

(REAPPROVED ON MAY 10, 2016 WITH CORRECTION ON PAGE 14)

**MINUTES
BOARD OF EDUCATION**

February 9, 2016

PLACE:

Darien Board of Education
Meeting Room
7:30 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Mr. Harman, Chair; Mesdames Hagerty-Ross, Stein, Zuro and Sullivan (7:44 p.m.); and Messrs. Burke, Dineen, and Martens.

MEMBERS ABSENT:

Ms. McNamara.

ADMINISTRATION PRESENT:

Dr. Dan Brenner, Superintendent of Schools; Dr. Susie DaSilva, Assistant Superintendent of Curriculum and Instruction; Ms. Shirley Klein, Assistant Superintendent of Special Education and Student Services; Mr. Michael Feeney, Director of Finance and Operations; Ms. Marjorie Cion, Director of Human Resources.

VISITORS:

Approximately 25.

CALL TO ORDER.

Mr. Harman called the meeting to order at 7:35 p.m. The next Regular BOE meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, February 23, 2016 at 7:30 p.m. in the Board of Education Meeting Room

CHAIRPERSON'S REPORT.

Mr. Harman thanked everyone who came to the public hearing. He thanked Mr. Lynch for taking care of the schools over the weekend and keeping the schools open during the snow storms.

PUBLIC COMMENT.

There was no one present who wished to address the Board at this time.

SUPERINTENDENT'S REPORT.

Dr. Brenner said that he had recently attended the successful science fair at DHS. Dr. Brenner said he also attended the middle school play which was wonderful. Due to the snowstorm, the SATs and SBACs have to be rescheduled. Dr. Brenner discussed his decision process regarding the cancelling of schools during inclement weather.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES.

January 26, 2016 Special Meeting and Executive Session

**** MS. HAGERTY-ROSS MOVED THE MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 26, 2016 SPECIAL MEETING AND EXECUTIVE SESSION.**

**** MS. STEIN SECONDED.**

**** THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 26, 2016 SPECIAL MEETING AND EXECUTIVE SESSION AS SUBMITTED PASSED WITH SEVEN IN FAVOR AND ONE ABSTENTION (DINEEN).**

January 26, 2016 Regular Meeting

**** MS. HAGERTY-ROSS MOVED THE MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 26, 2016 REGULAR MEETING.**

**** MR. BURKE SECONDED.**

**** THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 26, 2016 REGULAR MEETING AS SUBMITTED PASSED WITH SEVEN IN FAVOR AND ONE ABSTENTION (DINEEN).**

February 2, 2016 Public Hearing.

**** MS. HAGERTY-ROSS MOVED THE MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 2, 2016 PUBLIC HEARING.**

**** MS. STEIN SECONDED.**

**** THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 2, 2016 PUBLIC HEARING AS SUBMITTED PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

BOARD COMMITTEE REPORTS

Budget Committee - Ms. Hagerty-Ross said that a Budget Committee meeting was held on February 8th and discussion on the 2015-16 budget took place.

PRESENTATIONS/DISCUSSIONS

A. FURTHER DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON 200/400 LEVEL COURSES FOR DARIEN HIGH SCHOOL.

Principal Dunn came forward and presented the results of the recent student survey. The majority of the students felt that the teaching team aspect was very good. Consistency in grading practices was the one issue that the students expressed concern about. The staff will work to make sure the parents and students feel comfortable with the process. There will be initial information session meetings starting on February 25th with morning and evening sessions for the parents.

Board questions and comments and Administration's responses: a) **With regard to the survey and grading practices, is there a part of the administration that reviews the grading practices of the various teachers in the same subject?** (Principal Dunn said that in the last three years, the administration has begun to work with departments rather than the individual teachers. This model has improved the departmental philosophy, the delivery of information in the subject courses and the vision for the overall 9th-12th expectations for the students. She said that she thought they had a very consistent approach among the teachers.) b) **In offering**

more options, what is the role of the parents and students in choosing the courses. (Principal Dunn said that the staff will be working with the parents to choose the appropriate courses. c) **To follow up on that, you have the informational sessions for the high school. What about the incoming 9th graders?** (Principal Dunn said that the incoming 9th graders would be included in the informational sessions.)

**** MS. STEIN MOVED TO APPROVE THE 200/400 LEVEL COURSES FOR DARIEN HIGH SCHOOL.**

**** MR. DINEEN SECONDED.**

**** THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

B. DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON REVISED 2016-2017 SCHOOL CALENDAR CHANGE APRIL 17 PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT DAY TO JANUARY 3RD. (File #2463)

Dr. Brenner presented the proposed revised Darien School Calendar to the Board. He reviewed the changes in the Professional Development days along with the rationale.

