



Monterey Select Board

SOUTHERN BERKSHIRE REGIONAL SCHOOL DISTRICT

July 2, 2013

PLEASE POST

Notice:

The Buildings, Grounds & Technology Subcommittee of the of the Southern Berkshire Regional School Committee will Meet with Members of the Select Boards of Alford, Egremont, Monterey, New Marlborough and Sheffield on

**Wednesday, July 31, 2013
6:00 – 7:30 p.m.**

Mt. Everett Regional School 491 Berkshire School Road
Sheffield, MA

(Members of the Public are Invited to Attend)

AGENDA

1. Distribution and approval of minutes (M. Rundle)
2. Presentation of student demographic information of the Community Schools past and future (V. Valentini)
3. Presentation of current operating costs for the Community Schools (V. Valentini)
4. Presentation of preliminary estimate of capital requirements of the Community Schools as developed by B. Turner, F. Finkle (V. Valentini)
5. Open discussion
6. Adjourn

Michael J. Singleton, Ed.D.
Superintendent

Bruce C. Turner
Business Administrator

Carl Stewart
School Committee Chair

E. Bonnie Silvers
School Committee Vice Chair

School Committee Members

Arthur J. Batacchi, Jr.

Kenzie Fields

Charles B. Flynn

Maria Rundle

Jennifer Sahn

H. Dennis Sears

Kristen Sparhawk

Vito Valentini

Southern Berkshire Regional School District
Mt. Everett Regional School Sheffield, MA
June 25, 2013

Buildings, Grounds, and Technology Sub-committee Meeting with the Selectmen from the local towns

Sub-committee members: Jennifer Sahn, Bonnie Silvers, Maria Rundle, Vito Valentini

Others present: Rene Wood, Tara White, Bruce Turner, Nat Yohalem, Muriel Lazzarini, Charlie Ketchen, Carl Stewart, Julie Hannum, Wayne Burkhardt, Ted Dobson, and Tom Casey from the Berkshire Record

Meeting brought to order at 6:07pm

Introductions were made around the table.

Mr. Valentini thanked everyone for coming and emphasized the district's commitment to supporting an educational program in the community schools. He reminded everyone that the School Committee had voted to keep the program and that we were not meeting tonight to discuss closing those schools.

Mr. Ketchem interjected that Alford voted to have the School Committee (SC) put the question of closing the schools on the ballot for all taxpayers to have a vote. He asked why that had not happened. Mr. Valentini reminded him that the SC had voted last year *not* to bring the question to the voters and that he did not know about a separate vote by Alford otherwise. Mr. Stewart asked how a vote on which schools to close could be executed legally by each of the five towns.

Ms. Sahn reminded everyone that this issue was not on tonight's agenda and Mr. Valentini proceeded with his welcome of the selectmen to the BG&T meeting. He reiterated that the vote by the SC was that these community schools are valuable programs and that the issue of the viability of the program has been separated from the issue of the viability of the facilities. The Elementary Task Force described significant capital needs in the community schools but finding solutions to those capital needs is outside the scope of what this committee can solve. Instead, the BG&T sub-committee wants to work with the five towns as a group to come up with options.

Mr. Valentini acknowledged that as these meetings go forward we may need to modify the Regional Agreement (*attached document*), which he referred to as ambiguous as to ownership of capital needs. He added that either the group makes a decision about what "maintenance" means as set out in the agreement or the issue could lead to a court case to determine legal responsibility for the maintenance of the buildings.

Mr. Yohalem cited p. 6, paragraph 4 of the Regional Agreement to argue that capital costs have been treated as though they were apportioned among the five towns, as stipulated in paragraph 3, p. 6, while paragraph 4 directly mentions capital, operations, and transportation in a different context. The question arose as to what "cost of site" means and Ms. Lazzarini suggested that a new roof would fall within that definition. Mr. Valentini reiterated that the District does not own the buildings and Ms. Sahn reminded everyone that this sub-committee is bringing the towns together to because the SC can't pass budgets so we're trying to find a way to work on this all together.

Ms. Lazzarini said that if we want to find new solutions, we can't rely on this Regional Agreement to have the answers. Mr. Yohalem replied that the practical problem is that we can't get the capital costs through the towns' budgets and each town is trying to problem-solve on their own; Monterey is moving ahead at looking at building their own school and Egremont has found some government funding. Mr. Turner clarified that the funding was \$12,000 and allocated for making the building more handicapped accessible. Mr. Yohalem noted that New Marlborough had done nothing.

