



## Board of Education Budget Questions – 2019-2020 Superintendent’s Proposed Budget January 17, 2019

#	BOE	Question	Response
1		<p>District – Employee Benefits - The total year to year reduction of \$1,093,300 is great news; \$800,000 of it is reduction for medical insurance. The projections for the following years are steady and incremental but how sure are we that will be the case since the projections are less than we are budgeting this current year?</p>	<p>As Anne shared during the budget workshop session, we work very closely with our insurance broker, maintain a healthy reserve and subscribe to a stop loss policy. We are confident that we are protected from major cost swings year-over-year. (KJS).</p> <p>There are two type of reductions with caused the medical budget to drop \$800,000.00.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Related to employee retirements (3) from the ITS department but those savings are offset by the increase in the Technology consultant contract, approx. 75K</li> <li>2. Pure reductions due to lower claims over a 12 month look back period versus the allocation rates that were set in the current budget.</li> </ol> <p>There was a separate fund that was set up “Health Insurance Fund” to protect the BOE and Town General Fund from fluctuations. It has a reserve to absorb for any large fluctuations that may occur while keeping the General Fund consistent. The BOE/Town also has a Stop Loss policy in the Health Insurance Fund to protect against any high claims. Again, this policy protects the General Fund</p>

			<p>budget from very large claims which unfortunately have happened and as the reserve was designed to do, we have not seen the fluctuation in the general fund.</p> <p>We also have a worker' comp fund that is designed to protect the General Fund from fluctuations similar to Health Care.</p> <p>When the budget is set in January of each year, the insurance allocation rates are supplied by our insurance carrier. They are typically higher than what is given as the final rates for HR/payroll processing.</p> <p>I am comfortable that we are covered. (AKL).</p>
2		<p>Miller/Driscoll – 1100-2400 1314 Substitutes cert. training – increase of 205%; \$17,400) - not a huge amount of money, but concerned if this represents an increase in teachers out of the classroom for professional development. It looks like a big portion is for 145 subs to cover TC RWW training? Also newly added amounts in math and science? Reduction in Instructional Program Improvement page– but building substitutes cert training total is still an increase overall? This is a concern, especially because we put increased number of days for PD in the school calendar, reducing instructional time. Now it seems we also may be taking teachers out of the classroom more often.</p>	<p>The sub line in 18-19 was insufficient to cover the true cost of the Teachers College partnership. The increase represents the budget required for subs for both the on-site training as well as the TC Calendar Day participation for our teachers. On average, teachers this year have attended two TC Calendar Days. There have been five on-site training days which require a total of 60 subs for the year. In my opinion, this is such high quality professional development it is well worth the cost and the time out of the classroom. (KC).</p>
3		<p>Miller/Driscoll – \$50,000 tuition increase from pre-school – this is in part from the tuition rate</p>	<p>The increase in the preschool teacher is budgeted to happen in January of 2020. If we increase to a sixth</p>

		increase? How confident are we of the pre-school enrollment projections? How does it relate to the increase in Pre-School teacher – 4seems like staff cost will be at least somewhat offset?	teacher, there will be an increase in revenue from tuition because we will be able to accept more typical peers. (KC).																																			
4		Cider Mill building-wide total – looks like subs for training/conf remains the same level as 2018-19 (\$6,000)	There was no request for additional substitute funds at Cider Mill.																																			
5		Future projections: Middlebrook enrollment is projected to decrease by 57 students across three grades (not evenly) for 2019-20. I understand the middle school teaming model is appropriate for the age-group and has been in place for a long time. It is also important to maintain reasonable class sizes. However, because the teaming approach is not set up like the high school, it is not as easy to respond to year-to-year enrollment changes by dropping or adding individual course sections. In preparation for the future, can we get an overview of Middlebrook’s projected enrollment by grade level for the next few years? If enrollment is projected to decline over a long period, is there a point at which we will need to examine the number of teams and/or think of other structures?	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th><u>2019-20</u></th> <th><u>20-21</u></th> <th><u>21-22</u></th> <th><u>22-23</u></th> <th><u>23-24</u></th> <th><u>24-25</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>6<sup>th</sup> Gr</td> <td>290</td> <td>314</td> <td>283</td> <td>282</td> <td>263</td> <td>299</td> </tr> <tr> <td>7<sup>th</sup> Gr</td> <td>313</td> <td>296</td> <td>320</td> <td>288</td> <td>287</td> <td>268</td> </tr> <tr> <td>8<sup>th</sup> Gr</td> <td><u>345</u></td> <td><u>313</u></td> <td><u>296</u></td> <td><u>320</u></td> <td><u>288</u></td> <td><u>287</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total =</td> <td>948</td> <td>923</td> <td>899</td> <td>890</td> <td>838</td> <td>854</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Kevin and Lauren will be meeting with a team of teachers at Middlebrook later this winter to examine the enrollment trend and consider a range of possible structural alternatives. (LF/KJS).</p>		<u>2019-20</u>	<u>20-21</u>	<u>21-22</u>	<u>22-23</u>	<u>23-24</u>	<u>24-25</u>	6 <sup>th</sup> Gr	290	314	283	282	263	299	7 <sup>th</sup> Gr	313	296	320	288	287	268	8 <sup>th</sup> Gr	<u>345</u>	<u>313</u>	<u>296</u>	<u>320</u>	<u>288</u>	<u>287</u>	Total =	948	923	899	890	838	854
	<u>2019-20</u>	<u>20-21</u>	<u>21-22</u>	<u>22-23</u>	<u>23-24</u>	<u>24-25</u>																																
6 <sup>th</sup> Gr	290	314	283	282	263	299																																
7 <sup>th</sup> Gr	313	296	320	288	287	268																																
8 <sup>th</sup> Gr	<u>345</u>	<u>313</u>	<u>296</u>	<u>320</u>	<u>288</u>	<u>287</u>																																
Total =	948	923	899	890	838	854																																
6		Middlebrook - Could you provide some background about the \$100,000 drain repair needed	In 2012 the main roof was replaced, and a recommendation was made to add more roof drains on the main roof to prevent water from pooling. The																																			