**** MR. MARTENS MOVED TO APPROVE THE REVISED 2016-2017 SCHOOL CALENDAR TO CHANGE APRIL 17 PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT DAY TO JANUARY 3RD.**

**** MR. BURKE SECONDED.**

**** THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

C. DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON HIGH SCHOOL PROFESSIONAL LEARNING COMMUNITY (PLC) DAYS 2016-2017. (File #2463)

**** MS. STEIN MOVED TO APPROVE THE REVISED HIGH SCHOOL PROFESSIONAL LEARNING COMMUNITY (PLC) DAYS 2016-2017 AS AMENDED.**

**** MS. SULLIVAN SECONDED.**

**** THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

D. REPORT ON 2015-2016 DISTRICT BUDGET AND BUDGET TRANSFERS. (File #s2464 and 2465)

Mr. Feeney came forward and presented his report. He said this was a follow up on the recent Budget meeting the previous day.

Board questions and comments and Administration's responses: a) **Will the proposed State cut affect this year?** (No.) b) **When will we get our final number?** (Mr. Feeney said that will be in April.) c) **How much of a percentage cut will the 8 million work out to be?** (Mr. Feeney said he looked at what the percentage of the pie was for Darien. The total pool is \$139,000,000 and Darien's 2.4 million dollars represents 1.73%.)

**** MS. ZURO MOVED TO APPROVE THE 2015-2016 DISTRICT BUDGET REPORT AND BUDGET TRANSFERS AS PRESENTED.**

**** MR. MARTENS SECONDED.**

**** THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

E. DISCUSSION AND APPROVAL OF PROPOSED 2016-2017 BUDGET.

Mr. Harman explained the process. The motions require a 5/3 to pass and the Board will be working off a cut list as provided by Mr. Feeney.

Dr. Brenner said that he had a number of responses to RTM F&B's questions. Many of those questions have been communicated to the two Committees.

He then read and answered the following questions into the record:

Does the District have the infrastructure in place to support the various devices in the network? Please elaborate on what system is currently in place, what enhancements are needed to support it, the planned technology, equipment and technological upgrades. (Dr. Brenner said that he had reviewed both the Darien Technology Plan and the audit that were done with one of the Board of Finance members. This audit clearly indicated that the District is appropriately positioned to perform everything that the District has projected.)

According to the current technology plan, will all the devices be required for the 16-17 school year or could there be a more gradual roll out? (Dr. Brenner said that the plan that has been presented shows a four year roll out and that the spending plan is staged in that way. The proposed technology request on the table for approval is in fact the first year of the plan. Nothing in that has changed. This is one to one initiatives that will start with Grade 4. Students in Grades 5, 6, and 7 will be issued Chrome Books no later than December of 2016.)

Has the District created an overarching plan for District technology for the management of the District? (Dr. Brenner said that the administration understood this to be what kind of programs are going to be used to run the District. There is a long list. However, for the sake of the meeting, he said that he suggested that the District use a program called MUNIS for both HR and business functions along with a list a number of different programs that would be used for the attendance system, student management system, communication software, cafeteria point of sales program, the phone system, library management and the school security system.)

As strong supporters of the SRBI program and have requested for several years that an automated system be put in place. Can the District provide details on the roll out features and functionality? Are parents able to track their own child's progress? We believe that when properly implemented not only does this program provide excellent value to the students but reduces the future cost by teaching the students alternate tools and skills in early education. (Dr. Brenner said in fact, this is a program that the State Board of Education approved on a menu of K-3 as a universal screening assessment and on July 9, 2014, pursuant to the Public Act 116, this required that we select a particular universal screener, which the District has now done and is currently using. The State does not mandate which type of universal screener the District uses for Grades 4 and above. An effective intervention model includes the use of a universal screener. Dr. Brenner said that the District was very fortunate to have Dr. DaSilva who has spent a significant amount of time managing the SRBI program as it is being rolled out. Any further questions on this would best be directed to her outside the context of this meeting.)

Regarding Excess Cost Reimbursement, in 2015-16, the District originally estimated the ECR cost to be 1.8 million dollars which has been revised to 2.1 million. Historically, the administration under budgets this reimbursement. It is the opinion of members of F&B that this figure should be increased for the proposed '16-17 budget given the historical rate of funding by the State. Some feel that this is a low probability that this figure will be lower by the State. (Dr. Brenner suggested that Mr. Feeney had just addressed this item in his earlier remarks and at this point, the administration is recommending that it be 1.8 to

increase the amount by \$500,000. So, the administration is also acknowledging that they believe that the amount should be increased and have agreed to a \$500,000 increase in this budget.)

There is concern about the increase in the tuition for non-public schools. This figure has increased by 3.2 million to a total of 6.3 million overall in the proposed budget for '16-17. F&B understands that the administration has inherited this condition associated with SPED and the budget impact for future years. F&B also realizes that there is a low probability of returning the current out of district students to the District. Are there resources in place to remedy or create District solutions to reduce the potential for out of district placements? (Dr. Brenner said that the District was in the midst of a building program and it is the administration's expectation that they are going forward that there will be additional programs that will serve the students and allow parents to make educated decisions about keeping their children in the Darien schools because we have great programs and not feel compelled to out place.)