Mr. Ketchen reminded everyone that to change the Regional Agreement and to change how the buildings are paid for has to go to all five towns for a vote and be agreed upon by four of the five. Ms. Lazzarini added that opening the Agreement up for this one change could leave the whole agreement open to revision.

Mr. Valentini said that only in the last 2-3 years has there been adequate funding for capital needs and that this year the district applied to the School Building Authority (SBA) for funding for larger projects. Mr. Ketchen agreed that there have been great improvements in the Sheffield campus in the last couple years but added that in 2000-2001 there were 1000 students where there are now only 775 and that those higher numbers of students would not be coming back. From that perspective, he found it hard to justify sinking money into the outlying schools.

Ms. Silvers reminded everyone that at this initial meeting we were looking for a way to address this problem together and not go back to the days of people acting as though they were out for their own piece of turf. There was general agreement that those had been some hard and ugly times.

Mr. Stewart referred the group back to p. 6, paragraph 4a of the Regional Agreement where it is written that capital is apportioned for a *new* school. Mr. Yohalem disagreed and (jokingly) offered the New Marlborough Central School to the district for \$1.00. Mr. Valentini emphasized that that's the kind of creative thinking we should engage in with this group.

Mr. Yohalem continued that the real problem is whether the district and towns want to sink \$2 million in these three buildings. The selectmen need to make a recommendation to voters that makes sense and he was doubtful that that idea could be sold. Ms. White added that the cost is more than \$2 million because you also have to maintain the Sheffield campus and Mr. Ketchen added that the community schools would have to be maintained, too, along with paying teachers salaries. He suggested decreasing staff size through attrition and asked how much it costs to keep an outlying school open.

Mr. Valentini answered that we do not have an average cost per student in the district. He asked, "Is it expensive to operate Monterey? Yes. Is it of a magnitude that's different than other special programs like athletics for students here? I don't think so." Ms. Sahn added that the community schools keep the district viable and draw students. She emphasized the need to publicize these schools more to attract more school choice students.

Mr. Ketchen asked where Monterey and New Marlborough students go when they graduate. Mr. Valentini responded that there is a question of how we service better transportation to these towns on the table in the Transportation sub-committee so that it is more attractive for families to stay in the district. Mr. Ketchen added that Alford closed its community school for the betterment of the district and that he is in favor of keeping the district at the top level. Mr. Valentini appreciated his past experience and Ms. Lazzarini suggested that this group start from "now" and reminded everyone that the history was nasty but that the present SC is turning that around.

Mr. Yohalem asked what the capital costs really are and asked to hear where the five towns were in addressing this issue. Mr. Burkhart spoke for Monterey and shared that the town's capital assessment of the school that was done a few years ago was scary. He encouraged the group to figure out what form of support the district could offer and then try and see if Monterey could work with that to build its own school building. He asked if New Marlborough Central (NMC) might be more important to the district and ownership of the building be subsumed to the district and suggested that solutions might vary as to what to do about these schools. He emphasized that the district has to have give and take with the towns to see how possible it is to move forward. Monterey has had architectural drawings made of a new school for the town and they were passed out at the May Town Meeting. Selectman Scott Jensen is chairing a committee to move this project forward if feasible. There is a location and land reserved for this project and the program could remain the same (early kindergarten and kindergarten) or change.

(Mr. Stewart left the meeting.)

Mr. Valentini noted that the Transportation sub-committee is looking at smaller vehicles such as vans that would transport 10-12 students and minimize bus routes. Mr. Yohalem asked if this proposal could be sold to the town and Ms. Lazzarini affirmed that if could. Mr. Burkhart added that there is a lot of commitment from the town but that Monterey is not facility rich and its population has decreased. The finance committee is committed to making this new building a part of the solution but it takes cooperation with the district. Ms. White interjected that most of Monterey's kids aren't Monterey kids and was corrected that that is not true. She went on that the students from Monterey go outside the district for their further education. Mr. Valentini reiterated that transportation might be a factor and that it was possible to make changes in getting students to and from Great Barrington. He emphasized that we have the best schools in the county and getting students to stay in district is a matter of logistics and PR. Ms. White pressed on that transportation is an added expense and something that needs to be added in to the cost of the community schools. Mr. Valentini assured her that there were inefficiencies to be eliminated that would help streamline costs and Ms. Silvers suggested the use of software programs to increase efficiency.

