

WESTPORT BOARD OF EDUCATION

***AGENDA**

(Agenda Subject to Modification in Accordance with Law)

PUBLIC CALL TO ORDER

6:00 p.m., Staples High School, Room 1025c, Principal’s Conference Room

EXECUTIVE SESSION: Personnel Matter: Formative Evaluation of the Superintendent

RESUME PUBLIC SESSION/PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

7:30 p.m., Staples High School, Cafeteria B (Room 301)

ANNOUNCEMENTS FROM BOARD AND ADMINISTRATION

PUBLIC QUESTIONS/COMMENTS ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS (15 MINUTES)

MINUTES: October 9, 2017

DISCUSSION/ACTION:

- 1. Anticipated Vote on Establishment of Ad Hoc Finance Committee Dr. Colleen Palmer
- 2. Approval of FY 2019 Budget Preparation Calendar, *page 1* (Encl.) Mr. Elio Longo

DISCUSSION:

- 1. Board of Education Establishment of FY 2019 Budget Guidelines: Goals and Priorities Dr. Colleen Palmer
- 2. School Resource Officer, *pages 3-13* (Encl.) Dr. Colleen Palmer

UPDATES:

- 1. Health and Medical Insurance Revenues and Expenses; Projected Year-End Balance in Health Reserve Account, *page 15* (Encl.) Mr. Elio Longo
- 2. Quarterly Financial Report: July 1, 2017 – September 30, 2017, *pages 17-22* (Encl.) Mr. Elio Longo

ADJOURNMENT

*A 2/3 vote is required to go to executive session, to add a topic to the agenda of a regular meeting, or to start a new topic after 10:30 p.m. The meeting can also be viewed on cable TV on channel 78; AT&T channel 99 and by video stream @www.westportps.org

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION WELCOME USING THE FOLLOWING GUIDELINES:

- Comment on non-agenda topics will occur during the first 15 minutes *except* when staff or guest presentations are scheduled.
- Board will not engage in dialogue on non-agenda items.
- Public may speak as agenda topics come up for discussion or information.
- Speakers on non-agenda items are limited to 2 minutes each, except by prior arrangement with chair.
- Speakers on agenda items are limited to 3 minutes each, except by prior arrangement with chair.
- Speakers must give name and use microphone.
- Responses to questions may be deferred if answers not immediately available.
- Public comment is normally not invited for topics listed for action after having been publicly discussed at one or more meetings.

**WESTPORT PUBLIC SCHOOLS
BUDGET CALENDAR FOR FISCAL YEAR 2018-2019 (DRAFT)**

October 5, 2017	Superintendent holds budget discussion with Principals and distributes forms Administrators (BMS/LMC at 3:30 Leadership meeting)
Oct/Nov 2017	Administrators work with staff to develop budget plan(s)
October 30, 2017	Administrators submit budget plans, Pentamation input and required forms to Director of School Business Operations. Request Narrative from Administrators
November 6, 9, & 14, 2017	Superintendent and CO Administrators meet with Cost Center Administrators to review budget requests (Agenda in Handbook)
December 4, 2017	Board of Ed meets with Board of Finance and RTM Education and Finance Chairs for preliminary budget discussions, including major budget assumptions (such as enrollment, capital projects etc.)
December 28, 2017	Superintendent's Proposed Budget distributed to Board of Education
January 2, 2018	Board of Education Meeting – Superintendent presents Executive Summary of Superintendent's Proposed 2018-18 Education Budget
January 4, 2018	Board of Education Meeting – Budget Discussions (all day meeting beginning 8:30 am) Auditorium, Westport Town Hall
January 8, 2018	Board of Education (Regular Meeting) – Budget Discussions <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Invitees include: Board of Finance; RTM Education and Finance Committee Chairs; and Health and Medical Insurance Consultant (For discussion of health and medical insurance) for Discussion of Health Insurance and Capital Projects
January 16, 2018	Board of Education (Regular Meeting) – Budget Discussions
January 22, 2018	Board of Education (Regular Meeting) – Budget Discussions
January 29, 2018	Board of Education (Regular Meeting) – Board Approves Budget Submission
*February 5, 2018	Board of Education (Special Meeting –Snow Date) – Board Approves Budget Submission
February 9, 2018	Board of Education Submits Budget Request to Town of Westport
March 2018	Board of Finance Meeting <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Budget Workshops (<i>dates determined by BOF</i>) • Acts on Board of Education Budget (<i>dates determined by BOF</i>)
April 2018	Representative Town Meeting (RTM) – Budget Workshops with Sub-Committees (<i>dates determined by RTM</i>) April 9-13 Spring Recess
May 2018	Representative Town Meeting (RTM) – Adopts Budget (<i>dates determined by RTM</i>)
May/June 2018	Board of Education (Regular Meetings) - Adopts 2018-2019 Budget

This page has been intentionally left blank.

School Resource Officers: Benefits and Challenges

John Rosiak, Founder, Prevention Partnerships

Abstract

With the continuation of high profile school shootings in the United States, and growing concern about school violence in countries across the world, the issue of whether and how to engage law enforcement in schools has been raised to a new level of discussion. Communities must decide whether they want to employ police in schools in the capacity of School Resource Officers (SROs). If so, these communities must figure out how they go about it in the most effective way by developing positive relationships with students and collaboration with educators and mental health professionals to proactively address school safety issues and *divert* at-risk students from the juvenile justice system. Implementing effective SRO programs that support the positive development of youth is an essential part of youth justice reform.

This article presents the SRO model of school-based law enforcement (SBLE), discussing the SRO's role as an educator, informal counselor, and proactive law enforcer. It presents the potential benefits and challenges of school-based law enforcement, and outlines the key steps to creating an effective SRO program through proper selection, training, and governance.

Introduction

If students and educators are to achieve their full potential, schools must be safe and feel safe. Students who report feeling safe in school are more engaged in class, have higher academic achievement, and have lower rates of absenteeism, truancy, and behavioral issues. Educators also benefit from safe schools. Those educators who report feeling safe in school are better able to focus on academics, are more likely to remain in their positions, and are better equipped to teach and support students. Simply put, feeling safe in school is connected to achieving educational outcomes for students.

Many communities seek the help of law enforcement to promote school safety and protect schools from violence. SRO programs that are implemented and sustained through a well-conceived, organized and comprehensive process can help prevent school-based violence, connect at-risk students to needed services, divert youth from juvenile court, and create safe, secure, and peaceful school environments.

Effective school-based law enforcement programs require more than simply assigning officers to schools. More established SRO programs are built on careful selection of the right officer, and training that SRO in well-defined roles and responsibilities. More robust school-based law enforcement programs involve a comprehensive agreement between the school and the law enforcement agency that fosters collaboration, communication, and ongoing evaluation. This article outlines the important issues related to school-based law enforcement, including:

- What SROs are and their roles as educators, informal counselors, and law enforcers
- The potential benefits and pitfalls of school-based law enforcement programs
- The proactive, collaborative role SROs can play in schools
- The value of a comprehensive agreement between the school and the law enforcement agency, and of written guidelines clarifying an SRO's work
- How to properly select and train SROs.

What Are School Resource Officers?

SROs are sworn law enforcement officers who are specially selected and trained to promote safety within schools. These officers are typically employed by law enforcement agencies, such as the local police department or sheriff's office, and are usually funded through local law enforcement or education budgets

(or a combination of the two). In the United States, funding may also come from government agencies, such as the U. S. Department of Justice's Office of Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS). The school is the SRO's "police beat" where the officer fulfills a multifaceted role, proactively promoting safety by building trusting relationships with students, staff, and other caregivers.

First initiated in the 1950s, school-based law enforcement programs have grown in popularity in recent decades. In the 1990s, amid growing fears about juvenile crime, several high-profile school shootings, and increased federal funding for school-based law enforcement programs, more communities began assigning officers to schools. From 1997 to 2003, the number of school-based law enforcement officers rose 52 percent, from 9,400 to 14,337. As of 2012, well over 10,000 officers police approximately 40 percent of U.S. schools nationwide, primarily at the secondary school level.

