plan Specific Action 1.1**

**Grades K – 5 Total Cost: Add grade 2 - 1.7 FTE or \$129,569**

**Research and develop K-5 program - \$30,813 (Option 2 recommended for 2017-2018)**

- Add world language instruction to elementary grades

### **Rationale**

A review of the Fairfield Public School's middle and elementary World Language program was conducted in the fall of 2014. As a result, the administration proposed, and the Board of

Education supported, expanding the grade 6 World Languages program. The grades 4 and 5 program was recommended to remain at two 25-minute sessions per week for the 2015-16 school year. This year we have added two 25-minute sessions per week for grade 3.

We face several factors as we expand the program.

- Our intention is to continue the expansion of the World Languages program from Kindergarten to grade 2. We believe it would be most impactful if the language is consistent (Spanish) in the elementary program. We are mindful of the impact that additional programs requirements will have on the instructional minutes of our core programs. The revisions of Social Studies curriculum next year and the Science curriculum in 2017-18 will require an expansion of those program minutes. Further we are mindful of the impact of the program expansion on the budget. Finally, there is a shortage area in teachers certified in World Languages. Hiring as many teachers as we need in one year poses risks to ensuring highly qualified instructors in front of every student.
- Our recommendation remains to start world language instruction in kindergarten. We are considering two options for program expansion in 2017-18. The first adds grade 2 and requires revisions to the grades 3-5 curriculum. The second option delays implementation of additional grades by one year and allows us to develop a more meaningful program. Given the extra time, we can develop a program that creates a Spanish immersion program in grades K-5, accelerates expectations for middle school and has the opportunity to change learning expectations through grade 12. This approach would also allow us to connect to other potential program changes in the elementary grades.

**Option 1:** Creating a grade 2 Spanish program. The class would meet twice a week for 25 minutes each period. This will require an additional 1.7 FTE in staffing at a cost of \$129,636 (\$95,346 salary, \$34,290 benefits). The materials cost for grade 2 would be an additional \$250 per school for a total of \$2,750. We will need to make changes in the curriculum expectations and performance assessments for grades 3-5 and therefore we are budgeting \$4,000 for curriculum revisions. We would then intend to add additional grades in ensuing years. Each grade, added in this approach, necessitates ongoing revisions to the existing grade level curricula.

**Option 2:** In October our World Languages Curriculum Coordinator, two elementary Principals, and an elementary Spanish teacher visited two elementary Spanish programs in Maryland. They witnessed two strong programs with diverse approaches. Both programs required additional staffing, materials, and time resources. Both programs provided students with a rich immersive Spanish experience. Our staff witnessed grade 1 students totally immersed in the target language and grade 5 students speaking fluently in Spanish. We would need to spend

the remainder of this school year and the fall of 2017 developing expectations and needs for a high quality K-5 World Languages program. This program must support and align to the grades 6-12 program. The amount of \$30,813 requested above will fund the research and instructional time needed to present a strong program vision in the fall of 2017. It will include \$17,220 for curriculum development, \$10,800 for a consultant to work with our staff, \$4,800 for additional staff to visit the Maryland programs, and \$3,000 for curricular materials in grades 3-5. This time to plan will allow us to design and deliver a program that best serves our students.

### **Elementary Scheduling/ 6 Day Rotation**

#### **District Improvement Plan Specific Action 1.14, 1.20**

**Grades K – 5 Total Cost: 0.2 FTE or \$14,640 (salary and benefits)**

The elementary program would move to a 6-day rotation next year in order to increase the amount of time teachers have to collaboratively plan for instruction and to work with instructional coaches. This increased time will support the teachers in implementing the instructional approaches to best serve students. This will allow us to standardize specialist time blocks across grades and create common meeting times for teachers on grade levels. We need to add 0.2 FTE in specialist areas. If we were to remain at the 5-day schedule we could reduce specialist FTE by 1.8. This assumes that Spanish will not be implemented in grade 2 next year.

Dr. Meg Boice, Director of Secondary Education

Mr. Michael Cummings, Director of Elementary Education

November, 2016

## 5141.3(a)

*Existing policy, #5510 revised on 9/23/14, recodified and modified to reflect new requirements regarding religious exemptions. Legal references have also been updated. Existing policy #5511 has been made a part of this policy also.*

### **Students**

#### **Health Assessments and Immunizations**

- I. In accordance with Connecticut General statutes, each student enrolled in the Fairfield schools shall be required to have a health assessment by a legally qualified practitioner of medicine (physician or osteopath licensed to practice in the United States), or by an advanced practice registered nurse, registered nurse, or Physician Assistant licensed to practice in Connecticut.
- prior to initial entrance into preschool programs,
  - prior to initial entrance into kindergarten,
  - for transfer students, prior to initial entrance into the Fairfield schools in grades 6 and 9,
  - for ungraded students, prior to initial entrance and whenever a health assessment is required for students of the same age cohort as the ungraded student.

All health assessments required above and done on or after August 15, 2005 shall include documentation of an assessment of the student's risk of exposure to tuberculosis. Any student determined to be at high risk shall receive a Mantoux tuberculin skin test performed in the United States as part of the required health assessment.

Health assessments required prior to initial entrance into a Fairfield school shall include evidence of a Mantoux tuberculin skin test performed after most recent entry into the United States for students entering school in Fairfield from a country with a high prevalence of tuberculosis.

Countries with a high prevalence of tuberculosis include those identified as such by the Connecticut Department of Public Health. Refer to corresponding Administrative Regulations.

Any student found to have a positive Mantoux tuberculin skin test or tuberculosis disease shall be permitted to attend school only in accordance with the tuberculosis control protocols established by the Fairfield Director of Health and School Medical Advisor.

Any student not in accordance with this policy shall not be permitted to register for or continue attendance in school.

All students are encouraged to have their health assessments done by their private health care provider to promote continuity of care. However, if this is not done, health assessments will be available in the schools or in the Fairfield Well Child Clinic for eligible students with parent authorization.

Students who are experiencing health problems or are suspected of having a health problem may be referred to their private health care provider for a health assessment at other than required times.

## Students

### Health Assessments and Immunizations (continued)

- II. Students in high schools participating in interscholastic sports (tryouts, practice and play) will be required to have a health assessment by their private health care provider within one calendar year prior to start of participation in the sport for the current school year. Students who do not have evidence of the health assessment within the calendar year cannot participate in the sport. Students participating in high school interscholastic sports (tryouts, practice, or play) shall be required to have a health assessment no more than thirteen months prior to participation in the sport for the current school year. The health assessment is valid for a period of thirteen months from the date it was done. Once the health assessment becomes more than thirteen-months old, the student cannot continue to participate in the sport until a new health assessment is done and submitted to the school. The health assessment must be done by a legally qualified practitioner of medicine (physician or osteopath licensed to practice in the United States), or by an advanced practice registered nurse, registered nurse, or Physician Assistant licensed to practice in Connecticut.
- III. Timing of health assessments shall be in accordance with the corresponding Administrative Regulations.
- IV. Connecticut state statutes permit exemption from physical or medical examination required for entry into school or entry into grades 6 or 9 if the parent/legal guardian of a student provides a written statement that the parent/legal guardian of the student, or the student, objects on religious grounds, to physical or medical examination. These exemptions do not apply to health assessments required for participation in sports.
- V. In accordance with Connecticut General Statutes, the Board of Education shall require students to be protected by adequate immunizations against diphtheria, pertussis, tetanus, poliomyelitis, measles, mumps, rubella, hemophilus influenza type b, hepatitis B, chicken pox (varicella), pneumococcal, hepatitis A, influenza, meningococcal (unless medically contraindicated or failure to do so is based upon exercise of the rights of freedom or religion as provided in the United States and Connecticut Constitutions and in the Connecticut General Statutes.)