(Mr. Dobson joined the meeting.)

Ms. Silvers suggested that there are many ways in which the district is making positive changes and asked that if the selectmen felt that the SC was making strides towards excellence, that they join us in solving this capital needs issue together.

Mr. Turner spoke for the town of Egremont. He shared that the town received a historic preservation grant of \$24,000 to make the building handicapped accessible. Mr. Yohalem asked if the town is prepared to spend \$350,000 on the estimated capital costs and Mr. Turner responded that the town is capable but not necessarily prepared to do so. Ms. Rundle noted that these capital costs are the result of years of neglect by the district to maintain these buildings and that while there was not always money in the budget to make improvements on any of these buildings, including the Sheffield campus, there has been money in the capital budget for the past 2-3 years but that it hasn't gone towards capital expenses in the community schools. Ms. Wood reminded the group that the bond for capital costs was rejected by voters 3 years ago.

Mr. Turner and Fred Finkle listed all capital costs in the application to the SBA, including construction of a new school in Monterey. Mr. Yohalem noted that the capital costs for NMC were

estimated at \$800k a few years ago and since then more needed improvements have come to light, specifically from the recommendations of the Elementary Schools Task Force that the building be expanded and pre-k programs added. He estimated the new figure at \$1-1.5 million and said that the voters wouldn't pay that for the school, that it would have to come from private donors, especially since Sheffield pays 57% of the bill.

Ms. Hannum spoke for the town of Sheffield as the chairwoman of their board. She said she couldn't see Sheffield ponying up 57% of \$1.5 million; that all these towns have infrastructure issues and are worried about money. The voters would probably vote no. Mr. Ketchen again suggested that the question go to the voters as to whether or not they want to fix up the outlying schools. Ms. Wood responded that it might sabotage the vote to bring all capital needs to the voters and that the capital needs of the community schools be singled out from the capital needs of the Sheffield campus.

Mr. Valentini reminded the group that the district is supporting the educational programs in the community schools, that the district is well supported by the towns, and that the towns are getting along with each other right now. There were some clarifying points made about the SBA submission: the district does not have a dollar figure on the requests made to the SBA or a timetable besides the accelerated repair request for improvements to the Sheffield campus. The next step would be for the SBA to invite the district into the second round of applications. The capital needs of the Sheffield campus are not in a crisis situation or as critical as those of the community schools.

Ms. Wood said that she could not support anything that would address the capital needs of the community schools and not the Sheffield campus. Mr. Yohalem added that the district needed to go to the voters with a capital needs plan for the next 5 years and that they would need a \$4 million bond.

Ms. Wood noted that this is a very delicate issue to bring forward in a way that doesn't raise the issue of closing the community schools. She added that the SC and Task Force made a funding commitment to the program but the capital costs are owned by the towns, with a special consideration of NMC. Ms. Rundle noted that in following through on that support of the educational program in the community schools, nothing would be taken away or diminished in the educational program on the Sheffield campus. Mr. Yohalem disagreed, noting that if you close the schools you save taxes. Ms. Sahn suggested the SC put a timeline on the commitment to not close the community schools.

Mr. Valentini noted that the next step for this group is to get together the information mentioned in this meeting. Mr. Ketchen reiterated that each town should vote at their annual meetings on whether to keep the schools open and then proceed with funding from there. Ms. White also said that she can't ask for the vote without knowing what the district commitment is and that the selectmen meetings were packed every week last year with supporters of the community schools but that not one of those people have been seen since then because their only position was to keep the school open. She added that the question of keeping the school open would be decided by whoever showed up to the Town meeting and they would probably vote no. She also added that the voters in her town support the schools and are passionate and informed so the political presentation of any changes would have to be taken into account.

Mr. Valentini agreed and emphasized a unified approach

Mr. Yohalem asked what it would cost to close the schools and Ms. White reminded the group about the 5 bridges needed in New Marlborough. Mr. Burkhart responded that there's no good in pitting one town against the other and asked the group to be more positive. All the towns have infrastructure issues and Monterey is willing to do something to ensure an education program in the town but not if everybody else doesn't also do something.

