



**School Committee
Meeting Book**

**June 7, 2017
7:00 pm**

**Town Hall -100 Maple Avenue
Selectmen's Meeting Room**



SHREWSBURY PUBLIC SCHOOLS SCHOOL COMMITTEE MEETING

AGENDA

June 7, 2017 7:00pm
Town Hall—Selectmen's Meeting Room
100 Maple Avenue

- | | | |
|-------|---|-------------|
| I. | Public Participation | |
| II. | Chairperson's Report & Members' Reports | |
| III. | Superintendent's Report | |
| IV. | Time Scheduled Appointments: | |
| | A. Senator Michael O. Moore: Legislative Update | 7:10 – 7:35 |
| | B. Foundation Budget & Chapter 70: Discussion & Potential Vote | 7:35 – 7:50 |
| | C. College Admissions Officers: Panel Discussion | 7:50 – 8:20 |
| V. | Curriculum | |
| | A. Strategic Priorities Progress Report:
Enhancing Learning Through Technology | 8:20 – 8:45 |
| VI. | Policy | |
| VII. | Finance & Operations | |
| VIII. | Old Business | |
| | A. Recommendation for Extended School Care Tuition Increase: Vote | 8:45 – 8:50 |
| IX. | New Business | |
| | A. Updated Assabet Valley Collaborative Agreement: Vote | 8:50 – 9:00 |
| X. | Approval of Minutes | 9:00 – 9:05 |
| XI. | Executive Session | |
| | A. Negotiations with non-represented staff | 9:05 – 9:30 |
| XII. | Adjournment | 9:30 |

Next regular meeting: June 14, 2017



SHREWSBURY PUBLIC SCHOOLS SCHOOL COMMITTEE MEETING

ITEM NO: I Public Participation

MEETING DATE: 6/7/17

SPECIFIC STATEMENT OR QUESTION:

Will the School Committee hear thoughts and ideas from the public regarding the operations and the programs of the school system?

BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

Copies of the policy and procedure for Public Participation are available to the public at each School Committee meeting.

ITEM NO: II. Chairperson's Report/Members' Reports

SPECIFIC STATEMENT OR QUESTION:

Will the School Committee hear a report from the Chairperson of the School Committee and other members of the School Committee who may wish to comment on school affairs?

BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

This agenda item provides an opportunity for the Chairperson and members of the Shrewsbury School Committee to comment on school affairs that are of interest to the community.

STAFF AVAILABLE FOR PRESENTATION:

School Committee Members
Dr. B. Dale Magee, Chairperson
Mr. Jon Wensky, Vice Chairperson
Ms. Sandra Fryc, Secretary
Ms. Erin Canzano, Committee Member
Mr. Jason Palitsch, Committee Member

ITEM NO: III. Superintendent's Report

SPECIFIC STATEMENT OR QUESTION:

Will the School Committee hear a report from Dr. Joseph M. Sawyer, Superintendent of Schools?

BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

This agenda item allows the Superintendent of the Shrewsbury Public Schools to comment informally on the programs and activities of the school system.

STAFF AVAILABLE FOR PRESENTATION:

Dr. Joseph M. Sawyer, Superintendent of Schools

ACTION RECOMMENDED FOR ITEMS I, II, & III: That the School Committee accept the report and take such action as it deems in the best interest of the school system.



**SHREWSBURY PUBLIC SCHOOLS
SCHOOL COMMITTEE MEETING**

ITEM NO: **IV. Time Scheduled Appointments:** MEETING DATE: **6/7/17**
A. Senator Michael O. Moore: Legislative Update

SPECIFIC STATEMENT OR QUESTION:

Will the School Committee hear a presentation by Senator Michael Moore regarding the status of state funding for public education and other state level issues?

BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

1. Senator Moore will discuss developments at the state level related to school finance and other issues that affect public education.
2. This will also be an opportunity for the School Committee and the district administration to communicate priorities to Senator Moore, including advocacy for the state budget.

ACTION RECOMMENDED:

That the School Committee hear the report and take such action as it deems in the best interest of the school system.

STAFF AVAILABLE FOR PRESENTATION:

Dr. Joseph M. Sawyer, Superintendent of Schools



SHREWSBURY PUBLIC SCHOOLS SCHOOL COMMITTEE MEETING

ITEM NO: IV. Time Scheduled Appointments:

MEETING DATE: 6/7/17

B. Foundation Budget & Chapter 70: Discussion & Potential Vote

SPECIFIC STATEMENT OR QUESTION:

Will the Committee engage in discussion of, and potentially vote to endorse, the recommendations made by the Foundation Budget Review Commission regarding the funding formula used for so-called Chapter 70 state aid for education?

BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

1. The Foundation Budget is used to calculate the minimum legal level of spending on public education for a community, which also is used to determine the amount of state fiscal aid for public education provided to that community (see #2 below). The Foundation Budget is based on the number and characteristics of the students enrolled in a school district as well as the community's income and property wealth. It is generally acknowledged that the funding formula that creates the Foundation Budget, created in response to the 1993 Education Reform Act with some updates, is outdated and does not accurately represent the current realities of the cost of public education.
2. The Chapter 70 program is the major program of state aid to public elementary and secondary schools. In addition to providing state aid to support school operations, it also establishes minimum spending requirements for each school district and minimum requirements for each municipality's share of school costs.
3. In October 2015, the State Legislature's Foundation Budget Review Commission issued its final report regarding recommendations for changing the funding formula for the Foundation Budget (this report is enclosed, along with a summary of the recommended changes provided by the Massachusetts Association of School Committees). It is suggested that the School Committee discuss the recommendations that were made, and, if it wishes, take a vote to formally endorse these recommendations.

ACTION RECOMMENDED:

That the Committee engage in discussion of, and potentially vote to endorse, the recommendations made by the Foundation Budget Review Commission regarding the funding formula used for so-called Chapter 70 state aid for education.

STAFF AVAILABLE FOR PRESENTATION:

Dr. Joseph M. Sawyer, Superintendent of Schools

Mr. Patrick Collins, Assistant Superintendent for Finance and Operations



Recommendations of the Foundation Budget Review Commission

Regarding health insurance:

- adjust health insurance to be in line with average GIC rates
- add retired health insurance to the foundation budget
- calculate health insurance inflation separately from inflation of the rest of the budget

Regarding special education:

- change the assumed in-district sped cost (from an assumed 15% of students to an assumed 16% of students)
- increase the out-of-district special ed cost rate to capture full cost before the circuit breaker is triggered
- recognize "the growing use of inclusion as the preferred pedagogical model in the Commonwealth"

Regarding English Language Learners:

- make ELL an increment added to the base rate per pupil
- include it for vocational students
- make it the same rate at all levels, choosing the middle school level; this is to make up for the previous assumption that older kids required fewer services (or less funding), which has been found not to be the case.

Regarding low income:

This recommendation does not spell out numbers or calculations, but cites the large number of programs -- extended learning time, wraparound services, instructional improvement, class size reduction, early ed--that have been found to be successful with low income students, and laying out some parameters on costs.

Note further that this includes posting a plan of what the district will do with additional dollars, BUT includes district flexibility to best meet student needs.

Regarding data collection:

It recommends establishment of a committee to improve data reporting, specifically around reporting of use of funding at a school level.

Regarding preschool:

There is a recognition (*not a recommendation*) of the state's needs in early childhood. The data on the huge positive effects of early childhood education is overwhelming and clear, which the Commission recognized.

Regarding inflation:

- an adjustment for the missed quarter in 2010=\$55 million statewide
- an adjustment for the statutory cap=\$158 million statewide

Note that those numbers are not included in other calculations, so some would balance out.

...the good work begun by the education reform act of 1993, and the educational progress made since, will be at risk so long as our school systems are fiscally strained by the ongoing failure to substantively reconsider the adequacy of the foundation budget.
Conclusion of the final report of the Foundation Budget Review Commission

Foundation Budget Review Commission

Final Report

October 30, 2015

Table of Contents

I.	<u>Commission Members</u>	3
II.	<u>Overview</u>	4
III.	<u>Findings and Recommendations</u>	
	Part A.....	7
	Part B.....	13
	Part C.....	15
	Part D.....	17
IV.	<u>Appendix A: Public Hearing Testimony Summary</u>	18
V.	<u>Appendix B: Commission Meetings & Documents</u>	19

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The Foundation Budget Review Commission is grateful to the many individuals and organizations that contributed to the completion of its study.

First and foremost, the Commission gratefully acknowledges the exceptional work and support provided by David Bunker, who was hired by the Commission in September to manage the Commission's remaining work and complete an analysis of the topics identified by the Commission in its preliminary report. The Commission benefited enormously from David's extensive expertise and research, and his work was invaluable to the final production of the Commission's report.

We would like to thank Melissa King and Roger Hatch from the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education's Office of School Finance, who have contributed an extraordinary amount of time and expertise to the work of the Commission. The cooperation of Melissa and Roger in providing data and running projections has been instrumental to the Commission throughout the course of its deliberations, and we wish to express our gratitude for their efforts and support.

We would also like to acknowledge the members of the Advisory Committee who contributed valuable knowledge, experience, and perspectives throughout the Commission's work.

Finally, the Commission is grateful to the many groups and individuals who provided policy expertise and insight through presentations at various Commission meetings, including Dr. Karla Baehr, Dr. Paul Dakin, the Rennie Center for Education Research & Policy, and the Massachusetts Budget and Policy Center.

Senator Sonia Chang-Díaz
Co-Chairs

Representative Alice H. Peisch

Foundation Budget Review Commission Membership

Commission Chairs

Senator Sonia Chang-Díaz, *Senate Chair of the Joint Committee on Education*

Representative Alice H. Peisch, *House Chair of the Joint Committee on Education*

Commission Members

Tom Moreau, *Secretary of Education Designee*

Commissioner Mitchell D. Chester, *Department of Elementary & Secondary Education*

Commissioner Tom Weber, *Department of Early Education & Care*

Representative Michael Moran, *Speaker of the House Designee*

Senator Patricia Jehlen, *Senate President Designee*

Representative Kimberly Ferguson, *House Minority Leader Designee*

Edward Moscovitch, *Senate Minority Leader Designee*

Paul Reville, *Governor Designee*

Evan Ross, *House Ways & Means Chair Designee*

Senator Sal DiDomenico, *Senate Ways & Means Chair Designee*

Mayor Kevin Dumas, *Massachusetts Municipal Association Appointee*

Joe Esposito, *Massachusetts Business Alliance for Education Appointee*

Patrick Francomano, *Massachusetts Association of School Committees Appointee*

Mary Bourque, *Massachusetts Association of School Superintendents Appointee*

Barbara Madeloni, *Massachusetts Teachers Association Appointee*

John Coleman Walsh, *American Federation of Teachers Massachusetts Appointee*

John Lafleche, *Massachusetts Association of Vocational Administrators Appointee*

Michael Wood, *Massachusetts Association of Regional Schools Appointee*

David Verdolino, *Massachusetts Association of School Business Officials Appointee*

Advisory Members (non-voting)

Mary Frantz, *League of Women Voters of Massachusetts Appointee*

Luc Schuster, *Massachusetts Budget and Policy Center Appointee*

JD Chesloff, *Massachusetts Business Roundtable Appointee*

Jennifer Francioso, *Massachusetts Parent Teacher Association Appointee*

Carolyn Ryan, *Massachusetts Taxpayers Foundation Appointee*

Jason Williams, *Stand for Children Massachusetts Appointee*

Chris Martes, *Strategies for Children Appointee*

Commission Staff

Jennie Williamson, *Research Director of the Joint Committee on Education*

Nathanael Shea, *Chief of Staff in the Office of Senator Sonia Chang-Díaz*

David Bunker, *Staff consultant to the Commission*

Overview

Mission

Sections 124 and 278 of the FY15 State Budget established the Foundation Budget Review Commission (Commission) to “determine the educational programs and services necessary to achieve the commonwealth’s educational goals” and to “review the way foundation budgets are calculated and to make recommendations for potential changes in those calculations as the commission deems appropriate.” In conducting such review, the Commission was charged with determining “the educational programs and services necessary to achieve the commonwealth’s educational goals and to prepare students to achieve passing scores on the Massachusetts Comprehensive Assessment System examinations.” The statute also directed the Commission to “determine and recommend measures to promote the adoption of ways in which resources can be most effectively utilized and consider various models of efficient and effective resource allocation.” In the FY16 State Budget, the Commission was granted an extension until November 1, 2015 to finish its work, and issue a final report.

