

Minutes – Advisory Committee Education Subcommittee Meeting of January 26, 2020 at School Administration Conference Room

Members present – David Anderson, George Danis, Bob Curley

Absent – Evan Sheehan

Also present: School Superintendent Paul Austin, Assistant Jamie LaBillois, Business Manager John Ferris, Michelle Ayer and members of the School Committee, and Advisory Committee Members Victor Baltera (Chair), Kathleen Ahlman, Julie Strehle, Nancy MacDonald.

The meeting was called to order at 1:00pm

Dr. Austin provided a PowerPoint presentation outlining trends in District metrics such as enrollment, student performance (MCAS, AP and college placement data). He also provided an overview of the District's efforts related to Special Education and a summary of issues with certain District facilities. Dr. Austin then summarized the District's proposed 2021 budget.

As shown in more detail in the materials handed out at the meeting, Dr. Austin presented a continuum of District needs and the associated costs associated with meeting those needs. As shown below, the District is currently proposing an FY 2021 budget of \$57,661,728, or 6.15% growth versus 2020 – shown as the Level 1: Most Critical Needs budget below:

HPS Proposed FY' 21 Budget(s)

- **Status Quo Base Budget**
 - The Status Quo Budget keeps all current supports and services, but accounts for increases in salary, supplies, and other required costs associated with the operation of the district.
 - The Approved FY'20 Budget was \$54,319,826
 - The FY'21 Status Quo Budget is \$56,730,985
 - The Status Quo Budget represents an increase of \$2,411,159 –or- 4.44%
- **Fundamental and Structural Needs**
 - These are the longer term needs that are future-focused for system growth, management of facilities, and meeting the needs of students and the community
 - Fully-funded all-day Kindergarten and moving recurring capital (technology) into the operating budget
 - Additional District Administrator (TBD)
 - The FY'21 Proposed Budget with all needs (Level 1-3) funded is \$60,629,086 –or- 11.62%
- **Level 3: Critical Needs**
 - The requisites of the district that are focused on our changing demographics, the expectations of the community, and the specific needs of our students.
 - The Level 3 Critical Needs total \$1,058,033 – and is \$2,330,971 above the Status Quo Base Budget
 - The FY'21 Proposed Budget with Level 3 addition is \$59,084,086 –or- 8.77%
- **Level 2: Highly Critical Needs**
 - Highly critical needs and supports needed to meet the needs of all children now and into the future.
 - The Level 2 Critical Needs total \$342,195 – and is \$1,272,938 above the Status Quo Base Budget
 - The FY'21 Proposed Budget with Level 2 addition is \$58,003,923 –or- 6.78%
- **Level 1: Most Critical Needs**
 - Most critical and necessary supports and services needed to meet the needs of all children in Hingham Public Schools.
 - The Level 1 Most Critical Needs total \$930,743 above the Status Quo Base Budget
 - The FY'21 Proposed Budget with Level 1 addition is \$57,661,728 –or- 6.15%

22

There was a discussion of many aspects of the budget proposal itself and a discussion of the per student education expenditures in Hingham as compared to other comparable towns. According to the data presented by the School Administration (page 21 of the PowerPoint), Hingham ranked last (20 out of 20) on a per pupil spend in 2018. It was represented that the comparison across towns was an “apples to apples” comparison. However, it should be noted that at least one variable that appeared to differ across towns was how much the respective Town’s contributed to employees’ health insurance expenses – Hingham contributes 50% while some other towns contribute a higher percentage which would have the effect of increasing per public spending in those towns.

Following the budget discussion, there was a brief discussion of the Administration’s warrant article to add funds for the feasibility study of Foster Elementary School in light of the recent Massachusetts School Building Authority (“MSBA”) decision to accept Foster into its eligibility program. In addition, there was a discussion of the forthcoming statement of interest to be submitted to the MSBA regarding replacement of the windows at Plymouth River School.

Dr. Austin and Mr. Ferris provided an update on possible locations for the Traces program for the balance of this school year and longer-term since the program can no longer use Building 12 at Bare Cove Park. Two possible locations, subject to further study and evaluation, are Building 179 at Bare Cove Park and the former Hingham Municipal Light Plant on Cushing Street.

Finally, there was a discussion of school department capital needs and whether the recurring annual cost of certain technology should be included in the operating budget rather than the capital budget.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:45 pm.

Documents used at meeting:

Agenda

Hingham Public Schools Review of FY’21 Budget with Town Officials presentation from Dr. Paul Austin, dated 1/26/20

Approved by the subcommittee on 3/10/20.