

2015 – 2016 Superintendent’s Proposed Budget

Questions as of December 1, 2014

Page 7--I had not realized that the adventure course was not offered as an after school activity. Any possibility of offering that again?

Response: All grade 7 & 8 students participate as a part of the Health / Physical Education Curriculum so there is no need to offer it as an after school co-curricular offering during the school year. This will be discussed further with Principal to determine need.

Page 19--Projected class size report...Assuming we are going to have PreK next year, shouldn't that projected enrollment be added to the 3,204 total (before we determine projected decrease in enrollment)? Should 9th grade projected enrollment be reduced to reflect the "normal" attrition to private schools?

Response: We will add the Pre-K numbers in and provide a revised sheet. Revised sheet is attached.

Page 29--What is the criteria (what will be the criteria next year), to determine minimum number of students in a "regular ed" section e.g. Genocide with 12 and 13 students seems like they could be combined--I realize they are different semesters? Hopefully next year the engineering classes won't all be CP.

Response: We have already anticipated these opportunities and they are reflected in the total certified staff reductions reflected on page 185. All electives will be offered at CP and Honors level next year.

Page 128--Have we determined why gate receipts have decreased from \$30,000 to \$20,000 to \$17,000?

Response: Other events had admission charge in the past, Attendees have decreased noticeably, Impact of Booster Club selling "free admission cards" as a fundraiser, not charging for Spirit Week games.

Why do we believe Pay to Play will be lower next year than projected for this year?

Response: This projection excludes having an abnormally high number of (100+) student athletes participating in Crew as was the case this year.

Is this year's projection too high (based on fall/winter sports?)

Response: See above.

Page 130--How do lunch sales for the first three months of 14/15 compare to the same period last year?

Response: We appear to be at least the same if not slightly better. New reports are waiting to be generated from new POS system.

Page 131--Why do we believe projected building use revenue will decrease as compared to last year?

Response: We projected decrease attributed to new rates in Board's revised policy.

Page 133--Why is our expected Title I for 2014/15 so much lower? Doesn't the \$50,000 open choice grant increase because of our increased number of students?

Response: The \$50,000 grant amount is to be used with the Open Choice Liaison required. Cost and FTE of position are offset by some revenue from Granby.

Page 136--next year 2009/10 and 2014/15 should be asterisked as revaluation years.

Response: We will make that change for next year. Revised sheet is attached.

Pages 153/154--I assume when we speak about SpED these schedules will be explained. It appears to me that for 14/15, we are currently \$47,000 over budget....since the 15/16 column sys as of 10/9/14.

Response: Our projection for next year lowers tuition by \$90,898.37. When this projection is projected in the aggregate with other line items in the pupil services portion of the budget, it results in us requesting \$47,115.68 in additional funds for 2015-2016.

Page 155--Doesn't the paraeducator contract expire 6/30/15 (not 2014)?

Response: It expired on 6/30/14.

Page 158--Should the title of this schedule actually be "salary" rather than "compensation"?

Response: We will make this change as suggested and revise page. Revised sheet is attached.

Page 161--Are a bunch of the 120 computers at central office new ones that are in the process of being deployed?

Response: A detail page has been attached. Those identified as "CO" in furthest right hand column (page 2 & 3) are slated for deployment to schools.

Page 226--Should we indicate that the 2014-15 numbers are only through October 31?

Response: We will make the change and issue a revised page. Revised sheet is attached.

Page 227--How do these numbers of vehicles compare to what Dattco used for Avon? I thought Specialty added a couple of vehicles?

Response: Specialty has confirmed that they are using the same number of vehicles as Dattco.

Page 234--Do we need to revise the out of state travel policy so trips can go to Old Sturbridge Village without BOE approval (I don't recall ever approving these trips--maybe there is already verbiage in the policy allowing these trips).

Response: I would not recommend revising the Board's policy at this time with the rationale that if this site is specifically identified some may request and/or assume that other locations that are equidistant may be assumed to be approved.

Pages 281--Curious about the 504 homebound tutos and Tuition reimbursement--just more monies that we normally need? Total numbers o

Response: We revised the request to reflect the actual that we know to be in place for next year.

Page 283--Does the Non-certified \$249,000 reduction represent the 12 people on slide 14?

Response: Yes

Page 283-- How many people does the \$477,000 reduction represent? 5?

Response: Yes

Page 285--What do the \$25,000 non cert salaries at PGS and RBS represent?

Response: Grant funded Teaching Assistants for Grade 2. Please see note (**) on slide #19. We have committed to maintaining grant funded Teaching Assistants in K, 1st and 2nd at each school.