

North Hampton Budget Committee
Minutes of December 6, 2007 Meeting
North Hampton School Library



December^[TCF1] 6 North Hampton Budget Committee Meeting Minutes

Budget committee members in attendance: David Peck, Bob Hamilton, Mike Golden, Larry Miller, Jim Maggiore, Bob Copp

Members Not in attendance: Don Gould, Kari Schmitz

School Board Members in attendance: Mary Pat Dolan, Janet Gorham, Casey Whittier

Others in attendance: Amy Kane, Peter Sweet, Jen Sciozione (curriculum director)

Call to order at 7:05

Dave asked everyone at the table to introduce themselves and then turned the meeting over to Mary Pat. She explained that Kari would present the financial portion on Monday and that she would give the Budcom an overview of the North Hampton School. Mary Pat explained that North Hampton has adopted a policy limiting class size which drives the decisions made by the school board in order to meet the needs of children. Bob Hamilton commented on the statement that 15 out of 27 classrooms did not meet the 900 square foot required by the state standards as deceiving because they are grandfathered.

Dave asked that the staff composition be explained in more detail and Peter said he would do that in time for Monday's meeting .

Janet explained that we are in the first year of a three year contract with the teachers and that they were presently engaged with the associate staff (SESPA) for a two year contract. She explained that a representative from each of the six district school boards made up the negotiating team. Once contract is approved by all the negotiating members it goes to all six school boards for approval and then to the voters for approval. Every town must approve the contract. Janet answered Jim question about negotiation expenses , explaining that they hire an attorney to be part of the team and that mediation which they have been forced into in the past are expensive for the board.

Mary Pat went on to explain that the school mission statement and philosophy are compatible with what was being done in special education. Individual educational plans are developed in the context classroom inclusion. Peter explained that providing in-house services was a savings to the taxpayer because the SPED teachers are in the classroom providing services to all children. He further explained that the district is responsible for providing services to special needs children from age 3. This provides a history when the child enters school.

Peter explained that the \$2000 out of district cost was for sped children attending summer programs. He also responded to Larry's inquiry regarding the increase in professional services that the previous year was paid for out of IDEA grant money which the district could not do again.

Technology Mary Pat told the committee that the school was on a 5 year replacement plan. She pointed out the GREEN PAGES REPORT gave the school high marks in technology. The replacement in the future would come in the form of mobile laptop carts. Larry asked if there was a backup for the systems and was it in the same building which is not typically the case. Peter said that it was still being discussed and that a decision had not been made yet.

Facilities Mary Pat referred us to the TURNER REPORT which assesses the condition of the facility by a professional organization. That report would generate a five year plan to correct the issues and spread the cost of improvements out over time. Some of the discussion centered security improvements, energy savings which referenced a PSNH audit, an infrared survey of the roof, window shades for classroom, door locks, cameras, and bathrooms. Larry asked how the lapsing fund was going to be used. Mary Pat stated that no decision had been made. She stated that they were waiting for some quotes to come back and that the process was slowed down for that reason. There was discussion regarding the landscape near the generator and the area from the building to the driveway.

Warrant Articles

1. Operating budget
2. SESPA contract costs
3. Kindergarten NOT YET DETERMINED
4. Funding capital improvement projects
5. Disaster back-up system for the schools technology
6. One mobile laptop cart
7. \$50000 to the building maintenance expendable trust fund. (no impact on the tax rate)
8. RSA 198:20-b indefinite acceptance of funds
9. Withdrawal committee recommendation

Kindergarten

One of the questions asked was "Is it mandatory?" Peter explained that it was not at this time, but that the legislature was considering it. Transportation for a full time program was not an issue because there were no addition bus runs and the company had drivers available. The next subject in this discussion was that of staffing and Mary Pat explained that one or more teacher might be needed but no addition support staff would be needed. The utilization of space within the school was the next issue. The present space is adequate if the enrollment remains stable. If there is an Increase then a modular might have to be considered. A utilization study by an outside agency was being proposed by the board. Mary Pat explained that the board had not decided on this issue, but would be voting on it soon. Larry pointed out that one cannot fit a size seven foot into a six shoe. Mary Pat commented on the work of the kindergarten study committee noting the survey and research that was compiled

Mary Pat brought attention to the school board goals, school improvement plan, and the school report card (an assessment by the community of the school). All were included in the budget presentation book with little discussion.

Summary: The budget committee requests for the following information to be presented at the next meeting:

1. A listing of the current technology assets
2. Analysis of the health benefit increases

- 3. Revenues
- 4. Playground expenses