Parents/guardians wanting their children excused from immunizations on religious grounds (prior to kindergarten entry and grade 7 entry) must request such exemption in writing to the Superintendent of Schools if such immunization is contrary to the religious beliefs of the child or of the parent/guardian of the child. The request must be officially acknowledged by a notary public or a judge, a clerk or deputy clerk of a court having a seal, a town clerk, a justice of the peace, a Connecticut-licensed attorney or a school nurse. It is the responsibility of the Principal to insure that each student enrolled has been adequately immunized and has fulfilled the required health assessments. The school nurse shall check and document immunizations and health assessments on all students enrolling in school and to report the status to the school principal. The school nurse shall also contact parents or guardians to make them aware if immunizations and/or health assessments are insufficient or not up-to-date. The school nurse will maintain in good order the immunization and health assessment records of each student enrolled.



## Students

### Health Assessments and Immunizations (continued)

Legal Reference: Connecticut General Statutes

10-204a Required immunizations (as amended by PA 15-174 and PA 15-242)

10-204c Immunity from liability

10-205 Appointment of school medical adviser

10-206 Health assessments

10-206a Free health assessments

10-207 Duties of medical advisors

10-208 Exemption from examination or treatment

10-208a Physical activity of student restricted; board to honor notice

10-209 Records not to be public. Provision of reports to schools.

10-212 School nurses and nurse practitioners

10-214 Vision, audiometric and postural screenings. When required. Notification of parents re defects; record of results.

Department of Public Health, Public Health Code, 10-204a-2a, 10-204a-3a, 10-204a-4

Section 4 of P.A. 14-231

20 U.S.C. Section 1232h, No Child Left Behind Act

Federal Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974 (section 438 of the General Education Provisions Act, as amended, added by section 513 of P.L. 93-568, codified at 20 U.S.C. 1232g)

42 U.S.C. 1320d-1320d-8, P.L. 104-191, Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996 (HIPAA)

Policy adopted: FAIRFIELD PUBLIC SCHOOLS

**Regular Meeting Minutes  
Fairfield BoE, October 18, 2016**

**NOTICE:** A full meeting recording can be obtained from Fairfield Public Schools. Please call 203-255-8371 for more information and/or see the FPS website (under Board Meeting Minutes) for a link to FAIRTV.

*Call to Order of the Regular Meeting of the Board of Education and Roll Call*

Chairman Philip Dwyer called the Regular meeting to order at 7:34PM. Present were members Eileen Liu-McCormack (arrived 7:50PM), Marc Patten (arrived 7:38PM), Donna Karnal (arrived 7:44PM), Jessica Gerber, Philip Dwyer, Anthony Calabrese, Trisha Pytko, Jennifer Maxon-Kennelly and John Llewellyn. Others present were Interim Superintendent Dr. Stephen Tracy, FLHS student representatives Catherine Behjati and Sean Oppenheimer; FWHS student representatives Ashley Agrello and Brittany Shuster; members of the central office leadership team, and approximately 25 members of the public.

*Student Reports*

Fairfield Warde High School students Ms. Agrello and Ms. Shuster reported: Orientation was very successful; Open House was held on September 8; Fridays in October are Senior Spirit Days; Homecoming is on Saturday. Over the summer, some students chose a research project over summer reading; Red Ribbon Week brought in various speakers; the seniors are working hard on college applications.

Fairfield Ludlowe High School students Ms. Behjati and Mr. Oppenheimer reported: During the PSAT administration to sophomores and juniors, seniors will be visiting counselors to get help with college applications and freshmen will be participating in the anti-defamation program; the upcoming High School 101 presentation will be helpful to freshman parents; Mr. Hatzis recently informed the Ludlowe parent community about MRSA precautionary measures currently underway and the rise in popularity of a new e-cigarette known as JUUL.

Mrs. Maxon-Kennelly asked the student representatives if any of them had attended the PTA-sponsored college admissions event; none were able to attend.

*Presentations*

*Racial Imbalance Plan*

Dr. Tracy provided some history on racial imbalance and said CT §10-226 requires that school districts see to it that the minority make-up of any particular school not deviate from the district-wide average by more than 25%. For the past 6 years, McKinley has fallen outside of that range. The Racial Imbalance Plan submitted in 2007 was amended in 2010, and the Board was again directed last year to amend the plan. The consulting firm Milone & MacBroom was hired last year to conduct a redistricting study as an option to deal with this issue. It was concluded that a comprehensive redistricting solution would not likely be practical until after the Holland Hill and Mill Hill construction projects were completed. The CT State Board of Education (CSBE) will address this issue at its January meeting, but the plan must be submitted before November 18.

There are 2 corrections to the Racial Imbalance Plan – the asterisk note under chart 1 should be disregarded – the chart is correct and includes all 11 elementary schools; and on page 6, the last paragraph should be 3%, not 6%.

The Plan outlines:

- The phase-out of the Dwight PK program, adding a new PK program at Stratfield and adding a 3<sup>rd</sup> PK program at Stratfield or Burr.
- Expansion of the Open Choice Program from 72 to 100 seats by the start of the 18/19 school year.
- The consideration of a modest magnet program at McKinley for approximately 50 students - if further steps are necessary.

The cost related to the PK expansion is staff salary and transportation of \$105K, with additional one-time costs for playground, technology and furniture of \$40K in year 1, off-set by revenue of \$54K in PK tuition and \$42K from Open Choice. Year 2 would cost \$121K, against revenue of \$38K in PK tuition and \$42K from Open Choice.

Mr. Dwyer added that the CSBE has a longer lead time for agenda enclosures. The CSBE meeting will take place in January, but the plan needs to be submitted well in advance.

Mrs. Maxon-Kennelly asked for a repeat of the financial information; Dr. Tracy said he will provide this in writing.

Mr. Patten said a one-page financial summary would be helpful.

