

Concord School District Board of Education  
**Board work session #4 – Curriculum and Technology**  
**March 2, 2020**

**Board members present:** Jennifer Patterson, Gina Cannon, Tom Croteau, Barb Higgins (arrived at 5:46 p.m.), Jim Richards, Danielle Smith, David Parker, Liza Poinier

**Board members absent:** Chuck Crush

**Administration:** Dr. Frank Bass, *Superintendent*; Donna Palley, *Assistant Superintendent*; Jack Dunn, *Business Administrator*; Matt Cashman, *Director of Facilities*; Pam McLeod, *Director of Information Technology*

Board President Jennifer Patterson called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m., noting that Board Work Session #4 was a discussion of curriculum and technology. Business Administrator Jack Dunn presented the agenda: technology, a budget update, curriculum, public information, and public comment.

Director of Information Technology Pam McLeod reviewed technology expenditures, noting that the turnover of both the systems and network managers last summer caused a delay in some projects, but that projects are mostly caught up.

**Staffing**

- (1) Director of Technology
- (1) Network Administrator<sup>†</sup>
- (1) System Administrator<sup>†</sup>
- (2) Desktop Technicians
- (1) Database Analyst

<sup>†</sup> Positions turned over summer 2019

**Device statistics** (*prefer to use new Tech Stabilization Fund or finance over 3 years*)

- iPads: 1600 (*student and staff, includes shared carts*)
- Staff: Laptops 439, Desktops 49
- Student Chromebooks: 4,044 (*student and staff, includes shared carts*)
- Classroom and student PC labs: (2) RMS, (5) CHS, (1) BGS, (1) BMS

**Infrastructure statistics** (*prefer to finance over 5 years*)

- (400) Wireless access points
- (8) Physical servers (*includes backup servers; hosting 80+ virtual servers*)
- (26) Switches
- (1) Firewalls
- (1) Content filters
- (2) Server room A/C
- (2) Enterprise battery backups
- (18) Telephone switches (old phone system)

- (312) Wall- ceiling-mounted projectors
- Security and access control \*

Ms. McLeod noted that the District would be piloting 20 Winbooks as a possible replacement for Chromebooks, which have a more limited functionality and accessibility. She explained that CHS staff were using 4- and 5-year old laptops and that those would be replaced this year, along with a new Districtwide phone system. Central Office would convert this spring and the rest of the District over the summer.

### Highlights

- Technology Stabilization Fund
  - No deposit into the Stabilization Fund
  - In FY20 (*current year*)
    - \$350,000 – new phone system
    - \$250,000 – deposit into Technology Trust Fund
- Fund repairs and maintenance
  - Based on \$3.25 per student for repairs and maintenance, and \$4.00 per student for general supplies
  - Level-fund dues, fees and contingency, supplies, etc.
- Level-fund software. Some systems are retired (DreamBox); some are new (SNAP)

Ms. McLeod described additional technology projects, including staff ID badges, bus cameras, and infrastructure improvements. She described the implementation of a new unified voice communications system, which will allow for web conferencing and more robust mobile functionality in addition to traditional phone services.

### Student focus

- Student devices: fully 1-to-1 in FY18, grades 1-12
- iPads – PreK–2
- Chromebooks – grades 3-12 (grade 3 moved from iPads to Chromebooks in FY19).
- FY21: Concord High School refresh – testing Winbooks
- Continued focus on Google Classroom / “Drive”
- Competency-based reporting (continued)
- Take-home Chromebooks grades 8-12 (continued), expanded to grades 6 and 7 this year
- Data privacy – major focus this year

### Staff focus

- Teachers: replacing 4- and 5-year old laptops for Concord High School, nurses, administrators. K-8 teachers received new laptops in past 3 years.
- Telephone replacement summer 2020 (Central Office in spring)
- New Nursing / EHR software (April 2020 implementation)
- Policy / compliance management system

### Security focus

- Completion of integration of security cameras, intrusion, and access control at CHS / elementary schools
- Data privacy and security per RSA 189:66, V (HB 1612)

- Bus cameras – beginning selection now (transportation budget)

**Infrastructure focus**

- Secondary internet/fiber at MBS for physical redundancy
- Added additional server nodes last summer (grant funds)
- New unified communications (voice) system:
  - Old telephone system was several years past “end of life”
  - Side-by-side upgrade with old and new system in place simultaneously
  - Server side complete
  - 9 test users at Central Office, will migrate Central Office by April
  - Web conferencing and IM and mobile and traditional phone

Ms. McLeod reviewed software expenditures, highlighting both District operational and student learning programs.