Mr. Valentini spoke as the only member of the group who had voted to keep the community schools open last year. He shared that he made that evaluation not based on a financial figure but from the point of view that the community schools are valuable to the district. He did not like the way the schools were advocated for by some people but came to the conclusion that the programs are valuable. He added that if Monterey decides not to have a program, the district can't do anything about it and that in his opinion the least valuable school is Egremont. He urged the group to stop saying that it costs more to send a child to Monterey than Sheffield because it's divisive. Ms. Wood responded that all the schools have value but money spent in one means there's less money to spend in another. Mr. Ketchen noted that it's for the betterment of the SBRSD to cut off the extremities to keep the district alive.

Ms. Silvers reminded the group that the SC has been trying to change the perception in the public of the quality of education in the SBRSD and progress is being made on that front. She asked for more facts and figures on possible solutions so that if something is so beyond a realistic possibility for the district, it will be seen by the group and will probably be unpopular with everyone and thereby avoid a fight. Ms. Rundle added that the community schools are making a concerted effort to create a district identity for students and increase retention of these children in the district as they graduate. Mr. Valentini noted that the figures used in the Superintendent's proposal to close the schools in 2012 co-inflated capital needs and operating costs and gave the wrong impression. Ms. Sahn emphasized that the positive changes happening on the SC were just the beginning and that there were more big things ahead, such as what is coming out of the Transportation sub-committee. She noted that looking at the historical numbers will not be an accurate reflection of the SC's goals for supporting a robust, special district.

Mr. Dobson encouraged an environment of positive synergy between the towns, balanced by respect for the bottom line, too. Ms. Wood noted that education of the voters by the SC is important and that non-parents do not know what goes on in the schools. She encouraged an aggressive marketing campaign to sell these programs to the voters who will be voting to approve a bond, as well as attendance at select board meetings by SC members. Mr. Ketchen added that it is more convenient to school choice these kids when there is adequate transportation and that he had advocated in the past for sending a bus to Big Y to make that possible.

Mr. Valentini suggested a tentative date of Tuesday July 30th for a next meeting and this meeting was adjourned at 7:42pm.

Southern Berkshire Regional School District

ENROLLMENT OF DISTRICT STUDENTS BY TOWN AND GRADE, 10/3/2012

	Alford			Egremont			Monterey			New Marlborough			Sheffield			Total Students Residing in District
	In-District	Choice Out	Private	In-District	Choice Out	Private	In-District	Choice Out	Private	In-District	Choice Out	Private	In-District	Choice Out	Private	
Kdg.	2	1	0	8	0	0	10	1	1	1	3	0	11	3	0	
PK	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	
1	1	0	0	8	2	1	3	2	0	0	1	0	12	1	0	
2	3	3	0	6	0	4	4	1	0	0	0	1	6	1	3	
3	0	2	1	4	4	3	5	0	2	3	1	1	10	3	1	
4	0	0	2	5	0	1	1	4	1	2	2	2	13	0	1	
5	0	3	2	6	2	2	5	2	0	1	2	1	7	3	1	
6	0	2	1	4	1	4	0	3	0	3	3	3	11	0	4	
7	1	1	0	2	2	3	2	3	3	2	2	3	8	2	4	
8	3	0	3	6	1	2	4	9	1	1	2	2	13	4	3	
9	2	0	0	5	1	2	5	3	0	0	2	1	11	3	6	
10	1	2	1	7	4	4	2	4	1	1	4	1	7	4	8	
11	0	1	1	4	2	2	1	2	0	0	3	2	5	5	4	
12	0	1	2	3	1	1	1	6	0	0	1	1	10	4	10	
UG	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Total	10	16	13	69	20	30	45	40	9	128	32	20	382	33	48	
Total Students 10/3/12	39			119			94			180			463			895
Total Students 10/3/11	51			131			91.5			190			497.5			961
Total Students 10/1/10	53			141			97.5			188			503.5			983
Total Students 10/1/09	57			146			102.5			185			525.5			1016
Total Students 10/1/08	53			145			96			202			540			1036
Total Students 10/1/07	56			146			103.5			212			573.5			1091
Total Students 10/1/06	62			158			102			216			562			1100

Note: Sheffield's private school numbers include 5 who attend out of state vocational schools (paid directly by the town)