Please provide us with the increase of the number of students being out placed. (Dr. Brenner said that in 2014-15, the District out placed 61 students. In 2015-16, 72 students have been out placed.)

Is there any cost reduction when students are placed out of the District? Please elaborate as to why or why not. (Dr. Brenner said that there was no cost reduction. Typically, it costs the District more money. There are efficiencies in educating a student in the District schools that are realized every day in class size. Every time a student is sent out of district, there are necessary associated costs for educating the most challenged Darien students.)

Can we have the current number of SPED students including those who are enrolled in schools out of District? (Dr. Brenner said that there were 623 students including out of District.)

Will the District provide the number of SPED students by disability category? (No. No information will be provided that could potentially identify any student by disability.)

What is the status on the SESS? Are there any future restructuring plans for SPED? Will there be any future head count reduction as a result? (Dr. Brenner said that in this particular budget, there are two. This has been discussed before by the Board. The SESS facilitators at the secondary level have been eliminated and the District is utilizing current staff and additional program directors to make this work.)

Are your plans to move SPED into school's budgets as it pertains to future budgets? If so, we request that there be a separate SPED statement. (Dr. Brenner said that it was the District's goal to make the budget year over year as easy to follow in multiple ways as possible for all of the codes.)

Could the administration in the addendum provide the fully loaded costs for SPED and the ELP and the benefits of lessening any Federal Grants? (Dr. Brenner said that he was not exactly sure what was being asked. While he was happy to provide the information, it would most likely require some additional conversation.)

Can the formula costs associated with the schools be revisited to insure that the various new initiatives have not impacted the State formulary amounts? (Dr. Brenner said this was another question that he was not sure of and said that there would have to be additional conversation.)

Can the District create a separate payroll line item for SPED for the internal drivers initiative? (Yes. That is easy enough to do.)

Regarding facilities and the continued use of portables throughout the District, portables present a safety risk and are not an ideal learning environment for our children. (Dr. Brenner said that F&B had come to the right place and he could not agree with them more.)

What was the original charge given to Milone and MacBroom? (Dr. Brenner said that the original charge was to do a space utilization and enrollment study. They complete their work as defined in the charge. However, the lack of solutions for the identified space problems led the Facility Committee to engage another firm to expedite that process. An RFP has been issued and Dr. Brenner said that his expectation was that the proposal opening was scheduled for February 12th.)

Dr. Brenner said that those were the questions from F&B. He then answered the questions submitted by the RTM Education Committee.

Will the Teacher Professional Development be done on a ongoing basis with technology? We believe that teachers need to be on board. (Dr. Brenner said that the administration agrees whole heartedly about the PD and the training for the pilot programs was scheduled to start in the coming weeks. It will take place in his office with the Central Office administrators, principals and teachers.)

Will the support for each Chrome Book be in each school, or a central IT hub? (Dr. Brenner said that the support would be inside the schools and there has been some conversation about creating what he referred to as “geek squads” composed of students at both the high school and the middle school. This is an untapped resource since there are students who have an extensive knowledge of how to repair the various devices.)

There are desktops in the elementary schools and not lap tops. Why not? When can we roll them out? (Dr. Brenner said that there have been cuts made to the budget line for desktops and those desktops are primarily for non-classroom teachers such as music, art, library & PE along with secretaries, and administrators.)

The technology plan was approved. Has the administration taken over and has anything changed? (Dr. Brenner said that there were no secrets and the administration has laid out their technology plan. He encouraged everyone to reference that plan for information as to how the administration plans to proceed.)

We have concerns about the Hindley project. We are trying to picture the project. (Dr. Brenner said that it might be clearer once there is a tour of the schools. There was also a question about losing classroom space. He explained that it would actually be a swap and no classroom space would be lost.)

We also have concerns about the high school cafeteria and struggle with the reasons why a cafeteria increase is needed without a correlating increase in students. Do we need to spend 1.2 million dollars for 60 more seats. (Dr. Brenner said that there were numerous aspects to this question. The high school has systematically reduced the cafeteria space in order to adjust to the increasing number of students that have attended since the building was constructed. Auxiliary cafeterias that were originally included now serve as classrooms. At any given moment, the cafeteria is bulging at the seams. Locker pods have also been converted into classroom spaces and more locker pods will also be converted in the future. With the one to one plan, it is possible that the school will have as many as four tech rooms that can be reclaimed as classrooms. When the

high school was built, there were over 900 students, but now there are more than 1,400 students. The cafeteria addition is not 50 or 60 seats. It may be as many as 100 to 125 seats. The high school would survive without this addition, but it does not provide enough space for the students to eat in one location. At some point, this expansion will have to be done and the cost will be incrementally more, so it will become a question of when the Town wants to make that decision. From the perspective of the administration, we believe it is prudent to build the addition now.)