Mrs. Liu-McCormack asked:

- What are the assumptions of the per student cost for Open Choice? Dr. Tracy said new Open Choice students will be placed in early grades in empty seats where no new sections need to be added. CES confirmed that Special Education costs beyond the \$3K are borne by the sending district.
- Are we assuming no cost for the additional 28 students? Dr. Tracy said not beyond things like supplies and texts.
- How is transportation paid for? Mr. Cummings said transportation costs are covered by the state and coordinated by CES.
- What if they qualify for Free Lunch? Mr. Cumming said that is covered by the Free Lunch Program.
- Who covers the Special Education costs over \$3K? Mr. Cummings said special education services beyond what are normally provided are coordinated through our special education department and paid for by the sending district.
- So the only costs are the teacher's time, technology and that sort of thing? Mr. Cummings said much of the cost is in economies of scale; a relatively low cost per student. Mrs. Liu-McCormack said she is fully aware of the incremental, marginal, student-cost concept and said the cost of these students is not 0.

Ms. Pytko asked if a feeder pattern existed for PK, or can parents choose? Given that ECC is facing overcrowding, will special education services be provided at Stratfield? Dr. Tracy said the current program gives PK students the option to remain at the PK school and also invite siblings to join them as well; Stratfield, Burr and McKinley are all in the same feeder pattern for Tomlinson Middle School. Mr. Cummings added that under the current system, there is a PK feeder pattern for Burr and Dwight; anyone can attend ECC at Warde, and we will have to re-establish whether this will be replicated. Ms. Leonardi would guide us on special education services at Stratfield, but that is currently not part of the plan.

Ms. Karnal noted that a possible 50-student magnet program may add too many students at McKinley, given current enrollment numbers.

Mrs. Gerber said that McKinley projections show a lower enrollment in future years.

Ms. Karnal asked:

- What is the timeframe for the magnet school? Dr. Tracy said the idea is to wait and see how effective the first two options are.
- From the student's perspective, what is the cost to the teacher's time, not just the planning but the day-day? Mr. Cummings said the extra students will have a minimal impact. The goal is to remain under 25 students in grades 3,4, and 5 per Board policy.

Mr. Dwyer said 28 students will be spread over 220 sections. Mr. Cummings added that students will be added where there is a minimal impact.

Mrs. Karnal mentioned that Mill Hill was impacted by 2 students enrolling at the last minute and a new teacher had to be hired. Additionally, students will be spread over less than 220 sections - not every school will receive Open Choice students. Mr. Cummings said the number of new Open Choice students is an aspirational number – if slots can't be identified, then students won't be added.

Mrs. Liu-McCormack questioned this Open Choice solution, given that it will have minimal impact. If there truly is a problem, and the state will not accept that the McKinley population likes to be at McKinley, then a permanent solution is needed. We don't want to create other incidental issues that we then have to manage. The PK program was not fully enrolled and barely moved the needle at all. The only way to be efficient is to grow the Open Choice program to match the growth at McKinley; this is a band aid at best and the total cost of PK and Open Choice is more than \$100K. Dr. Tracy said that even ½ point will make a big difference. Open Choice is more predictable than the PK program, given that all Open Choice students are minorities. Mrs. Liu-McCormack has to imagine there are more efficient solutions. We don't have a solution that's definitive.

Mr. Llewellyn asked:

- What is the state deadline? Mr. Dwyer said the CSBE extended the due date to November 18; action must be taken by this Board by November 15 to meet this deadline.
- Will the magnet program be offered to children outside the district? Dr. Tracy said it will be limited to Fairfield residents.
- Will busing be reimbursed? Mrs. Munsell said CES manages transportation costs through the state grant.
- How have these 2 solutions impacted us over the last 5 years? Please provide 3 additional columns to page 2 – actual numbers of students, absolute imbalance without the impact of PK students, and absolute imbalance without the impact of Open Choice students. It would be helpful to get these numbers well ahead of the next meeting.
- What are the numbers by grade level? Dr. Tracy said that was already provided as a handout.
- How many Open Choice students are in special education, is it similar to the district's number of 10% and are we reimbursed for every dollar? Mr. Dwyer said it was his understanding that costs over \$3K were covered and Mrs. Munsell said it was dependent on the situation. Mr. Llewellyn said he hasn't seen anything in the budget book listed under "revenue."
- For PK, he is unclear on actual costs since revenue from Open Choice appears to be included in the numbers which is apples and oranges. Does opening PK guarantee a \$175K loss? Dr. Tracy said it's \$91K the first year and \$83K the second year
- Are we getting reimbursed for the full amount – there have been many cuts at the state level and the increase in Open Choice students for this year is not noted in the budget book. He thought Dr. Title stated there was no increase to Open Choice. Mr. Cummings said 12 students were added in February - Open Choice is budgeted with previous year's numbers.
- Are there any litigation expenses, what are the total out-of-pocket expenses? Shouldn't frame this as an economic advantage to the town. The desire to increase PK and Open Choice programs doesn't address the racial imbalance. Rather, racial imbalance is being used to increase these programs; we have been questioning why schools are being built as 504 with declining enrollment and that is another concern, where are we headed. He has requested numbers and would like to see them well in advance of the next meeting.

Mrs. Gerber mentioned that not all schools are being built to 504.

Mr. Patten clarified with Mr. Cummings that student placement will not violate the enrollment policy in terms of the numbers of students at each grade level.

Mrs. Maxon-Kennelly, using the October 1 enrollment, noted that there are 13 sections of KDG and 21 sections of 1<sup>st</sup> grade that have 19 or fewer students – leaving 34 sections where students could be added. She mentioned that 4 elementary schools are not built to 504 and clarified that a magnet program is much smaller and more specific than a magnet school.

- The PK program is open to all Fairfield residents – could you speak to the idea of using race or socio-economic status as criteria for enrollment in PK? Mr. Dwyer said this is not allowed and Dr. Tracy said the program is difficult to fine-tune, as it is based on so many individual decisions.
- With Dwight being phased out, would remaining students still be able to opt-in at Dwight? Mr. Cummings said yes.

- What is the cost to maintain the program at Dwight? Mr. Cummings said there are currently eight 3-year-old students at Dwight – this would have to be part of the budget discussion going forward.
- Page 5b – wasn't priority initially given to those on free/reduced lunch? Mr. Cummings said the program is first-come first-served and the district looks for a balance – roughly  $\frac{1}{3}$  of students pay full tuition,  $\frac{1}{2}$  are free, and  $\frac{1}{6}$  pay a reduced rate.
- Is there a savings in transportation with moving the PK program to Stratfield? Dr. Tracy said he did not assume any savings.
- The cultural diversity task force, on which she served, considered many low cost options over several years. It appears that Mrs. Liu-McCormack wants redistricting as a permanent solution but the Board did not accept that, based on the Milone and MacBroom redistricting study. This has been covered and it is a disservice to the public to suggest otherwise.

Mrs. Liu-McCormack said she never used the word redistricting so perhaps that is what Mrs. Maxon-Kennelly thinks of as a permanent solution; what we are looking at does not help racial imbalance. She recommends asking the state for more time. It is not a good expenditure of funds in a tight budget year and she has yet to see data that will solve this problem. The incoming superintendent may have a different perspective. There may be creative solutions out there. It's very much not clear that expanding Open Choice and PK is a good use of funds in addressing racial imbalance.

