

**LEXINGTON SCHOOL COMMITTEE**  
**Tuesday, December 15, 2015**  
**Lexington Town Office Building, Selectmen's Meeting Room**  
**1605 Massachusetts Avenue**

**PRESENT:** Jessie Steigerwald, Chair; Bill Hurley, Vice Chair; Margaret Coppe; Judy Crocker, Clerk; Mary Czajkowski, Superintendent  
Alessandro Alessandrini arrived at 7:00 PM  
Student Representative Abigail Schwartz was not present

**OTHERS PRESENT:** Carol Pilarski (Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum and Instruction and Professional Development); Pat Goddard (Director of Facilities); Jon Himmel (Permanent Building Committee Chair); Ian Dailey (Interim Director of Finance and Operations); Maureen Kavanaugh (Director of Planning and Assessment); Ellen Sugita (Director of Special Education); Anna Monaco (Principal Clarke Middle School); Anne Carothers (Principal Diamond Middle School); Louise Lipsitz (Principal Hastings); Laura Lasa (Principal Lexington High School); Marie Murphy (World Language Department Head / Trip Coordinators); Dr. Mary Anton (Principal Bowman ); Meg Colella (Principal Bridge); Thomas Martellone (Principal Fiske)

**The Minutes were taken by Paula McDonough, Executive Assistant to the School Committee.**

**6:30 PM Call to order Open Session**

**Call to Order and Welcome:**

Chair called the meeting to order, and introduced committee members.

**Motion to go into Executive Session**

Ms. Steigerwald stated: "I move that the School Committee go into Executive Session under Exemption 3 to discuss strategy with respect to collective bargaining pertaining to Lexington Education Association Technology Unit and Unit D, to return to open session. Further, as chair, I declare that an executive session is necessary to protect the bargaining position of the School Committee." (Crocker seconded the motion).

**Coppe -AYE; Steigerwald -AYE; Crocker -AYE; Hurley -AYE; Alessandrini-Absent**

6:31 PM **Executive Session Convened**

6:48 PM **Executive Session Ends and Return to Open Session and Chair called a brief recess.**

6:54 PM **The Meeting Convened**

**Return to Public Session and Welcome**

The Chair called the Public Session to order and invited public comment.

**Public Comments:**

There were none.

**Superintendent's Announcements:**

1. Barbara Hansberry from the MSBA is organizing a special tour of Estabrook that will take place February 4, 2016 (snow date February 11); 8:00 am - 4:30 pm. It will show the process of moving a project through the complete MSBA process.
2. Redistricting Committee update: AppGeo selected as consultant and will provide recommendations.
3. The restraining policy must be updated. Ellen Sugita will meet with the Policy Subcommittee to bring forward recommendations.
4. Lexington Children's Place update: an additional three classrooms may be needed and they are looking at space in the Central Office. This will require relocating the MELP program and the LABBB program.
5. Dr. Czajkowski is attending a meeting with other superintendent in Middlesex regarding a later start time for high schools. She will provide an update following the meeting.
6. Blackboard Connect will be the new communications system.
7. Dr. Czajkowski attended a state-wide nurse leader program and provided an update.

**School Committee Member Announcements:**

Steigerwald moved Agenda Item A.3 into announcements.

Lexington Community Coalition Update

- Next Community Coalition Event will be January 13 at Community Center 6:30 – 8:45 p.m. and will include students, town and school staff, community leaders.
- The next Community Coalition Steering Committee meeting will be held this Friday, December 18.
- Last meeting the School Department was represented by Valerie Viscosi and, Maureen Kavanaugh and, from the Municipal Departments, Chief Wilson and Charlotte Rodgers.
- Discussion at the meeting was to refer to Youth Behavior Risk Survey results as a data source. These results will be used to set goals to improve support for youth mental health, stress reduction and alcohol and drug prevention. Additional data is being contributed from Police, Fire and Human Service Departments.

Hurley recognized the recent loss of Lexington High School student Nate Cavallo and extended sympathy to the Cavallo Abair family.

Alessandrini: None

Crocker shared that she and Mr. Hurley attended a Permanent Building Committee (PBC) and Integrated Design Meeting and that she has forward her updates to the School Committee.