School-based law enforcement poses some unique challenges to policing. SBLE is a broad term that includes SROs as the largest group. But others play roles in SBLE, including: School security guards, patrol officers who make stops at the school, and juvenile officers. There are important distinctions among these different groups in terms of background and training, and roles and responsibilities.

Traditionally, schools focus on promoting academic achievement, while the work of law enforcement centers on creating and maintaining public safety. These differing missions can impact how each party interacts and relates with youth. Differences in training and disposition can also result in differing approaches in responding to problem behavior. SRO programs encourage dialogue between schools and law enforcement to help bridge the gap across these professional cultures, identify and develop a shared vision, and align school philosophies with SROs' commitment to safety.

Unlike most law enforcement officers, who typically work with a largely adult population, SROs predominately serve youth in schools. Challenges that SROs face are many, including: the need for crisis intervention training, communications skills with youth as well as school personnel, a thorough understanding of juvenile justice, and knowledge of and sensitivity to the social, emotional, and intellectual development of young people. Full-time, long-term assignments to schools coupled with comprehensive training can help to ensure that SROs build the skills, knowledge, and relationships necessary for serving in a school environment.

SRO Roles: Educators, Informal Counselors, and Law Enforcers

SROs can fulfill a variety of roles: Preventing and responding to school-based crime; fostering positive relationships among law enforcement, educators, and youth; and helping to promote a positive school climate. The National Association of School Resource Officers (NASRO) in the U.S. advocates for SROs to fulfill a "triad" role encompassing three primary functions: Educator, informal counselor, and law enforcer.

Educator

Law enforcement training and experience equip SROs with specialized knowledge that can be particularly valuable in an educational environment. SROs apply this knowledge to school staff, students, parents, and the community in several ways:

Educating students. SROs can serve as guest lecturers in the classroom. They can: Implement evidence-based curricula, such as the Olweus Bullying Prevention Program, Second Step, and Gang Resistance Education and Training (GREAT); teach students about criminal investigation, laws and constitutional rights, law enforcement as a career, substance abuse, conflict resolution and restorative justice, and youth-relevant crimes such as dating violence. Officers have even shown math students the value of mathematics as it is applied to accident reconstruction investigations. Spending time in the classroom also serves to build positive relationships between law enforcement and youth.

Teaching school staff. SROs can lead in-service trainings for school personnel, educate staff about crime and justice issues, and provide training on crime prevention.

Advising on emergency preparedness and crisis and incident management. SROs can help prepare schools to handle crises by informing crisis planning and management systems, developing and coordinating emergency response plans, creating protocols for handling specific emergencies, and leading exercises, ideally according to the Federal Emergency Management Agency's National Incident Management System (NIMS) in the U.S.

Promoting crime prevention through environmental design (CPTED). SROs can educate administrators on how to decrease risks and opportunities for problem behaviors by employing the CPTED principles of surveillance, access control, territorial reinforcement, and maintenance. These principles may require altering aspects of the physical environment (e.g., building architecture or landscape design), increasing supervision in problem areas, and revising school policies to ensure that students and visitors move through monitored areas.

Teaching parents and the community. SROs can provide training and present information at community meetings on relevant crime and legal issues, such as the signs of substance abuse or gang involvement.

Informal Counselor

Another very important role of the SRO is that of informal counselor. Positive relationships between the SRO and students are consistently identified as a key to success for SRO programs. Youth often view and turn to officers in the same way they might turn to parents or other adults in their lives, seeking out SROs to discuss issues. SROs can build trust and foster relationships with youth through formal and informal interactions. For example, as part of the Boston Public Schools' Saturday Morning Alternative Reach Out and Teach Program, SROs meet with at-risk students on Saturday mornings to discuss their behavior and educate them about criminal justice.

When youth are guided about a variety of challenging issues, such as underage drinking, stressful life situations, or even the illegality of school pranks, students can come to trust SROs to answer questions and address problems, which in turn enables the officers to identify at-risk students early. These relationships also allow SROs to intervene before issues escalate, refer students to appropriate resources (e.g., mental and behavioral services within and outside of the school), and divert them from the juvenile justice system.

"The kind of relationships police forge with teachers and students, rather than the number of arrests they make, promotes school safety." —American Civil Liberties Union and Citizens for Juvenile Justice

Law Enforcer

Protecting students and staff from threats of violence is a primary component of an SRO's law enforcer role. Having a sworn law enforcement officer available at the school diminishes critical response time when a violent incident or other emergency occurs. Likewise, an SRO's familiarity with a school's layout and design, as well as knowledge of the individuals involved in a problem, can further improve the efficiency of response to an incident.

SROs fulfill a number of traditional law enforcement functions:

- Responding to emergencies or other calls for service on campus, such as dealing with trespassers, and dealing with off-campus crimes involving students
- Deterring on-campus violence and criminality
- Conducting criminal investigations, and sharing information with investigation units
- Patrolling the school property, and attending to truancy, security, and traffic issues
- Issuing citations and making arrests if necessary.

The Case for High-Quality SRO Programs

In recent years, school-based law enforcement has come under heightened scrutiny. The result of this attention can serve to advance the way law enforcement interacts with students and school staff. News reports of some local officers misusing their power to search, restrain, or arrest youth inside schools have raised significant concerns for SRO programs nationwide. This is a serious matter because involvement in

the juvenile justice system can negatively impact a child's life trajectory, holding back educational success and raising the risk of adult criminal behavior. Some studies have found associations between the presence of school-based law enforcement and increased student arrests and referrals to juvenile court for school discipline issues—often for public order offenses, such as willful defiance, disorderly conduct, disrupting the educational process, or disrupting a public school.

At the same time, a larger view of the trend data from the U.S. Departments of Education and Justice reveals that over the past two decades schools have been safer, juvenile arrests are down, and that this coincides with the expansion of SRO programs as part of a comprehensive strategy. Some studies and local evaluations indicate that SROs can have a positive impact, resulting in reduced suspensions, arrests for assaults and weapons charges, disciplinary actions, serious school violence, and crime in the areas surrounding schools.

Surveys of educators, students, officers, and community members suggest that school-based law enforcement programs are popular and perceived as effective. Respondents report that officers can do the following:

- Increase feelings of safety among students, teachers, and administrators
- Deter aggressive behavior, and empower staff to maintain order and address behavioral issues in a timely fashion
- Diminish classroom time spent on discipline and behavioral disruptions
- Improve school safety and reduce school-based crime
- Increase the likelihood that students report witnessing a crime, and help reduce community-wide criminality
- Improve relationships between law enforcement and youth.

Existing data suggest that more rigorous research, such as randomized controlled trials, may be warranted to assess the true impact of school-based law enforcement broadly, and SROs in particular. Nevertheless, in communities that opt to use school-based law enforcement as part of their school safety strategy, the evidence to date suggests that properly selected, trained, and governed SROs can achieve positive outcomes and avoid the pitfalls linked to some school-based law enforcement programs.

A Proactive, Collaborative Approach to School-Based Law Enforcement

In settings where SROs are well-chosen and well-trained they can focus on prevention and early intervention. This reflects a shift in the law enforcement role from *reactive* (responding to problems as they occur) to *proactive* (identifying and altering the conditions that create school safety issues). A common law enforcement approach to addressing school safety issues in a more proactive way is the SARA Model:

Scan the environment to identify patterns in recurrent issues of school safety

Analyze the causes of these patterns to target areas amenable for intervention

Respond with interventions to reduce the frequency or severity of these issues

Assess the impact of interventions, and refine them as needed.

Proactive school-based law enforcement relies on positive relationships between officers and students. These relationships build trust between SROs and the student body, reduce school safety issues, and promote perceptions of safety. Successful SRO programs require cross-sector connections among the school, law enforcement, mental health agencies, and other community-based partners. A cross-sector school safety team can help align these groups and play an integral role in school-based emergency planning, improving access to resources, and integrating all responders, including law enforcement.