**Operational examples:**

- PowerSchool – student management software | 26,500
- MUNIS – ERP system to manage District HR and finances | 61,000
- VersaTrans – bus route system | 7,400
- Lightspeed content filtering | 19,200
- Microsoft agreement – server, desktop operating system, and office licenses | 34,500
- PowerSchool online registration | 11,000
- SWIS/CICO | 3,500
- Various monitoring and backup tools – Carbonite, Monitis server monitoring, PaperCut, ManageEngine, and PTC Wizard
- (NEW) CatchOn | \$9,450
- (NEW) SNAP health | \$7,500

**Student learning examples:**

- (NEW) Zearn (Math) | 12,500 – replaces DreamBox
- Lexia Core 5 (Reading) | 54,835
- Mystery Science | 5,000 – fully funded by GF in FY20
- BrainPop | 1,900
- RazKids | 1,600
- Apps | 7,500
- Newsela | 1,500
- Destiny Software – Library | 6,500
- Typing Club | 2,100

Mr. Dunn described the technology budget overall, noting an increase of \$508,354, due mostly to new equipment purchase needs. Ms. McLeod described a change in technology from a ramping-up stage to a maintenance state.

**OVERVIEW – TECHNOLOGY BUDGET**

OBJECT DESCRIPTION	FY20	FY21	CHANGE (\$)	CHANGE (%)
[610000] - SALARIES	547,642.00	563,428.00	15,786.00	2.88
[620000] - BENEFITS	239,198.00	211,766.00	(27,432.00)	(11.47)
[630000] - PROFESSIONAL SERVICES	17,750.00	17,750.00	0.00	0.00
[640000] - PURCHASED PROPERTY	367,779.50	17,779.50	(350,000.00)	(95.17)
[650000] - PURCHASED SERVICES	36,610.00	36,610.00	0.00	0.00
[660000] - SUPPLIES, BOOKS AND UTILITIES	360,051.54	360,051.54	0.00	0.00
[670000] - EQUIPMENT	0.00	870,000.00	870,000.00	
[680000] - DUES, FEES & INTEREST	41,099.00	41,099.00	0.00	0.00
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>1,610,130.04</b>	<b>2,118,484.04</b>	<b>508,354.00</b>	<b>31.57</b>

Ms. McLeod reviewed future infrastructure needs, including classroom projector upgrades, elementary gymnasium/café projector upgrades, WiFi and security camera upgrades. She noted that a city fiber upgrade in FY25-27 could involve some cost, but there was no way of knowing this yet. The District planned to be involved in capital planning meetings with the city.

**Infrastructure needs/highlights**

- Elementary classroom projector upgrades: \$430,500 (ASAP)
- New elementary projectors: \$40,500 (ASAP)
- Elementary gymnasium/cafe projector upgrades: \$60,000 (ASAP)
- RMS/CHS classroom projector upgrades: \$450,000 (FY22-25)
- WiFi replacement: \$400,000 (up to 60% e-rate) (FY22)
- Security camera upgrade: \$500,000 (FY24)
- City fiber: unknown (FY25-27) – capital planning with city

Ms. Patterson clarified that students were assigned one device, for use from grade to grade.

Barb Higgins arrived at 5:46 p.m.