Coppe: None

**Consent Agenda:**

1. Accept Curriculum Work Group Liaison Report of 11/12/15 from Margaret Coppe
2. Accept Youth Services Council Liaison Report of 12/2/15 from Margaret Coppe
3. Vote to Approve School Committee Minutes of October 20, 2015
4. Vote to Approve School Committee Minutes of November 23, 2015
5. Vote to Approve School Committee Minutes of December 7, 2015
6. Vote to Approve a \$1,000 Donation from Raytheon to the LHS Robotics Club

***Motion to approve consent agenda Items 1-6 (Crocker/Alessandrini)***

***The motion was approved (5-0).***

**A.1. COMMUNITY UPDATE – LEXINGTON SCHOLARSHIP FUND**

David Williams and Lynne Wilson, Co-Chairs; Karen Dooks, Treasurer

- The Lexington Scholarship fund provides financial assistance to students to support their attendance in college. Scholarships may be granted beyond the first year of college.
- There is a greater need than the fund can meet, and contributions are welcome.
- Students and families can find applications on the web site and there are representatives at the Lexington High School Financial Night.

School Committee thanked Mr. Williams, Ms. Wilson and Ms. Dooks for their presentation.

**A.2. DISCUSSION OF APPROVED INTERNATIONAL FIELD TRIPS IN LIGHT OF THE NOVEMBER 23, 2015, U.S. STATE DEPARTMENT WORLDWIDE TRAVEL ALERT**

LHS, Clarke, and Diamond Principals, Foreign Language Department Heads, and K-12 Performing Arts Department Coordinator. Laura Lasa, Principal / Marie Murphy, World Language Department Head / Trip Coordinators.

- The high school has several upcoming trips abroad, including exchange programs. The recent events in Paris, France prompted a discussion about the French Exchange trip scheduled for February of 2016. The changing climate in the world has the potential to impact families' decisions around upcoming trips. Because the School Committee approves all trips abroad, the high school is interested in the School Committee's perspective and recommendation for trips that have been approved for 2016, as well as funding implications (e.g., potential partial reimbursement).
- Approved 2016 international field trips are listed below:

<p><b><u>Lexington High School</u></b></p> <p>February 4-20 – France/Belgium  February 16-25 – Costa Rica  April 9-23 – China  April 14-23 – Italy  April 18-25 – Germany</p>	<p><b><u>Clarke Middle School:</u></b></p> <p>March 2-11 – Costa Rica  June 8-10 – Canada  April 6-17 – China</p>
<p><b><u>Diamond Middle School:</u></b></p> <p>January 27 - February 5 – Costa Rica  May 31 - June 3 - Canada</p>	

- Beckie Rankin: France/Belgium – 16 students, 3 chaperons \$2600 per student if trip is canceled \$1600 will be reimbursed per family. Ms Rankin has heard from two parents inquiring on what discussions have taken place and the financial impact would be. There is a medical travel insurance but do not have a travel insurance; Heather Arrigo/ Maureen Haviland: Italy – 30 students, 4 chaperones, no parents have expressed any concerns; Jieying Yao: China – 7 students, 2 chaperones, no parents have expressed any concerns.

School Committee Members had questions and comments regarding the international trips, and shared their perspective.

- How do the teachers feel about the trips? – Answer: We evaluate prior incidents and the decisions made around those incidents, teachers are willing to go.
- School committee would like to receive updates. Members reviewed differences between the current travel alert and the label “travel warning”.
- Members expressed their concerns but respect the decisions that parents make regarding their children.
- Does the district supply international phones for the trips? – Answer: yes
- School Committee thanked everyone involved. There were no motions.

**A.3. LEXINGTON COMMUNITY COALITION UPDATE:**

Steigerwald discussed agenda item A.3 as part of the School Committee announcements

**A.4. CAPITAL PROJECTS UPDATE – NEXT STEPS FOLLOWING SPECIAL TOWN MEETING #1**

**A.4.1. PLACEMENT OF MODULARS**

**A.4.2. PROGRAMMATIC IMPACT OF MODULARS**

Pat Goddard presented Modular Options for Bowman/Bridge/Fiske/Estabrook

- The design team is evaluating potential locations for installation of modular classrooms. Potential location markers have been added to the site plans for Bowman, Bridge, Fiske, and Estabrook elementary schools. After assessing these locations, the Superintendent will bring a recommendation to School Committee for location of up to six modular classrooms for September of 2016.