Southern Berkshire Regional School District

Enrollment by School and Town As of October 3, 2012

School	# Students	Town of Residence
Monterey:	7	Monterey
	1	New Marlborough
	3	Choice
Total:	11	
Egremont:	1	Alford
	5	Egremont
	4	Choice
Total:	10	
New Marlborough	3	Egremont
	12	Monterey
	25	New Marlborough
	12	Sheffield
	7	Choice
	10	PreK
Total:	69	
Undermountain	2	Alford
	34	Egremont
	9	Monterey
	46	New Marlborough
	198	Sheffield
	1	Mt. Washington
	50	Choice
	3	Out of State
Total:	343	
Mt. Everett	7	Alford
	27	Egremont
	15	Monterey
	54	New Marlborough
	173	Sheffield
	9	Mt. Washington
	1	Out of State
	57	Choice
Total:	343	
District Total:	776	

Southern Berkshire Regional School District

Enrollment by School and Town As of October 3, 2011

School	# Students	Town of Residence
Monterey:	6	Monterey
	4	Choice
Total:	10	
Egremont:	3	Alford
	7	Egremont
	4	Sheffield
	3	Choice
Total:	17	
New Marlborough:	2	Egremont
	12	Monterey
	39	New Marlborough
	13	Sheffield
	8	Choice
Total:	75	
Undermountain	2	Alford
	32	Egremont
	9	Monterey
	46	New Marlborough
	199	Sheffield
	5	Mt. Washington
	53	Choice
Total:	346	
Mt. Everett	9	Alford
	28	Egremont
	15.5	Monterey
	53	New Marlborough
	187.5	Sheffield
	8	Mt. Washington
	1	Out of State
	1	Tuition
	58	Choice
Total:	361	
District Total:	809	

Southern Berkshire Regional School District

Enrollment by School and Town
As of October 1, 2010

School	# Students	Town of Residence
Monterey:	6	Monterey
	5	Choice
Total:	11	
Egremont:	3	Alford
	6	Egremont
	4	Sheffield
	1	Monterey
	3	Choice
	1	Mt. Washington
Total:	18	
New Marlborough:	16	Monterey
	38	New Marlborough
	13	Sheffield
	8	Choice
Total:	75	
Undermountain	7	Alford
	37	Egremont
	13	Monterey
	50	New Marlborough
	197	Sheffield
	6	Mt. Washington
	61	Choice
Total:	371	
Mt. Everett	6	Alford
	34	Egremont
	14	Monterey
	56	New Marlborough
	213	Sheffield
	6	Mt. Washington
	1	Out of State
	1	Tuition
	61	Choice
	2	Foreign Exchange
	394	
Total:		
District Total:	869	

Southern Berkshire Regional School District

**Enrollment by School and Town
As of October 1, 2009**

School	# Students	Town of Residence
Monterey:	7	Monterey
Total:	7	
Egremont:	2	Alford
	6	Egremont
	2	Sheffield
	1	Monterey
	6	Choice
Total:	17	
New Marlborough:	1	Egremont
	13	Monterey
	43	New Marlborough
	17	Sheffield
	8	Choice
Total:	82	
Undermountain	6	Alford
	42	Egremont
	16	Monterey
	47	New Marlborough
	209	Sheffield
	8	Mt. Washington
	65	Choice
	1	Out of State *
Total:	394	
Mt. Everett	10	Alford
	35	Egremont
	11.5	Monterey
	57	New Marlborough
	217.5	Sheffield
	6	Mt. Washington
	2	Tuition
	61	Choice
	1	Out of State *
	401	
Total:		
District Total:	901	

* Out of state = 2 children of out-of-state staff members

Choice from Monterey (07-11)

- Monterey:
 - 2-Farmington River
 - 2 BHRSD
 - 1 Steiner.
- Otis: All 8 students returned to home district.
- Sandisfield: The one student returned to home district.
- Stockbridge: The one student attended NMC.