Mrs. Gerber said this is not a new topic for the Board. She would like to see what new ideas Mrs. Liu-McCormack has now; if there are other options, they would have been presented. An extension has already been requested and the only accommodation is for additional time for the presentation but the plan is still due in one month. If Mrs. Liu-McCormack does not want redistricting, what does she want?

Mrs. Liu-McCormack said she had spoken to the interim superintendent, and that we have a new superintendent coming in should justify asking for an extension from the state. If someone else wants to redistrict that's up to them. Expanding Open Choice does not seem to solve the problem and has its own issues.

Mrs. Gerber clarified with Mr. Dwyer that he had spoken to the state. He confirmed her questions as to the fact that they are aware that we have a new superintendent starting in December but the only accommodation they will give us is extending the date of the presentation. We cannot delay the vote on November 15.

Mr. Patten asked what percent of Open Choice students remain through graduation? Do we choose the students? Why not adapt the plan each year? Dr. Tracy said the goal is for them to remain through graduation; if students move out of Bridgeport, they are out of the program. This plan only addresses 100 students district-wide, but the Board and the superintendent could expand it. The focus of the plan will be on KDG and 1<sup>st</sup> grades but upper elementary grades can also be considered. Mr. Cummings added that the district chooses the slots, not the students.

Mr. Lewellyn confirmed with Mr. Dwyer that a vote is needed at the next meeting. The Milone and MacBroom study did not make a recommendation; the committee did. The six Open Choice students in 1<sup>st</sup> grade at Dwight may have actually increased sections and therefore the addition of staff members and costs - perhaps this decision belongs in a referendum, it's more of a social concept rather than an educational one.

Mr. Dwyer said the Milone and MacBroom study presented several redistricting scenarios to solve racial imbalance; they were not asked to make a recommendation. The Board was not interested in spot redistricting.

Mrs. Maxon-Kennelly requested through the Chair that Mrs. Liu-McCormack, having adamantly denied that redistricting was her permanent solution, prepare her idea or ideas for a permanent solution for the Friday Packet well in advance of the next meeting. She said redistricting also has costs and asked Mr. Dwyer if all scenarios as presented by Milone and MacBroom violated the Redistricting Principles and he said yes; no scenario would work.

Mrs. Gerber noted that in the Milone and MacBroom study – only 2 scenarios were viable and only after renovations were completed at Holland Hill and Mill Hill. Both included enormous redistricting.

Mrs. Liu-McCormack said again that she never mentioned redistricting. However, the Board could choose to re-open the concept of redistricting. She has ideas on this but can't do this in isolation – she needs more time. There could be many many other options. We can continue to do more. Open Choice is basically redistricting kids from one town to another. Is loathe to spending more money to resolve this issue. People are happy at McKinley.

Mrs. Gerber said that the state is aware that McKinley families are happy but that is not a factor for this issue. She apologized for thinking that Mrs. Liu-McCormack wanted to redistrict. Mrs. Liu-McCormack said she may want to look at redistricting. Mrs. Gerber stated that she was now confused that Mrs. Liu-McCormack was saying she would consider

redistricting, but regardless, there is a deadline to get the report to the state. She would like to hear what Mrs. Liu-McCormack's many ideas were, whether they were redistricting or something else.

Mrs. Maxon-Kennelly said that Mrs. Liu-McCormack said she has lots of ideas so she would like to hear them. We are talking about state law so families being happy does not play into that.

Mr. Llewellyn asked what would happen in the event there is no agreed upon solution? The state hasn't managed their finances well. One solution may be to move several streets in the McKinley district to Riverfield. It may not be palatable but it's a possibility. Could also move a couple of streets from McKinley to Stratfield. Or there could be other options.

Mr. Dwyer said the original proposal to the state requested a spring 2017 submittal date to accommodate the incoming superintendent, but that was rejected. Rather than a forced redistricting, this is a voluntary approach; the Board had previously rejected spot redistricting. The purpose is to convince the state that we are making efforts; there can be no permanent solution until the two schools are renovated. The PK and Open Choice options are the least costly. Fairfield has the lowest Open Choice participation rate for a suburban district; there is a social purpose to expanding these opportunities to others. Other districts have gravitated towards magnet programs and redistricting to address racial imbalance. How long would it take to study and implement a magnet program? Mr. Cummings, while not familiar with the program in Greenwich, said his best guess was a minimum of two years to plan and budget.

Mr. Llewellyn questioned what percentage of Open Choice participation would Mr. Dwyer like to get to?

Mr. Dwyer said he would like to be in the middle of the list at about 1.7%.

Mr. Llewellyn said that would equal 170 students and asked why follow this path if other districts used redistricting and magnet programs – neither of which we are pursuing?

Mr. Dwyer said it is not in our best interest to not follow state law.

Mr. Llewellyn said it should not be up to nine people to determine social responsibility.

Ms. Karnal asked if the McKinley Opt-out option might be reconsidered. Dr. Tracy said that option was proven ineffective and was discontinued in 2013. Currently, the Opt-in program is also proving ineffective.

<i>Old Business</i>
---------------------

*Approval of the 2017-2018 School Calendar*

Mrs. Gerber moved, Mrs. Maxon-Kennelly seconded that the Board of Education approve the 2017-2018 School Calendar.

Mrs. Parks addressed Mrs. Maxon-Kennelly's suggestion to have one district-wide early dismissal day in October. Several factors force 2 separate early dismissals and include Professional Development on extended meeting Tuesdays for the elementary level and the pre-set date of the PSAT administration at the high school level.

Mrs. Maxon-Kennelly appreciated the feedback.

Ms. Karnal asked about calendar days – given that one of the Jewish holidays falls on a weekend. Mrs. Parks said the number of school days appears in the upper right hand corner of each month.

Mr. Patten asked if there are contractual issues with PD over the summer. Mrs. Parks said teachers have a contractual number of days to work and this drives the calendar. Teachers are paid for summer work which includes training and curriculum writing.

**Motion Passed: 9-0**

*Adoption of Policies 5111 – Students – Admission/Placement; and 5113 – Students – Attendance/Excuses/Dismissal*

Mrs. Maxon-Kennelly moved, Mrs. Gerber seconded that the Board of Education adopt Policies 5111 and 5113.

**Motion Passed: 9-0**

<i>New Business</i>
---------------------

*Discussion of 2017-2018 Budget Ideas from BOE Members*

Dr. Tracy said he has been working with Dr. Jones on preliminary budget discussions. The savings realized in the switch to the CT Partnership plan have been realized and are part of the budget. The surplus in the medical retention fund will cover the budget reduction of \$740K in the health insurance account; however, the medical retention fund will be dissolved this year - meaning, we need to add \$740K to the health budget just to make it even. Salary and health insurance adjustments in the budget for 17-18 already account for about a 3% increase, before any discussion regarding new programs. The Town is also experiencing a \$4M reduction in state aid, including a reduction in the Education Cost Sharing grant. The obligation is to develop a budget proposal that responds to students, including steps to continue with the District Improvement Plan. The Board will receive the budget on January 10, Special Meetings will be held on January 17 and 24, and the vote will take place on January 26.