We're a bit confused over the changes in Music, Art and IDEA. While we understand curriculum and IT to be run from Central Office, we struggle to understand why Music, Art and IDEA need control from each school. (The answer is very simple. Where people need to be supervised, the control belongs in the schools. Items that are purchased or managed can be handled centrally. When people are not coming in contact with others who are supervisors, then those people are not supervised.)

It seems to us there should be centralization of everything: technology, curriculum and specialists. It seems all we do is add head count in the future by taking this out of Central control. How do we insure that each school has the same standards? (Dr. Brenner said that those questions were kind of competing forces. He suggested that both would apply. It is the job of Central Administration to insure that the building staff were held accountable along with keeping track of what is going on. The management takes place at the local level. The supervision of what is being done and the organization of that is done at the central level. That's the philosophy of an organizational structure that Dr. Brenner said he felt made the most sense.)

Regarding the replacement of the stadium turf over the next few years and the baseball diamond, we recall that those were supposed to be replaced by a Foundation that pre-dated the Darien Athletic Foundation. Is that incorrect? (Dr. Brenner said that what he could say definitely was that there was no fund for the other fields. The DAF has set up a foundation for the fields that they are replacing, but the fields that pre-date them have no funds.)

Can we have a work up of what it costs for the fields being turfed to what the cost would be to maintain grass fields? (Dr. Brenner said that turfing a field costs approximately 1 million dollars. Installing a proper grass field with irrigation and proper drainage costs about \$500,000. Maintaining a grass field with fertilizer, water and maintenance costs including lining, cutting and seasonal patching of worn spots costs approximately \$35,000 annually.)

Is the center oval turf field the Board of Education's responsibility or has the DAF pledged to fund that? (The center oval is the Board of Education's responsibility. The upper oval field is the responsibility of the DAF. The center oval was turfed as a Board of Education project. The DAF agreed to re-turf it but it is not their responsibility.)

Regarding questions about Universal Screening, Dr. Brenner said that these had already been addressed at an earlier time.

The majority of the Committee liked the one day budget session. (Dr. Brenner said thank you.)

He then presented the budget additions and reductions to the Board. These represented a grand total Budget of \$93,849,816.00 including a reduction of \$365,527.00. This is an overall increase in the budget of 3.45%.

Mr. Harman then began the review of the Administration's 2016-2017 budget modifications.

**** MR. HARMAN MOVED TO INCREASE RC 01 - 021301 – DHS ENGLISH 200/200/400 CLASSROOMS TO \$40,000.00.**

**** MS. STEIN SECONDED.**

**** THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

**** MR. HARMAN MOVED TO INCREASE RC 01 - 021301 – DHS MATH 200/200/400 CLASSROOMS TO \$40,000.00.**

**** MS. HAGERTY-ROSS SECONDED.**

**** THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

**** MR. HARMAN MOVED TO REDUCE RC 07 - 021301 – HOLMES CLASSROOM TEACHERS GRADE 2 BY \$69,904.00.**

**** MS. SULLIVAN SECONDED.**

**** THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

**** MR. HARMAN MOVED TO INCREASE RC 12 – 073020 - MAINTENANCE – REPLACEMENT CLASSROOM FURNITURE TO \$45,000.00.**

**** MS. ZURO SECONDED.**

**** THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

**** MR. HARMAN MOVED TO REDUCE RC 15 – 123021 - TECHNOLOGY - NEW COMPUTER EQUIPMENT BY \$22,610.00.**

**** MS. STEIN SECONDED.**

**** THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

**** MR. HARMAN MOVED TO REDUCE RC 20 – 012005 – FINANCE - AUDIT BY \$9,500.00**

**** MS. HAGERTY-ROSS SECONDED.**

**** THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

**** MR. HARMAN MOVED TO REDUCE RC 22 – 073008 – TECH ED - REPLACEMENT EQUIPMENT BY \$8,132.00.**

**** MS. SULLIVAN SECONDED.**

**** THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

**** MR. HARMAN MOVED TO REDUCE RC 24 – 143002 – SPED - EXCESS COST BY \$200,000.00.**

**** MS. STEIN SECONDED.**

**** THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

**** MR. HARMAN MOVED TO INCREASE RC 24 – 012001 - SPED – CONSULTING SERVICES BY \$75,000.00.**

**** MS. ZURO SECONDED.**

**** THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

**** MR. HARMAN MOVED TO REDUCE RC 25 – 084001 – FIXED – RETIREMENT BY \$237,953.00.**

**** MS. SULLIVAN SECONDED.**

**** THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

**** MR. HARMAN MOVED TO REDUCE RC 25 – 084004 – FIXED – OPEB EXPENSE BY \$168,128.00.**

**** MS. ZURO SECONDED.**

**** THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

**** MR. HARMAN MOVED TO INCREASE RC 25 – 084005 – FIXED – OPEB REVENUE BY \$150,700.00.**

**** MS. HAGERTY-ROSS SECONDED.**

**** THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

Mr. Harman announced that the next group of votes would be on the Board's proposed modifications.