Thursday, July 25, 2013

7

Monterey

Where they went after June 2012

- **Monterey (6)**
 - 4-Monterey
 - 2-New Marlborough Central
- **Otis (3)**
 - 3-Undermountain Elementary
- **Sandisfield (1)**
 - 1-New Marlborough Central

Thursday, July 25, 2013

8

So. Egremont School

Thursday, July 25, 2013

9

So Egremont School Details

Town	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12
Egremont	6	3	6	6	7
Sheffield	4	4	2	4	4
Alford	2	0	2	4	3
Gt. Barrington	7	9	5	3	4
W. Stockbridge	0	1	1	1	0
Monterey	0	0	1	1	0
TOTAL	19	17	17	19	18

Thursday, July 25, 2013

10

So. Egremont Student Years (07-11)

- Egremont 28
- Gt. Barrington 21
- Sheffield 18
- Alford 11
- West Stockbridge 3
- Monterey 2

Average enrollment: 18 students

Thursday, July 25, 2013

11

Choice from So. Egremont (07-11)

- Egremont & Sheffield: No Choice students
- Alford:
 - 2 students to BHRSD
- Monterey: The one student moved to BHRSD
- Gt. Barrington:
 - 3 returned to BHRSD
- West Stockbridge: Both students returned to BHRSD

Thursday, July 25, 2013

12

South Egremont

Where they went after June 2012

- **Egremont (7)**
 - 2-UME
 - 2-Egremont
 - 1- New Marlborough Central
 - 2-BHRSD
- **Great Barrington (4)**
 - 2-Egremont
 - 1-UME
 - 1-BHRSD

Thursday, July 25, 2013

13

South Egremont

Where they went in 2012

- **Alford (3)**
 - 1-UME
 - 1-Egremont
 - 1-BHRSD
- **Sheffield (4)**
 - 2-Undermountain
 - 2-New Marlborough

Thursday, July 25, 2013

14

New Marlborough Central School

Thursday, July 25, 2013

15

New Marlborough Central Details

Town	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12
New Marlborough	45	47	40	38	38
Monterey	14	10	12	14	13
Sheffield	15	20	17	13	15
Gt. Barrington	1	3	5	5	6
Sandisfield	7	6	6	6	6
Egremont	1	1	0	0	2
TOTAL	83	87	80	76	80

Thursday, July 25, 2013

16

New Marlborough Central Student Years

- New Marlborough 208
- Monterey 63
- Sheffield 80
- Sandisfield 31
- Great Barrington 20
- Egremont 2

Average enrollment: 81 students

Thursday, July 25, 2013

17

Choice from New Marlborough (07-11)

- New Marlborough:
 - 5 to BHRSD
 - 3 to St. Mary's
 - 1 to Montessori
- Monterey: 1 to BHRSD
- Sheffield : 1 to St. Mary's
- Sandisfield: 1 to BHRSD
- Gt. Barrington: 8 returned to BHRSD

Thursday, July 25, 2013

18

New Marlborough Central

Where they went in 2012

- **New Marlborough (38)**
 - 23-New Marlborough Central
 - 8-Undermountain Elementary School
 - 5-BHRSD
 - 2-St. Mary's
- **Sheffield (15)**
 - 4-Undermountain Elementary School
 - 9-New Marlborough Central
 - 1-BHRSD
- **Egremont (2)**
 - 1-New Marlborough
 - 1-Moved to Connecticut

Thursday, July 25, 2013

19

New Marlborough Central

Where they went in 2012

- **Monterey (13)**
 - 4-Undermountain
 - 9-New Marlborough Central
- **Great Barrington (6)**
 - 5- New Marlborough Central
 - 1-BHRSD
- **Sandisfield (6)**
 - 5-New Marlborough Central
 - 1-BHRSD

Thursday, July 25, 2013

20

The Egremont School

Operational Costs – As extracted from the budget lines. (Dollars)

(Exclusive of all capital costs)

Internet access	750
Electricity	1,200
Telephone	1,800
Water	1,800
Heating	3,700
Custodial Services	3,500
(Time allocation of provider whose main employ is at the Sheffield campus)	
Food Service: No Extra personnel required.	-0-
Transportation	-0-
(There are no building specific transportation services provided to Egremont School)	
Teacher K/1	54, 140 (12,500)
Aide K/1	13,885(12,500)
Total: (Before offsets)	<u>81, 475(25,000)</u>

Offsets:

Internet Access	-0-
Electricity	-0-
Telephone	-0-
Water	-0-
Heating	-0-
Custodial Services	3,500
(Provider would be reassigned to Sheffield Campus)	
Food Service:	-0-
Transportation	-0-
Teacher K/1	54,140(12,500)
Aide K/1	13,885(12,500)
The historical average enrollment is 18. Therefore it will still be necessary to provide services if the program were housed at UME)	
Total offset necessary to provide services at UME	71,525(25,000)
Net operating Costs	<u>9,950</u>

New Marlboro Central

Operational Costs – As extracted from budget lines. (Dollars)
(Exclusive of all capital costs.)