Ms. McLeod highlighted a WiFi replacement in FY22, noting that up to 60% of that cost should be reimbursable via e-Rate. Jim Richards asked if it was typical for security cameras to have only a 4- to 5-year lifespan and if they would in fact need to be replaced after that short a period of time. Ms. McLeod noted that 5 years was fairly conservative for technology replacement, and that cameras would likely continue to improve and evolve in that timespan. David Parker asked whether both external as well as internal cameras would be installed on District school buses, and for clarification on the intent of the cameras. Ms. McLeod noted that the process of installing cameras on buses was at an early stage and that the intent for external cameras was to mitigate student safety-related issues, such as vehicles illegally passing bus stop signs. Ms. Patterson referenced Policy 758 Video/Audio Surveillance and Recordings, suggesting that it might be a good idea to revisit that policy for possible revisions. In response to a question whether the \$500,000 projected for security camera upgrades in FY24 included software and associated fees or costs, Ms. McLeod noted that it would. In response to a question whether

contracted external student transportation vehicles would carry cameras, Ms. McLeod made a note to explore this issue and address it at a future meeting.

Ms. McLeod reviewed average annual projections for current systems maintenance. In response to a question about how many classroom projectors were nonfunctional, Ms. McLeod explained that they were functional but older, “glitchy,” and in need of replacement in order to be useful for staff and students.

## Average Annual Projections for Maintenance<sup>†</sup> of Current Systems

Category	Cost per year	Cycle years
Laptops/Desktops	\$183,000	4
Student 1:1, K, PK	\$426,000	4
Networking / Servers	\$200,000 *	varies
Projectors	\$200,000 ** (\$67K after caught up)	5-8

† After refresh of current equipment

\* WiFi / Networking upgrades up to 60% E-Rate reimbursable

\*\* Recommend budgeting this factor to cover projector / board replacements and upgrades over next 5 years. \$531K needed now to update elementary schools; about the same will be needed in 3-5 years to update RMS/CHS. Long term replacement cost \$67K/year for an 8-year life.

Mr. Dunn reviewed technology revenues, explaining that the FCC’s e-rate program had made telecommunications and information services affordable for schools and libraries. With funding from the Universal Service Fund, e-rate provides discounts for telecommunications, Internet access and internal connections to eligible schools and libraries. He noted that funding for cell, landlines and PRIs were no longer eligible for a federal reimbursement. Funding declined 20% per year starting in FY16; only Internet connections are currently eligible. Mr. Richards noted that school cameras for RMS were missing from the budget. Ms. McLeod noted that the District might be eligible for less state building aid with additions like this. Ms. Patterson added that the District might be stuck paying for this even after the new middle school building comes online, as this was projected within the next 5 years. Liza Poinier suggested that a best-case scenario was that a new middle school would open in 5 years and that, since this was a typical camera lifespan, it might make sense to discuss something in the meantime until there was a new RMS building. Ms. Higgins expressed concerns about student safety by holding off on RMS cameras until there was a new building.

In response to a request for the history of technology expenditures, Mr. Dunn explained that this tended to hover around \$1.5 million, due to the necessary replacement of hardware every few years, annual software licenses and subscription fees. Tom Croteau emphasized the importance of the Technology Trust Fund to mitigate these costs. Ms. McLeod emphasized the ever-growing importance of data safety and privacy; that these services were critical and necessary expenses to protect student and District data. Mr. Richards noted that data breaches were a huge potential cost risk and asked whether staff were provided with annual training on data privacy and safety. Ms. McLeod explained that there was no formal training program, but that there was ongoing “phish testing” for users as well as training and information when new employees were hired. She emphasized the “tech-savvy” culture of the District. Ms. Patterson described the training modules provided to state staff, noting the importance of being prepared for cyberattacks. Mr. Parker asked whether there had been an assessment of technology usage to determine whether items like projectors were being used. He suggested rethinking distribution as a way to save money. Ms. McLeod explained that the older model was to share equipment and move it between classrooms, and that as classrooms move away from hard textbooks, technology such as projectors have become more critical for daily classroom activity. Gina Cannon asked what happened with old technology when it was replaced and whether these items were donated or sold. Ms. McLeod noted that she looks for resale value to recoup some money to the District, or has these items refurbished and resold to places like churches or low-income families.

Mr. Dunn provided a budget update, with a comparison of the version presented on February 10 and the current version. He noted reductions including unemployment insurance, transportation equipment purchases, copy paper at CHS due to the copy center, Medicaid MSB expenses and school postage, with a reduction of approximately \$215,000.