**** MR. HARMAN MOVED RC 01 – DHS – LINES 10 TO 17 - VARIOUS ACCOUNT #'S - A REVIEW OF THE 200/300/400 CLASS STRUCTURES.**

**** THE MOTION FAILED DUE TO THE LACK OF A SECOND.**

**** MR. HARMAN MOVED RC 03 –MMS – LINE 114 – 22002 – TEXTBOOK REPLACEMENTS REVIEW FOR A REDUCTION OF \$2,000.00.**

**** THE MOTION FAILED DUE TO THE LACK OF A SECOND.**

**** MR. HARMAN MOVED TO REDUCE RC 03 –MMS – LINE 116 – 23003 – CLASSROOM REFERENCE BY \$1,500.00.**

**** MS. HAGERTY-ROSS SECONDED.**

**** THE MOTION FAILED TO PASS WITH FOUR IN FAVOR (HARMAN, STEIN, HAGERTY-ROSS AND BURKE) AND FOUR AGAINST (ZURO, DINEEN, SULLIVAN AND MARTENS).**

**** MR. HARMAN MOVED RC 03 –MMS – LINE 118 – 23004 – RESOURCE MATERIALS – REVIEW ACCOUNT – PARENTAL CONTRIBUTIONS.**

**** THE MOTION FAILED DUE TO THE LACK OF A SECOND.**

**** MR. HARMAN MOVED TO REDUCE RC 03 –MMS – LINE 121 – 24009 – SCIENCE TEACHING SUPPLIES - BY \$1,000.**

**** MS. HAGERTY-ROSS SECONDED.**

**** THE MOTION PASSED WITH SEVEN IN FAVOR (HARMAN, STEIN, HAGERTY-ROSS, ZURO, BURKE, DINEEN AND SULLIVAN) AND ONE OPPOSED (MARTENS).**

**** MR. HARMAN MOVED TO REDUCE RC 03 –MMS – LINE 123 – 25001 – MISC. OFFICE SUPPLIES – BY \$1,000.**

**** MS. HAGERTY-ROSS SECONDED.**

**** THE MOTION PASSED WITH SIX IN FAVOR (STEIN, HAGERTY-ROSS, DINEEN, SULLIVAN, BURKE AND ZURO) AND TWO OPPOSED (HARMAN AND MARTENS).**

**** MR. HARMAN MOVED RC 05 – HINDLEY – LINES 156-161 – VARIOUS ACCOUNT #'S – PERSONNEL – REVIEW BUDGET CONTROLS.**

**** THE MOTION FAILED DUE TO THE LACK OF A SECOND.**

**** MR. HARMAN MOVED RC 07 – HOLMES – LINES 207-212 – VARIOUS ACCOUNT #'S – PERSONNEL – REVIEW BUDGET CONTROLS.**

**** THE MOTION FAILED DUE TO THE LACK OF A SECOND.**

**** MR. HARMAN MOVED RC 08 – OX RIDGE – LINES 256-261 – VARIOUS ACCOUNT #'S – PERSONNEL – REVIEW BUDGET CONTROLS.**

**** THE MOTION FAILED DUE TO THE LACK OF A SECOND.**

**** MR. HARMAN MOVED RC 09 – ROYLE – LINES 304 -309 – VARIOUS ACCOUNT #'S – PERSONNEL – REVIEW BUDGET CONTROLS.**

**** THE MOTION FAILED DUE TO THE LACK OF A SECOND.**

**** MR. HARMAN MOVED RC 10 – TOKENEKE – LINES 351-356 – VARIOUS ACCOUNT #'S – PERSONNEL – REVIEW BUDGET CONTROLS.**

**** THE MOTION FAILED DUE TO THE LACK OF A SECOND.**

**** MR. HARMAN MOVED RC 09 – ROYLE – LINE 312 – 21302 – SUBSTITUTE TEACHERS. – AN INCREASE RELATED TO INTERN ACCOUNT.**

**** THE MOTION FAILED DUE TO THE LACK OF A SECOND.**

**** MR. HARMAN MOVED RC 11 – PHYS. ED. – LINE 398 – 21220 – CURRICULUM SUPERVISION TO PROVIDE INFORMATION ON THE INCREASE.**

**** THE MOTION FAILED DUE TO THE LACK OF A SECOND.**

**** MR. HARMAN MOVED RC 11 – PHYS. ED. – LINE 402 – 101002 – INTERSCHOLASTIC DARIEN HS – REVIEW ACCOUNT.**

**** THE MOTION FAILED DUE TO THE LACK OF A SECOND.**

**** MR. HARMAN MOVED RC 11 – PHYS. ED. – LINE 421 – 102001 – INTERSCHOLASTIC /DARIEN HS. UNIFORM CLARIFICATION.**

**** MS. SULLIVAN SECONDED.**

A brief discussion regarding what this line item entailed followed.