			<p>problem the roofers faced was they could not run the piping into the classrooms due to the wooden support beam. The only solution was to have the drains tied into the courtyard, which caused the drain not to perform properly.</p> <p>The best and most cost effective solution is to dig a trench from the drain in the courtyard going into the corridor by the art room and out the double doors through the sidewalk and bus loop. They will then tie in the 12 inch relief pipe into the existing catch basin.</p> <p>Scope of Work</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Removing carpet and protection walls</li><li>2. Dismantling storefronts to provide access for mini excavator into courtyard thru school corridor</li><li>3. Sawcutting interior slabs and exterior walks and pavement for pipe installation</li><li>4. Slab and pavement removal and disposal</li><li>5. Excavation for 12" HDPE pipe</li><li>6. Cutting holes thru foundation walls for pipe access</li><li>7. Setting pipe with 1/2" per 10' of pitch</li><li>8. Installing pipe into and out of 2 Catch Basins</li><li>9. All backfilling and compaction</li><li>10. Re-pouring concrete slabs and sidewalks and patching pavement trench</li><li>11. Removal of mini and restoration of courtyard, storefront windows and doors</li><li>12. Replacing carpets and final cleaning</li><li>13. All necessary supervision and clean up.</li></ol>
--	--	--	--

			(JF).
<b>7</b>		Middlebrook building-wide total – looks like subs for certified training/confs remains the same level as 2018-19 (\$12,000)?	Our budget allocation for this has not changed. (LF).
<b>8</b>		WHS – looks like subs for certified training/confs remains the same level as 2018-19 (\$9,000)?	Our budget allocation for this has not changed. (KJS).
<b>9</b>		WHS Athletics 1420 3310 20 Some explanation for large percentage increase in cont. svcs in Athletics (not a large \$\$ amount - \$28,000) The budget notes reference CPR training and custodial overtime but what is contracted athletic trainer?	This large increase is the result of the custodial overtime now being in the athletics section of the budget. Overtime was accounted for on a different line previously. The cost for the CPR training for coaches is nominal. The contracted trainer costs are for substitute athletic trainers when needed.
<b>10</b>		WHS Athletics - athletic trainer staffing increase – Is the .5 FTE increase sufficient? Want to be sure health/safety needs are fully addressed.	Yes, the .5 increase is sufficient for the 2019-2020 year. This will allow for a trainer at both ends of the Wilton High School Athletic Complex. This will also help us have a trainer on site and at an off site location during the winter season, when necessary.
<b>11</b>		WHS Co-curricular – background on how totals for participation fees are estimated? Seems like fees collected over the last few years have varied widely?	Wilton High School process-Students enrolled as a member of a club (defined as attending 3 or more meetings) sign a contract agreeing to pay the participation fee. Midway through the year we send a reminder to families of students who are listed in at least one club but still have a fee balance in Power School. At this point we have collected rosters from every club and