Dr. Mary Anton, Bowman Principal, Meg Colella, Bridge Principal and Thomas Martellone, Fiske Principal provided materials for this agenda item:

- Immediate space challenges at Bowman, Bridge and Fiske Schools and how modular classrooms would alleviate this pressure memos dated December 8, 2015 from Mary Anton, Principal of Bowman School; Meg Colella, Principal of Bridge School and memo dated December Thomas Martellone, Principal of Fiske School were presented to the School Committee.
- Bowman, Bridge and Fiske Schools each face challenges in space and programming due to increased student enrollment. School administrators attached provisions as to how modular space would potentially be used and how it would impact space allocations in each school.

School Committee Members had questions and comments regarding the placement of modulars:

- Bowman has 3 locations identified; does that mean these are places that 1 or more modulars can be located? Answer: The drawings indicate 1 or more could be placed at each location. The number will be confirmed later.
- Are these permanent modulars? Answer: Yes, they would stay in place as long as there is an education need.
- Modulars are not designed for redistricting purposes; the modulars are to ease the pressure the schools currently have. Some schools are losing art and music.
- Fiske site: which of the proposed spots involve moving geothermal wells? Answer: 2
- Fiske site/geothermal well and proximity to conservation land. Answer: These would not be installed on conservation land.
- Why is Harrington not on the list for modulars? Answer: There are no good locations.
- Design request on Harrington from DiNisco, when can we expect it? Answer: To be completed by the end of the year, make it available for January 5, 2016.
- Time frame – when do you need the Committee to take a formal vote as to where to locate the modulars? Answer: Pat does not have an answer tonight. He will update the schedule for the January 5, 2016 meeting.
- One challenge is that all the redistricting data will not be available. Questions about timing for AppGeo's recommendations.
- School Committee will wait for the recommendation of the superintendent.
- What is timing for the bid process? Answer: Get bids out in time so that site work can be done while school is not in session.

Dr. Czajkowski mentioned that the location and the number of modulars to be determined at each site needs to take into consideration the redistricting that will occur to relieve any pressure from Bowman, Fiske and Bridge. Before any recommendation of placement and how many and where they get placed, conversations need to happen with the principals and consultants regarding who and how many students are being redistricted out of Fiske, Bowman and Bridge – how many classes and how many students. She believes Fiske needs the most relief, and she will look into redistricting students out of Fiske.

Jon Himmel, Chair of the Permanent Building Committee (PBC) joined the presenter's table. He produced a memo dated 12/15/15 and wished to provide information and answer any questions.

- At Special Town Meeting, Mr. Himmel recommended “Peer Review.” There are two separate issues: the Elementary/Pre-K and the Middle School proposals. The funding authorized at the December Special Town meeting is about the middle schools with little focus on the bricks and mortar related to the elementary/pre-k schools, so the focus is primarily on the Middle Schools.
- DiNisco’s design addresses all that was asked and may be considered the “best” short of total building replacements. Now that costs are better understood, can we proceed without asking about scope, cost, and benefit?
- The Permanent Building Committee was uneasy last Thursday for a number of reasons: One item of concern had to do with the information provided to us related to the delta between providing all of the new growth at Diamond and foregoing new construction at Clarke. If the delta is in fact less than \$1 million, then it may be appropriate to build at both Clarke and Diamond. The PBC failed to understand how the delta could be as small as the Architect reported. PBC was of the opinion that the new construction triggered the majority of the renovation on the first and second floors and almost all of the site work. How can that delta be worth less than a \$1m when the site work is said to be \$3m and the renovation many more millions?
- DiNisco agreed to add clarity. To make the December 22, 2015 PBC meeting productive, the PBC requests that the Schools, with their consultants, please review his document and help clear up any misstatements that may be in the document, and replace the question marks with the missing information prior to the PBC’s next scheduled meeting on December 22<sup>nd</sup>.