**** MS. SULLIVAN WITHDREW HER SECOND.**

**** THE MOTION FAILED DUE TO LACK OF A SECOND.**

**** MR. HARMAN MOVED RC 12 – MAINTENANCE – LINE 476 – 72021 – SECURITY – REVIEW EXPENSES.**

**** THE MOTION FAILED DUE TO LACK OF A SECOND.**

**** MR. HARMAN MOVED RC 12 – MAINTENANCE – LINE 479 – 72048 – AIR CONDITIONER REPAIRS – REVIEW \$7,500 INCREASE.**

**** THE MOTION FAILED DUE TO LACK OF A SECOND.**

**** MR. HARMAN MOVED RC 12 – MAINTENANCE – LINE 490 – 122000 – IMPROVEMENT OF BUILDINGS – REVIEW ACCOUNT.**

**** THE MOTION FAILED DUE TO LACK OF A SECOND.**

**** MR. HARMAN MOVED RC 12 – MAINTENANCE – LINE 497 – 73020 – REPLACEMENT OF CLASSROOM FURNITURE – REVIEW ACCOUNT.**

**** THE MOTION FAILED DUE TO LACK OF A SECOND.**

**** MR. HARMAN MOVED RC 15 – TECH – LINE 582 – 12001 – CONSULTANT SERVICES – REVIEW ACCOUNT.**

**** THE MOTION FAILED DUE TO LACK OF A SECOND.**

**** MR. HARMAN MOVED RC 15 – TECH – LINE 584 – 13035 – SOFTWARE MAINTENANCE – REVIEW ACCOUNT.**

**** THE MOTION FAILED DUE TO LACK OF A SECOND.**

**** MR. HARMAN MOVED RC 15 – TECH – LINE 588 – 25029 – STAFF DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM – REVIEW ACCOUNT.**

**** THE MOTION FAILED DUE TO LACK OF A SECOND.**

**** MR. HARMAN MOVED RC 15 – TECH – LINE 597 – 123021 – NEW COMPUTER EQUIPMENT – REVIEW ACCOUNT.**

**** THE MOTION FAILED DUE TO LACK OF A SECOND.**

**** MR. HARMAN MOVED RC 16 – ADMIN - LINE 618 – 12001 – CONSULTANT SERVICES – REVIEW ACCOUNT.**

**** THE MOTION FAILED DUE TO LACK OF A SECOND.**

**** MR. HARMAN MOVED RC 16 – ADMIN - LINE 619 – 12004 – LEGAL SERVICES – REVIEW ACCOUNT – REDUCE BY \$50,000.00.**

**** MR. BURKE SECONDED.**

Mr. Burke then spoke about his reasoning for proposing this reduction.

**** MR. BURKE MOVED TO AMEND RC 16 – ADMIN - LINE 619 – 12004 – LEGAL SERVICES – REVIEW ACCOUNT – REDUCE BY \$50,000.00 TO A REDUCTION OF \$25,000.**

**** MR. MARTENS SECONDED.**

Dr. Brenner pointed out that while the budget coded the two legal line items differently, the District employed Shipman and Goodwin as their legal representative. He explained that while the individual line item appeared to be over budgeted, when it was combined with the normal legal service line, the District was on track for the year. Discussion followed.

**** THE MOTION TO AMEND RC 16 – ADMIN - LINE 619 – 12004 – LEGAL SERVICES – REVIEW ACCOUNT – REDUCE BY \$50,000.00 TO A REDUCTION OF \$25,000 FAILED TO PASS WITH TWO IN FAVOR (SULLIVAN AND BURKE) AND SIX AGAINST (HARMAN, HAGERTY-ROSS, ZURO, STEIN, DINEEN AND MARTENS).**

**** THE MOTION TO APPROVE RC 16 - ADMIN - LINE 619 – 12004 – LEGAL SERVICES – REVIEW ACCOUNT – REDUCE BY \$50,000.00 FAILED TO PASS WITH TWO IN FAVOR (SULLIVAN AND BURKE) AND SIX AGAINST (HARMAN, HAGERTY-ROSS, ZURO, STEIN, DINEEN AND MARTENS).**