Through their positive relationships with students, SROs can gain knowledge of issues occurring in the community that can impact school safety, which gives them insight into campus threats, community problems, and safety concerns. As a member of the school safety team, SROs can interpret the policies and procedures of the law enforcement agency, share knowledge of community resources, clarify the

connections between school and community crime, and help develop effective prevention strategies and interventions. In this way, SROs act as information liaisons, gathering and sharing knowledge across sectors.

Governing the SRO Program: Memoranda of Understanding and Standard Operating Procedures

Governance documents can be used to prevent confusion among SROs and school staff, decrease conflict between the agencies, while ensuring that the SRO program upholds the school's educational philosophy.

Memoranda of Understanding

Memoranda of Understanding (MOUs), sometimes called Memoranda of Agreement, define the school-law enforcement partnership and delineate the program mission and goals.

“One of the most frequent and destructive mistakes many SRO programs make is to fail to define the SROs’ roles and responsibilities in detail before—or even after—the officers take up their posts in the schools. When programs fail to do this, problems are often rampant at the beginning of the program—and often persist for months and even years.” —National Assessment of School Resource Officers, U.S.

MOUs should be created through a collaborative process that includes stakeholders from education, law enforcement, and the wider community. This process can establish a common vision that meets the unique needs, goals, and safety challenges of the school and its surrounding community. Moreover, MOUs should allow for adaptation to evolving needs and goals in the school and community.

Key components of MOUs

Mission. Define the overarching purpose of the SRO program (e.g., to promote school safety and improve the educational environment).

Goals and objectives. Outline the purpose and expected outcomes of the program. Goals and objectives should be informed by a needs assessment to identify the issues impacting school safety.

Roles and responsibilities. Define the SRO's responsibilities within the larger context of the educational mission, and the SRO's role related to teaching, crisis situations, and truancy. This includes clarification that the SRO's role is NOT to be a school disciplinarian.

Level and type of commitment from partners. Spell out allocations of funding and resources (e.g., school office space and supplies).

Governance structure. Outline the leadership team, the chain of command, the decision-making process, the lines of communication across agencies, and SRO supervision and accountability.

Process for selecting SROs. Outline the process, including how school administrators will be involved.

Minimum training requirements for SROs. Describe pre- and in-service training content and training funding sources.

Information exchange. Explain the process by which partners gather and share information.

Program and SRO evaluation. Clarify measures of success, evaluation, team composition and scope, and input from stakeholders.

Student rights. Discuss students' rights related to a safe and positive school environment, police search and seizure, and use of force.

Integrating the SRO. Outline mechanisms for incorporating the SRO into the school environment and existing school-based prevention and promotion efforts (e.g., involvement in evidence-based prevention programs).

Transparency and accountability. Clarify the collection and public sharing of data related to SRO programming, including numbers of SROs and law enforcement interventions, and outlining plans to openly and appropriately share information about arrests, police use of force, and school-wide disciplinary actions by SROs with school staff and parents.

Standard Operating Procedures

Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) provide detailed guidance to SROs about daily operations, policies, and procedures. Some communities prefer to incorporate SOPs directly into their MOUs. Making SOPs available to the public can help to ensure that community members, school professionals,

and administrators understand the SROs' role and duties, and what they are not, for example, school discipline.

“An SRO who observes a violation of the school code of conduct preserves a safe and orderly environment by making sure that a school administrator is aware of the violation so that school discipline can be determined solely by school officials.” —National Association of School Resource Officers, U.S.

Key components of SOPs:

- *School discipline versus legal processing*
Delineate which offenses require a legal referral versus the use of traditional school discipline procedures, including behaviors that fall into gray areas between criminal offenses and school discipline issues (e.g., harassment, fighting, vandalism).
Limit arrests for public order offenses (e.g., willful defiance or disobedience, disorderly conduct, disrupting the educational process) to help to ensure that discipline remains the responsibility of school staff.
- *Chain of command*
Delineate to whom the officer reports, how the administrator and officer collaborate to address incidents, and what the procedure is when there is a disagreement between the administrator and the SRO.
- *Arresting students and use of force*
Delineate when arrest or restraint of students or taking them into custody is appropriate, recognizing that these are actions of last resort to deal with offenses that cannot be handled through traditional school procedures.
Define procedures for arresting students, including whom should be consulted and when and where arrests should take place (e.g., off school grounds and outside of school hours, except in cases where there is an immediate threat to school safety).
Clarify procedures for calling in patrol officers to arrest students to protect the relationship between the SRO and the student body.
- *Communication and collaboration*
Define when the SRO will talk with school staff and law enforcement officials, including discussions about at-risk students and ongoing investigations.
Detail what meetings SROs should attend (e.g., parent-teacher organizations, school board meetings, faculty meetings).
Outline how SROs will be integrated into educational teams to help the SRO adapt to the school culture and improve understanding of school resources, referral options, and information sharing.
Specify SRO engagement in periodic roll calls and other law enforcement meetings to help SROs remain part of the law enforcement team and aware of changing community issues impacting school safety.
- *Uniform*
Outline SRO uniform requirements, which may include law enforcement attire, a utility belt, and a service weapon, which can be a deterrent to criminal behavior. This SOP recognizes that in some communities traditional police uniforms may create disruptions or mistrust among the student population and that SRO uniforms can vary based on community needs and the requirements of the law enforcement agency.

“Because of their special training, school resource officers are the only professionals who should be armed in a school, and the decision to use such armed security should be made based on individual community and school need, not via universal mandate.” —National Association of School Psychologists
- *Searching and questioning students*
Outline when and how SROs can search and question students, and whether administrators and/or parents need to be alerted prior to the search.

Discuss limitations on strip searches and other intrusive searches, and may prohibit SROs from being present when school staff are searching or questioning students. (Generally, SROs in the U.S. can constitutionally search students if the SRO has probable cause that the student has committed or is committing a criminal act.)

Selecting the Right Officer

SRO programs are built on the selection of qualified officers, chosen for their willingness and ability to work with youth and educators. Effective SROs are motivated by opportunities to proactively address safety issues, build effective working relationships with school staff, and positively impact the lives of children.

Programs benefit when officers selected are motivated and willing to meet the unique challenges of working in schools, such as fulfilling nontraditional police roles like teaching, and serving in a more confined patrol areas than traditional policing. Support from supervising officers in managing these challenges increases the SROs' dedication and improves their performance.

School and law enforcement administrators can work collaboratively to identify SRO employment criteria that are the best match for the school. Certain character traits, including being patient, approachable, non-authoritarian, team-oriented, and being less sensitive to disrespect, are likely to enhance SROs' effectiveness. Because SROs serve as role models and rely heavily on individual discretion, high levels of integrity and dependability are essential. Officers skilled in de-escalation techniques and who have expertise in how to counsel or refer students can better promote school safety and a positive school climate. An officer's professional and life experience may provide added value to a school. For example, veteran patrol officers or road deputies bring experience working in the community and responding to crisis situations, along with knowledge of law enforcement work that is often of interest to students.

Providing Multifaceted SRO Training

SROs must not only be well-chosen but also well-trained. Studies suggest that traditional police training often does not provide adequate instruction on topics relevant to school-based law enforcement, such as prevention and early intervention, diversion, adolescent and developmental psychology, and substance abuse. This lack of specialized training can result in SROs who may be ill-equipped to fulfill key roles, jeopardizing the success of the SRO program and hindering school safety.

“Developmentally competent adults align their expectations, response, and interactions, as well as those of institutions and organizations, to the developmental stage of the children and youth they serve.” — Lisa Thureau, Strategies for Youth.

Comprehensive training programs can combine classroom-based training, online distance learning, role-playing or scenario-based instruction, field training (within or outside the district), and orientation to the educational mission and school policies. Programs also include regular in-service training that provides refreshers on key concepts and updates on new developments, and may include such topics as adolescent psychology, positive school discipline, and mental health referrals, while affording SROs opportunities to share lessons learned with one another.