			we are currently finalizing the list of students who have not paid.
<b>12</b>		WHS Alternative High school – Obviously significant increase in staffing but budget questions are premature until presentation.	See below as this program would also result in future cost avoidance. (AL).
<b>13</b>		Special Education – addition of 1.0 FTE Secondary Coordinator. What will resulting structure look like? Will the current Assistant Director focus on Elementary? Would the person have a role with the Alternative School? Would the person take a role in addressing our achievement gap between special education and general education students as measured by standardized testing? What would be the impact of NOT funding the position and remaining with the status quo?	With the addition of an Assistant Director for Secondary Special Education we would have program leaders for both PreK-5 and 6-21. The focus would be on building a sufficiently robust continuum of services to meet the needs of our most diverse learners. These individuals would work on program design and planning at the individual and group level. The secondary person would also have a leadership role in building our school-to-life transition planning. I would anticipate that this person would work collaboratively with the alternative school students with disabilities as needed to insure students were receiving an appropriate educational program. This leader would also work with parents to provide technical assistance and support. (AL).
<b>14</b>		Special Education – out of district placements – tuition costs both public and private are projected to dramatically decrease - \$641,812- even though enrollment is projected to increase (29 to 37). This is good news - what are the reasons? How confident are we in the projection? Any estimates for the future? (As an aside: maybe adjust Comment section on	This offset is the result of the three factors: 1) We are no longer sending students to ACES. 2) We have closed out several substantial settlement agreements, and 3) Additional tracking of the excess cost reimbursements has resulted in increased reimbursement to the district. Please note, this account remains volatile and we watch it very carefully. (AL/KJS).

		budget page– speaks about increase even though it’s a decrease)	
<b>15</b>		Special Education – Overall question - One of the rationales for adding and expanding district special education (or regular) programs has been the idea of “cost avoidance” – can we get some examples or more detail? Are there any specific \$\$ amounts that we can point to?	<p>The most contemporary example of cost avoidance would be the Community Steps Program. Prior to the creation of this program, Wilton sent all of the 18-21 students to private programs, paying tuition and transportation to various programs costing anywhere from \$75,000 to \$110,000 (conservatively) per student/per year plus transportation. By creating internal capacity the district currently serves 6 students in the program. Using the most conservative tuition amount without transportation costs would result in tuition of \$450,000. If we take the CS budget of \$214,800 + \$70,000 for transportation we come up with a total budget for these 6 students of \$284,800. This results in the avoidance of \$165,200. As the program grows the cost avoidance increases.</p> <p>Our business office estimates that we have avoided nearly \$300,000 over the two years CS has been in place. (AL/KJS).</p>
<b>16</b>		Special Services – Transportation – 2700 5110 30 (In district placements?) the amounts have been steady and even decreasing for the last three years, but there is a large increase for next year (25%, \$68,551) And the need for transportation aides – not budgeted this year but back for next year? On the other hand, Special Services Out of District Placements – transportation costs have decreased (down	<p>Approximately \$70,000 for Community Steps was included in out of district transportation. The funds have been shifted to in-district transportation because this is technically an in-district program. (KJS).</p>

		\$40,000). Are these changes because of shifting student enrollment? Number of placements?	
17		District – Pupil Personnel – The need for additional 1.0 FTE ELL teacher –information about the rationale and the number of students served in the different schools and the number of different languages and assessment results and state requirements, etc.? Enrollment projections for the future?	<p>The previous staffing level (i.e., 1 FTE) did not provide sufficient time for the ELL teacher to collaborate with grade-level and content area teachers, making instruction for ELL students less effective and less well-informed. There were also fewer opportunities for the teacher to confer with building-level administrators on standardized testing of ELL students. As noted last year, the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) has strict and ambitious growth targets based on yearly progress on the Connecticut LAS Links (a measure of student language proficiency). The possibility existed that the district could have reported insufficient progress, which in turn could have resulted in ELL students being referred more often for consideration for special education supports and services.</p> <p>Below are data on the number of students historically served in each school and the languages students speak. Note that the data include students receiving direct services as well as those who must be monitored academically by the ELL teachers. Also note that the ELL teachers spend a significant amount of time screening and assessing students referred for ELL services, as well as assessing students already receiving direct services (using the LAS Links).</p>

Year	School	# of ELL students	# of ELL student languages	# of monitored students year 1	# of monitored students year 2
2018-19	M-D	16	10	10	
	CM	3	3	6	7
	MB	5	4	2	1
	WHS	1	1	1	
			25	18	19
2017-18	M-D	17	8		4
	CM	10	7	7	3
	MB	3	2	1	1
	WHS	4	4		
			34	21	8
2016-17	M-D	11	8	4	
	CM	7	7	3	4
	MB	3	2	1	3
	WHS	3	3		1
			24	20	8
2015-16	M-D	10	8		
	CM	5	4	4	3
	MB	3	2	3	1
	WHS	2	2	1	4
			20	16	8
2014-15	M-D	16	9		4
	CM	5	3	3	1
	MB	2	2	1	1
	WHS	1	1	4	
			24	15	8

The Connecticut State Department of Education requires two-year monitoring of students who have met ELL program exit criteria.

