

March 27, 2014, 7:30am

OSC School Program Task Force meeting

Task Force attendees: Lisa Serafin Sheehan, Tim Sullivan, Beth Jackson Stram, Jim Stergios

Additional attendees: Susan Wolf Ditkoff, Cliff Brown, Peter Rowe

The group reviewed of School Program Summary document Beth circulated on 3/26.

### **Personnel**

- Lisa raised concern as to how to address the recommendation of the 2008 OSC that annual compensation and benefits increase at a rate considered sustainable over time -- not exceeding revenue limitations imposed by proposition 2 ½ and State Aid (approximately 3.75% per year) – given the anticipated increases in staffing requirements and need for “catch up” for student supports.
- The financial model will assist in development of a final recommendation
- T. Sullivan will work with P. Rowe to break out each contributing item including Steps & Lanes, Collective Bargaining, Health Care and Special Ed.
- The group acknowledged that there might be a “catch up” number but questioned whether the 3.75 could be sustainable ongoing following catch up
- S. Wolf Ditkoff wondered whether and eastern mass or comparable district was living under the 3.75 (Prop 2 ½). The group agreed tha this was an interesting question and would see what kind of data is available

### **Class Size**

- The group discussed the OSC presentation regarding class size of the previous night
- J. Stergios reported that Belmont is doing an August class placement
- The group made the distinction that there are two different components to getting to a reduction in number of classes with the same amount of students – class assignment and larger class sizes
- Discussed the class assignment options of having a date cut off or assignment changing after a certain number of kids enrolled (last mile)
- Cliff noted it would be helpful to know the number of kids impacted (B. Lupini to report on this and other class assignment facts on 4/1)

### **Classroom Supports/ Assumptions for the short term model**

- Regarding classroom supports, Beth referenced prior discussions of modeling it in three thirds of the baseline request and wondered if maybe that approach wasn't too drastic given that the Subcommittee's work had essentially confirmed that the classroom supports are needed.
- There was a discussion about only going 90% as the first jump but that that number might not be enough of a difference to be meaningful in the model.

- Tim requested that PSB provide alternative budgets. Peter suggested that PSB will provide an overview of impacts once the funding alternatives are modeled.
  - The group discussed whether the Superintendents budget message is an accurate reflection of priorities and Susan and Peter agreed that while exact priorities are different each year, the budget messages are generally reflective of priorities.
- **Tutorial program**
- Beth asked about salary assumptions in the writeup and Tim clarified that \$58k (baseline) x 1.25 (for benefits) was used
  - The group discussed whether there students progress and whether there are more freshmen than seniors. Tim indicated he would ask this question of J. Fischer-Mueller.
  - Tim to draft implementation options of 1) every other year; 2) increase student ratio and 3) graduation/attrition
- **Technology**
- Jim reported that Peter has provided dimensions for labs at Pierce, Heath, Runkle and Driscoll
  - Need a discussion on PARC – everyone needs to meet at the same time, perhaps on the 10<sup>th</sup>
- **Elementary World Language**
- Reconfirmed numbers
  - The write up should tease out the facts of teacher coverage and explain why a change in 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> grade is possible
  - Also highlight whether an implication is a lost “special” – what is the service delivery?

Meeting adjourned at 9:30am.