Training and resources are offered by local, state, and federal agencies (such as the U.S. Department of Justice's COPS Office), technical colleges, and other private organizations, including the National Center for Mental Health and Juvenile Justice, NASRO, and other organizations. To defray costs, communities can train officers to become trainers, sponsor local training conferences, and partner with other communities to implement training.

Basic SRO training includes instruction on how to teach, mentor, and counsel students, work collaboratively with administrators and staff, manage time in a school environment, and adhere to juvenile justice and privacy laws. Specialized training on other topics can also promote an SRO's effectiveness. For example:

Mental health. Training SROs to understand mental illness and mental health problems, recognize signs of emotional disturbance, and intervene in mental health crises can diminish referrals to juvenile court

and promote diversion of at-risk youth into mental health services. Experienced officers can champion mental health awareness and increase support among new SROs through active endorsement of mental health training.

Adolescent development and communication. With continued development in key decision-making areas of the brain, youth are more reactive, prone to risk-taking behavior, and influenced by social pressures. Environmental factors (including culture, socio-economic status, and family structure) also impact youth behavior and perceptions. Instruction on adolescent physical and social development and developmentally appropriate communication prepares SROs to respond to youth misbehavior.

Implicit bias. Some communities train officers to understand that all individuals harbor unconscious bias, helping them recognize bias and its impacts, and instructing them on how to implement controlled responses can promote fair and impartial reactions to misbehavior and offenses.

Trauma-informed care. Adverse events (e.g., domestic violence, neglect, physical and sexual abuse) can potentially harm a child's emotional and physical well-being and can lead to behavioral issues. Instruction on how to recognize and respond to the causes and implications of trauma can help officers intervene more effectively when signs of trauma appear.

De-escalation techniques. SROs can benefit from instruction on how to interact with and respond to students in crises using validated communication and behavioral techniques. For instance, former patrol officers and road deputies may need to be "untrained" in standard law enforcement methods that promote a heavier reliance on use of force.

School-specific topics. Training in bullying, positive school discipline, substance abuse, truancy, dropout prevention, and school crisis planning can help SROs more effectively carry out their duties.

Cultural competence. This type of training prepares SROs to communicate and tailor interventions based on an understanding of student and staff cultures. Culturally competent SROs can work with individuals representing diverse cultures, including students of various socio-economic strata, religions, ethnicities, or countries of origin.

Conclusion

SROs can be valued members of a multi-disciplinary cross-agency school safety team, helping to promote a safe, supportive, and peaceful school environment. Creating an effective SRO program begins with a strong relationship between the school and law enforcement agency that defines the multifaceted role of the SRO as an educator, informal counselor, and law enforcement problem-solver. A clearly articulated description of SRO responsibilities recognizes that school discipline resides with school administrators, not the SRO. Through positive relationships with students and collaboration with educators and mental health professionals, SROs can proactively address school safety issues and divert at-risk students from the juvenile justice system. Properly selected, trained, and governed SROs can achieve positive outcomes for students and the community by providing youth with the supports they need to succeed in school and in life.

References

Kellie Anderson, Laura Towvim, Jane Repetti, Nakita Carney, John Rosiak, Benjamin Thomas, and Chris Blaber, *Law Enforcement: Snapshots from the Safe Schools/Healthy Students Initiative*. (Waltham, MA: The National Center for Mental Health Promotion and Youth Violence Prevention, Education Development Center, Inc., 2013).

Council of State Governments Justice Center, *The School Discipline Consensus Report: Strategies from the Field to Keep Students Engaged in School and Out of the Juvenile Justice System* (2013).

Peter Finn, Meg Townsend, Michael Shively, Tom Rich, *A Guide to Developing, Maintaining, and Succeeding with Your School Resource Officer Program* (Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Community Oriented Policing Services, 2005).

International Association of Chiefs of Police, *Juvenile Justice Training Needs Assessment: A Survey of Law Enforcement* (2011).

Bernard James, Mo Canady, Janet Nease, *To Protect and Educate: The School Resource Officer and the Prevention of Violence In Schools* (Hoover, AL: National Association of School Resource Officers, 2012).

Shane Jimerson, Amanda Nickerson, Matthew Mayer, Michael Furlong, *Handbook on School Violence and School Safety: International Research and Practice, Second Edition* (New York: Taylor and Francis, 2012).

June Kane, *Violence and Schools* (Brussels: European Commission, 2008).

Catherine Kim and India Geronimo, *Policing in Schools: Developing a Governance Document for School Resource Officers in K-12 Schools* (New York: American Civil Liberties Union, 2009).

Dana Markey, Laura Usher, Darcy Gruttadaro, Ron Honberg, and Sam Cochran, *Responding to Youth with Mental Health Needs: A CIT for Youth Implementation Manual* (Arlington, VA: National Alliance on Mental Illness, 2011).

Shawn Marsh and Carly Dierkhising, "Toward a Conceptual Framework for Trauma-Informed Practice in Juvenile and Family Courts," *Juvenile and Family Justice Today*. (2013, Summer): 18-20.

Karen Moore, Nicola Jones, and Emma Broadbent, *School Violence in OEDC Countries* (Surrey, United Kingdom: Plan Limited, Chobham House, 2008).

Anthony Petrosino, Sarah Guckenburg, and Trevor Fronious, "Policing Schools" Strategies: A Review of the Evaluation Evidence. *Journal of Multi-disciplinary Evaluation*, 2012. January): 80-101,
Barbara Raymond, Assigning Police Officers to Schools. *Problem-Oriented Guides for Police Response Guides Series* (Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Community Oriented Policing Services , 2010).

John Rosiak, "Sustaining the SRO Position in Tough Financial Times," *School Safety*. National Association of School Resource Officers (2011, Spring): 8-11.

John Rosiak, "Developing Safe Schools Partnerships with Law Enforcement," *Forum on Public Policy* (2009).

Forum on Public Policy

John Rosiak, “Developing Safe Schools Partnerships: Spotlight on Law Enforcement” (paper presented at the International Conference on Violence, Abuse, and Trauma, San Diego, CA., September 24, 2009).

Steven Teske, “A Study of Zero Tolerance Policies in Schools: A Multi-Integrated Systems Approach to Improve Outcomes for Adolescents,” *Journal of Child and Adolescent Psychiatric Nursing* (2011): 88-97.
Matthew Theriot, “School Resource Officers and the Criminalization of Student Behavior,” *Journal of Criminal Justice* (2009): 280-287.

Benjamin Thomas, Laura Towvim, John Rosiak, and Kellie Anderson, *School Resource Officers: Steps to Effective School-based Law Enforcement* (Waltham, MA: National Center for Mental Health Promotion and Youth Violence Prevention, Education Development Center, Inc., 2013).

Lisa Thureau, Paige Buckley, Geneva Gann, and Johanna Wald, *If Not Now, When? A Survey of Juvenile Justice Training In America's Police Academies* (Cambridge, MA: Strategies for Youth, 2013).

FORUM ON PUBLIC POLICY

[Home](#)[Journals](#)[Authors](#)[Contributor Information](#)[Board Members](#)[Contact](#)[Volume 2017 no 1](#)[Volume 2017 no 2](#)[Volume 2018 no 2](#)[Volume 2018 no 1](#)

The *Forum on Public Policy* seeks to disseminate knowledge with regard to salient issues in public affairs. This includes research and policy advancement in both the public and private sectors that address government issues at state, national and international levels of discourse. The editorial staff welcomes manuscripts of relevance to this broad area of interest. There are three criteria applied to the review and selection of articles for publication:

First, articles must advance knowledge, theory, and practice.

Second, the content of articles must be accurate and technically competent.

Third, articles must be well written, clear, well organized, and stylistically correct.

A manuscript submitted for publication to the *Forum* must be original and not under consideration for any other publications. When a manuscript is published by the *Forum*, it becomes the property of the *Forum* with the *Forum* possessing exclusive right to publication. All authors will be required to sign a consent to publish form upon acceptance.

This page has been intentionally left blank.