Internet Access	5,500
Electricity	8,000
Telephone	250
Gas (Kitchen)	700
Heating	18,000
Custodial Services	31,750 (12,500)
Food service (This is the gross cost before any offset by income generated by food sales.)	16,000
Transportation (Transportation costs would remain constant or even increase slightly if program terminated.)	-0-
Personnel	
Teacher Pre-K	61,000 (12,500)
Teacher K	79,670 (12,500)
Teacher 1 (.5)	23,342 (12,500)
Teacher 2 (.5, .5)	47,897(12,500)
Teacher 3 (.5,.5)	50,320 (12,500)
Teacher 4 (.5)	20, 128
(Total teacher roster = 5)	
Aide Pre-K (.5)	8,884
Aide K	20,074(12,500)
Aide 1 and 2	19,924(12, 500)
Aide 3 and 4	13,848
SPED (1.5)	41,502(12,500)
Teacher Title 1 (.5) (Shared with UME)	20,128
SPED/ESP(.5)	40,256
Secretary NMC	32,076 (12,500)
Nurse NMC(.5)	24,427
Total: (Before offsets)	<u>583,676 (125,000)</u>

Offsets:

Internet Access	-0-
Electricity	-0-
Telephone	-0-
Gas	-0-
Heating	-0-

Custodial Services: -0-

(For purposes of this report, I shall consider this to be a fully recoverable expense with -0- offset. However, in actual practice these services would probably be reassigned to the Sheffield Campus.

Food service (In this case, these services are part of the full food service staff, and would be reassigned to the Sheffield Campus. 16,000

Transportation costs are incurred in all situations. -0-

Personnel : With an historical average enrolment of 81, The elimination of this program has the potential to eliminate one teaching position and one aide position, However, the numbers would have to break right and there is the potential for large classes in UME. However, to calculate a best case scenario, I shall proceed with this assumption.

Teacher Pre-K	61,000(12,500)
Teacher K	79,670(12,500)
Teacher 1 (.5)	23,342 (12,500)
Teacher 2 (.5,.5) (Assumed recovered)	-0-
Teacher 3 (.5,.5)	50,320 (12,500)
Teacher4 (.5)	20,128
Aide Per-K (.5)	8,884
Aide K	20,074(12,500)
Aide 1 and 2 (Assumed recovered)	-0-
Aide 3 and 4	13,848
SPED (1.5) (Services still necessary at UME)	41,502(12,500)
Teacher Title 1 (.5)	20,128
SPED/ESP (.5)	40,256
Secretary NMC	-0-
Nurse NMC	-0-
Total offset necessary to provide services at UME	395,152 (75,000)
Net operating costs	<u>188,524(50,000)</u>

The Monterey School
 Operational Costs – As extracted from budget lines (Dollars)
 (Exclusive of all capital costs)

Internet Access	750
Electricity	1,027
Telephone	1,670
Water	644
Heating	6,768
Custodial Services (Contract to private provider)	3,500
Food service	-0-
Transportation (Transportation costs would remain constant or even increase slightly if program terminated.)	-0-
Personnel:	
Teacher K	50,337 (12,500)
Aide K	20,603(12,500)
Total before offsets	85,299(25,000)

Offsets:

Internet Access	-0-
Electricity	-0-
Telephone	-0-
Water	-0-
Heating	-0-
Custodial Services	-0-
Food Service	-0-
Transportation	-0-
Teacher K	-0-
Aide K	-0-

(With a historical average enrollment of 9, it is possible to eliminate the teaching and aide position if this program were terminated. However, eliminating the positions in Monterey may impact the possible position savings anticipated in the New Marlboro analysis)

Net Operating Costs 85,299(25,000)

Note: The teacher and Aide are more senior to some personnel in UME. Therefor seniority bumping might somewhat diminish the net operating cost.

Specials:

There are 4 specials teachers that visit the community programs.

Music	721
Art	426
Spanish	1,136
Physical Ed.	1,144
Total Specials	<u>3,427</u>

Listed above are the expense requests for these teachers.

However, it is not possible at this time to determine what part of these requests are attributable to the community programs and what to which program.

Therefore I have simply listed the totals for reference.