**** MR. HARMAN MOVED RC 17 – HEALTH – LINE 645 – 41004 – SUBSTITUTE NURSES – REVIEW ACCOUNT.**

**** THE MOTION FAILED DUE TO LACK OF A SECOND.**

**** MR. HARMAN MOVED RC 17 – HEALTH – LINE 645 – 41001 – HEALTH SUPPLIES – REVIEW ACCOUNT.**

**** THE MOTION FAILED DUE TO LACK OF A SECOND.**

**** MR. HARMAN MOVED RC 18 – PERSONNEL – LINE 677 – 11027 CONTRACT SUPPORT – REVIEW ACCOUNT.**

**** THE MOTION FAILED DUE TO LACK OF A SECOND.**

**** MR. HARMAN MOVED RC 18 – PERSONNEL – LINE 680 – 21300 – LONG TERM SUBS – REVIEW ACCOUNT.**

**** THE MOTION FAILED DUE TO LACK OF A SECOND.**

**** MR. HARMAN MOVED RC 18 – PERSONNEL – LINE 683 – 31000 – BUDGET CONTROL - REVIEW ACCOUNT.**

**** THE MOTION FAILED DUE TO LACK OF A SECOND.**

**** MR. HARMAN MOVED RC 19 – CURRICULUM – LINE 707 – 21312 – CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT – REVIEW ACCOUNT.**

**** THE MOTION FAILED DUE TO LACK OF A SECOND.**

**** MR. HARMAN MOVED RC 19 – CURRICULUM – LINE 708 – 21405 – ESL INSTRUCTION – REVIEW ACCOUNT.**

**** THE MOTION FAILED DUE TO LACK OF A SECOND.**

**** MR. HARMAN MOVED RC 19 – CURRICULUM – LINE 716 – 12001 – CONSULTANT SERVICES – REVIEW ACCOUNT.**

**** THE MOTION FAILED DUE TO LACK OF A SECOND.**

**** MR. HARMAN MOVED RC 19 – CURRICULUM – LINE 722 – 25003 – PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT – REVIEW ACCOUNT.**

**** THE MOTION FAILED DUE TO LACK OF A SECOND.**

**** MR. HARMAN MOVED RC 24 – SPED – LINE 865 – 21303 – SPECIAL CLASS TEACHERS – REVIEW 200/300/400 CLASS STRUCTURE.**

**** THE MOTION FAILED DUE TO LACK OF A SECOND.**

**** MR. HARMAN MOVED RC 24 – SPED – LINE 883 – 12004 – LEGAL SERVICES – REVIEW ACCOUNT.**

**** MR. BURKE SECONDED.**

Mr. Burke asked if Mr. Feeney believed that the legal services costs would exceed the \$300,000 budget. Mr. Feeney said that when both legal lines were combined, they equaled the current costs. Discussion followed.

**** MR. BURKE WITHDREW HIS SECOND.**

**** THE MOTION FOR RC 24 – SPED – LINE 883 – 12004 – LEGAL SERVICES – REVIEW ACCOUNT.**

****THE MOTION FAILED DUE TO LACK OF A SECOND.**

**** MR. HARMAN MOVED RC 24 – SPED – LINE 889 – 24013 – SPECIAL EDUCATION TESTING – REVIEW ACCOUNT.**

**** THE MOTION FAILED DUE TO LACK OF A SECOND.**

**** MR. HARMAN MOVED RC 24 – SPED – LINE 897 – 52002 IN DISTRICT TRANSPORTATION – REVIEW ACCOUNT.**

**** THE MOTION FAILED DUE TO LACK OF A SECOND.**

**** MR. HARMAN MOVED RC 24 – SPED – LINE 902 – 143001 – TUITION, NON PUBLIC – REVIEW ACCOUNT.**

**** THE MOTION FAILED DUE TO LACK OF A SECOND.**

**** MR. HARMAN MOVED RC 24 – SPED – LINE 917 – 143002 – EXCESS COST – REVIEW ACCOUNT.**

**** THE MOTION FAILED DUE TO LACK OF A SECOND.**

**** MR. HARMAN MOVED RC 25 – FIXED – 64004 – SEWER SERVICES – REVIEW ACCOUNT.**

**** THE MOTION FAILED DUE TO LACK OF A SECOND.**

**** MR. HARMAN MOVED RC 26 – ELP – LINE 1022 – 25003 – PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT – REVIEW ACCOUNT.**

**** THE MOTION FAILED DUE TO LACK OF A SECOND.**

The Board then moved on to review the proposed Priority 1 Capital Projects 2016/2017. Mr. Harman said that the description of all the proposed projects along with their account numbers were posted on the website.

Dr. Brenner said that after conversations with the Town and First Selectman, it appears that both the Town and the Board of Education had included replacing the sidewalk along Hoyt Street in their budgets. The Town of Darien will be replacing that sidewalk and therefore, the \$45,000 cost that was allocated for the replacement of the sidewalk by the Board has been removed from the Capital Project Budget.

Mr. Harman then read the various remaining projects listed on the Capital projects:

Darien High School: Cafeteria Expansion, Storage facility, Replacement Turf, Auditorium Sound System

There were no questions from the Board members regarding these items.

Middlesex Middle School: Replacement of the Master Clock System, Replacement of the carpet in the Main Office.