The members of the Commission approached their work in the spirit of those who originally proposed the Education Reform Act of 1993, and the many from the educational, business, philanthropic, governmental, and civic communities who have advanced its work in a bipartisan and collaborative way since then. We are convinced that providing a high quality education to every student within the Commonwealth regardless of wealth, income, educational background, or zip code is not only a matter of constitutional obligation but of generational responsibility. It is not only the means by which our children grow into active participants in our democracy and productive members of our economy, but by which they are given the tools of self-reflection and personal growth that ensure happy, successful, and fulfilled lives that fully unlock their potential, utilize their skills, and realize their dreams. Massachusetts has made great strides since 1993 in realizing this kind of high quality public education. Indeed, on many metrics, the Commonwealth is the envy of many other states and industrialized countries. But reports from the field and the research community alike in recent years have suggested that the system is fiscally strained by the failure to substantively reconsider the adequacy of the foundation budget since 1993, and that the formula may need re-tooling to meet the needs of the 21st Century. Moreover, 22 years after the advent of education reform, the challenge we have not yet achieved desired results on is to deliver quality consistently to all geographies and all demographic groups across our state.

To meet these challenges, the Commission focused not only on identifying areas where the foundation budget and district spending might be poorly aligned or out-of-date, but asked questions about best practice, efficiency, and productivity, to ensure that gaps between foundation budget assumptions and actual spending were not simply filled because they existed, but were filled because exhaustive analysis showed that either maximum efficiencies had been sought, or that even maximizing efficiencies would not have allowed districts to fully close such gaps. The Commission also undertook its task recognizing that the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE) has, in recent years, consistent with both the original Education Reform Act, and subsequent amendments to the law, including the Achievement Gap Act of 2010, been ramping up efforts to hold districts and schools accountable for results, and to ensure that every effort is being made to identify, reduce, and eliminate remaining achievement gaps. It was a special moral and fiscal focus of the Commission’s, then, to make sure that the schools and districts most likely to be held accountable for bringing high-need students to proficiency, also had sufficient resources to meet those standards, and educate their high-needs populations to the same standards as other students by reviewing the adequacy and efficacy of the ELL and low-income rates in the formula.

Legislative Charge

SECTION 124. Chapter 70 of the General Laws is hereby amended by striking out section 4, as so appearing, and inserting in place thereof the following section:-

Section 4. Upon action of the general court, there shall periodically be a foundation budget review commission to review the way foundation budgets are calculated and to make recommendations for potential changes in those calculations as the commission deems appropriate. In conducting such review, the commission shall seek to determine the educational programs and services necessary to achieve the commonwealth's educational goals and to prepare students to achieve passing scores on the Massachusetts Comprehensive Assessment System examinations. The review shall include, but not be limited to, those components of the foundation budget created pursuant to section 3 of chapter 70 and subsequent changes made to the foundation budget by law. In addition, the commission shall seek to determine and recommend measures to promote the adoption of ways in which resources can be most effectively utilized and consider various models of efficient and effective resource allocation. In carrying out the review, the commissioner of elementary and secondary education shall provide to the commission any data and information the commissioner considers relevant to the commission's charge.

The commission shall include the house and senate chairs of the joint committee on education, who shall serve as co-chairs, the secretary of education, the commissioner of elementary and secondary education, the commissioner of early education and care, the speaker of the house of representatives or a designee, the president of the senate or a designee, the minority leader of the house of representatives or a designee, the minority leader of the senate or a designee, the governor or a designee, the chair of the house committee on ways and means or a designee, the chair of the senate committee on ways and means or a designee and 1 member to be appointed by each of the following organizations: the Massachusetts Municipal Association, Inc., the Massachusetts Business Alliance for Education, Inc., the Massachusetts Association of School Committees, Inc., the Massachusetts Association of School Superintendents, Inc., the Massachusetts Teachers Association, the American Federation of Teachers Massachusetts, the Massachusetts Association of Vocational Administrators, Inc., the Massachusetts Association of Regional Schools, Inc. and the Massachusetts Association of School Business Officials. Members shall not receive compensation for their services but may receive reimbursement for the reasonable expenses incurred in carrying out their responsibilities as members of the commission. The commissioner of elementary and secondary education shall furnish reasonable staff and other support for the work of the commission. Prior to issuing its recommendations, the commission shall conduct not fewer than 4 public hearings across regions of the commonwealth. It shall not constitute a violation of chapter 268A for a person employed by a school district to serve on the commission or to participate in commission deliberations that may have a financial impact on the district employing that person or on the rate at which that person may be compensated. The commission may establish procedures to ensure that no such person participates in commission deliberations that may directly affect the school districts employing those persons or that may directly affect the rate at which those persons are compensated.

SECTION 278. (a) The foundation budget review commission established in section 4 of chapter 70 of the General Laws shall file its report on or before June 30, 2015. A copy of the report and recommendations shall be made publicly available on the website of the department of elementary and secondary education and submitted to the joint committee on education.

(b) In addition to the membership listed in section 4 of chapter 70 of the General Laws and for the purposes of this review, there shall be 1 advisory nonvoting member of the foundation budget review commission from each the following organizations: the League of Women Voters of Massachusetts, the Massachusetts Budget and Policy Center, the Massachusetts Business Roundtable, the Massachusetts Parent Teacher Association, the Massachusetts Taxpayers Foundation, Stand for Children and Strategies for Children. Advisory members shall be informed in advance of any public hearings or meetings scheduled by the commission and may be provided with written or electronic materials deemed appropriate by the commission's co-chairs. Before finalizing its recommendations, the foundation budget commission established in said section 4 of said chapter 70 shall solicit input from advisory members who may offer comments or further recommendations for the commission's consideration.

Process and Method

To inform its deliberations, the Commission conducted six public hearings across the Commonwealth to solicit testimony from members of the public (*refer to Appendix A for a summary of public hearing comments*). The Commission also held seven meetings between October 2014 and June 2015, during which members examined relevant research and considered information and data presented by various stakeholders (*refer to Appendix B for a summary of the Commission meetings and a list of documents reviewed at each meeting*). At the end of this period, recommendations were made and accepted relative to the foundation budget assumptions regarding health insurance and special education.

In September, the commission was able to hire a researcher and staff person, and instructed that the focus of remaining work be on identifying ways to reduce the achievement gap among low income students and English language learners by examining whether the existing additional amounts required by the formula are sufficient to meet the needs of those districts as defined by 2015 pedagogical standards and best practice. Multiple sources of evidence were considered in this phase of the work, including a review of national literature and research, as well as other state funding formulas, to determine whether our ELL and low income weightings in MA were adequate or in a reasonable national range, and interviews with superintendents, business managers, and teachers in MA districts that have found success in turning around schools and reducing or eliminating the achievement gap for high needs students. Given that insufficient time remained for either a professional judgment panel or a successful schools study, the commission's hope was that the principles underlying both models could be respected by seeking the advice, counsel, and professional judgment of those who had achieved some initial success at meeting the educational needs of ELL and low income students. The multiple sources of evidence gathered in this way are reflected in the additional recommendations made in this report relative to low income and ELL increments.

Finally, a number of areas remained in which the Commission either did not have time to carry out the due diligence needed to make an informed recommendation, or believes that current efforts and pilot programs must be continued and their results reviewed before any final inclusion of related costs in the Chapter 70 funding formula.

Findings & Recommendations

– PART A –

Foundation Budget Changes

The Education Reform Act of 1993 established the foundation budget to ensure adequate funding for all students in Massachusetts. Since then, some of the assumptions contained in the formula for calculating the foundation budget have become outdated. In particular, the actual costs of health insurance and special education have far surpassed the assumptions built into the formula for calculating the foundation budget.¹ As a result, those costs have significantly reduced the resources available to support other key investments. In addition, the added amounts intended to provide services to ELL and low-income students are less than needed to fully provide the level of intervention and support needed to ensure the academic and social-emotional success of these populations, or to allow the school districts serving them to fund the best practices that have been found successful.

I. Health Insurance

Findings

Actual spending on employee health insurance far exceeds the current foundation budget allotment for such costs, as noted in several recent studies.² Statewide, district spending on “Employee Benefits & Fixed Charges” exceeds the foundation budget allotment by more than 140%.³ This is primarily due to the dramatic growth in health insurance costs nationwide and the fact that such costs have increased at a significantly higher rate than the rate of inflation used to adjust the foundation budget. In addition, the “Employee Benefits & Fixed Charges” component of the foundation budget does not include retiree health insurance, even though districts or communities incur such costs.

In developing the below recommendations, the Commission leveraged the collective expertise of its members to engage in discussions about how to address the discrepancy between the foundation budget and actual spending on health insurance. To inform such discussions, the Commission reviewed the factors encompassed in the “Employee Benefits & Fixed Charges” component of the formula, examined data on municipal health insurance trends, and reviewed information regarding the participation of school district employees in the state’s Group Insurance Commission (GIC) health plans.

Recommendations

1. Adjust the employee health insurance rate captured in the “Employee Benefits/Fixed Charges” component of the formula to reflect the average⁴ Group Insurance Commission (GIC) rate*;

¹ Recent studies have estimated the gap between foundation and actual spending in these categories to be as high as \$2.1 billion combined (Massachusetts Budget & Policy Center, “Cutting Class: Underfunding the Foundation Budget’s Core Education Program,” 2011; Massachusetts Business Alliance for Education, “School Funding Reality: A Bargain Not Kept,” 2010; Massachusetts Department of Elementary & Secondary Education, “Report on the Status of the Public Education Financing System in Massachusetts,” 2013).

² Ibid.

³ Melissa King & Roger Hatch, DESE. “Massachusetts Foundation Budget: Focus on Special Education and Health Insurance.” March 2015. Powerpoint presentation.

⁴ While the Commission recommends using the average rate, it acknowledges that there may be other benchmarks that the Legislature may find more appropriate.

*The increment representing the other parts of the “Employee Benefits/Fixed Charges” component would remain the same.

2. Add a new category for “Retired Employee Health Insurance” to the foundation budget; and
3. Establish a separate health care cost inflation adjustor for the employee health insurance portion of the “Employee Benefits/Fixed Charges” component of the formula, based on the change in the GIC rates.

II. Special Education

Findings

Foundation enrollment accounts for the additional costs of providing special education services through an assumed rate of district enrollment, rather than an actual count of students. A district’s foundation enrollment is multiplied by 3.75% to add additional special education resources to the foundation budget. This translates to an assumption that 15% of students receive in-district special education services 25% of the time.⁵ In actuality, around 16% of students receive some level of in-district special education services statewide⁶, which suggests that the foundation budget understates the number of in-district special education students. Out-of-district special education enrollment is assumed at 1% of foundation enrollment, which mirrors the rate of out-of-district special education placements statewide. However, districts spend far more on special education tuition for out-of-district placements than what is allocated through the foundation budget. In FY13, actual costs were 59% higher than the foundation budget rate of \$25,454.⁷ To address the fact that the foundation budget understates the number of in-district special education students and the cost of out-of-district special education, the Commission has developed the below recommendations.

Recommendations

1. Increase the assumed in-district special education enrollment rate from 3.75% to 4.00% (for non-vocational students) and 4.75% to 5.00% (for vocational students)
 - *Current assumption (3.75%) = 15% of students receiving SPED services 25% of the time*
 - *Proposed change (4.00%) = 16% of students receiving SPED services 25% of the time*
2. Increase the out-of-district special education cost rate to capture the total costs that districts bear before circuit breaker reimbursement is triggered. One example of how this might be done is to increase the out-of-district special education cost rate by an amount equal to the following:

$$[4 \times \text{statewide foundation budget per-pupil amount}] - [\text{statewide foundation budget per-pupil amount}^{**} + \text{out-of-district special education cost rate}]^{***}$$

⁵ 15% x 25% = 3.75%

⁶ Melissa King & Roger Hatch, DESE. “Massachusetts Foundation Budget: Focus on Special Education and Health Insurance.” March 2015. Powerpoint presentation.

⁷ Melissa King & Roger Hatch, DESE. “Massachusetts Foundation Budget: Focus on Special Education and Health Insurance.” March 2015. Powerpoint presentation.

^{**} Not including assumed SPED costs.

^{***} This would be a one-time adjustment, with the resulting rate increased by inflation each year thereafter.

III. Budget Impact Summary: Health Insurance and Special Education Changes

Statewide Summary	GAA	25% Phase in	Difference	100%	Difference
	FY16	FY16		FY16	
Enrollment	942,120	942,120	0	942,120	0
Foundation budget	10,090,177,272	10,340,927,612	250,750,340	10,912,226,442	822,049,170
Required district contribution	5,943,909,031	6,002,726,108	58,817,077	6,080,502,587	136,593,556
Chapter 70 aid	4,511,521,973	4,607,300,066	95,778,093	4,943,298,626	431,776,654
Required net school spending (NSS)	10,455,431,004	10,610,026,174	154,595,170	11,023,801,213	568,370,210

The chart above illustrates the estimated impact of the Commission's recommended adjustments to the foundation budget categories for health insurance and special education, expressed both as a one year cost and based on a four year phase-in. Note that because of the structural changes recommended to both the ELL and low income rates below, further work would be needed to ensure that the Chapter 70 spreadsheets accurately reflected those changes. Those recommendations would also entail an increase in the amount of Chapter 70 aid, not reflected in this chart. In addition, if the legislature chose to incorporate any of the issues raised in Part C of this report as being worthy of further study and consideration, the final cost to the state would increase further.

