

**Celeste N. Griffin**

---

**From:** Amy Lapsis <alapsis@charter.net>  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 13, 2014 12:31 AM  
**To:** MBOE\_BOE; mboesupt  
**Cc:** James E. Palmer  
**Subject:** 2014-2015 Vinton class size

Dear Superintendent Baruzzi & Members of the Board of Education,

As you prepare to vote on the 2014-2015 school year budget we would like to take this opportunity to encourage you to consider re-examining class sizes and staffing at Annie Vinton School. Looking at the projected enrollment it appears that there will be a minimum of 20 students per Kindergarten class for the 2014-2015 school year. Through our experiences in the education field, we feel that lower class sizes in the lower elementary grades are imperative due to the ever increasing expectations put on both students and teachers.

As you know, education reform is happening at an unprecedented pace. The Kindergarten that we as adults experienced is much different than what our children are currently experiencing. We moved to Mansfield for its amazing schools. One of the things that we feel strongly contributed to this was its lower class sizes. Our daughter, who is now in second grade, has had a class size of approximately 15 students throughout her career at Vinton. Our son, who will be going in to Kindergarten next year, deserves the same benefits of having a lower, and more appropriate, class size. Increasing class size and increasing expectations are not a good combination and, in our opinion, will not lead to the same successes for the incoming students of Mansfield Public Schools.

It is our recommendation that you consider reinstating a third kindergarten teacher and instructional aid along with an additional first grade teacher for the 2014-2015 school year.

Thank you for your consideration.  
Christopher & Amy Lapsis



*Mansfield Middle School*

205 SPRING HILL ROAD | STORRS, CT 06268

WEBSITE: WWW.MANSFIELDCT.GOV/MMS  
EMAIL: AIMSOUTICE@MANSFIELDCT.ORG

PHONE: 860.429.9341  
FAX: 860.429.1020

THANH V. NGUYEN, PRINCIPAL

CANDACE V. MORELL, ASSISTANT PRINCIPAL

March 13, 2014

2014 MAR 13 PM 5:24

Fred Baruzzi  
Superintendent  
4 South Eagleville Road  
Storrs, CT 06268

Dear Mr. Baruzzi,

Please accept this letter as a formal notification that I am resigning from my position with the Mansfield Public Schools, effective June 30, 2014.

I want to express my appreciation for the privilege and honor of serving the students of Mansfield Middle School, dedicated teachers and staff, administrators, parents, and Board of Education members.

It has been rewarding and a source of personal pride to look back at the significant progress accomplished here. I will greatly treasure the experiences I have had at Mansfield Middle School. I look forward to furthering my educational career closer to home and being with my family.

Sincerely,

Thanh V. Nguyen  
Principal  
Mansfield Middle School

Cc. Mansfield Board of Education

**MANSFIELD PUBLIC SCHOOLS  
MEMORANDUM**

**TO:** Board of Education Members  
**FROM:** Fred Baruzzi  
**SUBJECT:** Enrollment  
**DATE:** 3/1/14

<b>Goodwin Elementary School</b>			
	<b>10/1/12</b>		<b>3/1/14</b>
<b>Preschool</b>	15, 15		16, 13
<b>Kindergarten</b>	15, 15, 15		17, 17
<b>1<sup>st</sup> grade</b>	17, 18		16, 14, 14
<b>2<sup>nd</sup> grade</b>	19, 20		15, 17
<b>3<sup>rd</sup> grade</b>	14, 14		20, 20
<b>4<sup>th</sup> grade</b>	22, 22		█, █
<b>Total</b>	<b>221</b>		<b>207</b>
<b>Southeast Elementary School</b>			
<b>Preschool</b>	15, 14		13, 13
<b>Kindergarten</b>	17, 14, 18		18, 19
<b>1<sup>st</sup> grade</b>	15, 17, 16		16, 17, 15
<b>2<sup>nd</sup> grade</b>	16, 15, 15		18, 17, 18
<b>3<sup>rd</sup> grade</b>	19, 18		23, 23
<b>4<sup>th</sup> grade</b>	█		17, 18
<b>Total</b>	<b>253</b>		<b>245</b>
<b>Vinton Elementary School</b>			
<b>Preschool</b>	16, 16		17, 17
<b>Kindergarten</b>	15, 15, 14		22, 20
<b>1<sup>st</sup> grade</b>	15, 16, 15		15, 17, 17
<b>2<sup>nd</sup> grade</b>	17, 18, 17		15, 15, 15
<b>3<sup>rd</sup> grade</b>	18, 18, 18		16, 15, 16
<b>4<sup>th</sup> grade</b>	22, 22		16, 17, 16
<b>Total</b>	<b>272</b>		<b>266</b>
<b>Total – PK-4</b>	<b>746</b>		<b>718</b>