**BUDGET UPDATE - SUMMARY BY EXPENDITURES BY OBJECT - PRESENTED ON FEB 10<sup>TH</sup>**

EXPENDITURE OBJECT	FY20 - BUDGET 10/28/19	FY21 - PROPOSED BUDGET	CHANGE (\$)	CHANGE (%)
[610000] - SALARIES	44,503,905.00	45,988,588.43	1,484,683.43	3.34
[620000] - BENEFITS	20,082,053.00	22,357,996.57	2,275,943.57	11.33
[630000] - PROFESSIONAL SERVICES	2,392,580.70	2,580,956.05	188,375.35	7.87
[640000] - PURCHASED PROPERTY	1,713,767.40	1,370,650.62	(343,116.78)	(20.02)
[650000] - PURCHASED SERVICES	3,145,252.24	3,501,761.78	356,509.54	11.33
[660000] - SUPPLIES, BOOKS AND UTILITIES	3,523,067.51	3,440,361.99	(82,705.52)	(2.35)
[670000] - EQUIPMENT	448,198.15	1,086,877.56	638,679.41	142.50
[680000] - DUES, FEES & INTEREST	3,660,923.00	3,340,174.00	(320,749.00)	(8.76)
[690000] - PRINCIPAL AND TRANSFERS	6,665,620.00	5,148,607.00	(1,517,013.00)	(22.76)
<b>TOTAL GENERAL FUND EXPENDITURES</b>	<b>86,135,367.00</b>	<b>88,815,974.00</b>	<b>2,680,607.00</b>	<b>3.11</b>

**BUDGET UPDATE - SUMMARY BY EXPENDITURES BY OBJECT - MARCH 2<sup>ND</sup>**

EXPENDITURE OBJECT	FY20 - BUDGET 10/28/19	FY21 - PROPOSED BUDGET	CHANGE (\$)	CHANGE (%)
[610000] - SALARIES	44,503,905.00	46,116,136.44	1,612,231.44	3.62
[620000] - BENEFITS	20,082,053.00	22,207,898.56	2,125,845.56	10.59
[630000] - PROFESSIONAL SERVICES	2,392,580.70	2,540,206.05	147,625.35	6.17
[640000] - PURCHASED PROPERTY	1,713,767.40	1,298,500.62	(415,266.78)	(24.23)
[650000] - PURCHASED SERVICES	3,145,252.24	3,490,661.78	345,409.54	10.98
[660000] - SUPPLIES, BOOKS AND UTILITIES	3,523,067.51	3,432,361.99	(90,705.52)	(2.57)
[670000] - EQUIPMENT	448,198.15	1,051,477.56	603,279.41	134.60
[680000] - DUES, FEES & INTEREST	3,660,923.00	3,340,174.00	(320,749.00)	(8.76)
[690000] - PRINCIPAL AND TRANSFERS	6,665,620.00	5,110,329.00	(1,555,291.00)	(23.33)
<b>TOTAL GENERAL FUND EXPENDITURES</b>	<b>86,135,367.00</b>	<b>88,587,746.00</b>	<b>2,452,379.00</b>	<b>2.85</b>

**BUDGET UPDATE**

**EXPENDITURES**

DESCRIPTION	BUDGET 2/10	BUDGET 3/2	DIFFERENCE
Unemployment Insurance	35,000.00	25,000.00	(10,000.00)
Transportation - Repeater	8,500.00	0.00	(8,500.00)
Copy Paper	25,000.00	15,000.00	(10,000.00)
Mercedes - Final Payment	72,150.00	0.00	(72,150.00)
John Deere x734 Tractor (replacement)	24,000.00	0.00	(24,000.00)
Medicaid MSB Expense	85,750.00	45,000.00	(40,750.00)
Reduce Transfer to Facilities Trust	1,456,024.00	1,417,746.00	(38,278.00)
Postage - Superintendent	12,000.00	7,000.00	(5,000.00)
Postage - RMS	8,600.00	5,100.00	(3,500.00)
Postage - CHS	8,000.00	4,500.00	(3,500.00)
<b>TOTAL EXPENDITURES</b>	<b>1,750,024.00</b>	<b>1,519,346.00</b>	<b>(215,678)</b>