Southern Berkshire Regional School District 2013-14 School Calendar

Events / Holidays

Date	Description
------	-------------

8/27/13	1st Day of School for Staff - Orientation Day
8/28/13	1st Day of School for Students - 1/2 day
8/29/13	2nd Day of School for Students - 1/2 day
9/2/13	Labor Day - No School
10/14/13	Columbus Day
11/11/13	Veterans Day
11/27/13	Thanksgiving Break
11/28/13	Thanksgiving
11/29/13	Thanksgiving Break
12/25/13	Christmas
1/1/14	New Years Day
1/20/14	ML King Day
2/17/14	President's Day
4/18/14	Good Friday
4/21/14	Patriots Day
5/26/14	Memorial Day

Teacher In-Service Days

8/28 - 1/2 day for students
8/29 - 1/2 day for students
9/27 - 1/2 day for students
10/4 - 1/2 day for students
11/1 - Full Day - NO SCHOOL

12/13 - 1/2 day for students
1/17 - 1/2 day for students
3/7 - 1/2 day for students
4/4 - 1/2 day for students
5/23 - Full Day - NO SCHOOL

6/30 - Potential last day of school (Includes 8 extra days for weather closings). 180th day = 6/19.
Note: The final 2 days of school will be 1/2 days for students.

October '13

Su	M	Tu	W	Th	F	Sa
		1	2	3	4	5
6	7	8	9	10	11	12
13	14	15	16	17	18	19
20	21	22	23	24	25	26
27	28	29	30	31		

January '14

Su	M	Tu	W	Th	F	Sa
			1	2	3	4
5	6	7	8	9	10	11
12	13	14	15	16	17	18
19	20	21	22	23	24	25
26	27	28	29	30	31	

April '14

Su	M	Tu	W	Th	F	Sa
		1	2	3	4	5
6	7	8	9	10	11	12
13	14	15	16	17	18	19
20	21	22	23	24	25	26
27	28	29	30			

Other Holidays of Note:

9/15-9/16	Rosh Hashanah *
9/14/2013	Yom Kippur *
12/26-1/1	Kwanza
4/15-4/22	Passover *

* Holiday begins at sundown of previous day

September '13

Su	M	Tu	W	Th	F	Sa
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8	9	10	11	12	13	14
15	16	17	18	19	20	21
22	23	24	25	26	27	28
29	30					

December '13

Su	M	Tu	W	Th	F	Sa
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8	9	10	11	12	13	14
15	16	17	18	19	20	21
22	23	24	25	26	27	28
29	30	31				

March '14

Su	M	Tu	W	Th	F	Sa
					1	
2	3	4	5	6	7	8
9	10	11	12	13	14	15
16	17	18	19	20	21	22
23	24	25	26	27	28	29
30	31					

June '14

Su	M	Tu	W	Th	F	Sa
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8	9	10	11	12	13	14
15	16	17	18	19	20	21
22	23	24	25	26	27	28
29	30					

August '13

Su	M	Tu	W	Th	F	Sa
				1	2	3
4	5	6	7	8	9	10
11	12	13	14	15	16	17
18	19	20	21	22	23	24
25	26	27	28	29	30	31

November '13

Su	M	Tu	W	Th	F	Sa
					1	2
3	4	5	6	7	8	9
10	11	12	13	14	15	16
17	18	19	20	21	22	23
24	25	26	27	28	29	30

February '14

Su	M	Tu	W	Th	F	Sa
					1	
2	3	4	5	6	7	8
9	10	11	12	13	14	15
16	17	18	19	20	21	22
23	24	25	26	27	28	

May '14

Su	M	Tu	W	Th	F	Sa
				1	2	3
4	5	6	7	8	9	10
11	12	13	14	15	16	17
18	19	20	21	22	23	24
25	26	27	28	29	30	31

Southern Berkshire Regional School District

Projected Enrollment By School and Grade
2013-14

		School:				
		UME	NMC	Egremont	Monterey	Mt. Everett
<u>Grade</u>	<u>Total</u>					
UG	0					
PK	17	10	7			
K	63	40	13	3	7	
1	66	46	13	7		
2	52	37	15			
3	60	46	14			
4	53	37	16			
5	59	45				
6	51	56				
7	54					54
8	55					55
9	55					55
10	71					71
11	58					58
12	50					50
Totals:	764	317	78	10	7	343