Mr. Dwyer encouraged Board members to discuss budget ideas without delving too much into the math.

Mr. Calabrese said he would like to see continued implementation of the District Improvement Plan, specifically the K-2 World Language Program; energy savings expansion; and the potential of combining IT services with the Town.

Mr. Patten will try to find offsets for two extra summer PD days to enhance/showcase new teaching strategies.

Mrs. Maxon-Kennelly would like the continued roll-out of the World Language Program, the purchase of the Social Studies texts, the continued focus on the District Improvement Plan; specifically 1-3, year 2 of embedding technology and associated PD; page 28, 1-20, PD by subject; and page 31, 4-17, enrichment opportunities for K-8.

Mr. Llewellyn is interested in the savings of consolidating the PK classroom from Dwight to Burr and the IT consolidation with the Town as mentioned by Mr. Calabrese. He may also be interested in looking at combining HR with the Town or outsourcing HR and the like.

Mr. Dwyer would also like to see the World Language Program continue. While the consolidation of administrative functions deserves review; department heads should be involved prior to the Board's discussion.

Mr. Llewellyn clarified with Mr. Dwyer that the \$740K related to self-insurance was applied to current year premium expenses.

Mr. Dwyer agreed and said the \$740K was in reserve to pay future claims; a member of the Board of Selectmen felt that was over-budgeting and reduced the 16/17 budget by that amount.

<i>Approval of Minutes</i>
----------------------------

*Approval of the Minutes of the Special Meeting of October 4, 2016*

Mrs. Gerber moved, Ms. Pytko seconded that the Board of Education approve the Minutes of the Special Meeting of October 4, 2016.

**Motion Passed: 6-0-3**

Favor: Mr. Patten, Mrs. Gerber, Mr. Dwyer, Mr. Calabrese, Ms. Pytko, Mr. Llewellyn

Abstain: Mrs. Liu-McCormack, Ms. Karnal, Mrs. Maxon-Kennelly

*Approval of the Minutes of the Regular Meeting of October 4, 2016*

Mrs. Gerber moved, Mrs. Maxon-Kennelly seconded that the Board of Education approve the Minutes of the Regular Meeting of October 4, 2016.

Mr. Llewellyn moved, Mrs. Liu-McCormack seconded to amend the minutes by changing the last sentence in bullet point 1 of Mr. Llewellyn's second set of remarks on page 3 to read "Mrs. Parks said the sample size is significantly smaller than the all student category: **21 students in 2013-14, 14 students in 2015-16.**" (new language in bold).

Mr. Llewellyn said this helps frame it in terms of the numbers.

Mr. Dwyer said he opposes this as it wasn't presented in advance so research could be done.

Mr. Llewellyn said he had only received the minutes Thursday night and didn't have a chance to look at them until Monday.

**Motion Passed: 5-3-1**

Favor: Mrs. Liu-McCormack, Mr. Patten, Ms. Karnal, Mrs. Gerber, Mr. Llewellyn

Oppose: Mr. Dwyer, Mr. Calabrese, Ms. Pytko

Abstain: Mrs. Maxon-Kennelly

**The Original Motion as Amended Passed: 9-0**

*Superintendent's Report*

Dr. Tracy reviewed the 2014-2015 School Profile and Performance District Report. The Connecticut Association of Boards of Education recognized 3 Fairfield publications with an Honorable Mention: District Budget, Budget Presentation and Social Studies Curriculum. He attended the recent 50-year anniversary celebration of the Mill River Wetland Committee which has benefitted thousands of Fairfield students.

*Committee/Liaison Report*

Mrs. Maxon-Kennelly said the PTAC held its first meeting and mentioned PTAC funding is available.

Mr. Llewellyn asked if the PTAC was creating videos. Mrs. Maxon-Kennelly said yes, they are taking advantage of FAIRTV for school events and community outreach.

Mr. Patten said the Board of Health reported on the MRSA infection at FLHS. Millie Sachs, a FWHS nurse, is retiring next month; \$1200 was saved on Epi-pens; a new vaccination policy was approved.

*Open Board Comment*

Ms. Karnal said we are all here to do our job for the Town and the students; mutual respect should be shown.

Ms. Pytko said the Mill River is holding a fundraiser at the Bear and Grill.

Mr. Dwyer asked Board members to confirm attendance at the CABE convention if they have not already done so. RYASAP survey results will be shared at the December meeting. The Town Hall meeting will take place on 10/24.

*Adjournment*

Mrs. Gerber moved, Ms. Karnal seconded that this Regular Meeting of the Board of Education adjourn.

**Motion Passed: 9-0**

Meeting adjourned at 10:22PM

*Respectfully submitted by  
Jessica Gerber  
Fairfield Board of Education  
Secretary*



(rev)DRAFT

**Special Meeting Minutes  
Fairfield BoE; October 24, 2016**

**Call to order of the Special Meeting of the Board of Education and Roll Call**

Chairman Philip Dwyer called the Special meeting to order at 7:34PM. Present were members Eileen Liu-McCormack, Marc Patten, Donna Karnal, Jessica Gerber, Philip Dwyer, Anthony Calabrese, Trisha Pytko, Jennifer Maxon-Kennelly and John Llewellyn. Others present were approximately 25 members of the public.

Mr. Dwyer thanked the public for attending and gave a brief background as to the history of the town hall meetings, which came out of the Communications subcommittee. He welcomed former BoE Chair and current BoF member John Mitola, who would act as moderator of the meeting, allowing Mr. Dwyer to participate more freely.

John Mitola thanked the Board and members of the public. He explained the parameters of the meeting as to how the public would comment and how Board members would respond.

**Frank Sahagian**, 20 Chelsea Street, and teacher at FWMS. Was interested in the previous Board meeting regarding the discussion on racial imbalance at McKinley. Is concerned about decline in population at the elementary school level and how it will impact school utilization in elementary school as well as middle school and its team format. Is there any plan about this? Is there a threshold for how many children should be in a school? His children were impacted by schools opening and closing. Middle schools will not have the ability to maintain team system, which is problematic for students and teachers. As this relates to racial imbalance, will this decline in enrollment impact the problem and perhaps require the district to take different actions?

**Mrs. Liu-McCormack** agreed with his insights and has grappled with similar questions. There is an apparent decreasing trend. The consultants' analysis may show growth with no apparent necessary reasons. In finance she used to do this all the time, and wondered how could that be? In reality it doesn't happen all the time, She questions expanding schools with declining enrollment. Would prefer board to look forward and not be so aggressive in expanding schools. Not sure what McKinley numbers are for next year. Agrees that team system in MS would be impacted. Thinks importing kids from another town should be a town discussion, it's a bigger social issue. Our mandate is to use funds for the benefit of Fairfield residents. If we have all this excess capacity do we extend to other communities or do we close schools. This requires future deliberation.