Mary Czajkowski, Superintendent provided the following data (related to the question marks in Mr. Himmel’s document):

- (a) Middle School population based October 1, 2015 enrollment report: 1646 students, anticipated to increase to 1785 by 2019-2020. The current DD design for Clarke provided for 2 new teams (not sections). (b) The current DD design for Diamond provides for 2 new teams. (c) Clarke currently has 864 students and 9.5 teams. If each team currently averaged 85 students Clarke would have a current excess student population of 56 students. Diamond currently has 782 and 9 teams. If each team currently averaged 85 students, Diamond would have a current, excess, student population of 17 students. Increasing from 85 to 89 potential you could have classroom sizes from 28, 29, 30, 31, 32 is not educationally sound.

Anna Monaco (Principal): Clarke was built for 765 students and 9 teams. If nothing was to be done at Clarke you would need to decrease the population, as they are about 100 students over capacity. Team sizes are large, corridors are crowded, and teachers are sharing classrooms in a way that is challenging. We are now at 9.5 teams and next year projected to go up by another half team.

School Committee members shared questions and comments:

- How much was the addition to Clarke and what was the breakdown of cost of the renovation and what was the cost of site work? \$1million did not seem reasonable so that’s why the questions from the PBC to the architect for more information.
- Note that part of the work is outdated mechanical or failing mechanical systems, and not capacity driven.

- When will the School Committee have information from the PBC meeting?
- How did PBC members consider only building at Diamond?

Ms. Steigerwald noted that the Permanent Building Committee will now be addressing two distinct projects: Diamond and Clarke. The School Committee may recommend up to two people for appointment on each project. Steigerwald outlined a proposal for making the appointments, with applications due by 5 January. Interested parents should submit a letter of interest by 1 January to the School Committee. [NOTE: this date was later extended to January 12<sup>th</sup>.]

Public Comment: Ms. Ashton 32 Cliff: Is the December 22<sup>nd</sup> SC and PBC meeting an open meeting? Answer: Yes.

### **A.5. & A.5.a FY 16 1<sup>ST</sup> QUARTERLY FINANCIAL REPORT**

#### **a. Superintendent Proposed Staffing Position – Source of Funding District Wide Salary Savings**

Ian Dailey (Interim Director of Finance and Operations) presented a memo and discussed the Fiscal Year 2016 First Quarter Financial Report:

- The current balance projected as of the First Quarter report is a surplus of \$1,059,772. The projection assumes all budgeted positions are filled and assumes all program budgets are fully expended. The major source of these funds causing the surplus in Salaries and Wages is turnover in staff, unpaid leaves of absence, and vacancy gaps. The major drivers for the deficit in the Expense portion of the budget are Special Education Tuitions, Special Education Transportation, and Homeless Transportation. A summary table is provided below:

<b>Appropriation Summary</b>	<b>FY 2016 Budget</b>	<b>Transfers/ Adjustments</b>	<b>FY 2016 Budget (adj)</b>	<b>YTD Expended</b>	<b>YTD Encumbered</b>	<b>Favorable/ (Unfavorable)</b>
Salary and Wages	\$ 78,675,324	\$ 81,426	\$ 78,756,750	\$ 23,671,210	\$ 53,627,266	\$ 1,458,274
Expenses	\$ 13,384,992	\$ (12,000)	\$ 13,372,992	\$ 3,812,788	\$ 9,958,706	\$ (398,502)
Total 1100 Lexington Public Schools	\$ 92,060,316	\$ 69,426	\$ 92,129,742	\$ 27,483,998	\$ 63,585,972	\$ 1,059,772

#### **Salaries & Wages**

- A detailed listing of the Salaries and Wages portion of the budget projection can be found attached. Projections are based on known positions and estimated wage settlements for units with unsettled contracts. The FY16 general fund operating budget included a total of 1,035.73 FTE system-wide. At this time, the current general fund operating budget has increased to a total of 1,046.80, an increase of 11.07 FTE. This is partially attributable to FTE transfers from grants (during Fiscal Year 2015 and 2016), the increase in hours for Full-Day Kindergarten Assistants (15 hours per week to 18 hours per week), and supplemental positions not included in the original budget developed last fall. The Fiscal Year 2015 First Quarter Financial Report included and FTE increase of 21.61 FTE. Therefore, in Fiscal Year 2016 this data point has improved. This has a direct effect on the projected balance in the Salaries & Wages portion of the projection.