**Medical Health Insurance Fund
FY 17-18 Projections
with Claims Cash Draw Data as of September 30, 2017**

	FY 18 Projection			
	Mar-17			
Cash receipts				
General Fund Budget from line 210	13,447,595			
Other Fund Contributions	100,000			
Employee Contributions (Active)	3,058,383			
Flex Spending Accounts	-			
Cobra Participants	49,397			
Retirees Self Insured	479,272			
State Teachers Retirement (TRB)	115,000			
Life Insurance Premiums	25,000			
Retirees Medicare Surround	492,000			
Other Contributions (FMLA, Retiree Life, etc.)	64,500			
Prescription Guarantee Adjustment	98,789			
Pharmacy Rebate	326,209			
Total cash receipts	18,256,145			
Cash disbursements				
Medical	12,060,244			
Prescription	2,649,308			
Dental	1,145,136			
Flex Spending Accounts	-			
Contribution to HSA	1,188,000			
Medical Administrative	388,214			
Network Access Fee	158,676			
Individual Stop-Loss	1,047,898			
Dental Administrative	55,236			
FSA Administrative	2,000			
Consulting Fee	50,000			
ACA Related Fees	-			
PCORI Fee	4,279			
Retirees Medicare Surround	810,747			
Total cash disbursements	19,559,738			
Change in cash balance	(1,303,593)			
Beginning cash balance	2,034,188			
Insurance Fund Draw Down (budget)	(1,509,944)			
Insurance Fund Draw Down (YTD delta)	-			
Projected Operating Surplus(Shortfall)-Cash basis	-			
Ending cash balance(deficit)-projection	524,244	3.3%	\$ 792,734	\$ (268,490)
Less: Incurred but not reported claims	(968,308)	-6.1%		
Net Position(Deficit) end of year-projection	(444,064)	-2.8%		

Claims Cash Draw Against Insurance Fund Account

	Medical/Rx	Dental	Flex	Other	Total	Avg. Monthly Claims (Med/Rx/Dental)	Variance	Avg. Monthly Claims-FY 17	
								(Med/Rx/Dental)	Variance
Jul 2017	\$ 1,385,628	\$ 101,584	\$ 875	\$ -	\$ 1,488,087	\$ 1,487,212		\$ 1,103,161	
Aug 2017	\$ 1,972,668	\$ 94,032	4,400	\$ -	\$ 2,071,100	\$ 1,776,956	\$ 289,744	\$ 1,426,306	\$ 323,145
Sept 2017	\$ 1,278,736	\$ 86,461	5,256	\$ -	\$ 1,370,454	\$ 1,639,702.99	\$ (137,253)	\$ 1,410,030	\$ (16,276)
	\$ 4,637,032	\$ 282,077	10,531	\$ -	\$ 4,929,640				
YTD/Estimate	31.5%	24.6%	n/a	n/a					
Theoretical YTD Spend Rate	25.0%	25.0%	n/a	n/a					
variance %	6.5%	-0.4%							
variance \$	\$ 959,644	\$ (4,207)							
FY18 Projection (Mar-17):	\$ 14,709,552	1,145,136							
YTD Expense:	\$ (4,637,032)	\$ (282,077)							
Balance available to June 30:	\$ 10,072,520	\$ 863,059							
Average remaining monthly allowance:	\$ 1,119,169	\$ 95,895	=	1,215,064					

INTEROFFICE MEMORANDUM

TO: DR. COLLEEN PALMER
SUPERINTENDENT

FROM: ELIO LONGO 
DIRECTOR OF SCHOOL BUSINESS OPERATIONS

SUBJECT: SEPTEMBER QUARTERLY REPORT

DATE: OCTOBER 16, 2017

CC: F. MEILAN, BUDGET FILE

Attached is the September Quarterly Report (1Q) for the 2017-18 fiscal year which reflects a potential fund balance of \$385,658 on June 30, 2018. The potential fund balance represents a 0.34% budget variation to the \$114,377,346 Board of Education Adopted 2017-2018 Budget.

The projected positive fund balance can mainly be attributed to the cumulative savings in Certified Salary accounts (Object codes 100-119); estimated at \$589,867. The most notable savings resulted from certified staff turnover exceeding the \$300,000 turnover savings estimate.

You will note that we have completed 3 of the 12 months of the fiscal year with nine months of expenditures left in the year. *This means that many of our expenditure projections continue as preliminary.* The differences between the "Adopted Budget" column and the "Adjusted Budget" column reflect the administrative transfers made within each "line item" of the budget as the year has progressed and specific expenditures have been modified. The "Estimated Adjustments" column reflects projected expenditures to June 30, 2018 that were not encumbered as of September 30; some indicative of market forces that have changed since the time the budget was prepared.

We encumber salaries for all full time employees and expenditures for anticipated purchases. Those encumbrances and expenditures account for 92.3% of the total budget. Actual expenditures made to date are 19.4% of total budget with encumbrances representing 72.9% of total budget. The remaining 7.4% of the budget projection represents my best estimate of unencumbered expenditures to be made during the nine months remaining in the fiscal year.

The greatest unknowns at this time are the projected substitute and overtime costs (objects 150 – 156) through the end of the year. It is too early to trend other salary expenditures as only one school month is captured in the 1Q report. Additionally, these accounts have the highest rate of volatility since staff attendance, workers compensation injuries, overtime, illness, and pregnancy cannot be definitively estimated.

The cost of heating fuel (natural gas & oil) and electricity is still an unknown since we have not entered the heating season. We have taken steps to mitigate short-term volatility by purchasing electricity and leveraging via a consortium purchase (Towns and BOEs). While electricity generation rates are fixed to January 2020 the delivery charges remain subject to market conditions. We will continue to closely monitor all utility accounts as we enter the 2017-18 heating season.

In Total Purchased Services (Object codes 300 – 332) I am projecting an end-of-year shortfall in the amount of \$158,106. This can be mostly attributed to an increase in contracted services resulting from the loss of two positions; Director of Secondary Education, and Curricular Instruction Resource Teacher (assigned to Central Office). At a future date a transfer request will be made to cover the projected shortfall with savings in the cumulative Salary accounts.

In Other Purchased Services (Object codes 510 – 580) I am projecting an end-of-year shortfall in the amount of \$112,470. The largest variance since budget adoption is the number of special education outplacements with rising tuition costs.

Listed below is a summary of the Line Item projected balances:

LINE ITEM	PROJECTED BALANCE
Total Salaries	\$494,547
Total Benefits	(\$3,787)
Total Purchased Services	(\$158,106)
Total Property Services	\$165,474
Total Other Purchased Services	(\$112,470)
Total Supplies and Materials	-
Total Equipment	-
Total Other	-
Projected Balance (Deficit)	\$385,658

I welcome the opportunity to review this projection with you.

WESTPORT PUBLIC SCHOOLS
Quarterly Financial Report - 1Q
September 30, 2017
Theoretical Expenditure Rate: 25%