**Mr. Patten** said that closing schools has proven to not be in Fairfield's favor; it's one of the reasons we built Burr. Most people don't want to touch redistricting. In the short term if there is a contraction, the staff does review these things and things can be altered if need be in terms of changing ed specs for future projects. Hope that teachers would not be impacted by any contractions. There shouldn't be any massive layoffs. In this town, when we close schools over time trends change. Economy is improving.

**Mr. Sahagian** said that this is not a temporary situation and other towns are experiencing this as well. There are problems in the state. That's his concern. Has concerns about fiscal responsibility.

**Mr. Patten** said that in the past most districts declined but not Fairfield. Fairfield is a lot more affordable than other towns but at the same time our school district is strong.

**Ms. Karnal** said thanks for looking up the stats, she's not sure the board reviews them often enough. Not sure if building all these schools to 504 is a good idea and not sure it will help with racial imbalance. We are trending down. Keep putting out those numbers.

**Mrs. Gerber** it's important to remember that trends go up and down. We're still dealing with too many schools being closed in the 80s. While it's true enrollment has gone down, there is residential building in town and enrollment will go back up. Only Holland Hill and Mill Hill will be expanded to 504 schools. Holland Hill is centrally located. New

(rev)DRAFT

developments are being built in Mill Hill area. Both projects are getting rid of portables. Closing a school could harm the district long-term.

Ms. Karnal wanted to clarify that six schools are 504, two more will be built to that, making it 8 out of 11 schools.

Mr. Dwyer said that many people recognize that they chose Fairfield because of the schools and because of the prices of houses. Our enrollment will go down and will go back up. People see this as a valuable town. Neighborhood schools are part of the stability of this town. Should the board move away from this concept and entertain closing a school? It's not just moving boundaries; it's moving families and children. Not wise to make a decision on just a 3-4 year trend. Board as a whole had not wanted to redistrict to solve racial imbalance.

Mr. Sahagian asked if enrollment changes for McKinley for next year were available and would they show that racial imbalance won't be an issue.

Mr. Dwyer state creates official numbers, which won't be known until spring. Looking at the trend, he doesn't think the enrollment numbers will impact the imbalance.

Mrs. Gerber said that because McKinley has a lot of renters in the district it is often hard to predict numbers there.

Mr. Calabrese said that consultants are looking at the numbers. Thinks it's a state issue, talked about upcoming proposed developments that will impact schools. Trusts that consultants are doing their best. Thinks that all Board members want to do what is right for the kids.

Ms. Pytko said that she lives in McKinley district, thinks that things will change because of new developments, making it hard to determine enrollment. We need to keep revisiting this.

Mrs. Maxon-Kennelly said that we have six schools at 504. Many Board members have been doing analysis of this issue. Majority of the Board believes building schools where children are, to avoid busing children. We may have to look at numbers if some schools get too small. Understands trends but warned that they can fluctuate. Trusts in administrative staff that team concept will stay in place. If town doesn't accept HUD money we would not be beholden to 830-G regulations, but there would be other implications that would have their costs. We need to be flexible and adjust accordingly.

Mr. Sahagian said that MS numbers are easier to determine because students are in the system

Mr. Llewellyn said that the observations presented are good. Said that some Board members questioned the need to expand Holland Hill and Mill Hill as 504s. Holland Hill doesn't go above 438 in projections. He does question overbuilding schools. Questioned Mr. Dwyer stating that we should be bringing 170 students into our town. We shouldn't grow schools for capacity for folks from out of town. Doesn't think costs are net neutral. We are responsible to all Fairfielders. Should hunker in and spend money on actually educating kids. Hopes the Board take this into consideration.

Mr. Dwyer said that when building a 504 school it is considered good planning to consider staying at 90% functional capacity. Looking at that, Holland Hill built to 504 would be within functional capacity. Neighborhoods with dense populations warrant 504 schools.

Mr. Llewellyn said that there's a trend in two of our schools toward increasing diversity. We might need to redistrict parts of neighborhoods. While Mr. Dwyer says that's pocket redistricting that's actually not true. Redistricting committee set boundaries that were impossible to meet. We've asked for raw data on demographics but haven't gotten anything so we can't do analysis.

**Bill Dunn** 205 Tuckahoe Lane. Questioned process of school building projects. Wanted to know Board ideas on feedback, improvements, changes, and what impact would new Superintendent have. Concerned about communication. Should there be a point person on the building committee to work with town bodies?

**Mr. Patten** said that some changes have been made to process of getting a building project done. Town charter dictates who is responsible for what, so that aspect probably won't change. Not sure how to speed things up. First Selectman's office and other town bodies work together. Mentioned waterfall chart and its place in the process.

**Mr. Dunn** said that sometimes priorities that BoE thinks are important don't seem as important to other town bodies. Some schools will need to be fixed, not necessarily space issues, but things will need to be addressed. Sometime projects are going to be multi-layered.

**Mrs. Gerber** said that there have been lapses in communication that have created problems. BoF is working on having a rep to all building projects, perhaps RTM should have more than one liaison. FairTV could record building committee meetings to supplement minutes, as many times complex issues are discussed that are hard to convey through minutes. Try to communicate better, engage school communities. People are busy but we still need to figure out ways to get them more involved. Maybe quarterly or annual update meetings would help.

**Mr. Dwyer** said that Board responsibility is ed specs. Process is responsibility of First Selectman's office. RTM approves building committee but then the committee reports to the First Selectman. Building committees sometimes go in different directions. Thinks that staff should be more involved in guiding the volunteers on a building committee. Perhaps town or district should create a position that will do that – a construction manager.

**Mr. Dunn** said that when EPA and Dept of Health gets involved that can complicate matters on a project.

**Mr. Dwyer** said that no one should think that a construction project should be simple – there are always complications that arise that add to the costs and extend the time of the project.

**Mr. Calabrese** said that committee gets charge from ed specs and then determine how things should be. That can be a problem. Changes will start with the First Selectman's office. Our buildings need to be maintained better. Need to stick to waterfall plan.

**Mrs. Maxon-Kennelly** asked Mr. Dunn if his question had been answered.

**Mr. Dunn** said he just wanted to get into the process, and addressed the problems that arise when a building committee has to ask for more money, which can get very controversial. We can work together better.

**Mrs. Maxon-Kennelly** said that the building process needs to be improved but there are parameters that don't really allow for flexibility. Process has been changing and evolving. There are aspects that can be improved, other town bodies have acknowledged this.

**Mr. Llewellyn** said that most households don't underbudget and overspend the way school projects do. Board should do more than approve ed specs. Should put rules in regarding budget. We can choose to put in more detail. Things don't need the best that it can be. There have been issues with schools being built and then having problems. Need to accept more accountability. It's a pass the buck with too many hands in the pot. There's no ownership.

**Mrs. Liu-McCormack** said that to the extent that the Board should review the processes more she would be supportive of that. It requires the will of multiple Boards to effect change.