IV. English Language Learners

Findings

A review of national literature showed that the weights for states with funding formulas that made adjustments for ELL students had weightings of between 9.6% and 99%. Although Massachusetts uses rates rather than weightings, those rates contain an implied weighting of between 7% and 34%. In general, then, MA weightings for ELL are well within the national range, with the exception of the high school rates of 7% and 40% respectively.

Although the origin of the high school rate differential is based in legitimately different class size assumptions in a historic iteration of the formula, it presents a challenge to the effective provision of services to the ELL population. A consistent point made by the superintendents and educators with whom we spoke was the sharp rise in students with interrupted education (SIFE) and students with limited or interrupted formal education (SLIFE), often children from war torn regions, or refugees, who have serious social and emotional needs, and arrive at school with little to no formal education for school districts to build upon. This challenge is exacerbated at the high school level, where such gaps in learning must be made up in an extremely short time frame, often with highly staff-intensive interventions involving class size of 10 or less per teacher, and support staff as well. Next, vocational schools which serve significant numbers of ELL students have frequently pointed out to the Commission that they receive no additional support in meeting their students' needs through the formula, because the ELL student amount is calculated as a base rate per student rather than as an added

increment. Therefore, no ELL increment is applied to the vocational foundation budget, despite the significant needs some vocational districts face in educating this population. Finally, smaller districts and their advocates urged that funding and flexibility remain in the formula in recognition of the fact that they too often have ELL learners, but, due to low incidence, may meet those needs in creative and cost-sharing ways with other districts.

Recommendations

1. Convert the ELL increase from a base rate to an increment on the base rate.
2. Apply the increment to vocational school ELL students as well.
3. Increase the increment for all grade levels, including high school, to the current effective middle school increment of \$2,361. This would increase the range of ELL-only weightings and expand available funds for staff-intensive high school age interventions.

V. Low-Income Students

Findings

Recommended weightings for low income students in the national literature range from an (admittedly conservative) 40% more than the base per student rate to 100% more. The low income increments in MA range from 32% at the high school level to 50% at the junior high/ middle school level, with low income ELL running between 30% and 84%. In our effort to determine where in the broader range of weightings MA should fall, the Commission reviewed the testimony made at public hearings and undertook focused interviews with successful educators in the fall. Among districts which had successfully carried out turnaround efforts, either district wide, or at select schools within the district identified as Level Four schools, many common themes and best practices emerged as worthy of replication in the effort to better meet the needs of ELL and low income learners, and reduce remaining achievement gaps, a few of which follow:

1. Extending the school day or year: This was among the top of the strategies identified as having been successful in the schools where it is tried. It is often extended to allow both more learning time for students, and common planning time for teachers and staff. More time is frequently viewed as essential to overcome existing deficits in learning and achievement.
2. Social and Emotional Needs/ Mental and Physical (including Oral) Health: Although educators are quick to stress that social and emotional needs are different and distinct from mental health, almost everyone interviewed stressed that the growth of need in this area has been staggering. Many asserted that they could not have accurately predicted in 1993, or even ten years ago, how much more effort and cost would be needed to ensure an adequate supply of social workers, guidance and adjustment counselors, wraparound coordinators, and other staff to ensure that the needs of their students are met, and that students arrive school stable and ready to learn.
3. Instructional Improvement: Improving instruction is usually key to any successful school turnaround, and several strategies emerge as valuable here: increased and improved professional development, common planning time for teachers and staff, and the use of instructional teams and instructional coaches.
4. Targeted Class Size Reductions for the Highest Need Populations: Although the formula's assumptions for K-3 class size, and for high needs students, are fairly low, several educators stressed that, for certain of the highest need populations, such as the SIFE/SLIFE ELL students mentioned above, or other high

school students with significant gaps to redress in a short time, or students with significant social-emotional needs, or who are at high risk of dropping out, or have a high history of truancy, who need intensive staff attention to help keep them in school and on task, class sizes lower than 10 to 1 were often necessary to increase achievement rapidly.

5. Early Education: Full Day Kindergarten and Full Day Pre-K. Many of the educators indicated both that bringing full day K into their districts had significantly impacted and improved school readiness, and that high on their wish list was the extension of full day pre-K and other early learning services in their districts.

For some of these strategies, the Commission was presented with solid and detailed estimates for what these implementations cost. MA 2020 presented evidence that extended learning time (or ELT) costs approximately \$1300-1500 per student. The Mass Budget and Policy Center (MBPC) presented a costing out of comprehensive wraparound services that was estimated at \$1300 per student. Worcester school officials presented evidence that their successful efforts at turning around Level 4 school cost about \$2000 more per student than other schools in the district received. Other strategies proved more elusive to cost out, although the range of weightings found in literature ranged from a conservative 40% in the Education Trust review, to 50% in the work of the Education Reform Review Commission of 2002, to almost 100% in Maryland. It was also clear from our interviews and emerging practices in other states that districts with the highest concentrations of poverty had a correspondingly high need for funding. The fact of concentration of challenging populations itself caused a change in the asset mix available to, and the expenditures required of, districts. They especially needed the educational and pedagogical synergies created by making more than one reform happen at a time.

The other challenge faced by the Commission was this: No one strategy or group of strategies is used consistently in every school district, but no model district limited so itself to one strategy only. Successful districts, and successful school turnarounds, require multiple concurrent, overlapping and reinforcing strategies, the exact details of which will vary from district to district. The question before the Commission was: How shall we account for the varying costs of diverse strategic educational choices through a standardized formula without simply summing the costs of every possible strategy, or limiting districts to one strategy at a time? The recommendations below attempt to find a way through that question by recommending that the low income increment be increased based on concentration of poverty, and that the poorest districts be provided enough per student to ensure that two to three reforms might be carried out simultaneously.

Recommendations

1. Increase the increment for districts with high concentrations of low income students. The Legislature will need to determine specific increments based on further review of data and debate, but based on its review of national literature, practices in other states, and model districts within our own state, the Commission offers the guidance that that weighting should fall within the range of 50%-100% and that multiple concurrent interventions are necessary to effectively close achievement gaps. The final decision should provide high poverty school districts with enough funding to pursue several turnaround strategies at once.
2. Ensure that any new definition of economically disadvantaged (necessitated by districts' shift away from collection of free and reduced school lunch eligibility data) properly and accurately count all economically needful students.
3. Leave the exact calculation of each increment to legislative action.
4. Require each district to post a plan online, on a highly accessible and visible state website as well as their district site, about how it will use the funds calculated in the ELL and low income allotments to serve the

intended populations, what outcome metrics they will use to measure the success of the programs so funded, performance against those metrics, and, subsequently, the results of the funding on improving student achievement. The plan will be public, but not subject to approval by DESE. The plan, which can be part of required school improvement plans, should detail how funds are being used to improve instructional quality, and/or ensure that services are provided that allow every student to arrive at school physically and mentally healthy, with their social and emotional needs met, and ready to learn.

5. Consistent with testimony provided to the Commission, the interviews conducted by Commission staff, and a national literature review to identify best practices, we anticipate that districts will use funding flexibility for one or more of the following best practices: a) expanded learning time, in the form of a longer day and/or year, and inclusive, where appropriate, of common planning time for teachers, b) wraparound services that improve and maintain the health of our students, including social and emotional health and skills, mental health and oral health, c) hiring staff at levels that support improved student performance and the development of the whole child, d) increased or improved professional development rooted in pedagogical research, and focused on instructional improvement, including evidence-based practices such as hiring instructional coaches, e) purchase of up-to-date curriculum materials and equipment, including instructional technology, and f) expanding kindergarten, pre-school, and early education options within the district.

– PART B –

EFFICIENT AND EFFECTIVE RESOURCE ALLOCATION

In the course of deliberations, Commission members often found themselves desiring even more detailed information than that immediately available. In addition, in approving foundation budget increases, they wanted to ensure the funding was used effectively and accountably to meet the educational needs of our most vulnerable children and high needs students. The first part of the recommendations below represents specific recommendations relative to the low income and ELL increment increases proposed in Part A of this report, and about school-based budgeting, the second part is the recommendation of a data working group that made recommendations to the Commission in September, and the third section contains the recommendations of the Commission relative to early education.

Data Collection Recommendations

1. Establish a data collection and reporting system that tracks funding allocated for ELL and Low Income students to ensure that spending is targeted to the intended populations, and to provide a better data source to future Foundation Budget Review Commissions about the accuracy and adequacy of the low income and ELL increments.
2. Establish a data collection and reporting system that allows for greater access to school-level expenditures and data across all districts to increase the understanding of state level policy makes about effective school-level interventions and investments, and which connects that data to student achievement data so more informed decisions can be made about the productivity, efficiency , and effectiveness of state expenditures.

Stakeholder Data Advisory Group Recommendations

1. *Establish Stakeholder Data Advisory Committee*
The Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE), in collaboration with the Executive Office of Education (EOE), should convene a Stakeholder Data Advisory Committee to promote effective resource allocation decisions at the local level
2. *Purpose of Data Advisory Committee*
The Data Advisory Committee will assist DESE to identify, implement and assess cost-effective ways to achieve three goals:
 - a) Streamline financial reporting, eliminate duplicate reporting requirements, and improve data quality
 - b) Strengthen DESE capacity to analyze and report staffing, scheduling and financial data in ways that support strategic resource allocation decisions at the district and school level
 - c) Strengthen district capacity to use data to make strategic resource allocation decisions
3. *Reports to the Board and Joint Education Committee*
The Data Advisory Committee will report its progress to the Board of Elementary and Secondary Education and to the Co-chairs of the Joint Committee on Education at least semi-annually, and will make such recommendations for new funding as are necessary for DESE to achieve the goals.
4. *Work of the DESE*
DESE actions to achieve these three goals may include:
 - Work with MTRS to obtain individual teacher salary information

- Develop strategies for securing more school-level financial data, including, where appropriate, developing ways to apportion more district expenditures to schools automatically
- Improve data accuracy by identifying more ways to “automate” the identification of “outlier” data on EPIMS staffing and EOY financial reports from districts to prompt district review
- Strengthen its training for district staff to improve accuracy and consistency of data reporting with special attention to: a) the use of clear and consistent definitions, and b) expected use of “Reports Tab” to explain significant changes and/or “outlier” data
- Eliminate duplication of effort at state and local levels by: a) aligning finance data with staffing (EPIMS) and enrollment (SIMS) data collections, and b) aligning grants management and reporting with EOY financial reporting
- Identify potential models, requirements, impacts, and estimated cost for a new financial reporting system
- Develop more powerful, actionable and publicly-available information and reports that combine and benchmark staffing, scheduling, and district/school-level funding data to support strategic resource allocation decisions at the local level
- Expand research focused on identifying promising practices for efficient and effective district and school resource allocation
- Collaborate closely with MASBO and MASS to develop the on-line (and other) training and support that DESE, education collaboratives, and local district and school staff need to make effective use of the current and new data and research
- Take other actions deemed necessary to achieve the goals

5. *Implications for Future State Funding*

Many of the above actions will require a cost-benefit analysis of a range of options. For some chosen options, new state funding will need to be recommended and secured.

Early Education

High-quality preschool is an effective practice identified by most school districts as one which increases the school readiness of students, especially high need students, and which is therefore worthy of further consideration and action by the legislature as it updates the structure and financing of public education for the 21st Century. While the Commission did not have sufficient time or resources to undertake specific recommendations on early education, it was a practice that was frequently highlighted in both national literature and in feedback from model districts within the Commonwealth—both for closing achievement gaps for disadvantaged students and in reducing special education costs for districts and the state. The state is currently using federal funds from the Preschool Expansion Grant (PEG) program, and some supplemental state funds, to examine and explore ways in which early education can be provided and expanded through the existing and robust mixed delivery system of public and private providers. As it considers whether the Chapter 70 funding formula can be adapted appropriately as a funding vehicle for the ongoing provision of pre-school, the Commission encourages the Legislature to incorporate the implementation wisdom gained through the PEG pilot programs and the Commonwealth’s other early education program, quality, and access initiatives as it rolls out any effort to provide these services more widely.

– PART C –

OTHER

The Commission wishes to make the following observations and recognitions, which due to time constraints, and limited resources, it has been unable to address more extensively:

I. IN-DISTRICT SPECIAL EDUCATION

A review at the September meeting of in-district SPED spending data confirms that the average expenditure per pupil exceeds the rate currently included in the foundation budget, and that, even upon adoption of the changes recommended in this report, a gap will remain of approximately \$700M between foundation budget assumptions, and district reported spending, and between foundation budget assumptions about staffing (assuming 4,394 teachers, or 8 special education FTEs to one teacher), and current practice (9,915 special education teachers, or approximately 5 special education FTEs to one teacher). Some evidence and testimony was presented that the central change driving this gap was that the original foundation budget for in-district special education was built on a model of substantially separate instruction, which has changed significantly over time to reflect the growing use of inclusion as the preferred pedagogical model in the Commonwealth. Since that model involves special education students spending most or all of their day in regular education classrooms, with special education (and para-professionals) coming into the classroom to provide extra help for struggling students, the working hypothesis of several Commissioners is that the added staffing needs of that model account for the significant difference in staffing and funding levels between the foundation budget and reported spending. Commissioners also noted the following challenges related to the data as presented: a) actual reported special education costs, including the counting of staff FTEs, don't line up precisely with functional categories in the foundation budget, and b) not all functional categories are collected by program, leaving key data missing for special education. In addition, some Commissioners expressed a desire for a more detailed review of district practice to confirm that inclusion, and its broad adoption at the district level, is the chief reason for any remaining funding shortfall, and to further examine how best to account for reported costs that may be shared between regular and special education. The Commission simply did not have sufficient time or resources to further analyze and review district teaching and funding practices in order to inform more specific recommendations. The gap between the foundation budget in-district SPED rate and actual district-level per pupil costs needs further attention by the legislature, in order to ensure that Chapter 70 supports best practices in creating and maintaining a 21st century special education system.