2014-2015 Year-End Expense	2015-2016 Year-End Expense	2016-2017 Year-End Expense	Object Code	Descriptions	2017-2018 ADOPTED BUDGET	2017-2018 ADJUSTED BUDGET	BUDGET ADJUSTMENT	2017-2018 ENCUMBERED TO DATE	2017-2018 EXPENDED TO DATE	YTD %	ESTIMATED ADJUSTMENTS	PROJECTED TO EOY	BALANCE AVAILABLE	Balance Available %
4,854,834	5,123,525	5,357,442	100	Certified Administrators	5,299,466	5,299,466	-	4,234,993	1,060,866	20%		5,295,860	3,606	0.1%
1,673,540	1,718,389	1,769,108	101	Directors	1,872,195	1,872,195	-	1,499,961	366,523	20%		1,866,484	5,711	0.3%
21,903,838	21,947,230	22,408,703	102	Reg Ed Teachers	22,939,794	22,939,794	-	20,877,557	2,073,528	9%	25,544	22,976,629	(36,835)	-0.2%
11,149,855	11,461,883	11,649,873	103	Special Area Teachers	11,910,353	11,910,353	-	10,655,527	1,034,580	9%	21,381	11,711,488	198,865	1.7%
3,266,368	3,784,443	4,189,360	104	Support Teachers	4,332,187	4,332,187	-	3,949,968	357,669	8%	18,073	4,325,710	6,477	0.1%
153,024	146,684	138,704	105	Curr/Instr Resource	173,600	173,600	-	61,224	2,299	1%		63,523	110,077	63.4%
884,215	816,856	916,666	107	Library/Media Teachers	949,118	949,118	-	819,280	91,618	10%		910,898	38,220	4.0%
1,363,386	1,375,320	1,455,550	108	Guidance	1,487,729	1,487,729	-	1,280,039	160,452	11%	6,419	1,446,909	40,820	2.7%
4,307,725	4,352,237	4,549,144	109	Special Ed Teachers	4,700,109	4,700,109	-	4,036,035	538,699	11%	22,523	4,597,257	102,852	2.2%
1,631,963	1,633,519	1,618,793	110	Psychologists	1,648,392	1,648,392	-	1,436,274	158,179	10%	1,200	1,595,653	52,739	3.2%
280,190	287,256	255,882	113	Social Workers	268,341	268,341	-	204,123	32,261	12%		236,383	31,958	11.9%
1,281,302	1,286,630	1,342,906	114	Speech/Hearing Therapists	1,382,613	1,382,613	-	1,179,511	160,969	12%	6,756	1,347,236	35,377	2.6%
162,192	140,846	116,329	115	Staff Dev/Leadership	113,903	113,903	-	89,155	8,105	7%	16,643	113,903	-	0.0%
643,940	660,281	666,363	116	Extra-Curricular	728,625	728,625	-	-	-	0%	728,625	728,625	-	0.0%
525,193	543,223	569,512	118	Coaches-Intrmrml/Intrschlstic	630,929	630,929	-	-	-	0%	630,929	630,929	-	0.0%
235,348	189,423	129,218	119	Curriculum Work/Other	151,130	151,130	-	-	45,727	30%	105,403	151,130	-	0.0%
\$ 54,316,913	\$ 55,467,744	\$ 57,133,554		Sub-Total Certified Salaries	\$ 58,588,485	\$ 58,588,485	\$ -	\$ 50,323,647	\$ 6,091,474		\$ 1,583,496	\$ 57,998,618	589,867	1.0%
100.0%	2.1%	3.0%			2.5%	2.5%		85.9%	10.4%		2.7%	99.0%	1.0%	
1,245,692	1,391,477	1,277,138	120	Support Supervisors	1,320,998	1,320,998	-	937,789	295,025	22%	88,184	1,320,998	-	0.0%
2,436,337	2,459,950	2,537,172	121	Secretaries	2,619,793	2,619,793	-	1,911,909	567,944	22%	88,487	2,568,340	51,453	2.0%
1,897,717	1,854,620	1,847,587	122	Paraprofessionals	1,875,037	1,875,037	-	1,670,533	164,710	9%	-	1,835,243	39,794	2.1%
2,448,846	2,500,622	2,707,700	123	Sped Paraprofessionals	2,754,092	2,754,092	-	2,305,942	351,877	13%	86,093	2,743,912	10,180	0.4%
2,678,600	2,716,638	2,748,852	124	Custodians	2,720,479	2,720,479	-	2,154,987	528,008	19%	35,000	2,717,995	2,485	0.1%
551,734	564,720	529,560	125	Maintainers	594,630	594,630	-	457,408	135,736	23%	-	593,144	1,486	0.2%
836,175	858,574	910,681	126	Nurses	901,267	901,267	-	762,339	104,307	12%	34,621	901,267	-	0.0%
230,624	250,962	253,524	127	Nurses Aides	262,574	262,574	-	239,246	23,611	9%	-	262,856	(282)	-0.1%
533,588	553,531	571,660	128	Technology Assistants	586,956	586,956	-	411,071	125,833	21%	50,052	586,956	-	0.0%
65,251	205,928	293,164	129	Security Aides	327,120	327,120	-	244,752	24,542	8%	57,826	327,120	-	0.0%
219,377	232,492	241,574	130	Bus Monitors	220,000	220,000	-	-	14,254	6%	205,746	220,000	-	0.0%
198,599	226,626	245,277	131	Athletics	213,858	213,858	-	168,413	15,043	7%	30,402	213,858	-	0.0%
110,596	146,001	142,160	133	Other	144,008	144,008	-	122,271	13,304	9%	8,433	144,008	-	0.0%
487,040	561,861	594,923	135	Occupational Therapists	605,324	605,324	-	529,767	81,653	13%	-	611,420	(6,096)	-1.0%
162,051	170,394	176,085	136	Physical Therapists	182,495	182,495	-	154,227	25,531	14%	-	179,758	2,737	1.5%
150,000	17,401	21,993	140	Adult Ed Mandated	25,000	25,000	-	75	22,000	88%	-	22,075	2,925	11.7%
\$ 14,252,227	\$ 14,711,797	\$ 15,099,052		Sub-Total Non-Certified Salaries	\$ 15,353,631	\$ 15,353,631	\$ -	\$ 12,070,729	\$ 2,493,377		\$ 684,845	\$ 15,248,950	104,680	0.7%
100.0%	3.2%	2.6%			1.7%	1.7%		78.6%	16.2%		4.5%	99.3%	0.7%	
267,766	187,191	171,210	150	Perm Cert Subs	432,400	432,400	-	287,950	10,600	2%	133,850	432,400	-	0.0%
168,199	213,519	199,407	151	Daily Cert Subs	222,040	222,040	-	18,800	3,980	2%	199,260	222,040	-	0.0%

WESTPORT PUBLIC SCHOOLS
Quarterly Financial Report - 1Q
September 30, 2017
Theoretical Expenditure Rate: 25%