The 26 Languages Spoken by ELL Students,  
Wilton Public Schools 2005-2019

			<p>Albanian  Arabic  Creole-Haitian  Farsi  Dutch  Hebrew  Hindi  Hungarian  Italian  Japanese  Kannada  Korean  Latvian</p> <p>Malayalam  Mandarin  Nepali  Patois  Polish  Portuguese  Russian  Spanish  Tamil  Telugu  Thai  Turkish  Ukrainian</p>
			(CS).
<b>18</b>		District – Evaluation & Testing – What is the Performance Matters data warehouse?	Performance Matters is a new feature of PowerSchool. It gives teachers and administrators the ability to easily access and analyze all of our student performance data. Interventionists also use it to create and track academic and behavioral intervention plans. (CS).
<b>19</b>		District - Instructional Program Improvement – 2210 3310 40 - Contracted Svs Computer – Decrease of \$46,000 - which is good for the budget, but the reason? Significantly lower than last three years	This change is under the 2210-3320-40 Account and is due to the IXL program being moved from Instructional Program Improvement to Digital Resources under the District Learning Commons account 2220-6111-40. (CS).

<b>20</b>	District – Safe School Climate – 2312 3310 40 Contract Svs - large increase (about \$75,000) – details? Is this for RULER training? If so, what is involved?	New Climate Survey for District - \$4000 each school = \$16,000 Kids in Crisis – Teen Talk Counselor - \$20,000 Kids in Crisis – Attendance - \$20,000 (grant dissolved) Threat Assessments Evaluations – 2 @ \$3,000 ea = \$6,000 Ruler Training & Anchor training roll out for students - \$15,000 (MS).	
<b>21</b>	District – Human Services – 2500 3320 40 – Contract Svs - Technology – Hefty increase and significant increases over last several years (from 2016-17 \$8,093 to proposed \$45,658) – details?	B.I.B – (Background investigation services) \$20,090 Talent Ed - \$9500 Aesop - \$16,068 (MS).	
<b>22</b>	District – Transportation Services – Diesel fuel – I realize we don’t have control, but cost has increased 44% in the budget from 2016-17 to proposed (four years)	Yes. Fuel contracts are negotiated annually. We attempt to watch the market and lock in a contract when rates are most favorable.	
<b>23</b>	District – Systemwide Technology – 2.5 classified FTE were reduced from the technology budget. Does the large increase (\$250,000) in the 1370 3310 40 line reflect the functions of those FTE now being addressed through contracted services?	Yes. It is important to note that we still see a total cost savings over time as we have re-assigned responsibilities to the contracted services line. (KJS).	

24		District – Systemwide Technology – What are E-Rate projects?	The current e-rate project is slated to use the remaining erate funds to complete the wired and wireless projects across all four schools. (EH).
25		District – Library Learning Commons – large year to year increase in digital resources (43.6%; \$67,308) but projected increases for following years level out. Is this a one-time spike? Rationale?	The year-to-year increase for digital resources across the district saw an increase of only 6.94%. We have been centralizing the management and purchasing of digital resources and the spike this year is a result of the movement of resources from other lines. (FK).
26		Why is the number of students served in Psychology jumping from 350 to 565? (Page 191) and if in fact it's jumping by 215 students almost 40% why is only at .5 FTE being added. It seems to me with all the student stress and talk about health and wellness, we should add at least one full FTE, if not two or 1.5 FTE. I think this is something we should discuss further.	Enrollment numbers on these pages is recorded locally and there has not been a consistent formula for calculating the number of students served. In some years the number included only students with IEPs. More recently the number has included non-IEP students who participate in groups as well as classes where the psychologist provides push-in services.
27		How did the number of hearing impaired drop by 7 kids in one year. Are the students with 504s not counted? It just struck me as odd. Makes sense to drop FTE to .4 if half the kids are there, but what if that number is missing counting some kids?	The number of students served for this position included students served under the TOHI's certification as a special education teacher. The new numbers are inclusive ONLY of students requiring the TOHI.
28		Line 1210/3310 the consultant for IEP settlements, services for evaluation, behavioral assessment and non district services? Does the \$86,900 increase mean there are more litigation and dispute resolutions, so the need is greater for a	The majority of this increase is reflected by the increase in costs of Independent Educational Evaluations (IEEs).

		consultant? Or just the need for students is not what our professionals can handle? I guess I just wanted clarification.	