**REVENUE**

DESCRIPTION	BUDGET 2/10	BUDGET 3/2	DIFFERENCE
UR Balance	1,900,000	2,100,000	200,000
CRTC Pre-School	60,550	48,000	(12,550)
Transfer from SPED Trust	0	100,000	100,000
<b>TOTAL REVENUE</b>	<b>1,960,550</b>	<b>2,248,000</b>	<b>287,450</b>

## BUDGET UPDATE – TAX IMPACT

	FY20 – FINAL RATE		FY21 – PROPOSED FEB 10 <sup>TH</sup>		FY21 – REVISED PROPOSAL MAR 2 <sup>ND</sup>	
	(\$)		(\$)	(%)	(\$)	(%)
Local Tax Rate	13.26		13.74	3.62	13.61	2.64
State Tax Rate*	2.05		1.99	-2.93	1.99	-2.93
Total Tax Rate**	<b>15.31</b>		<b>15.73</b>	<b>2.74</b>	<b>15.60</b>	<b>1.89</b>
<b>UPDATED 3/2</b>						

### TAX RATE SETTING

The Concord School Board does not set the Tax Rate. The Department of Revenue sets the Tax Rate. The information provided in this presentation is the best information we have at this time.

Mr. Dunn noted the tax impact had been updated to 1.89%. He reviewed the history of co-curricular revenue for various fall and winter sports at RMS and CHS. Several Board members asked about the discrepancy in the headcount numbers compared to the charge count. Mr. Dunn explained that students on the free- and reduced-cost lunch program were not required to pay for admission, and that families could also request fee waivers, granted at the discretion of the Athletic Director.

### CO-CURRICULAR – RMS – 2019-2020

#### FALL SPORTS

TEAM	HEADCOUNT	CHARGE COUNT	FEE	AMOUNT
Soccer (Boys)	45	29	85	2,465.00
Soccer (Girls)	23	16	85	1,360.00
Field Hockey	35	28	85	2,380.00
Cross Country	68	58	85	4,930.00
Volleyball (intermural)	61			-
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>232</b>	<b>131</b>		<b>11,135.00</b>

#### WINTER SPORTS

TEAM	HEADCOUNT	CHARGE COUNT	FEE	AMOUNT
Basketball (Boys)	31	14	85	1,190.00
Basketball (Girls)	24	15	85	1,275.00
Wrestling	50	21	85	1,785.00
Spirit	50	22	85	1,870.00
Cross Country Ski	42	36	85	3,060.00
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>197</b>	<b>108</b>		<b>9,180.00</b>

**CO-CURRICULAR – CHS – 2019-2020**

**FALL SPORTS**

TEAM	HEADCOUNT	CHARGE COUNT	FEE	AMOUNT
Cross Country (Boys)	30	27	90	2,430.00
Cross Country (Girls)	26	22	90	1,980.00
Field Hockey	40	33	90	2,970.00
Football*	73	39	90	3,510.00
Golf	16	16	90	1,440.00
Soccer (Boys)	54	37	90	3,330.00
Soccer (Girls)	57	47	90	4,230.00
Spirit	25	13	90	1,170.00
Volleyball	25	23	90	2,070.00
Soccer (Unified)	26	-	-	-
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>372</b>	<b>257</b>		<b>23,130.00</b>

**WINTER SPORTS**

TEAM	HEADCOUNT	CHARGE COUNT	FEE	AMOUNT
Alpine Ski	14	14	90	1,260.00
Basketball (Boys)	39	27	90	2,430.00
Basketball (Girls)	25	18	90	1,620.00
Basketball Unified	16		90	-
Cross Country Ski*	26	23	90	2,070.00
Hockey (Boys)	40	39	385	15,015.00
Hockey (Girls)	23	20	385	7,700.00
Indoor Track (Boys)	30	27	90	2,430.00
Indoor Track (Girls)	31	21	90	1,890.00
Ski Jumping	5	2	90	180.00
Spirit	22	14	90	1,260.00
Swimming	16	13	90	1,170.00
Wrestling*	52	24	90	2,160.00
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>339</b>	<b>242</b>		<b>39,185.00</b>