2014-2015 Year-End Expense	2015-2016 Year-End Expense	2016-2017 Year-End Expense	Object Code	Descriptions	2017-2018 ADOPTED BUDGET	2017-2018 ADJUSTED BUDGET	BUDGET ADJUSTMENT	2017-2018 ENCUMBERED TO DATE	2017-2018 EXPENDED TO DATE	YTD %	ESTIMATED ADJUSTMENTS	PROJECTED TO EOY	BALANCE AVAILABLE	Balance Available %
49,145	45,634	36,834	152	Staff Training Cert Subs	50,000	50,000	-	-	-	0%	50,000	50,000	-	0.0%
50,196	47,945	50,361	153	PPT Cert Subs	45,000	45,000	-	-	650	1%	44,350	45,000	-	0.0%
736,439	759,758	711,789	154	Long Term Subs	565,000	565,000	-	312,410	11,987	2%	440,603	765,000	(200,000)	-35.4%
209,479	216,713	267,253	155	Non-Cert Subs	200,000	200,000	-	9,476	43,608	22%	146,916	200,000	-	0.0%
355,379	412,140	473,855	156	Overtime	350,000	350,000	-	-	135,148	39%	214,852	350,000	-	0.0%
\$ 1,836,603	\$ 1,882,900	\$ 1,910,709		Sub-Total Other Salaries	\$ 1,864,440	\$ 1,864,440	\$ -	\$ 628,636	\$ 205,973		\$ 1,229,831	\$ 2,064,440	(200,000)	-10.7%
100.0%	2.5%	1.5%			-2.4%	-2.4%		33.7%	11.0%		66.0%	110.7%	-10.7%	
\$ 70,405,743	\$ 72,062,440	\$ 74,143,314		TOTAL SALARIES	\$ 75,806,555	\$ 75,806,555	\$ -	\$ 63,023,012	\$ 8,790,824		\$ 3,498,172	\$ 75,312,008	494,547	0.7%
100.0%	2.4%	2.9%			2.2%	2.2%		83.1%	11.6%		4.6%	99.3%	0.7%	
14,501,700	14,247,493	12,956,551	210	Health Insurance	13,447,595	13,447,595	-	8,061,329	5,386,266	40%	-	13,447,595	-	0.0%
279,470	288,098	317,898	211	Group Life Insurance	288,000	319,000	31,000	234,246	84,754	27%	-	319,000	-	0.0%
37,105	47,000	43,345	212	Teacher Child Care (WEA)	40,000	40,000	-	-	-	0%	40,000	40,000	-	0.0%
49,500	43,500	42,040	213	Health Insurance Waiver	45,000	45,000	-	25,000	6,724	15%	13,276	45,000	-	0.0%
1,886,312	1,962,571	2,016,354	220	FICA/Medicare	2,136,580	2,136,580	-	1,683,763	287,055	13%	165,762	2,136,580	-	0.0%
24,623	20,840	28,634	240	Course Reimbursement	50,000	50,000	-	1,000	5,749	11%	43,252	50,000	-	0.0%
19,195	87,866	24,449	250	Unemployment Compensation	55,000	55,000	-	27,500	10,056	18%	17,445	55,000	-	0.0%
551,512	568,206	547,396	260	Workers Compensation	475,556	444,556	(31,000)	236,568	194,775	44%	-	431,343	13,213	3.0%
33,115	39,355	35,020	287	Uniform Allowance	45,000	45,000	-	33,021	1,055	2%	10,924	45,000	-	0.0%
33,613	23,691	21,923	290	Other Employee Benefits	25,000	25,000	-	-	17,205	69%	24,795	42,000	(17,000)	-68.0%
\$ 17,416,145	\$ 17,328,620	\$ 16,033,609		TOTAL BENEFITS	\$ 16,607,731	\$ 16,607,731	\$ -	\$ 10,302,427	\$ 5,993,638		\$ 315,453	\$ 16,611,518	(3,787)	0.0%
100.0%	-0.5%	-7.5%			3.6%	3.6%		62.0%	36.1%		1.9%	100.0%	0.0%	
55,625	89,522	121,001	320	HomeBound	80,000	80,000	-	-	7,982	10%	92,018	100,000	(20,000)	-25.0%
47,665	41,118	20,178	321	Gifted Activities	40,000	40,000	-	1,062	1,230	3%	37,708	40,000	-	0.0%
-	47,610	68,700	322	Educational Interns	-	-	-	-	-	0%	-	-	-	0.0%
323,296	362,913	437,591	323	Instr Program Improvements	542,522	542,522	-	338,389	115,333	21%	188,010	641,732	(99,210)	-18.3%
20,127	15,587	11,092	324	Pupil Services	16,000	16,000	-	1,968	2,731	17%	11,301	16,000	-	0.0%
133,768	164,415	196,439	325	PPT Consultations	241,000	241,000	-	194,864	44,968	19%	1,168	241,000	-	0.0%
125,281	85,066	102,500	327	Student Evaluations-Outside	135,000	135,000	-	105,812	25,381	19%	3,807	135,000	-	0.0%
25,840	22,709	26,839	328	Medical Advisors	38,000	38,000	-	19,037	7,063	19%	11,900	38,000	-	0.0%
171,584	293,353	329,599	330	Other Prof/Tech Services	523,621	523,621	-	206,440	33,831	6%	283,349	523,621	-	0.0%
353,542	348,761	371,748	331	Legal/Negotiations	345,000	345,000	-	340,000	43,896	13%	-	383,896	(38,896)	-11.3%
66,306	-	-	332	Licenses & Fees	-	-	-	-	-	0%	-	-	-	0.0%
\$ 1,323,034	\$ 1,471,055	\$ 1,685,687		TOTAL PURCHASED SERVICES	\$ 1,961,143	\$ 1,961,143	\$ -	\$ 1,207,572	\$ 282,415		\$ 629,262	\$ 2,119,249	(158,106)	-8.1%
100.0%	11.2%	14.6%			16.3%	16.3%		61.6%	14.4%		32.1%	108.1%	-8.1%	
89,427	97,890	90,839	411	Water/Sewer	94,108	94,108	-	69,822	26,478	28%	-	96,300	(2,192)	-2.3%
1,803,729	2,058,317	1,971,458	413	Electricity	2,192,461	2,192,461	-	1,501,695	523,100	24%	-	2,024,795	167,666	7.6%

WESTPORT PUBLIC SCHOOLS
Quarterly Financial Report - 1Q
September 30, 2017
Theoretical Expenditure Rate: 25%

2014-2015 Year-End Expense	2015-2016 Year-End Expense	2016-2017 Year-End Expense	Object Code	Descriptions	2017-2018 ADOPTED BUDGET	2017-2018 ADJUSTED BUDGET	BUDGET ADJUSTMENT	2017-2018 ENCUMBERED TO DATE	2017-2018 EXPENDED TO DATE	YTD %	ESTIMATED ADJUSTMENTS	PROJECTED TO EOY	BALANCE AVAILABLE	Balance Available %
1,250,583	947,428	745,332	414	Natural Gas	1,022,822	1,022,822		726,542	47,233	5%	249,047	1,022,822	-	0.0%
87,477	12,062	13,196	415	Heating Oil	18,391	18,391		13,387	213	1%	4,791	18,391	-	0.0%
466,216	449,416	557,524	421	Contracted Maintenance	563,360	563,360		308,449	228,300	41%	26,611	563,360	-	0.0%
408,209	472,140	544,024	431	Building Maintenance	395,445	395,445		25,430	296,316	75%	73,699	395,445	-	0.0%
185,375	214,830	315,436	432	Grounds Maintenance	293,540	293,540		72,270	64,009	22%	157,261	293,540	-	0.0%
80,204	67,596	87,353	433	Repair Equip (Instructional)	102,515	102,515		25,810	12,883	13%	63,822	102,515	-	0.0%
74,313	59,180	35,536	434	Repair Equip (Non-Instructional)	79,050	79,050		170	5,503	7%	73,377	79,050	-	0.0%
1,522,111	55,511	314,886	435	Building Projects	278,132	282,645	4,513	112,637	42,550	15%	127,458	282,645	-	0.0%
136,400	55,778	228,432	436	Grounds Projects	363,780	359,267	(4,513)	17,550	124,070	35%	217,647	359,267	-	0.0%
342,984	441,008	626,838	437	Restore/Prevent Maintenance	230,500	230,500		7,750	24,405	11%	198,345	230,500	-	0.0%
185,405	170,845	161,462	440	Equip Rentals & Copiers	170,999	170,999		146,099	21,155	12%	3,746	170,999	-	0.0%
34,357	41,599	44,164	441	Building Rental	45,685	45,685		30,500	15,184	33%	1	45,685	-	0.0%
12,791	8,852	6,535	450	Gas/Travel Maintenance	13,860	13,860		5,170	1,003	7%	7,687	13,860	-	0.0%
222,009	245,173	194,453	451	Custodial Supplies	255,000	255,000		174,000	79,944	31%	1,056	255,000	-	0.0%
265,915	278,649	267,611	452	Maintenance Supplies	265,800	265,800		2,252	29,981	11%	233,567	265,800	-	0.0%
73,897	91,935	102,515	490	School Security	100,000	100,000		6,936	65,674	66%	27,390	100,000	-	0.0%
\$ 7,241,402	\$ 5,768,207	\$ 6,307,594		TOTAL PROPERTY SERVICES	\$ 6,485,448	\$ 6,485,448	\$ -	\$ 3,246,469	\$ 1,608,001		\$ 1,465,505	\$ 6,319,974	165,474	2.6%
100.0%	-20.3%	9.4%			2.8%	2.8%		50.1%	24.8%		22.6%	97.4%	2.6%	
3,031,623	3,317,099	3,584,711	510	Transportation - Regular	3,830,118	3,830,118		1,880,964	1,880,964	49%	68,191	3,830,118	-	0.0%
652,651	734,356	788,293	511	Trans-Spec Ed-Internal	913,194	913,194		446,072	406,072	44%	61,049	913,194	-	0.0%
144,469	163,391	182,149	512	Trans-Spec Ed-Public	138,570	138,570		-	5,727	4%	132,843	138,570	-	0.0%
271,964	330,884	352,591	513	Trans-Spec Ed-Private	343,650	343,650		4,705	40,037	12%	298,908	343,650	-	0.0%
29,731	35,945	37,539	516	Trans-Field Trips	41,002	41,002		13,492	3,204	8%	24,306	41,002	-	0.0%
256,742	173,175	157,350	517	Gasoline-Buses	238,750	238,750		-	-	0%	238,750	238,750	-	0.0%
174,755	185,491	146,958	520	Property Insurance	169,992	164,526	(5,466)	90,314	71,941	44%	-	162,256	2,270	1.4%
13,362	15,573	10,489	521	Flood Insurance	21,318	11,318	(10,000)	10,489	-	0%	-	10,489	829	7.3%
298,587	308,026	336,798	523	Liability Insurance	320,383	310,383	(10,000)	96,127	192,287	62%	10,625	299,039	11,344	3.7%
75,781	104,410	109,106	529	Athletic Insurance	120,017	145,483	25,466	-	145,483	100%	-	145,483	-	0.0%
598,442	424,940	479,644	530	Communication Systems	361,864	361,864		87,200	148,364	41%	126,301	361,864	-	0.0%
36,153	42,263	36,348	535	Postage	40,000	40,000		27,455	6,340	16%	6,205	40,000	-	0.0%
97,209	48,783	21,307	540	Advertising	77,500	77,500		7,185	471	1%	69,844	77,500	-	0.0%
31,486	31,172	25,867	550	Printing	32,240	32,240		4,491	10,116	31%	17,633	32,240	-	0.0%
1,619,445	1,513,287	2,003,856	560	Tuition-Public	1,874,754	1,874,754		1,918,482	722,089	39%	(625,426)	2,015,145	(140,391)	-7.5%
48,368	46,521	39,019	563	Tuition-Court & Agency Placed	55,000	55,000		-	10,818	20%	30,705	41,523	13,478	24.5%
44,290	29,324	-	565	Tuition-Alternative Ed	-	-		-	-	0%	-	-	-	0.0%
498,900	501,518	571,136	567	Tuition-Litigation	475,000	475,000		210,550	10,000	2%	254,450	475,000	-	0.0%
12,055	20,000	11,555	569	Tuition-Summer Programs	20,000	20,000		-	17,523	88%	2,477	20,000	-	0.0%
29,339	55,881	36,871	580	Staff Travel/Mileage	58,770	58,770		24,791	4,674	8%	29,305	58,770	-	0.0%
\$ 7,965,352	\$ 8,082,039	\$ 8,931,586		TOTAL OTHER PURCH SERVICES	\$ 9,132,122	\$ 9,132,122	\$ -	\$ 4,822,316	\$ 3,676,110		\$ 746,166	\$ 9,244,592	(112,470)	-1.2%