- As discussed at the December 1, 2015 School Committee Meeting, the Superintendent has indicated interest in a Special Assistant to the Superintendent position being established. As previously described, this position is a necessity to maintain an organized, efficient, and responsive Superintendent's office environment. This position would assist with a multitude of tasks related to residency, documentation, and special projects. This First Quarter Financial Report includes projected costs for the Superintendent's proposed staffing position effective immediately.

**Expenses**

- The overall expense budget currently projects a deficit of \$398,502. At this time the projection assumes all program budgets will be fully expended. Additionally, a detailed review of Transportation and Tuitions is conducted as these are the largest single expense items and are the largest drivers of budget variability in the Expense budget. A summary table of the budget lines reflecting the \$398,502 deficit can be seen below (it should be noted there is an anticipated transfer for the Tuition line of \$600,960):

Line #	Program	FY16 Budget (approved by ATM)	Transfers/ Adjustments	FY16 Expense Budget (adj)	Adjusted YTD EXPENDED	Adjusted ENCUMBERED	FY 16 Projected Expenditures	Favorable/ (Unfavorable)
41	TUITION	\$4,782,238	\$600,960	\$5,383,198	\$1,348,376	\$4,190,862	\$5,539,238	-\$156,040
42	Transportation: Special Education	\$1,387,574	\$0	\$1,387,574	\$234,433	\$1,250,009	\$1,484,442	-\$96,868
42.1	Transportation: Homeless	\$25,000	\$0	\$25,000	\$6,080	\$43,040	\$49,120	-\$24,120
47	Teacher Substitutes	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$6,547	\$114,926	\$121,473	-\$121,473
<b>Grand Total</b>		<b>\$6,194,812</b>	<b>\$600,960</b>	<b>\$6,795,772</b>	<b>\$1,595,436</b>	<b>\$5,598,837</b>	<b>\$7,194,273</b>	<b>-\$398,501</b>

**Line 41 - Tuition**

The Fiscal Year 2016 budget included a 50% reduction to the High Risk category of tuition, effectively lowering the tuition budget by \$773,580. This had a direct affect to Line 41 of the budget above. This budget line is being monitored very closely, as such a detailed breakdown can be seen below:

<b>Tuition Budget Analysis</b>	<b>FY16 Budget (approved by ATM)</b>	<b>FY 16 Projected Expenditures</b>	<b>Favorable/ (Unfavorable)</b>
High Risk Budget	\$1,547,160	\$1,047,559	
Short Term Placements	\$113,677	\$230,495	
Settlements	\$258,764	\$766,007	
Tuition	\$6,915,422	\$7,144,330	
<b>Total Tuition</b>	<b>\$8,835,023</b>	<b>\$9,188,390</b>	<b>-\$353,367</b>
Reduction to High Risk	-\$773,580		
Less LABBB Credit	-\$250,000	-\$250,000	
Less CB Reimbursement	-\$3,029,205	-\$3,190,110	
<b>Operating Budget Total</b>	<b>\$4,782,238</b>	<b>\$5,748,280</b>	<b>-\$966,042</b>
		High Risk Adjustment	\$209,042
		Anticipated One-time Transfer	\$600,960
		Adjusted Projected Surplus / (Deficit)	-\$156,040

As seen above when comparing the budget to the current tuition projection a deficit of \$966,042 is being projected. This deficit assumes all of the current High Risk Budget will be realized. After a detailed review of this information with the Special Education Department, it is anticipated the \$209,042 of the \$1,047,559 currently held in High Risk will not be realized. Based on this adjustment, this lowers the projected deficit. Additionally, upon review of expense accounts after the close of the Fiscal Year 2015 budget, an anticipated one-time transfer of \$600,960 will be completed to further offset the projected deficit.