There were no questions from the Board members regarding these items.

Hindley Elementary School: Movement of the Nurse's and Main Offices, Window Replacement program in the original building, Installation of bathroom partitions.

There were no questions from the Board members regarding these items.

Holmes Elementary School: Resurfacing of the parking lot and bus loop, Installation of bathroom partitions.

There were no questions from the Board members regarding these items.

Ox Ridge Elementary School: Replacement of the gym flooring.

There were no questions from the Board members regarding this item.

Royle Elementary School: Installation of the Emergency Generator, Fan Coil Heaters in Hallway of the First Grade wing.

There were no questions from the Board members regarding these items.

Central Office: New slate roof, Replacement of windows.

There were no questions from the Board members regarding these items.

District: Replacement of the 1997 Rack body dump truck, Replacement of the Land Trekker.

There were no questions from the Board members regarding these items.

**** MR. HARMAN MOVED TO APPROVE THE 2016-2017 CAPITAL PRIORITY 1 PROJECT AS LISTED ABOVE FOR ~~\$3,341,000~~-\$3,441,000 {amount corrected by Board action on May 10, 2016}.**

**** MS. STEIN SECONDED.**

**** THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

Mr. Feeney announced that the revised 2016-2017 Operating Budget was \$93,847,816.00 which was a \$3,125,290.00 increase over the current fiscal year, which represents an increase of 3.44%

**** MS. HAGERTY-ROSS MOVED TO APPROVE THE PROPOSED 2016-2017 OPERATING BUDGET OF \$93,847,816.00, WHICH REPRESENTS AN INCREASE OF 3.44%.**

**** MS. SULLIVAN SECONDED.**

**** THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

Mr. Harman thanked everyone who worked on this project and said that it was necessary for the Board to review every line item before voting on the budget. He said that the next step in the process would be presenting the Board of Education's Recommended Budget to the Board of Finance on March 1, 2016 at 7:30 p.m. The Board of Finance will be holding a public hearing on the Board of Education budget on March 8th at Town Hall.

F. UPDATE ON EVALUATION PROCESS FOR TEACHERS. (File #2466)

Dr. DaSilva and Ms. Cion narrated a Power Point presentation on the Evaluation Process that included the future plans and revisions that will be submitted to the State of Connecticut

Board questions and comments and Administration's responses: a) **I think this is some of the most important work that administrators can do, so I applaud you for this work. It sounds like you have a fine methodology. The one thing I don't see is something that was not in our last year's contract and that is the student evaluation of their high school teachers. I would be interested to see if there is some kind of paradigm for the way that students could evaluate their high school teachers. I would be interested to hear if others use it or if the District has used it at any point in time. Secondly, do we have any type of exit interview of the teaching staff that leave to determine if they are not receiving enough support in terms of their teaching style or for other reasons?** (Ms. Cion said that regarding the student evaluations, the problem that other districts had was that the State requires that the survey results be valid and reliable. Using a class targeted to a specific teacher is not large enough to be valid and reliable. The State wants a bigger sample size. Dr. DaSilva said that there is discussion around pedagogy as to whether the practice is effective. The discussion will be quite large and the various aspects need to be understood philosophically. The goal is to make the District's practices better. The question is how the student feedback would be integrated into the teacher's instructional style.) b) **The teachers prepare differently when they know that someone will be observing.** (Dr. Brenner said that when there are drop ins, the idea is not that the administration is out to catch someone, but that the administration should be spending significant time in the classrooms. The administrators should be more involved in and interacting with the process. The administrators need to own what happens in the classrooms. While there is value in asking the students, when you make them a critical component, it can polarize the classroom.) c) **In June, we have an opportunity to discuss this process. I'd like to see you come back and own what we have because I know there's been a lot of work done regarding the State requirements. But it's been done by three different administrations over the last three years.** (Dr. Brenner said that they had been having conversations at the administration meetings about compliance and best practices. It's easy to be compliant, but not so easy to work towards best practices. The administration is trying to work past compliance to best practices. It's now a bi-weekly discussion.)

G. APPROVAL OF BOARD MASTER AGENDA – FEBRUARY THROUGH AUGUST 2016. (File #2467)

**** MS. SULLIVAN MOVED TO APPROVE BOARD MASTER AGENDA – FEBRUARY THROUGH AUGUST 2016 AS AMENDED.**

**** MR. MARTENS SECONDED.**

**** THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

ACTION ITEMS

Personnel Items - Resignations/Retirements

There were no personnel actions to consider at this time.

PUBLIC COMMENT.

Ms. Jill McCammon of Old Kings Highway South said she would like to understand how special education faculty evaluations would be done and by whom.

ADJOURNMENT.

**** MR. BURKE MOVED TO ADJOURN.
** MR. MARTENS SECONDED.
** THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

The meeting adjourned at 9:47 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sarah Schneider Zuro
Secretary