

ASD Ways and Means  
January 17, 2023

**Names of Members:**

Dwayne Purvis (Chair) - Present  
Jeff Candito - Present  
Greg Fritz - Present  
Mike Akillian - Present  
Mozammel Husainy - Present  
Steve Frades - Remote  
Rick Barnes - Present  
Marilyn Gibson (Alternate) - Present

**Person(s) appearing before the Committee**

Amy Facey - Present  
Steve Chamberlin - Present  
Tom Gauthier - Present  
Victoria Parisi - Present

**Summary of topics discussed**

We discussed a summary of the draft facilities report. There are two large themes: (1) There is no detailed cost estimates for any alternative plans and alternate plans deserve serious consideration including the same resolution of cost estimation as the proposed plan. (2) It is not known if the proposed school will solve the issues mentioned by ASB including the need for appropriate space for special education since ASB has no projections on the special needs spatial requirements in the future (even 1 year in the future).

In addition, we discussed the history of spending on maintenance including the decrease in spending in FY2018 which was part of the capital needs assessment plan. We discussed how it is risky to fund the capital reserve fund with unexpended funds. We heard how this fund has existed since 2003.

We discussed the concept of a moratorium on PD and curriculum spending for 3 years to improve competence within a stable curriculum. There was a mention of freezing hiring and utilizing Centers to improve the utility of the staff and resources currently available.

We discussed the contract language in the AEA contract. We heard that the only changes in the AEA contract are those mentioned in the press release. Some members were hesitant to vote on the contract without reading the actual contract language.

We discussed the need to get our votes ready for the warrant that is posted around town as well as for the voters guide which is mailed to each mailing address.

We discussed Article 12 and voted 1 YES and 6 NO. The YES said that a facilities upgrade is badly needed and this is the only plan on the table. The NO said that this facilities plan is not comparable to other plans which are likely cheaper with the same confidence in solving the requirements.

We discussed Article 13 and voted 0 YES and 7 NO. The NO said that the budget is not tied to performance or a strategic plan; that the town cannot afford Articles 12,13, and 14 in

combination; that this budget is not built from zero but rather is baselined on previous budgets; that we want to send a signal that it is not OK to be significantly out of line in cost/pupil and there should be a \$5M cut; that we could not identify any such cut when we went line by line through the budget in subcommittees; that the Default budget is sufficient for the actual expected spending; that the priorities are not clear; that this budget should result in higher education performance if utilized as well as other districts.

We discussed Article 14 and voted 2 YES and 4 NO with 1 ABSTAIN. We heard that personnel cost is the highest cost in the budget and that this may be a good thing or a bad thing; that more items need to be addressed than were changed in this negotiation; that our personnel cost is out of line with comparable schools; that it was positive to see the salary scale shift in favor of newer teachers, no jump steps, and the reduction in steps; that if this fails, it sends a negative tone; that if this fails, there is a chance to get a better shorter term deal before next March, how the taxpayer's interest is and is not reflected in this contract, that the "COLA" is not a "cost of living increase" but rather a broad based raise on top of the step increases; that there is no way to reward a top performer; that the retirement plan is irksome; that the CBA is a driving force in our higher cost/pupil; that PD should be used in the classroom or PD should be cut; that there should be some proof that educational outputs are tied to teacher contracts.

We discussed Article 15 and voted 4 YES and 3 NO. The YES said that this would be a chance to get a short term contract allowing the teachers to get a raise but not a 3 year deal that commits future teachers, tax payers, and board members to this in a volatile environment. The NO said that this term should not be in a contract, that this is a second chance to get what the union and ASB wants after being rejected by voters in a popular vote; and that the makeup of voters in a special session could swing the vote outcome even though the issue is not any more broadly popular and the this would cost the town more money for the special meeting.

We discussed Article 16 and voted 5 YES and 2 NO. Greg Fritz recused himself from this vote and Marilyn Gibson became a voting member. The YES said that this was an improvement with the broad base increase needed to support this staff group and to attract more applicants.

We discussed Article 17 and voted 2 YES and 5 NO. Greg Fritz recused himself from this vote and Marilyn Gibson became a voting member. The reasons were similar to Article 15 above.

We discussed Article 18 and voted 7 YES and 0 NO. The YES hoped that this money would be used to fix the leaks at AMS and appreciated how this article was part of a strategic plan regarding facilities.

Next meeting will be Thursday.

Meeting ends.