The decision to reduce the High Risk budget by 50% in Fiscal Year 2016 is being reviewed as the Fiscal Year 2017 budget is developed because this will have a direct impact moving forward. A table analyzing the high risk budget and budget surpluses (deficits) each year has been compiled to identify trends. This table can be seen below:

	FY2014	FY2015	FY2016 (projected)
High Risk Budget	\$1,645,452	\$1,195,325	\$1,547,160
SC HR Budget Adjustments			-\$773,580
Net High Risk Budget	\$1,645,452	\$1,195,325	\$773,580
<b>Total Tuition Surplus / (Deficit)</b>	<b>\$852,485</b>	<b>\$61,145</b>	<b>-\$757,000</b>
High Risk cut reversal	\$0	\$0	\$773,580
<b>Difference</b>	<b>\$852,485</b>	<b>\$61,145</b>	<b>\$16,580</b>
<b>Percent of High Risk Returned</b>	<b>51.81%</b>	<b>5.12%</b>	<b>1.07%</b>

The table above outlines the tuition budget surplus (deficit) by fiscal year relative to the High Risk budget of that year. The table above is not adjusted for the anticipated one-time transfers identified in the prior section. The chart includes adjustments to Fiscal Year 2016 to have a consistent comparison with prior fiscal years where the High Risk budget was not reduced by 50%. It should be noted, at the time the Fiscal Year 2016 budget was being created Fiscal Year 2015 final figures were not available. The above table illustrates that budgeting practices in the Tuition line have improved over time. Any future adjustments to the High Risk budget are being examined closely as the Fiscal Year 2017 budget is being developed.

There were questions and comments from the School Committee with special attention to the way the out of district tuitions are budgeted.

- When Ms. Dunn and Dr. Ash recommended changing the budget for this line item, the percentage reduction may have been too extreme.

#### **Line 42 – Transportation: Special Education**

The Fiscal Year 2016 budget is projecting a \$96,868 deficit. The Fiscal Year 2016 Special Education Transportation budget was assembled using 182 students (99 In district and 83 Out of District). At this time a total of 196 students (108 In District and 88 Out of District) are riding in the program, an increase of 7.7% in total. This increase in ridership has triggered the currently projected deficit in this budget line.

#### **Line 42.1 – Transportation: Homeless**

The Fiscal Year 2016 budget is projecting a \$24,120 deficit. The Fiscal Year 2016 Special Education Transportation budget was assembled using 11 students. At this time a total of 3 students are riding in the program. Additional funds have been included in the projection for anticipated riders that will be added to the program. While the number of students reflected as Homeless has decreased, the costs have actually increase, which is why the budget line is projecting a deficit. This is attributable to the change in ridership. In Fiscal Year 2015, riders were able to utilize our existing Transportation services. The current ridership requires separate Transportation services.

#### **Line 47 – Teacher Substitutes**

The Fiscal Year 2016 budget is projecting a \$121,473 deficit. This expense line budget pays for Special Education consultants that are hired during a leave of absence for an employee in their Department as they are not regularly available in the typical substitute pool of employees. These consultants are acting in a substitute capacity due to the leave of absence. These expenditures are offset by salary savings on the Salaries and Wages portion of the budget.

### **Budget Transfers**

As in years past, the Second Quarter Fiscal Year 2016 budget will include a full listing of all budget transfers for Salaries and Expenses. This will include a summary of Fiscal Year 2016 grant transfers, expense line transfers, and all other necessary budget transfers.

School Committee thanked Mr. Dailey for his update.

### **A.6 PROPOSED ENROLLMENT REPORT DISCUSSION**

Maureen Kavanaugh, Director of Planning and Assessment presented a Draft FY2016 Annual Enrollment Report.

- The Lexington Public Schools is seeking feedback from members of the School Committee on the design of a new annual enrollment report. A working draft will be provided along with an example from another school district as a starting point for discussion. We ask that members review these materials and prepare feedback regarding the contents and format of a future LPS report.

School Committee found the report very informative and offered some comments.