**Mr. Mitola** confirmed that the Board of Finance is studying the issue

**Erika Taylor** 15 Brookfield Avenue, professor at Wesleyan University, parent at McKinley. Concerned about racial imbalance. Agreed that construction projects often have flaws. Is concerned about redistricting. McKinley is a wonderful school. Lots of communities have had underserved people come in and the benefits go both ways. Diversity brings life and perspective. If Fairfield was to allow students to come in from elsewhere would that help with racial imbalance?

**Ms. Karnal** said that she moved to Fairfield 21 years ago and saw how homogenous the town was. There are lots of differences of opinion on the Board. She doesn't have enough information to make a decision.

**Mrs. Gerber** said that we do have the Open Choice program that brings students in to Fairfield. One idea in the racial imbalance plan is to increase Open Choice students, which would increase diversity in other Fairfield schools. It could slightly change racial imbalance. The Board needs more information about potential costs of additional open choice students.

**Mr. Dwyer** said that the reality is that McKinley is the most in-balance school we have in our town. According to the state we are off by 2 ½ percentage points. More Open Choice students and moving pre-k from Dwight to Stratfield could help. Opt in option hasn't helped. Many parents value the diversity at McKinley.

**Ms. Pytko** said her daughter will be going to McKinley next year. She referenced Sheff vs. O'Neill and its impact on racial imbalance. Hopefully statute will be revisited. Hope is that state reps and state senators will look at the statute. She is passionate about this topic. Statute is taking away the positive diversity that we have.

**Mrs. Maxon-Kennelly** said that if the district had to redistrict it would have to be blind to the demographic makeup of the students.

**Ms. Taylor** said that you're trying to solve the demographic challenge by moving attendance lines, but you are moving people who contribute to the positive diversity. Educational impact of diversity at McKinley cannot be denied.

**Mrs. Maxon-Kennelly** said we need to take a close look at the budget issue of Open Choice. Questions were asked that staff couldn't answer on the spot. She anticipates the board will get additional information. We pay taxes to state as well so when underserved citizens receive a positive education that is an investment that comes back to Fairfield citizens. However, if it's cost-prohibitive she doesn't think it's viable.

**Ms. Taylor** said that if she has 14 students in a class or 18 students in a class there is still only one teacher.

**Mrs. Maxon-Kennelly** said that she saw that some class sections would be able to take more students without increasing the number of sections

**Mr. Llewellyn** said there's been plenty of time to get information he had asked more than once, and he doesn't think the Board will see it. Teachers in K-5 are different than college professors. Thinks that state should fund town more than it does. Doesn't think we should take guidance from the state since they don't have their financial house in order. We spend more per pupil than Bridgeport. Bridgeport gets 70% of their funding from the state. Open Choice can impact number of teachers. We can help with diversity in schools by moving students within Fairfield. We need to focus our spend. We are spending more than \$3000 per pupil from Open Choice but we probably won't see those numbers.

**Mr. Patten** recalled middle school redistricting, was a member of the redistricting committee on the BoE last year. Some redistricting may take place once Holland Hill and Mill Hill are complete, according to consultants. Hopefully it won't be too chaotic. Is in favor of Open Choice. Fairfield is a district with one of the lowest percentages of Open Choice students. Fairfield is a different place from many of our neighboring towns.

(rev)DRAFT

Mrs. Gerber said that the 2022 hypothetical plan done by Milone & MacBroom entailed moving small pockets of students from almost every elementary school, it would not be a pocket redistricting, although it should be noted that in some cases only small groups would be moved.

Mrs. Liu-McCormack said that we are talking about 23 students. Over the next five years that number could become 40. The issue is such a small problem in relation to 10,000 students. What will meet the needs of the state and be the least disruptive to people in Fairfield. Is bringing in lots of Open Choice students more or less disruptive than redistricting? Do we move up all other 10 elementary schools to get close to McKinley? It would be great to get 1000s of parents across CT and get the statute overturned.

**Veronica Monahan**: real estate agent, lives on Galloping Hill Road. Open Choice is a new idea being floated in the community and people are concerned by it. People are concerned about taxes primarily going to education. Our numbers are declining, Every client with kids she takes out asks what HS the house is in and they all say no to Warde. Everyone wants to buy in Ludlowe. There is a divide in town with the children. Test scores are declining. Houses over \$1 million are hard to sell. Westport has lower taxes and a higher educational standard. There's a perception that drives our values. Her taxes have gone up 50%, why is her money going to any more people outside this town. Need to focus on education. Talking about 24 kids is a waste of time. There's a huge issue in town. Need to look at socioeconomic and demographic issues in town. People need to know how many people rent in town. We shouldn't overbuild. Need to think of people who pay taxes. What happens to Open Choice students in HS and how does that impact test scores. When she bought into Fairfield she didn't buy because it was the most ethnically diverse, she bought because it was an attractive place to live. She could bring 50 realtors for a sit down to discuss issues.

Mrs. Gerber – Open Choice is not new concept, and it is a concept that many feel is beneficial to Fairfield in many ways. Respectfully disagrees regarding perception of divide in HS. She actually had and has children attending FLHS and they have many friends in both high schools. A perception existed in the past that Andrew Warde was inferior, which was not true, but that perception remains. It is not helpful when people perpetuate these perceptions, but that is a more townwide issue than a Board issue.

Mr. Dwyer said when you look at school rankings sometimes Ludlowe is ahead, sometimes Warde. Differences are marginal. Disagrees with Mrs. Monahan's assumption. Regarding costs – adding one student to an open chair does not add \$15,000 to a district budget, the same way subtracting a student doesn't take away \$15,000. We have to look at a marginal cost perspective not just the average cost of the student.

Mr. Llewellyn said marginal concept works well for an individual student, but when you move from 62 to 170 students...

Mr. Dwyer said that Mr. Llewellyn should not put words in his mouth.

Mr. Llewellyn said we could look at the tape, Mr. Dwyer had said his goal would be 170 students. If we are looking at doubling the program it will be more than de minimis costs.

Mrs. Maxon-Kennelly clarified that the recommendation from the staff was to increase the number of Open Choice students by 18 the first year and again by 18 the second year, to get to around 100 students, not looking at 170 students. To start becoming obsessed about test scores would be anathema. She is a teacher and disagrees with the notion that everything should be driven by test scores. To get test scores up many districts do test prep, constantly; we do not. We are focused on all of our students at all of our schools. She knows of three new people who purposely chose Stratfield and North Stratfield neighborhoods.

**Mrs. Monahan** asked how do you quantify or qualify how well students are doing. What data are you using?

Mrs. Maxon-Kennelly said that education is not designed to be competitive which is something that business people

(rev)DRAFT

cannot understand. Working collaboratively with peers is essential in education. DIP involves development of the whole person, a lot goes into it. Finding non-test score measures is a constant challenge. It is easy to point to test scores and say that one district is better than another because of them but the Board must reject that.

Ms. Pytko said that the state tried to address socioeconomic segregation through magnet schools, but that wasn't the answer. Open Choice became another option. We have fewer students than many other towns. Look to state reps and senators.