The Commission further notes that, while any increase made to the foundation budget to reflect special education costs would result in increased Chapter 70 aid for many districts, such additional funding would not need to be spent on special education services solely. Because special education is a legal entitlement, districts must fund individual education plans for all students in special education. Therefore, any gap between the foundation budget categories and actual legal obligations results in funds being diverted from other instructional priorities of the district to fund obligatory special education costs. Any increase in the Chapter 70 assumptions about special education that increases Chapter 70 aid to a district also frees up "other" funds currently being spent on special education services, and allows districts to make a broader set of investments in core instructional services and other supports that benefit the entire learning community of that district, should the district so choose. It is the expectation of the Commission that by more accurately reflecting special education (and health insurance costs) in the Chapter 70 formula, the Legislature will make possible numerous exciting reforms and instructional improvements that are currently beyond the fiscal capacity of the Commonwealth's school districts.

II. INFLATION FACTORS

The Commission also recognizes that, although the Chapter 70 formula contains an inflation adjustment, which has been applied in most years since 1993, in 2010, faced with a sharp downturn in revenues, and the serious budget challenge that resulted, the final budget used a lower inflation number (3.04%) from a different quarter than the quarter required by statute (6.75%). A correction for this “missed” quarter that acknowledges the statutory cap on inflation of 4.5% results in an adjustment of 1.4 % in FY16, and would have required additional Chapter 70 aid of almost \$55 million. A correction that suspended the statutory cap results in an adjustment of 3.6 % in FY16, and would have required additional Chapter 70 aid of almost \$158 million. Note, however, that these estimates were calculated separately from the recommendations made in Part A of this report. Were those changes adopted, there would be no need to make a corrective fix to those elements of the formula, which would lower the estimates above, and allow an inflation adjustment to be made to remaining categories for a lower cost in Chapter 70 aid.

– PART D –

CONCLUSION AND NEXT STEPS

As the Commission's work draws to a close, the legislature's work begins. We submit this report to the legislature with full recognition of the continued fiscal challenges of the Commonwealth, and the many competing priorities, and worthwhile goals, that the legislature must balance in crafting the annual state budget. We recognize that recommendations of this scope and size will need to be phased in to be affordable. However, we also note again what was stated at the beginning of this document: that the good work begun by the education reform act of 1993, and the educational progress made since, will be at risk so long as our school systems are fiscally strained by the ongoing failure to substantively reconsider the adequacy of the foundation budget. We therefore urge that the legislature act on these recommendations with a profound sense of the risks and opportunities at stake for our shared prosperity as a state and, as our constitution acknowledges, the critical nature of education to the health of our democracy. We advise a keen sense of the urgency when it comes to addressing the identified funding gaps, and the moral imperative of reducing the remaining achievement gaps.

The Commission also hopes, after passage of any revisions to Chapter 70, that careful and continued attention will be paid to the adequacy of the foundation budget, to the effectiveness of the implementation of any Chapter 70 revisions, and to best practices that emerge over coming years. We encourage the legislature to make the work of the Commission recurring, on some regular interval of years as was originally envisioned by the 1993 Act, since both pedagogical wisdom and relevant changes in our economy and society will always be emerging. We hope that, with the assistance of such a reconvened commission, the legislature will be in a position to act expeditiously on any new fiscal needs or implementation challenges that have arisen in the interim, or new strategies that permit more efficient and effective use of funds. Noting the challenges and frustrations faced by this Commission as the result of a lack of dedicated and funded staff, we strongly recommend that dedicated and timely funding be provided to any future Commission to allow a rigorous review of available data to make decisions that are in best long term interests of the Commonwealth both fiscally and educationally.

Education reform in Massachusetts is now 22 years old, and its strength has derived from a solid bipartisan commitment both to high academic standards and to providing adequate funding to allow districts to meet those standards. As a Commission composed of members from the educational, business, philanthropic, governmental, and civic communities, we hope that our proposals represent another step in that journey towards academic excellence and educational equity, and we look forward to continuing our work together to see these changes enacted and signed into law.

Appendix A

The Commission held six public hearings across the state to solicit testimony from members of the public. A summary of the main themes and issues that were raised during the public hearings are listed below. ***This list reflects the testimony heard at the public hearings only and is not meant to convey the Commission's formal findings or recommendations.***

Public Hearings Summary

- Actual spending on Special Education and Health Insurance far exceeds the foundation budget assumptions. As a result, foundation spending is consumed by these under-funded fixed charges, leaving less funding available to support other educational programs.
- Need to increase funding for at-risk students – especially low income and ELL students.
- The foundation budget does not provide sufficient resources to address the mental health needs of today's students.
- The foundation budget should provide greater support for wraparound services.
- The Commission should examine district allocation practices and efforts to remove barriers to efficient and adaptive uses of funds.
- Technology should be included in the foundation budget as such costs were not envisioned in the original foundation budget.
- The Commission should propose changes to simplify and clarify the foundation budget to make it easier for citizens to understand how funds are spent and whether these are bringing about results.
- Money should follow the student at the school level, to ensure that additional aid is being spent on the students who it is intended to benefit.
- Reconsider the use of October 1st enrollment data to calculate foundation budgets, which is especially problematic for districts that experience significant fluctuations in student enrollment throughout the year.
- The current method of funding charter schools is creating significant and growing financial difficulty for municipalities and school districts.
- The Commission should consider whether there is sufficient funding in the foundation budget for building maintenance.
- The foundation budget formula does not account for the cost of unfunded mandates.
- Need a better enforcement mechanism and/or greater clarity regarding a municipality's obligation to appropriate sufficient funds to meet the required local contribution.
- Transportation should be included and funded in the foundation budget.
- Need to address "equity" issues – the Commission should review and adjust the local contribution and school aid calculation factors in the Chapter 70 formula.
- The Commission should address concerns surrounding vocational education – i.e. how vocational education students are recruited and accepted, how tuition is calculated, and the high cost of student transportation.
- The foundation budget should include funding for school libraries.
- The foundation budget should account for the differences in costs among smaller, rural districts.

Appendix B

Summary of Commission Meetings & Materials

Meeting # 1: October 9, 2014

Commission members reviewed the charges set forth in the authorizing legislation (*Sections 124 & 278 of Chapter 165 of the Acts of 2014*), viewed a presentation on the foundation budget formula entitled “Measuring Adequacy – the Massachusetts Foundation Budget” prepared by Melissa King and Roger Hatch from the Department of Elementary & Secondary Education (DESE), and discussed the public hearing schedule. Commission members received the following materials: A copy of the authorizing legislation (*Section 124 & 278 of Chapter 165 of the Acts of 2014*), a summary of the authorizing legislation, and a copy of the power point presentation entitled “Measuring Adequacy – the Massachusetts Foundation Budget”.

Meeting #2: March 10, 2015

Commission members viewed a presentation on special education and health insurance entitled “Massachusetts Foundation Budget: Focus on Special Education and Health Insurance” prepared by Melissa King and Roger Hatch from DESE, viewed a presentation on municipal health insurance trends prepared by Carolyn Ryan from the Massachusetts Taxpayers Foundation, and reviewed the Commission’s meeting schedule and timeline. Commission members received the following materials: a copy of the power point presentation entitled “the Massachusetts Foundation Budget: Focus on Special Education and Health Insurance”, a copy of the power point presentation entitled “Municipal Health Insurance Trends”, and a copy of the Commission’s meeting schedule.

Meeting #3: March 27, 2015

Commission members viewed a presentation on the other foundation budget categories and differences in spending among districts entitled “Further Analysis of the Foundation Budget” prepared by Melissa King from DESE, viewed a presentation on the wage adjustment factor prepared by Melissa King from DESE, and considered information provided by DESE Commissioner Mitchell Chester on the relationship between spending and student outcomes. Commission members received the following materials: a copy of the power point presentation entitled “Further Analysis of the Foundation Budget”, a copy of the power point presentation entitled “Wage Adjustment Factor”, and a list of school districts by wealth and low-income quintile.

Meeting #4: April 14, 2015

Commission members viewed a presentation on evidence-based strategies for improving student outcomes entitled “Building a Foundation for Success” prepared by Chad d'Entremont and Luc Schuster from the Rennie Center and Mass Budget and Policy Center, considered information provided by Dr. Paul Dakin (Superintendent of Revere Public Schools) regarding the various investments and programs that have yielded positive outcomes in Revere, and discussed the process for reviewing and voting on recommendations that would be included in the Commission’s final report. Commission members received the following materials: a copy of the power point presentation entitled “Building a Foundation for Success”, and a handout on Revere Public Schools provided by Dr. Paul Dakin.

Meeting #5: May 5, 2015

Commission members viewed a presentation on effective resource allocation entitled “Effective & Efficient Resource Allocation: A Framework to Consider” prepared by Dr. Karla Baehr, discussed and approved changes to the Commission’s timeline and work plan, and reviewed a draft proposal containing recommendations for

health care and SPED adjustments. Commission members received the following materials: a copy of the power point entitled “Effective & Efficient Resource Allocation: A Framework to Consider”, a copy of the work plan proposed by Senator Chang-Díaz, and a copy of the draft recommendations for health care and SPED adjustments.

Meeting #6: June 9, 2015

Commission members reviewed and approved final recommendations for Health Care and SPED adjustments, considered proposals relative to full-day preschool and accountability, and discussed the other topics to be considered by the Commission during its extended deliberations. Commission members received the following materials: a copy of the final recommendations for health care and SPED adjustments, a document containing draft proposals relative to full-day preschool and accountability, and a copy of the Commission’s updated work plan.

Meeting #7: June 23, 2015

Commission members reviewed and approved edits to the preliminary report, discussed the process and methodology for analyzing the other topics to be considered during the Commission’s extended deliberations, and reviewed information presented by Roger Hatch from DESE on school-based data collection. Commission members received the following materials: a draft of the preliminary report, a document explaining the foundation budget comparison tool developed by Commission member Ed Moscovitch, and a document on school-level finance data.

Meeting #8: September 28, 2015

Commission members were introduced to David Bunker, who was hired by the co-chairs to staff the commission and draft the final report. They also reviewed and commented on his work plan, which was centered around examining the adequacy of the low income and ELL adjustments in the formula. Melissa King of DESE gave a presentation on in-district special education costs, members held a discussion on the “accountability” and “conditions” recommendations, and Dr. Karla Baehr gave a presentation of potential recommendations on data collection, which were unanimously approved by Commission members. Commission members received: a copy of the agenda, a copy of the work proposal prepared by David Bunker, a copy of the Power Point presentation on “In District Special Education Costs” by Melissa King, a document prepared by Dr. Karla Baehr containing recommendations to support effective and efficient allocation of resources, and a document containing a list of the “Accountability” proposals that the Commission has considered to date.

Meeting #9: October 16, 2015

Commission members reviewed the recommendations of David Bunker regarding the low income and ELL adjustments. They also discussed the issue of efficient resource allocation and reporting on spending. Finally, they had a follow-up discussion about in-district special education, and other remaining concerns expressed by Commission members.



SHREWSBURY PUBLIC SCHOOLS SCHOOL COMMITTEE MEETING

ITEM NO: IV. Time Scheduled Appointments:
C. College Admissions Officers: Panel Discussion

MEETING DATE: 6/7/17

SPECIFIC STATEMENT OR QUESTION:

Will the Committee hear College Admissions Officers engage in a panel discussion regarding the current environment and expectations for students applying to colleges and universities?

BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

1. A panel of College Admissions Officers from Massachusetts' colleges and universities will engage in a discussion regarding the expectations they have for students applying for admission to their schools.
2. The Panel will be comprised of admissions officers from the following schools: Clark University, College of the Holy Cross, University of Massachusetts at Amherst, and Worcester State University.

ACTION RECOMMENDED:

That the Committee hear the discussion and take such action as it deems in the best interest of the school system.