WESTPORT PUBLIC SCHOOLS
Quarterly Financial Report - 1Q
September 30, 2017
Theoretical Expenditure Rate: 25%

2014-2015 Year-End Expense	2015-2016 Year-End Expense	2016-2017 Year-End Expense	Object Code	Descriptions	2017-2018 ADOPTED BUDGET	2017-2018 ADJUSTED BUDGET	BUDGET ADJUSTMENT	2017-2018 ENCUMBERED TO DATE	2017-2018 EXPENDED TO DATE	YTD %	ESTIMATED ADJUSTMENTS	PROJECTED TO EOY	BALANCE AVAILABLE	Balance Available %
100.0%	1.5%	10.5%			2.2%	2.2%		52.8%	40.3%		8.2%	101.2%	-1.2%	
1,016,020	913,069	926,363	611	Supplies-Instructional	963,324	961,410	(1,914)	128,881	454,073	47%	378,456	961,410	-	0.0%
646,077	645,706	681,001	612	Software	886,388	886,947	559	55,566	667,957	75%	163,424	886,947	-	0.0%
134,139	170,135	156,539	613	Tech Supplies	151,925	151,925	-	3,368	28,573	19%	119,984	151,925	-	0.0%
35,646	36,924	37,260	615	Graduation Expenses	36,856	36,856	-	1,407	-	0%	35,449	36,856	-	0.0%
643,441	633,636	673,153	641	Textbooks	459,325	460,914	1,589	38,625	128,295	28%	293,994	460,914	-	0.0%
131,510	118,422	115,487	642	Library Books & Periodicals	121,569	121,919	350	42,875	30,429	25%	48,616	121,919	-	0.0%
14,615	14,856	15,750	643	A/V Materials	14,201	13,851	(350)	143	902	7%	12,806	13,851	-	0.0%
155,371	156,056	162,409	690	Non Instructional Supplies	181,400	181,166	(234)	61,140	45,264	25%	74,762	181,166	-	0.0%
29,089	27,496	19,044	691	Health Supplies	28,489	28,489	-	3,330	3,583	13%	21,575	28,489	-	0.0%
\$ 2,805,908	\$ 2,716,299	\$ 2,787,006		TOTAL SUPPLIES AND MTLs.	\$ 2,843,477	\$ 2,843,477	\$ -	\$ 335,334	\$ 1,359,076		\$ 1,149,067	\$ 2,843,477	-	0.0%
100.0%	-3.2%	2.6%			2.0%	2.0%		11.8%	47.8%		40.4%	100.0%	0.0%	
61,690	109,522	85,358	731	Equip-New Instructional	54,281	52,906	(1,375)	8,997	9,162	17%	34,747	52,906	-	0.0%
51,772	285,141	9,477	732	Equip-New Non Instructional	76,179	76,697	518	19,960	44,366	58%	12,371	76,697	-	0.0%
26,393	150,279	69,530	733	Equip-Replace Instructional	70,033	70,033	-	19,358	35,689	51%	14,986	70,033	-	0.0%
8,507	82,622	20,540	734	Equip-Replace Non Instructional	12,654	9,895	(2,759)	2,595	-	0%	7,300	9,895	-	0.0%
105,493	122,380	247,426	735	Furniture	25,242	28,858	3,616	7,458	8,891	31%	12,508	28,858	-	0.0%
1,037,198	1,034,670	998,464	736	Tech Equip-Instructional	754,019	749,849	(4,170)	24,750	287,757	38%	437,343	749,849	-	0.0%
26,729	18,151	40,988	737	Tech Equip-Non Instructional	36,268	40,438	4,170	6,330	31,760	79%	2,348	40,438	-	0.0%
\$ 1,317,782	\$ 1,802,765	\$ 1,471,782		TOTAL EQUIPMENT	\$ 1,028,676	\$ 1,028,676	\$ -	\$ 89,448	\$ 417,625		\$ 521,602	\$ 1,028,676	-	0.0%
100.0%	36.8%	-18.4%			-30.1%	-30.1%		8.7%	40.6%		50.7%	100.0%	0.0%	
77,075	80,833	86,472	810	Dues & Fees	92,462	92,462		6,817	64,588	70%	21,057	92,462	-	0.0%
27,254	29,950	31,743	811	Student Act & Awards	29,398	29,398		14,633	1,305	4%	13,460	29,398	-	0.0%
399,528	395,590	412,017	812	Student Athletics	390,334	390,334		300,724	40,008	10%	49,602	390,334	-	0.0%
\$ 503,857	\$ 506,373	\$ 530,233		TOTAL OTHER	\$ 512,194	\$ 512,194	\$ -	\$ 322,174	\$ 105,901		\$ 84,119	\$ 512,194	-	0.0%
100.0%	0.5%	4.7%			-3.4%	-3.4%		62.9%	20.7%		16.4%	100.0%	0.0%	
\$ 108,979,222	\$ 109,737,798	\$ 111,890,812		GRAND TOTAL	\$ 114,377,346	\$ 114,377,346	\$ -	\$ 83,348,751	\$ 22,233,590		\$ 8,409,347	\$ 113,991,688	385,658	0.3%
100.0%	0.7%	2.0%			2.2%	2.2%		72.9%	19.4%		7.4%	99.66%	0.3%	