**Mrs. Monahan** said that many people fear that town is building all these massive schools to take in students from out of town, that's the word on the street

Ms. Pytko said that the town made a choice to answer to the state. We as a town have to answer to the state. She would never pit the two high schools against each other

**Mrs. Monahan** said that for Ms. Pytko to say there's not a problem is naïve. You could poll people, she's out of touch with reality.

Mrs. Liu-McCormack wanted to say that Mrs. Monahan's opinion is as worthwhile as anybody else's. Oftentimes it's brave. It is respected and acknowledged, she herself has heard about this disparity between high schools through many sources. Everyone loves this town, when you hear this it kills you. How to fix the perception? It is a very real thing that she hopes we do address. Majority of the board needs to want to address it and face it. The points are very valid. Taxes have gone up, we've heard this from many many people. There are concerns with Open Choice. Nothing is free in life. Exact number is harder to quantify. From a social point, how much are we willing to spend? Whose choice is this to spend money on non-Fairfield residents? It should be discussed, probably powers beyond us. She believes our mandate is Fairfield residents. There will be a dilution of resource allocation. Each marginal kid is a further dilution. Diversity is a wonderful thing, but we do have diversity in town -- why not leverage diversity within our town? She wishes the Board would want to engage. The more brave people are to raise these issues and be vocal about them, the sooner something will be done.

Mr. Patten is looking for a house in Fairfield and has talked to five realtors in different parts of town. Would like to see data to back up the claims of the 50 realtors mentioned, not sure if claims are correct. FLHS and FWHS are very similar in test scores and rankings.

Mrs. Gerber said we are not building huge schools, we are getting rid of portables, we are adding core spaces, and are netting 11 classrooms across 11 schools.

Mr. Dwyer said we are not building for students outside the town, we look at demographic projections for neighborhoods surrounding each school. He also said that, in defense of renters -- when you rent you do pay taxes for your property.

Ms. Karnal said there seems to be a disagreement over building 504 schools. Looking at the sheet from the district, we have five 504s and are building two more but it appears there's only one school that's over 450 students.

Mr. Llewellyn said there is disagreement regarding building out schools to 504. There are 86 empty seats at Riverfield. Perception is both ways. We are slated to come up to 100 Open Choice, Mr. Dwyer has said he would like to go up to 170 students for Open Choice. Numbers this year went up by 12 students instead of two, as was previously stated. There is some concern about where the real numbers are. There will be additional costs adding 100+ students.

Mrs. Liu-McCormack said that in addition from going to 100 to 170 one Board member suggested taking in Open Choice students indefinitely. The groundwork has been laid, people have varying opinions on this it's not clear cut that this is a one time deal. We have to be open and realistic to the possibility that depending on who is in charge that view and

(rev)DRAFT

vision is what will happen in the coming years. We have to be realistic in planning and budgeting. We can all be there with our eyes wide open and say we know what could happen, what do we want to happen.

**Suzanne Miska**, 123 Ryegate Road

Said it was a shame that FairTV is not present to record the meeting. Asked that the Board rethink public comment when the new superintendent comes on this year. If it must stay with only agenda items at least allow there to be public comment at the end of meetings so members of the public can address topics discussed in the meeting. In regards to the hot button item, why has it taken so long to act on racial imbalance? We only do redistricting when it's convenient to us. The Board at the time of the middle school redistricting was in love with the redistricting program. Recently the district paid \$60k for a consultant who did a lovely redistricting presentation with pretty colors. She thought redistricting was on the table in five years. Is the Board looking at redistricting as an opportunity? This discussion got a lot of time last year through the redistricting subcommittee. Perception given to the public is that the interim superintendent with the past superintendent presented a new idea with only four weeks to digest. Presentation last week had no data in it. Please tell her what Board is going to do in regards to redistricting.

**Mr. Dwyer** a district wide redistricting plan is still an option down the road. It is hard to have a conversation today about something taking place six years from now. The state always expects us to present options.

**Mrs. Miska** asked that if redistricting is still on the table for 2022 why is a magnet program also being presented to the state. Trying to understand what the options are.

**Mr. Dwyer** said that the Board is keeping all its options open. For immediate response to the state, Open Choice and moving pre-K to Stratfield might help for the time being. Voluntary-based decisions rather than forced decisions until such time that both Holland Hill and Mill Hill are renovated and then perhaps we could look at redistricting. Magnet program could be another possibility to help with racial imbalance. It is a concept but there are no specific plans.

**Mr. Patten** every year the Board looks at bylaw changes. Personally he has no problem looking at public comment, 10-15 minutes at beginning and 10-15 minutes at the end perhaps. Can revisit. As for racial imbalance, there wasn't zero data presented. More info has been requested and he anticipates the Board will get it in time before the meeting. Wouldn't vote on something without all the proper information.

**Mrs. Miska** This is a new idea with little discussion. BoE is always under a four-minute fire drill. This came from the state in May of 2015. Why is the Board always down to the four-week time period. She is disheartened as a parent and taxpayer. Please revisit public comment, people ran on it last year.

**Mrs. Maxon-Kennelly** said that regarding the public comment issue – the Board votes on their bylaws, not the superintendent. Having a new superintendent does not impact the Board's stance on public comment.

**Mrs. Miska** said that Dr. Clark had different public comment than Dr. Title.

**Mrs. Maxon-Kennelly** clarified that Dr. Clark and Dr. Title did not have impact on public comment. In regards to the issue of redistricting – most people know it will probably have to happen but now is not the time. We do not want to move students more than once. It's not "just moving 23 students." It's just wrong to continually move small groups of students. Fairfield Woods had significant space added, which was why redistricting took place then. Peeling off a few streets here and there ignores the fact that we may very well have to move things again. That is looking at short-term gain and not long term one. She wants to see a plan that truly solves things.

**Mrs. Miska** said there was a perception that redistricting has been locked in a box. Holland Hill and Mill Hill may very well have issues. It may be time to move students. Frustrated with the committee that was formed last year and was

(rev)DRAFT

disheartened at what was said. We need to look at all of the options

Mr. Llewellyn said that the comment on public comment is well taken. Hardly anyone makes public comment anymore. It should be added and parents should talk about any concerns in the district. Re: redistricting -- there will be no choices offered to the Board. The plan needs to be approved, needs to be at the state three days after the vote. Board could have been having a good open debate but it didn't. The Board is hamstrung and tied up again so we don't have a lot of options here.

**Karen Secrist** FWHS PTA President. Lived in Fairfield, moved away for four years and came back. Moved specifically to Stratfield and Warde. Loved the community, proud to be a Fairfield Warde parent. Her children went through Warde, one just started; they all have friends at Ludlowe. They have an inclusive community. Thanked Board for thinking of students equally.

Mrs. Maxon-Kennelly thanked her for serving as PTA President

Mr. Dwyer said you hear differences of viewpoints but we do all take seriously that there is equity in our schools.

Mr. Dwyer thanked the public and Mr. Mitola.

### **Adjournment**

Mrs. Gerber moved/Ms. Karnal seconded the recommended motion "that this Special Meeting of the Board of Education adjourn." Motion passed 9-0. Meeting adjourned at 10:22PM