STAFF & PANELISTS AVAILABLE FOR PRESENTATION:

Dr. Joseph M. Sawyer, Superintendent of Schools
Erin Bernard, Senior Assistant Director of Admissions, UMass-Amherst
Joseph J. DiCarlo III, Director of Admissions, Worcester State University
Andrew N. Carter, Senior Associate Director, Office of Admissions, College of the Holy Cross
Shaun Holt, Associate Director of Admissions, Clark University



**SHREWSBURY PUBLIC SCHOOLS
SCHOOL COMMITTEE MEETING**

ITEM NO: **V. Curriculum**

MEETING DATE: **6/7/17**

A. Strategic Priorities Progress Report: Enhancing Learning Through Technology

SPECIFIC STATEMENT OR QUESTION:

Will the Committee hear a progress report on the district's strategic priority of "Enhancing Learning Through Technology"?

BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

1. In the spring of 2011, the Shrewsbury School Committee set four strategic priorities for our school district for a five-year period.
2. One of those adopted is the priority of "Enhancing Learning Through Technology".
3. Ms. Banios will present the report (provided under separate cover) and will be available to take questions from the Committee.

ACTION RECOMMENDED:

That the Committee hear the report and take such action as it deems in the best interest of the school system.

STAFF AVAILABLE FOR PRESENTATION:

Mary Beth Banios, Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum, Instruction & Assessment



**SHREWSBURY PUBLIC SCHOOLS
SCHOOL COMMITTEE MEETING**

ITEM NO: **VI. Policy**

MEETING DATE: **6/7/17**

SPECIFIC STATEMENT OR QUESTION:

BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

ACTION RECOMMENDED:

COMMITTEE MEMBERS/STAFF AVAILABLE FOR PRESENTATION:



**SHREWSBURY PUBLIC SCHOOLS
SCHOOL COMMITTEE MEETING**

ITEM NO: **VII. Finance & Operations**

MEETING DATE: **6/7/17**

SPECIFIC STATEMENT OR QUESTION:

BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

ACTION RECOMMENDED:

STAFF AVAILABLE FOR PRESENTATION:



SHREWSBURY PUBLIC SCHOOLS SCHOOL COMMITTEE MEETING

ITEM NO: **VIII. Old Business**

MEETING DATE: **6/7/17**

A. Recommendation for Extended School Care Tuition Increase: Vote

SPECIFIC STATEMENT OR QUESTION:

Will the Committee vote to approve an Extended School Care tuition increase of 3% for the 2017-2018 school year.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

1. The office of Extended Learning oversees the Extended School Care Program, the Elementary Summer Enrichment Program, the Middle School Summer Extensions Program, and a variety of other programs designed to enrich students' hours beyond the traditional school day.
2. At the May 24, 2017 meeting, Ms. Karen Isaacson, Director of Extended Learning, presented a report on the Extended School Care program that included information on enrollment, new initiatives, and a recommendation for a 3% tuition increase for the 2017-2018 school year to increase overall revenue and help defray rising costs. Dr. Sawyer recommends a vote in support of the 3% fee increase.
3. After the May 24 meeting, Ms. Isaacson sent a notification to parents whose children are enrolled in the Extended School Care program with information about the enrollment increase and inviting them to communicate with the School Committee or her with any feedback or questions.

ACTION RECOMMENDED:

That the Committee vote to approve an Extended School Care Tuition Increase of 3% for the 2017-2018 school year.

MEMBERS/STAFF AVAILABLE FOR PRESENTATION:

Dr. Joseph M. Sawyer, Superintendent of Schools

Mr. Patrick C. Collins, Assistant Superintendent for Finance & Operations



SHREWSBURY PUBLIC SCHOOLS SCHOOL COMMITTEE MEETING

ITEM NO: **IX. New Business**

MEETING DATE: **6/7/17**

A. Updated Assabet Valley Collaborative Agreement: Vote

SPECIFIC STATEMENT OR QUESTION:

Will the Committee vote to approve an updated Agreement to participate as a member of the Assabet Valley Collaborative?

BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

1. State law requires that member school districts vote to amend a collaborative agreement when any material changes are made to the operation of the collaborative.
2. The Auburn Public Schools wishes to join the Assabet Valley Collaborative. This has been approved by the AVC Board of Directors, and it is recommended that member school committees vote to amend the collaborative agreement to include Auburn.
3. As the agreement needs to be amended to include Auburn, the AVC Board of Directors also recommends approving other minor changes at this time, including a revision of the mission statement, a change of language to potentially allow the education of individuals outside of the age range of three to 22 years of age in the future, if collaborative law and regulations were to allow for this.
4. A copy of the amended agreement, with changes highlighted, is enclosed.

ACTION RECOMMENDED:

That the Committee vote to approve the amended Assabet Valley Collaborative Agreement.

STAFF AVAILABLE FOR PRESENTATION:

Dr. Joseph M. Sawyer, Superintendent of Schools



AMENDED AGREEMENT FOR THE ASSABET VALLEY COLLABORATIVE

Pursuant to *M.G.L. c. 40, § 4E*

PREAMBLE / AUTHORIZATION

This document constitutes the Collaborative Agreement of the Assabet Valley Collaborative (AVC), established pursuant to the provisions of Chapter 40, Section 4E of the General Laws of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and acts or amendments thereof as they may from time to time be enacted by the legislature, and 603 CMR 50.00.

This agreement replaces the original agreement dated August 27, 1987, as most recently amended on **March 3, 2015**, entered into by and between the school committees listed in Section I (herein, the “member districts”) and will be effective upon the approval of the member districts and the Massachusetts Board of Elementary and Secondary Education as indicated on the signatory page.

SECTION I: MEMBERSHIP

The membership of the Assabet Valley Collaborative, as of the effective date of this agreement, includes the school committees from the following districts, as indicated by the signatures of the chairs of the school committees:

- A. School Committee for the Assabet Valley Regional Vocational School District
- B. School Committee for the Auburn Public Schools**
- C. School Committee for the Berlin Public Schools
- D. School Committee for the Berlin-Boylston Public Schools
- E. School Committee for the Boylston Public Schools
- F. School Committee for the Hudson Public Schools
- G. School Committee for the Grafton Public Schools
- H. School Committee for the Marlborough Public Schools
- I. School Committee for the Maynard Public Schools
- J. School Committee for the Millbury Public Schools
- K. School Committee for the Nashoba Regional School District
- L. School Committee for the Northborough Public Schools
- M. School Committee for the Northborough-Southborough Public Schools
- N. School Committee for the Shrewsbury Public Schools
- O. School Committee for the Southborough Public Schools
- P. School Committee for the Westborough Public Schools**

SECTION II: MISSION, OBJECTIVES, FOCUS, AND PURPOSES

The mission of the Assabet Valley Collaborative is to provide effective and efficient services to meet the current and evolving needs of member communities to promote student success and community integration. It is also the mission of the Assabet Valley Collaborative is to jointly conduct programs and/or services in a cost-effective manner which shall complement and strengthen those provided by member school committees and to increase equitable and inclusive educational opportunities for children ages 3 up to 22 and as they transition to adulthood.

The purpose of this collaborative is to provide:

- specialized education programs and services for students ages 3 up to 22 and as they transition to adulthood
- special education transportation and other transportation services
- professional development, training and resource sharing
- an array of consultative and direct services
- cooperative purchasing/procurement services
- cost effective responses to needs articulated by member districts
- services to adults with disabilities subject to authorizing statute, regulations, state contracts/approvals and board approval
- early childhood services to children with disabilities under the age of 3 subject to authorizing statute, regulations, state contracts/approvals and board approval

The focus of this collaborative is the development and delivery of high quality programs and/or services to member districts which shall complement and strengthen those provided by member school committees.

The overall objectives of this collaborative include:

- the creation and/or delivery of cost effective responses to needs articulated by member districts
- the delivery of high quality specialized education programs and services for students ages 3 up to 22 and as they transition to adulthood
- the delivery of cost effective and efficient special education transportation services
- the development and delivery of high quality and cost effective consultative and direct services
- the development and delivery of high quality and cost effective professional development, training and resource sharing
- the provision of effective and efficient cooperative purchasing/procurement services
- subject to statutory and regulatory authorization, the development of continuous and evolving services that may include leveraging expertise and resources to expand continuum of services to include young children with disabilities and/or adults with disabilities (22+)

SECTION III: PROGRAMS AND SERVICES TO BE OFFERED

The collaborative will offer the following programs and services, which shall complement the educational programs and services of the member districts in a cost-effective manner:

- specialized education programs and services for students ages 3 up to 22 and as they transition to adulthood
- special education transportation services and other transportation services
- professional development, training and resource sharing
- an array of consultative services
- cooperative purchasing/procurement services
- cost effective responses to needs articulated by member districts
- subject to statutory and regulatory authorization, a continuum of services to include young children with disabilities and/or adults with disabilities (22+)

SECTION IV: GOVERNANCE

Each school committee executing this collaborative agreement shall annually appoint the Superintendent of Schools to serve as its representative on the Assabet Valley Collaborative Board of Directors before September 15 of each school year. These Board members shall be referred to in this agreement as “appointed representatives.”

Each appointed representative on the Board of Directors will represent his/her respective school district(s) and will have one (1) vote.

An appointee of the Commissioner of Elementary and Secondary Education (herein Commissioner) shall also be a voting member of the collaborative Board of Directors.

The Executive Director of the Assabet Valley Collaborative will attend all Board of Directors meetings.

The Assabet Valley Collaborative shall be managed by this collaborative Board of Directors, hereinafter referred to as the “Board”.

- A. Regular meetings of the Board shall be held monthly from September to June, and at additional times if necessary.
- B. A quorum for conducting business shall consist of a simple majority of the voting members of the Board.
- C. The Board has the authority to act by a simple majority vote of members present, unless otherwise provided in this Agreement.
- D. The Board shall annually organize itself by electing a chairperson and vice-chairperson, as outlined in the “Board Policies.” In the absence of the Board Chairperson, the Vice-Chairperson acts as Chairperson.
- E. The Collaborative’s Executive Director, or designee, will act as Executive Secretary to the Board.
- F. The Chairperson, by vote of the Board, may appoint such subcommittees or advisory committees of the Board, as the need arises, as will facilitate the work of the Board. Such

sub-committees may also make recommendations with respect to other services and cooperative efforts.

- G. The Board shall establish a standing Policy Committee and a standing Finance Committee whose members represent superintendents, business managers, and special education administrators.
- H. The Board shall establish an Operating Committee made up of the person within each member's school district responsible for student services and/or for special education. This committee shall have the primary responsibility for providing recommendations to the Board on policies and procedures as they pertain to the delivery of special education services to students with disabilities or other special needs. The committee shall meet once a month or more often if necessary to conduct its business.

SECTION V: CONDITIONS OF MEMBERSHIP

Each member district shall have the following rights and responsibilities as a member of the Assabet Valley Collaborative:

- A. Each member of the Board shall be entitled to a vote.
- B. Fees for membership in the collaborative shall be established annually, as described in Section VII of this agreement.
- C. Each appointed representative shall be responsible for providing timely information and updates to its appointing member district(s) on collaborative activities, as outlined in M.G.L. c. 40, § 4E and 603 CMR 50.04(2) and for providing other information as required or requested.
- D. Each appointed representative is expected to attend every Board meeting. When an appointed representative has missed one-half (1/2) of the meetings within a fiscal year, the Chair of the Board shall inform the Chair of the appointing member district or institution of the appointed representative's absences.
- E. Each appointed representative must attend training required by the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (Department), as outlined in M.G.L. Ch. 40, § 4E; 603 CMR 50.05(3) and 603 CMR 50.12 (3). Should an appointed representative fail to complete the required training within the timelines set in law and regulations, the member district shall automatically become an inactive member of the Board, shall not count towards a quorum, and shall not have voting rights on the Board, but shall continue to have all other rights and obligations of membership. The member district shall become an active member and voting rights shall be reinstated once the appointed representative completes the training.
- F. No appointed representative on the Board shall serve as a member of a Board of Directors or as an officer or employee of any related for-profit or non-profit organization as defined in M.G.L. c. 40, § 4E, as most recently amended.
- G. No appointed representative shall receive an additional salary or stipend for his/her service as a Board member.
- H. No appointed representative shall delegate his/her powers or send a representative in his/her place as a voting Board member and no member district shall delegate the rights, responsibilities, or duties of its appointed representative to any other individual, unless the member district is replacing the appointed representative with that individual.