Mr. Dunn reviewed co-curricular revenues from FY15 to present, showing fairly consistent numbers year to year. The co-curricular budget had an increase of 4.29%. Ms. Patterson asked about coach staff stipends and benefits. Mr. Dunn explained that the only benefit paid from stipends was FICA. Many coaches were also District employees, so their salaries and benefits should show in the General Fund budget, not the co-curricular budget.

**CO-CURRICULAR – EXPENDITURE BUDGET (FUNCTION 1410 AND 1420)**

SUMMARY BY OBJECT	FY20 BUDGET	FY21 BUDGET	CHANGE(\$)	CHANGE(%)
[610000] - SALARIES	650,963.00	682,303.00	31,340.00	4.81
[620000] - BENEFITS	198,606.00	208,278.00	9,672.00	4.87
[630000] - PROFESSIONAL SERVICES	123,168.00	123,168.00	0.00	0.00
[640000] - PURCHASED PROPERTY	65,779.00	65,779.00	0.00	0.00
[650000] - PURCHASED SERVICES	8,618.00	9,518.00	900.00	10.44
[660000] - SUPPLIES, BOOKS AND UTILITIES	35,483.00	37,483.00	2,000.00	5.64
[670000] - EQUIPMENT	8,636.00	12,736.00	4,100.00	47.48
[680000] - DUES, FEES & INTEREST	27,883.00	27,883.00	0.00	0.00
<b>EXPENSES Total</b>	<b>1,119,136.00</b>	<b>1,167,148.00</b>	<b>48,012.00</b>	<b>4.29</b>

Mr. Dunn reviewed the JV hockey program, including its history, an overview from Athletic Director Steve Mello, and its budget ramifications. He explained that the program was initially meant to be reviewed in a year. Ms. Patterson asked whether the Board approved the \$2,000 expenditure this year, and how the program would be funded going forward. Mr. Croteau explained that his understanding was that the program was meant to be self-funded, then reviewed after a year to determine whether the program would stay in the budget. He asked what the Board might do if other groups were to come forward and ask for budget inclusion based on the JV hockey team’s experience. Ms. Poinier asked for an updated statement on the

program's success this season, and if perhaps the group could go back to a partial booster club model as a way of splitting the difference. Ms. Patterson suggested the Board vote on what to do about this year, and clearly articulate the plan for next year so there was no confusion about how the group was funded. Mr. Parker and Mr. Richards expressed a desire to see how much money is spent on other co-curricular activities, as the Board needed to prioritize these funds while ensuring as many students as possible had the opportunity to get involved in these activities. Dr. Bass noted that districts handle these activities differently, such as self-funding for a certain number of years as a way of determining participation and success. He added that it was important to have a policy and procedure for proposed activities, to determine how these programs were funded so there is no confusion about how they fit into the budget. Ms. Patterson referred to Board Policy #690.1 Athletic Philosophy and Guidelines, noting that it was the standard to which the District should hold all new proposed programs. Mr. Croteau suggested a presentation of costs, success rate history and proposed future funding plan.

Ms. Patterson suggested JV hockey remain an element of the budget and that perhaps someone involved with the team might present to the Board about the merits of the program. She added that it would be advantageous to have a discussion after the budget season, to present the information Mr. Croteau mentioned earlier and to establish a clear process for next year. Ms. Cannon asked if the Board ever reviewed existing programs. Dr. Bass agreed that it would be a good idea to review costs and the participation level of current programs, as well as their value and impact on students and community. Ms. Higgins suggested that the Board could request a report on numbers and participation from the Athletic Director.

**The Board voted 8-0 to adjourn (moved by Mr. Parker, seconded by Ms. Higgins).**

The meeting adjourned at 6:58 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Barb Higgins, *Secretary*

Lauren Hynds, *Recorder*