### **A.7 ELEMENTARY WORLD LANGUAGE**

Carol Pilarski (Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum and Instruction) presented an overview of Restructuring the Elementary School Schedule to Accommodate the reinstatement of a K-5 World Language Program

- In 2013-14, a World Language (WL) Committee was assembled to study the possible reinstatement of an Elementary World Language program in the district's elementary schools. A recent Memorandum of Agreement, signed by the LSC and the LEA in July of 2015, was developed to provide for the time needed to offer a WL program. Some of the provisions of the MOA have extensive implications on not only the development and implementation of a WL program, but will also require the concurrent development of "other" elementary programs or opportunities, in order to meet the expectations of this MOA. The goals of this presentation at the December 15, 2015 LSC meeting are twofold: 1) to outline the short-term and long-term needs of this elementary restructuring and 2) to share the budgetary and programmatic issues that will need to be addressed by the district and the LSC.

The final report of the WL committee issued on June 10, 2014 outlining the recommendations, the outstanding considerations/decisions needing to be made, and a proposed timeline for implementation, as were suggested by the task force.

1. A reminder memorandum to the LSC on October 7, 2014 outlining the suggested implementation plan, timetable, and next steps.
2. A copy of the recent Memorandum of Agreement signed by the LSC and the LEA in July 2015 which outlines that in the first year of World Language implementation (possibly FY18 or FY19), early Thursday dismissal at the elementary level would be eliminated and an additional 1% salary increase would be put in place for all K-12 Unit A members.
3. A document outlining the estimated planning, programming, and staffing costs related to both the K-5 World Language reinstatement and the K-5 restructuring efforts.

School Committee Members had questions and comments.

- How would the Superintendent structure next year's budget if a .25 FTE was added?
- How reasonable and practical is it to expand this program? Answer: A lot of work to form a committee, concerned, redistricting, capital building projects, day to day operations, assessment system at this point in order to bring World Language back.
- Voters should have an opportunity to speak to the issue in the future.
- Some members have been advocating for restoration of elementary world language since 2006 when the program was cut (following a failed Operating Override).
- How do the current projections for the operating budget look in 2018? 2019? Can we afford to add the program? What might Dr. Czajkowski need to be cut elsewhere?
- What is the next budget doing to address future rising operating expenses attributed to rising enrollment? Is it a level service budget or are there program improvements?
- What does the administration recommend? Dr. Czajkowski asked members if they included the .25 FTE now, would they continue to advocate to implement the program in three years.

Mr. Hurley made a motion that was not seconded, to include a .25 FTE, but not to go as far as the administration's proposed language. Steigerwald asked if the item could be tabled until the next meeting. Dr. Czajkowski asked for the committee to make a decision during this meeting.

Public Comments:

Ms. Dawn McKenna expressed frustration and would like to see World Language implemented.

Mr. Andrei Radelescu-Banu, 86 Cedar St. would like to see World Language implemented.

Ms. Kate Colburn, 49 Forest St. would like to see World Language implemented. She also noted that eliminating some of the half-day Thursdays would be helpful to parents.

***Motion that the School Committee recommend the inclusion of a .25 FTE in the FY17 World Language budget, so as to create an interim K-8 World Language coordinator to assist the Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum and Instruction with the development, planning, and details related to K-5 World Language Program. (Steigerwald /Alessandrini) The motion was approved 3-2 (Crocker, Hurley in the minority).***

***The committee did not take action on the administration's second proposed motion.***

## **A.8 REVISION TO 2016-2017 SCHOOL CALENDAR**

Carol Pilarski (Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum and Instruction)

- Ms. Pilarski drew attention to two school calendars: the currently approved calendar for 2016-2017 AND a requested revision for the 2016-17 academic calendar. There is only **one** slight change/revision being requested in this calendar. The LHS staff has requested via the Lexington Education Association president a change in Back to School Night from the originally approved Wednesday, September 28, 2016 date to Thursday, September 29, 2016.