SECTION VI: POWERS AND DUTIES OF THE BOARD AND APPOINTED REPRESENTATIVES TO THE BOARD

The Assabet Valley Collaborative Board shall manage the educational collaborative and shall be responsible for providing fiduciary and organizational oversight and accountability over the operation of the educational collaborative. The Board shall be vested with all authority and responsibilities provided to it by M.G.L. c. 40, § 4E and 603 CMR 50.00 and all acts and regulations amendatory thereof, including but not limited to the following:

- A. The Board shall hire or appoint an Executive Director, to serve under its general direction, to manage and supervise the Collaborative, oversee the day to day operation of its programs and services, and implement policies of the Board. The Executive Director shall have the authority granted by M.G.L. Ch. 40, § 4E. The Board shall annually evaluate the Executive Director's performance in accordance with state laws and regulations for the evaluation of educators.
- B. It is the function and responsibility of the Board to formulate policy for the collaborative and to ensure compliance with applicable state and federal laws and regulations, including M.G.L. c. 40, § 4E and 603 CMR 50.00.
- C. The Assabet Valley Collaborative is a governmental entity.
- D. The Board shall be vested with the authority to enter into agreements with member and non-member districts or other collaboratives to establish mutually beneficial programs and services or pricing arrangements.
- E. The Board shall be responsible for:
 - 1. ensuring adherence to this collaborative agreement and progress toward achieving the purposes and objectives set forth in the agreement;
 - 2. determining the cost-effectiveness of programs and services offered by the collaborative;
 - 3. ensuring that any borrowing, loans, or mortgages are cost effective, necessary to carry out the purposes for which the collaborative is established, in the best interest of the collaborative and its member districts, and consistent with the terms of this agreement; and
 - 4. approving all expenditures, including, but not limited to, contracts, borrowing, and the purchase and sale of fixed assets.
- F. The Board has standing to sue and be sued to the same extent as a city, town, or regional school district.
- G. The Board is a public employer and shall hire all employees of the educational collaborative and ensure that all employees possess the necessary and required licenses and approvals as required by M.G.L. c. 40, § 4E.
- H. The Board shall hire or appoint a Business Manager or an employee with responsibilities similar to those of a town accountant who shall be subject to Massachusetts General Laws Chapter 41, Section 52. The business manager may not serve concurrently as an appointed representative, as the treasurer, or as the Executive Director of the Collaborative. The Board shall ensure that an evaluation of the performance and effectiveness of the business manager is conducted annually.
- I. The Board shall hire or appoint a Treasurer. The Treasurer shall be responsible for the oversight and certification of all receipts and disbursements related to the collaborative's funds and shall perform duties as required by the Board and authorized by M.G.L. Ch.

40, § 4E and its regulations and any amendments thereof. The Treasurer shall not serve concurrently as an appointed representative, as the Executive Director, or as the Collaborative's business manager. The Treasurer shall annually give bond consistent with the requirements of M.G.L. Ch. 40, § 4E. The Board shall annually evaluate the performance of the Treasurer.

- J. The Board shall ensure that there is segregation of duties between the Executive Director, Treasurer, and Business Manager, and that these employees shall not serve as a member of the collaborative Board of Directors or as an officer or employee of any related for-profit or non-profit organization as defined in M.G.L. Ch. 40, § 4E.
- K. The Board shall hire or appoint one or more registered nurse(s) as a School Nurse to support collaborative programs and shall provide such nurses with proper facilities to ensure that the health needs of the Collaborative students are met.
- L. The Board shall ensure that no employee of an educational collaborative is employed at any related for-profit or non-profit organization.
- M. The Board shall develop such policies as it deems necessary to support the operation of the collaborative, including, but not limited to, policies relative to personnel, students, finance and internal controls, health and nursing, and any other policies required by state or federal law and regulation. The Board shall review the effectiveness of such policies to ensure currency and appropriateness, and may establish a subcommittee to make recommendations to the Board concerning such policies.
- N. The Board shall ensure that the collaborative completes and files an annual report and an annual independent audit, as well as such other student, program, financial and staffing information, reports or documents as the Department deems necessary. The Board shall ensure that annual reports and annual independent audits are filed with appropriate governmental agencies and posted on the collaborative's website, consistent with the requirements of M.G.L. c. 40, § 4E and 603 CMR 50.00.
- O. The Board shall establish a process to provide member districts, students, parents/guardians, the Board of Elementary and Secondary Education, and the public all information required by law and regulation.

INDEMNIFICATION

Neither the Executive Director nor any appointed representatives shall be liable to the Collaborative or to any member district hereof for any act or omission of the Executive Director or any appointed representative or be held personally liable in connection with the affairs of the Collaborative except only liability arising out of his/her own willful malfeasance, bad faith, gross negligence or reckless disregard of duty to the Collaborative or its members.

Neither the Executive Director nor any appointed representative or member district shall be personally liable for any debt, claim, demand, judgment, decree, liability or obligation of any kind, against or with respect to the Collaborative or arising out of any action taken or omitted for or on behalf of the Collaborative and the Collaborative shall be solely liable thereof and resort shall be had exclusively to the Collaborative property for the payment or performance thereof.

The Executive Director, appointed representative, or member district shall be entitled to full indemnity and full reimbursement out of Collaborative property, including, without limitation,

fees and disbursements of counsel, if, contrary provisions hereof, such Executive Director, appointed representative, or member district shall be held personally liable. Any person dealing with the Collaborative shall be informed of the substance of this provision except that any such person need not be informed of the indemnification contained herein, where the Board deems it appropriate, documents or instruments executed by or by authority of the Board shall contain reference hereto.

The Executive Director and his/her legal representatives and each appointed representative and his/her legal representatives and each member district and its legal representatives shall be indemnified by the Collaborative against all liabilities and expenses, exclusive of amounts paid to the Collaborative, including judgments, fines, penalties, amounts paid in settlement and counsel fees, incurred in reasonable settlement of any action, suit or proceeding to which such Executive Director, appointed representative, or member district, or his/her/its legal representatives may be made a party or otherwise involved by reason of his/her/its capacity as Executive Director, appointed representative, or member district, except only liabilities and expenses arising out of his/her/its own willful misfeasance, bad faith, gross negligence or reckless disregard of duty to the Collaborative as finally adjudged in such action or, in the event of settlement or termination of such action without final adjudication, as determined by independent counsel for the Collaborative. Said right of indemnification shall be in addition to any other rights to which such Executive Director, appointed representative, or member district may be entitled as a matter of law or which may be lawfully granted to him/her/it.

SECTION VII: FINANCE

A. Financial Terms:

1. Membership fees shall be assessed to each member district on July 1 of each year. The Board shall establish a Policy that identifies the procedure to calculate an annual membership fee; membership fees will fund up to and will not exceed 50% of the administrative costs for the Collaborative. Annually, the Board shall establish the membership fee by a majority vote.
2. The remaining administrative costs of the collaborative will be distributed across all programs operated by the collaborative through an administration allocation expense proportionate to the operating budget for each program. The proportional share of administrative costs will be added to the operating budget of each program operated by the collaborative.
3. The fees, tuitions, and rates to be charged to districts for all collaborative services will be set annually by the Board of Directors. These include tuitions for specialized programs for students, hourly rates for therapy, evaluative, consultative, and the like services, and overhead calculations for transportation, professional development, cooperative purchasing/procurement and the like services rendered. Fees, tuitions, and rates will be calculated through the annual budgeting process for each program, including the administrative cost allocation noted in 2 above and capital expenses noted in Section VII (F)(h) below, with projections based on past usage.
4. Districts will be charged per unit of usage, i.e. per student enrolled, per hour of service delivery, per transportation route, per participant enrolled in courses or

workshops, or per district for multi-district initiatives. Each type of service may require a different schedule of billing, e.g. 3-4 times per year for program tuitions, per use for courses/PD, monthly for transportation, etc.

5. The collaborative will submit invoices to districts for services to be paid within thirty (30) days of receipt.
6. A Non-member surcharge rate of up to 15% will be set annually by the Board of Directors to determine rates charged to non-member districts, agencies and organizations for services rendered by the collaborative. Non-member surcharges will be utilized within each program or service area in order to contain costs for member districts and as an offset to corresponding administrative fees apportioned to each program/service area. The Board has the authority to waive or decrease the percentage of the non-member surcharge to non-member districts when doing so is determined to be in the best interest of the collaborative.
7. The Board may enter into agreements with non-member and member districts or other collaboratives to establish mutually beneficial pricing arrangements.
8. The Board may apply, by majority vote, for state, federal, corporate, or foundation grants, and may accept gifts, grants, or contributions from governmental and private sources, whether in cash or in kind.
9. The Board may enter into contracts to obtain the funds necessary to carry out the purpose for which the collaborative was established.
10. The collaborative is subject to M.G.L. c. 30B for the procurement of goods and services.
11. A Procurement Officer will be designated to coordinate procurement activities on behalf of the collaborative and its members.
12. Procurement awards require Board approval.

B. Collaborative Fund:

1. The Board shall establish and manage a fund to be known as the *Assabet Valley Collaborative Educational Collaborative Fund* (herein, “the AVC fund”).
2. The AVC fund shall be the depository of all monies paid by the member districts and non-member districts and all grants, gifts, or contracts from the federal government, state government, charitable foundations, private corporations, or any other source; all such monies shall be paid directly to the collaborative Board and deposited in the fund.
3. The Treasurer, subject to the direction of the Board, shall receive and disburse all money belonging to the collaborative without further appropriation.
4. All payments must be approved by the Board.
5. The Treasurer may make appropriate investments of funds of the collaborative not immediately necessary for operations, consistent with M.G.L. c. 44, § 55B.

C. Borrowing, Loans, and Mortgages:

1. The Board may authorize the borrowing of funds or enter into short- or long-term agreements or mortgages, and acquire or improve real property to support collaborative operations, subject to the following procedures:

- a. all borrowing, loans, and mortgages shall be discussed at a public meeting of the Board;
 - b. the Board shall investigate options related to borrowing, loans, and mortgages in order to determine that the terms related to any borrowing, loans and mortgages are the most favorable available at the time of the application;
 - c. the Board shall determine, at a public meeting, through a majority vote, that the terms related to borrowing, loans, and mortgages are cost-effective and are the most favorable available at the time of the application; and
 - d. the Board shall determine, at a public meeting, through a majority vote, that the borrowing, loans and mortgages are necessary to carry out the purposes for which the collaborative is established.
 - 2. In the event that such borrowing loan or mortgage is for the acquisition or improvement of real property:
 - a. the Board shall discuss its intent to apply for a real estate mortgage at a public meeting of the Board prior to the meeting of the collaborative Board at which the final vote is taken;
 - b. the Board shall provide notice to each member district within thirty (30) calendar days of applying for real estate mortgages; and
 - c. the Board shall approve such action by a majority vote.
- D. Surplus Funds: Unexpended general funds as defined in 603 CMR 50.07 at the end of the fiscal year plus any previous year's surplus funds, as determined through the financial statements, will be considered cumulative surplus.
- 1. The determination of cumulative surplus shall not include funds deposited in a capital reserve as provided for in 603 CMR 50.07(10), funds deposited in trust in accordance with M.G.L. c. 32B, § 20 and any amounts prepaid for services or tuitions in accordance with M.G.L. c. 40, § 4E.
 - 2. The Board will retain no more than 25 percent in cumulative surplus, as defined by 603 CMR 50.03(5)(b)10.
 - 3. On an annual basis, after the Board has discussed the audit results of the previous fiscal year, the Board shall approve by majority vote, the final dollar amount of the cumulative surplus.
 - 4. The Board shall determine whether such final dollar amount of surplus funds is within the established 25 percent limit, and whether the funds will be retained by the collaborative or whether all or some portion will be disbursed to the member districts or credited to support programs and services offered to member districts.
 - 5. If the Board determines that a disbursement of surplus funds will be made to member districts, the amount will be distributed based on a weighted average of all costs paid by each district to the collaborative for the previous three year period, based on audited financial statements.

E. Capital Reserve Fund

- a. The Assabet Valley Collaborative shall create a capital reserve fund to support costs associated with the acquisition, maintenance, and improvement of fixed assets, including real property, pursuant to a capital plan.
- b. Funds in a capital reserve account may be used only for the project or purpose for which the account was established.
- c. The establishment of a capital reserve shall be subject to the approval of two-thirds of the member districts. The request for approval must state the reason for the reserve and a limit on the balance that may be held in the reserve.
- d. Deposits into the capital reserve shall be proposed and approved through the budget process.
- e. In the event that the purpose for which the capital reserve was created requires modification, the collaborative Board of Directors shall revise its capital plan and provide notice to all member districts. If the member district does not vote to disapprove the revised capital plan within a 45 day period, that member shall be deemed to have approved the revised capital plan. Two-thirds (2/3) approval of the member districts is required to revise the capital plan.

F. Annual Budget Preparation and Assessment of Costs

1. Development of the Collaborative Budget: The Board shall annually determine the collaborative budget consistent with the timelines, terms, and requirements in M.G.L. c. 40, s 4E, regulations promulgated by the Department and this agreement.
 - a. In collaboration with staff and member districts, AVC begins forecasting the annual budget each October. The process includes input from collaborative committees, program directors and staff. Strategic plans created will guide this process. Program directors estimate future program services/enrollments based on this input. The Executive Director and Director of Finance meet with program directors to review anticipated enrollment and prior trends to establish appropriate staffing and fiscal resources. When final enrollment and expenses are forecasted, rates are established to support both the qualitative and quantitative program elements. Forecasted revenues generated by programs and services are used to pay for staff salaries, supplies and services. Administrative costs are absorbed by these revenues.
 - b. The preliminary budget draft is presented and reviewed by the Finance Subcommittee before submission to the collaborative Board of Directors. The Finance Subcommittee's recommended preliminary budget is presented to the Board of Directors for initial review (first reading) in December. The timing of the budget presentation is critical to inform member districts of forecasted rates for the upcoming fiscal year. A second reading of the budget is held in January for the Board vote. Additional meetings will be held as necessary to finalize the annual budget. Forecasts are created in accordance with governing local and state policies.
 - c. The proposed budget shall contain all planned financial activity for the upcoming fiscal year.
 - d. The general fund budget shall segregate all operating expenditures, capital expenditures, debt service payments, and deposits to capital reserve.

- e. Expenditures from grant funds, trust funds, and other funds not designated as general funds that by law may be expended by the Board without further appropriation shall be segregated in the budget.
 - f. The proposed budget shall be classified into such line items as the Board shall determine, but shall at a minimum delineate amounts for operating expenditures, including, administration, instructional and rental expenses and capital expenditures, including debt service payments and deposits to capital reserve.
 - g. The proposed budget shall include the methodology used to determine tuition prices for member and non-member students as well as the methodology to determine fees for services and membership dues based on the cost of providing collaborative programs.
 - h. Capital costs will be included in the operating budget of each program requiring capital expenditures and will be used to determine the tuitions/fees for each program. Capital reserves will be used with approval of the Board of Directors to offset capital expenditures in programs as determined by the Capital Reserve Plan noted in Section E above.
2. The proposed budget shall be discussed at a public meeting of the Board and notice shall be provided to each member district ten (10) working days before the date of the Board meeting at which the proposed budget will be discussed.
 3. The Board shall adopt the final budget by affirmative majority vote at a subsequent meeting no earlier than ten (10) working days after the Board meeting at which the collaborative budget was first proposed but no later than June 30 of the preceding fiscal year.

G. Transmitting the Budget and Payment Terms:

1. The Treasurer shall certify and transmit the budget and the tuition rates, membership dues and fees for services for the upcoming fiscal year to each member district not later than June 30 of the preceding fiscal year.
2. The collaborative shall submit invoices to member and non-member districts according to the following schedule:
 - a) Tuitions are invoiced quarterly.
 - b) Consultation, transportation and professional development services are invoiced monthly. Annual membership fees are invoiced annually.
3. Invoices shall be paid within thirty (30) days of receipt of invoice.

H. Procedure for Amending the Budget:

1. All budget amendments shall be proposed at a public meeting of the Board and must be approved by the majority of the Board to take effect.
2. Any amendment that does not result in an increase in tuition rates, membership dues or fees for services shall be approved by the Board by a majority vote.
3. Any amendment to the budget that results in an increase in the tuition rates, membership dues or fees for services shall adhere to the following procedures:
 - a. All appointed representatives shall, within ten (10) working days of the public meeting at which the amendment was first proposed, report to their member districts the content of the proposed amendment.

- b. All amendments shall be voted on by the Board at a second public meeting of the Board next following the Board meeting at which the amendment was first proposed; adoption shall require a majority vote.
- c. The treasurer shall certify and transmit the amended tuition rates, membership dues and fees for services to each member district not later than ten (10) working days following the affirmative vote of the Board.
- 4. The Board has the authority to reduce tuition rates, membership dues and fees for services to member and non-member districts, when doing so is determined to be in the best interest of the collaborative.

SECTION VIII: PROCEDURE FOR AMENDING THE COLLABORATIVE AGREEMENT

The Collaborative Agreement of the Assabet Valley Collaborative may be amended from time to time in accordance with the following procedures:

- A. A proposal for amendment of the Collaborative Agreement may be initiated by any member school committee or district, any member of the Board, or by the Executive Director.
- B. The proposed amendment shall be presented in writing to the Executive Director of the collaborative and the Chair of the Board no less than ten (10) days prior to a meeting of the Board at which it shall first be read.
- C. Following the first reading of any proposed amendment and any changes as requested by the Board, the Executive Director shall submit the proposed amendment to the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (herein Department) for initial review.
- D. Following the Department review, the Executive Director shall make such changes as the Department requires.
- E. No less than ten (10) days prior to a meeting of the Board at which the revised amendment shall be discussed, the Executive Director shall cause copies thereof to be sent to all appointed representatives and the chairs of the school committees of the member districts together with notice as to the time and place of the second reading of the amendment and vote thereon.
- F. The proposed amendment shall be read a second time at the regular meeting next subsequent to the Department review, at which time, in order to be approved, there must be a two-thirds (2/3) vote of the Board in favor of the amendment.
- G. Following approval by the Board, the amended agreement shall be submitted by the Chair of the Board to the member districts for a vote to approve the amended agreement.
- H. Once a majority of all member districts have approved and signed the amended agreement, the Collaborative shall submit the signed amended agreement in accordance with 603 CMR 50.03 to the Commissioner for approval by the Board of Elementary and Secondary Education.
- I. No amendment to the collaborative agreement shall be effective until approved and authorized by a majority of the member districts and by the Board of Elementary and Secondary Education.

SECTION IX: PROCEDURE AND TIMELINE FOR ADMITTING NEW MEMBERS

Any school district, through a vote of its school committee, or charter school board, may become a member of the Assabet Valley Collaborative consistent with the following terms:

- A. At least 120 days prior to the beginning of a new fiscal year, the prospective member district shall submit to the Chair of the Board and the Executive Director of the Assabet Valley Collaborative notification of intent to join the collaborative and a copy of the school committee/charter school board minutes that indicates an affirmative vote of the committee/charter school board to seek membership in the collaborative.
- B. Upon receipt of the prospective member's notification of intent to join the collaborative and the minutes, the Board will consider the request.
- C. Upon a two-thirds (2/3) affirmative vote of the Board, the collaborative agreement shall be amended to add the new member district. The collaborative agreement shall be amended consistent with Section VIII of this agreement.
- D. The amendment may provide for the deferral of the admission of a new member district until July 1 of the subsequent fiscal year.
- E. The admission of a new member district to the Assabet Valley Collaborative shall become effective only after the execution and delivery by the current member districts and the applicant school committee or charter school board of an amendment to the collaborative agreement agreeing to be bound by all the terms and conditions thereof, and approval by the Board of Elementary and Secondary Education.
- F. A school committee or charter school board may be admitted to the collaborative as of July 1st of any fiscal year provided that all required approvals, including that of the Board of Elementary and Secondary Education, are obtained by the preceding April 30th of the fiscal year prior to the fiscal year in which the new member district is to be admitted to the collaborative.
- G. If all elements of the amendment process have been completed, but approval from the Board of Elementary and Secondary Education is delayed past July 1 of the fiscal year, the Collaborative Board may authorize the pending new member district to participate in the Collaborative as a non-voting member district through a simple majority vote at a public meeting. As a non-voting member district awaiting official approval from the Board of Elementary and Secondary Education, the pending new member district will be entitled to membership privileges and services, but will not be entitled to a vote on the Board of Directors until official approval of the Board of Elementary and Secondary Education.

SECTION X: PROCEDURE AND TIMELINE FOR WITHDRAWAL OF CURRENT MEMBER DISTRICT(S)

A member district may withdraw from the Assabet Valley Collaborative as of July 1st in any year subject to the following terms:

- A. At least 180 days prior to the end of the current fiscal year, the withdrawing member shall provide written notice to every other member district that is party to this agreement as well as to the Executive Director of the collaborative and the collaborative Board of intent to withdraw.
- B. Written notification of a member district's intent to withdraw from the collaborative at the end of a fiscal year shall include the following:

1. Notification addressed to the Chair of the Board and the Executive Director that the member district has voted to withdraw from the collaborative with the effective date of withdrawal; and
 2. A copy of the minutes from the school committee meeting in which the member district voted to withdraw from the collaborative.
- C. Within thirty (30) days of notification of a member district's intent to withdraw from the collaborative, an amendment shall be prepared to reflect changes in the agreement caused as a result of the change in membership of the collaborative and submitted to the Commissioner for approval by the Board of Elementary and Secondary Education.
 - D. Upon a two-thirds (2/3) affirmative vote of the Board, the collaborative agreement will be amended to withdraw the exiting member district. The collaborative agreement shall be amended consistent with Section VIII of this agreement. The withdrawal is not in effect until and unless the Board of Elementary and Secondary Education has approved the withdrawal by April 30th of the fiscal year in which the withdrawal is to occur.
 - E. Upon withdrawal from the collaborative, a former member district shall not be entitled to any assets or a portion of any assets of the Assabet Valley Collaborative, including any surplus funds that may have been carried over from prior years and any capital reserve fund that may have been established by the Board.
 - F. The withdrawing school committee must fulfill all of its financial obligations and commitments to the collaborative.
 - G. A withdrawing district will be charged a one-time exit fee, equal in amount to the annual membership fee established by the Board. This fee will be due prior to the end of the fiscal year which would mark the withdrawing district's final year as a member of the collaborative.
 - H. Upon withdrawal from the collaborative, after having fulfilled all financial obligations and commitments to the collaborative and after having paid the exit fee, a former member district shall not have any further commitments, liabilities, or obligations to the collaborative.
 - I. Following the final audit of that fiscal year's financial records, the withdrawing district will be reimbursed any funds that remain on balance at the collaborative as a result of prepayments to the collaborative by the member district for tuition or services under M.G.L. c. 40, § 4E.
 - J. The withdrawal of any member district(s) at any time shall not affect the status of the collaborative agreement and the same shall remain in full force and effect unless specifically changed or amended by the Board and approved by the member districts and the Board of Elementary and Secondary Education.
 - K. If, after the withdrawal of a member district(s), less than two member districts remain, the collaborative Board will initiate termination proceedings as provided in Section XI.

SECTION XI: PROCEDURE FOR TERMINATION OF THE COLLABORATIVE AGREEMENT

- A. A member district may request that the Board initiate proceedings to terminate this collaborative agreement by giving notice to all other member districts and the Executive Director at least *twelve (12) months* before the end of the current fiscal year.
- B. Within thirty (30) days of a request that the Board initiate termination proceedings, the Board shall discuss the request to terminate the collaborative and determine next steps. A

two-thirds (2/3) vote of the collaborative Board is required in order to initiate termination proceedings. Should the Board vote to initiate termination proceedings, notice must be provided to all member districts within ten (10) working days of such vote.

- C. The collaborative agreement shall only be terminated at the end of a fiscal year.
- D. The collaborative agreement shall be terminated at the end of any fiscal year following votes in favor of termination by two-thirds (2/3) of the school committees of the member districts.
- E. Following the affirmative votes of the member districts to terminate this collaborative agreement, the Executive Director shall inform the member districts and non-member districts who are served by the collaborative and the Department in writing 180 days prior to the effective date of any termination.
- F. Following the affirmative votes of the member districts to terminate the collaborative agreement, a final independent audit will take place and will be provided to all appointed representatives and member districts as well as to the Department, including an accounting of assets and liabilities (debts and obligations) of the collaborative and the proposed disposition of same according to Board policy
- G. Prior to termination, the Board shall:
 - 1. determine the fair market value of all assets for the collaborative, including, but not limited to, real estate, capital property, equipment and supplies owned by the collaborative.
 - 2. determine the process for the appropriate disposition of federal/state funds.
 - 3. identify the member district responsible for maintaining all fiscal records.
 - 4. identify the member districts responsible for maintaining student, employee and program records.
 - 5. determine the means of meeting all liabilities (debts and obligations) of the collaborative, including obligations for post-employment benefits. All liabilities must be met before any monies are distributed to member districts.
 - 7. distribute surplus funds or capital reserve funds to the member districts based on a weighted average of cumulative costs paid by each district to the collaborative since FY2002 - or the year of membership if after FY2002 - based on audited financial statements.
 - 8. ensure the appropriate disposition of all assets of the collaborative, including any unencumbered funds held by the collaborative, and any capital property and real estate owned by the collaborative. Unless the Board determines otherwise, all assets shall be sold and the monies shall be distributed to the member districts based on a weighted average of all costs paid by each district to the collaborative since FY2002 - or the year of membership if after FY2002 - based on audited financial statements.
 - 6. determine the plans for member districts to address the needs of students that were being addressed by the collaborative.
- H. Following the affirmative vote of the member districts to terminate the collaborative agreement, the Board shall notify the Department of the official termination date of the collaborative, and shall submit the documentation required by 603 CMR 50.11 to the Department.
- I. Should the Department revoke and/or suspend the approval of the educational collaborative agreement, the Board will follow all instructions from the Department, and

Sections XI. E through XI. H, inclusive, shall be implemented to the extent these procedures are consistent with the order of the Department terminating the collaborative agreement.

NON-DISCRIMINATION PRACTICES

Assabet Valley Collaborative does not discriminate on the basis of race, color, sex, gender identity, religion, national origin, or sexual orientation and ensures that all students have equal rights of access and equal enjoyment of the opportunities, advantages, privileges and courses of study.

Assabet Valley Collaborative is an Equal Opportunity Employer.

This agreement shall take effect on the date of approval by the Board of Elementary and Secondary Education and shall continue indefinitely. This agreement has been approved by duly authorized votes at public meetings held by the individual school committees whose chairpersons have signed below.