***Motion that the School Committee vote to approve the requested change in dates for the Lexington High School Back To School Night in the 2016-2017 calendar from Wednesday, September 28, 2016 to Thursday, September 29, 2016. (Coppe /Crocker)  
The motion was approved (5-0)***

## **A.9 RECOMMENDATION FOR MCAS ADMINISTRATION IN SPRING OF 2016**

Carol Pilarski (Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum and Instruction)

- The Massachusetts Commissioner of Education, Mitchell Chester, in his weekly update on November 20, 2015, indicated that: “In spring 2016, districts that used PARCC (Partnership for the Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers) in 2015 will do so again, and the remainder of the districts will continue with MCAS unless they affirmatively choose to administer PARCC. The spring 2016 MCAS tests will be augmented to include a limited number of PARCC items in order to help make statewide comparisons easier and to offer students and staff the opportunity to experience PARCC items while the new assessment is being developed.”
- Additional highlights include:
  1. The ELA long composition in grades 4 & 7 will be eliminated and be replaced with open-ended “response to text” items.
  2. The dates for the MCAS administration in grades 3-8 will be postponed by one week (March 28-April 12, 2016).
  3. All grade 10 MCAS assessments (ELA, Mathematics, & Science) and all associated dates will remain the same.
- The state’s goal is that the “next generation” MCAS will be fully updated for administration by 2019

***Motion to approve the recommendation that the Lexington Public Schools will continue to administer the MCAS assessment in spring of 2016 (Coppe/ Steigerwald)  
The Motion was approved (5-0).***

Ms. Steigerwald noted as a housekeeping item, that the Committee has one full-time employee and that there was a request for a description in the budget book. She distributed a draft and invited comments as soon as possible. She also noted that the Committee would be discussing the location of Ms. McDonough’s office as soon as that could be arranged.

Ms. Coppe requested to make a point of personal preference and Ms. Steigerwald recognized her.

Ms. Coppe read the following prepared statement, and asked to have it included in the minutes in full: “Everyone knows that the School Committee has had issues communicating and working well together, and we are taking steps to improve this. Now we are in a situation that has nothing to do with how we function as a committee. One of the important relationships in the schools is between the School Committee Chair and the Superintendent and that relationship is not working and we have reached a crisis point.

It is crucial that as we move forward with our building projects and possible debt exclusion, not to mention the everyday running of the school system that the Superintendent is allowed to do the job she was hired for. I think in this situation it would be best for the community if the current chair resigned, then under our policies we could reorganize and elect a new chair.”

Ms. Crocker said she took offense at Ms. Coppe’s comments. Ms. Crocker stated that the School Committee has a policy of Operating Norms and Procedures and suggested that many have been violated with the statement. Crocker will not entertain such a motion or suggestion.

Mr. Hurley asked Dr. Czajkowski if she wished to take action on the item for additional staff and she said it could be postponed. Mr. Hurley noted that his colleague used the word crisis, and has the right to express a point of view but that he does not see us in a crisis. He said he saw us going through some difficulties working diligently to try to be as effective as we possibly can. It’s not easy; this isn’t the UN trying to bring peace in the Middle East. It is 6 people working together and I think we all want to achieve that and are making strides to try to achieve that.

Ms. Steigerwald asked Dr. Czajkowski if she would like to make any statement. Dr. Czajkowski responded that she had no comment.

Ms. Steigerwald shared that for the public who are watching she suggested they look at the evidence of this meeting as an example of how they work, and the amount of work on their plate, and also how they treat one other, and make a decision on their own about how they feel things are functioning. She said that in terms of the role of the chair, it is up to the committee, whoever serves as the Chair serves at the pleasure of the committee. She said she was open to anyone’s further comments.

There were no further comments.

**10:29 p.m. Adjourn:** On a motion made by Hurley and seconded by Coppe the School Committee voted unanimously 5-0 to adjourn at 10:29 pm.

*Meeting Materials:*

**A.1.** Community Update – Lexington Scholarship Fund; **A.2.** Discussion Of Approved International Field Trips In Light Of The November 23, 2015, U.S. State Department Worldwide Travel Alert; **A.3.** Lexington Community Coalition Update; **A.4.** Capital Projects Update Next Steps Following Special Town Meeting #1; **A.4.1.** Placement of Modulars; **A.4.2.** Programmatic Impact Of Modulars; **A.5. & A.5.A** FY 16 1<sup>st</sup> Quarterly Financial Report; **A.6** Proposed

Enrollment Report Discussion; **A.7** Elementary World Language; **A.8** Revision To 2016-2017 School Calendar; **A.9** Recommendation For MCAS Administration In Spring Of 2016

Voted Approved January 12, 2016