Assabet Valley Collaborative Board of Directors first reading: April 28, 2017

Assabet Valley Collaborative Board of Directors second reading: May 26, 2017

Date approved by Assabet Valley Collaborative Board of Directors: May 26, 2017

Dates approved by member school committees:

Assabet Valley Regional Vocational School District Member district	Date
Auburn Public Schools Member district	Date
Berlin Public Schools Member district	Date
Berlin-Boylston Public Schools Member district	Date
Boylston Public Schools Member district	Date
Hudson Public Schools Member district	Date
Grafton Public Schools Member district	Date
Marlborough Public Schools Member district	Date
Maynard Public Schools Member district	Date
Millbury Public Schools Member district	Date
Nashoba Regional School District Member district	Date
Northborough Public Schools Member district	Date
Northborough-Southborough Public Schools Member district	Date
Shrewsbury Public Schools Member district	Date
Southborough Public Schools Member district	Date
Westborough Public Schools Member district	Date

Assabet Valley Collaborative Agreement

Member District School Committee Chair Signatures:

Chairperson of Assabet Valley Regional Vocational School District

Date

Assabet Valley Collaborative Agreement

Member District School Committee Chair Signatures:

Chairperson of Auburn Public Schools

Date

Assabet Valley Collaborative Agreement

Member District School Committee Chair Signatures:

Chairperson of Berlin Public Schools

Date

Assabet Valley Collaborative Agreement

Member District School Committee Chair Signatures:

Chairperson of Berlin-Boylston Public Schools

Date

Assabet Valley Collaborative Agreement

Member District School Committee Chair Signatures:

Chairperson of Boylston Public Schools

Date

Assabet Valley Collaborative Agreement

Member District School Committee Chair Signatures:

Chairperson of Hudson Public Schools

Date

Assabet Valley Collaborative Agreement

Member District School Committee Chair Signatures:

Chairperson of Grafton Public Schools

Date

Assabet Valley Collaborative Agreement

Member District School Committee Chair Signatures:

Chairperson of Marlborough Public Schools

Date

Assabet Valley Collaborative Agreement

Member District School Committee Chair Signatures:

Chairperson of Maynard Public Schools

Date

Assabet Valley Collaborative Agreement

Member District School Committee Chair Signatures:

Chairperson of Millbury Public Schools

Date

Assabet Valley Collaborative Agreement

Member District School Committee Chair Signatures:

Chairperson of Nashoba Regional School District

Date

Assabet Valley Collaborative Agreement

Member District School Committee Chair Signatures:

Chairperson of Northborough Public Schools

Date

Assabet Valley Collaborative Agreement

Member District School Committee Chair Signatures:

Chairperson of Northborough-Southborough Public Schools

Date

Assabet Valley Collaborative Agreement

Member District School Committee Chair Signatures:

Chairperson of Shrewsbury Public Schools

Date

Assabet Valley Collaborative Agreement

Member District School Committee Chair Signatures:

Chairperson of Southborough Public Schools

Date

Assabet Valley Collaborative Agreement

Member District School Committee Chair Signatures:

Chairperson of Westborough Public Schools

Date

Assabet Valley Collaborative Agreement

Approved by the Board of Elementary and Secondary Education:

Commissioner of the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education

Date



**SHREWSBURY PUBLIC SCHOOLS
SCHOOL COMMITTEE MEETING**

ITEM NO: **X. Approval of Minutes**

MEETING DATE: **6/7/17**

SPECIFIC STATEMENT OR QUESTION:

Will the Committee accept the minutes from the School Committee meeting held on May 24, 2017?

BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

1. The minutes are enclosed.

ACTION RECOMMENDED:

That the Committee accept the minutes from the School Committee meeting held on May 24, 2017.

STAFF AVAILABLE FOR PRESENTATION:

Dr. B. Dale Magee, Chairperson

Ms. Sandra Fryc, Secretary

**SHREWSBURY PUBLIC SCHOOLS
100 MAPLE AVENUE
SHREWSBURY, MASSACHUSETTS**

MINUTES OF SCHOOL COMMITTEE MEETING

Wednesday, May 24, 2017

Present: Dr. Dale Magee, Chairperson; Mr. Jon Wensky, Vice Chairperson; Ms. Sandy Fryc, Secretary; Ms. Erin Canzano; Mr. Jason Palitsch; Mr. Patrick Collins, Assistant Superintendent for Finance and Operations; Ms. Mary Beth Banios, Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum & Instruction; Ms. Barb Malone, Director of Human Resources; and Dr. Joseph Sawyer, Superintendent of Schools.

A complete audio/visual recording of this meeting is available on the Shrewsbury Public Schools website.

The meeting was convened by Dr. Magee at 7:00 pm.

I. Public Participation

None.

II. Chairperson's Report & Members' Reports

None.

III. Superintendent's Report

Dr. Sawyer offered congratulations to students whose artwork was displayed in the recent elementary, middle and high school art shows; to the new members of the National Honor Society, who were inducted on May 11; and to all Shrewsbury High School (SHS) students who were honored at Academic Awards Night on May 16.

Dr. Sawyer expressed his appreciation to Town Meeting members for their strong approval of the budget and overwhelming endorsement of the SHS athletic field project. He also thanked Karen Isaacson and Beth McCollum for their work on the 2016 Annual Report, gave special thanks to SHS Senior, Kevin Murphy, who did the graphic design work, and noted the report would be mailed soon to all households, and featured on the district's website.

IV. Time Scheduled Appointments:

A. Project 351 Student Ambassador: Report & Recognition

Dr. Ann Jones, Principal, Oak Middle School, began by providing a summary of Grade 8 student Preston Karp's achievements that qualified him for this honor. Dr. Jones then introduced Preston, who gave a report on his experience at Project 351, the largest youth-led service project in Massachusetts. Preston's presentation provided an overview of his year so far, noting Launch Day, the Spring Service Project "Clothes of Fury", and an opportunity to serve in the Service Honor Guard greeting guests at a May dinner held at the JFK Presidential Library. Preston finished the presentation by detailing his future plans for service with the program.

Committee members congratulated Preston on his achievements and thanked him for taking on a leadership role among his peers. Dr. Sawyer added his congratulations, and noted that in addition to his roles as a student leader and Project 351 Ambassador, Preston was an outstanding student who had also attained great success in the performing arts.

V. Curriculum

A. Strategic Priorities Progress Report: Engaging & Challenging All Students

In the spring of 2011, the Shrewsbury School Committee set four strategic priorities for our school district for a five-year period, and one of those adopted was the priority of "Engaging & Challenging All Students". Ms. Banios' presentation gave an overview of the key goals of the program - having all students participate in projects involving real world problem solving; fully implementing the Shrewsbury Writing Project; providing all educators with Professional Development opportunities to support 21st century teaching; and having 90% of students, parents, and educators "agree", when surveyed, that student learning experiences are engaging and that students participate in appropriately challenging coursework that meets their needs. Ms. Banios gave examples of projects implemented that support the problem solving and Writing Project goals, described several Professional Development Pathways available to educators, and noted that 87.43% of those surveyed "agree" that student learning experiences in SPS are engaging, which was very close to the goal of 90%.

The Committee noted that the "teacher-driven, student-focused" approach being utilized was a recipe for success, and that SPS was ahead of the curve on engaging students with real-world-driven projects. Clarifying questions were asked relative to next steps resulting from the Engagement Survey, balancing Project Based Learning time with core curriculum standards, compiling student achievement information that standardized tests don't reflect, and how teachers manage students working on group projects. Dr. Sawyer noted that the cutting edge Professional Development work being done in the district was a direct result of Ms. Banios' vision, advised that he was proud of this work, and added that he looked forward to publicizing an online "evidence board" that Ms. Banios and her team are assembling to show examples of the work that was done to meet the strategic priorities and goals.

VI. Policy

None.

VII. Finance & Operations

A. Extended Learning Programs: Report & Tuition Recommendation

Ms. Karen Isaacson, Director of Extended Learning, noted that the Extended Learning Program at SPS includes Extended School Care (ESC), Summer Enrichment programs, the Elementary After School Activities Program, and vacation week programs. Her presentation, the first since March 2015, illustrated the tremendous growth in participant enrollment (from 555 student full time equivalents in 2015 to 653 in 2017) and provided information on staffing, noting that many employees also work during the school day at SPS. Ms. Isaacson noted that a June 2016 Parent Satisfaction survey showed 87% of respondents noting they were “very satisfied”, which was the highest rating option offered.

When discussing finances, Ms. Isaacson provided a local rate comparison table showing SPS among the least expensive programs; noted that ESC rates have been steady for five years; advised that revenue no longer covers expenses; noted costs were increasing; advised that more families were qualifying for financial assistance; and noted that more students were needing support services. As a result, Ms. Isaacson recommended a rate increase of 3% (\$8/month), which would be the first since 2012.

In response to clarifying questions from the Committee, Ms. Isaacson noted that the program does not accept vouchers, but utilizes the state’s sliding scale for subsidized child care; advised that participants who qualify for free lunch may not necessarily qualify for extended day child care assistance; and noted the rate increase would not cover the overall net loss, but would be a reasonable initial step towards adjusting rates over time to address the shortfall. Mr. Collins added that the program is self-financed and covers some energy and health care costs, which helps the town by easing the financial burden on the municipal side.

Committee members and Dr. Sawyer recommended adopting the 3% rate increase, noted that ESC adds tremendous value to the overall SPS program, and Dr. Sawyer acknowledged Ms. Isaacson’s thoughtful and innovative approach to her work as the Director of Extended Learning. After an opportunity for public feedback, the School Committee will vote on the recommended increase at their June 7 meeting.

B. School Safety & Security: Report

Mr. Patrick Collins, Assistant Superintendent for Finance & Operations, began by noting that Bus Registration for 2017-2018 was open, then introduced Mr. Stephen Rocco, Coordinator of Transportation, Safety & Security. Mr. Rocco began by summarizing the security goals and objectives of the district. He went on to provide updates on the Video Surveillance Camera system at SPS and the Standard Response Protocol utilized in the district, and gave examples of Emergency Management table top exercises that had been conducted over the course of the year in partnership with other emergency response personnel. Mr. Rocco gave a description of the

Building Assessment Team, which includes School Resource Officers, a representative of the Public Buildings Department, and himself, and their work to annually review each school building's physical layout and condition with regard to safety and security. He also described ongoing training, and discussed future plans relative to the safety and security in the district.

In response to questions from the Committee, Mr. Rocco advised that the video surveillance system has a two week archive capability, and that the best practices being utilized are based on FEMA or Homeland Security guidelines. Dr. Sawyer added that he was grateful for the addition of the Safety and Security components to Mr. Rocco's role (which historically addressed just transportation needs); appreciated the community's support for a fourth Assistant Principal at SHS, which would enhance safety and security at the school; and noted the great relationship SPS enjoys with the Shrewsbury Police and Fire Departments.

VIII. Old Business

None.

IX. New Business

None.

X. Approval of Minutes

Without objections from the Committee, the minutes from the School Committee meeting held on May 10, 2017 were approved as distributed.

XI. Executive Session

Dr. Magee requested a motion to adjourn to Executive Session for the purpose of discussing negotiations with non-represented employees, adding that the Committee would reconvene to open session only for the purpose of adjourning for the evening. On a motion by Mr. Palitsch, seconded by Ms. Canzano, on a roll call vote: Mr. Palitsch, yes; Ms. Canzano, yes; Ms. Fryc, yes; Mr. Wensky, yes; Dr. Magee, yes, the Committee voted to adjourn to Executive Session at 9:04 pm.

XII. Adjournment

On a motion by Mr. Palitsch, seconded by Mr. Wensky, the Committee unanimously agreed to adjourn the meeting at 9:16 pm. Roll call votes were as follows: Mr. Palitsch, yes; Mr. Wensky, yes; Ms. Canzano, yes; Ms. Fryc, yes; and Dr. Magee, yes.

Respectfully submitted,

Elizabeth McCollum, Clerk

Documents referenced:

1. Project 351 Ambassador Nomination Memo
2. Project 351 Slide Presentation
3. Engaging & Challenging All Students Report
4. Engaging & Challenging All Students Slide Presentation
5. Extended Learning Programs Report
6. Extended Learning Programs Slide Presentation
7. School Safety & Security Report
8. School Safety & Security Slide Presentation



**SHREWSBURY PUBLIC SCHOOLS
SCHOOL COMMITTEE MEETING**

ITEM NO: **XI. Executive Session**

MEETING DATE: **6/7/17**

A. Negotiations with non-represented staff

SPECIFIC STATEMENT OR QUESTION:

Will the School Committee enter into executive session in order to discuss negotiations with non-represented staff, where deliberation in an open meeting may have a detrimental effect on the School Committee's bargaining position?

BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

Executive session is warranted for these purposes.

ACTION RECOMMENDED:

That the School Committee enter into executive session in order to discuss negotiations with non-represented staff, where deliberation in an open meeting may have a detrimental effect on the School Committee's bargaining position.

STAFF AVAILABLE FOR PRESENTATION:

Ms. Barbara A. Malone, Director of Human Resources
Dr. Joseph M. Sawyer, Superintendent of Schools

ITEM NO: **XII. Adjournment**