	<b>10/1/12</b>	<b>10/1/13</b>	<b>11/1/13</b>	<b>12/1/13</b>	<b>1/1/14</b>	<b>2/1/14</b>	<b>3/1/14</b>
		3					
<b>K-4 Above Guideline</b>	7	6	7	8	7	8	8
█	3	2	2	2	2	2	2
<b>K-4 Within Guideline</b>	29	29	28	27	28	27	27
<b>% Within Guideline</b>	74%	78%	76%	73%	76%	73%	73%

Middle School								
	10/1/12	3/1/14						
		Block 1	Block 2	Block 3	Block 4	Block 5	Specials I	Specials II
5 <sup>th</sup> grade	139	█, █, █, 16, 22, █, █, 17, █	█ 16, █ 17, 22, 16, █, 26	21, █, █ █, 17, 23, 23, 18	█, █, █ 18, 27, 25, 24	25, █, 20, 18, 18, █, 27	█, 1, 17, █ █, 16, █, 16, 21, 20, 20, █	█, █, █, █, 18, 16, █, 16, 22, 23, 20, █ █
6 <sup>th</sup> grade	142	22, █, █, 23, █, █, 21, 26	21, █, 24, █, █, 25, 25	█, █, █, 23, █, 23	19, 18, 20, 14, 20, 20, 21, █	█, █, █, █, 21, █, 21, █	█, █, █, █, █, █, █, 22, 22, █	█, █, █, █, █, █, █, █, █, 23, 23, █, █
7 <sup>th</sup> grade	147	█, █, █, 21, █, █, █, 21	█, █, █, █, █, █, 21, 21	21, █, █, █, █, █, █, 21	█, █, █, █, 22, █, █, 22, 21,	21, █, 23, █, █, █, 45, 25, █	█, █, █, 24, █, █, █, █, 21, █, 53, █	█, 24, █, █, █, █, █, █, █, 33, 21, █
8 <sup>th</sup> grade	142	█, █, 23, █, █, 24, 21, 25, 24	█, █, █, █, 23, 23, 21, 21	23, 25, 23, █, 28, 24, █, 24	21, █, █, █, 24, █, █, 26, █	23, █, 25, █, 23, █, 25, 25	█, █, █, 22, █ █, █, █, █, 21, 32, 24, █, █, █	26, 23, █, █, █, █, █, 32, █, 23, █, █
<b>Total</b>	<b>570</b>	<b>543</b>						

5-8 Above Guideline	36	44	44	44	44	40	40
█	125	113	114	118	118	120	120
5-8 Within Guideline	71	63	62	59	59	62	62
% Within Guideline	31%	29%	28%	27%	27%	28%	28%
<b>Total – PK-8</b>	<b>1316</b>	<b>1248</b>	<b>1251</b>	<b>1255</b>	<b>1252</b>	<b>1260</b>	<b>1260</b>
K-8 Above Guideline	43	50	51	52	51	48	48
█	128	115	116	120	120	122	122
K-8 Within Guideline	100	92	90	86	87	89	89
% Within Guideline	37%	36%	35%	33%	34%	34%	34%

Class Size Guidelines:

K-3            14-18  
 4-5            16-20  
 6-8            21-23

**Mansfield Board of Education Proposed Budget 2014-2015**

**Questions from Board Members**

**March 13, 2014**

**John Fratiello**

I tried tracking the mileage reimbursement throughout the budget and got to account number 52212 under employee benefits a figure of \$45,000. (page 93) It's not under your office or any of the schools. Who gets reimbursed and why is it not under a school or district office? Traditionally, employee benefits are categorized under a separate activity and not allocated by department/school. Various employee benefit line items (travel & conference fees, mileage reimbursement, life insurance, etc.) are included along with salary-related benefits (social security, medicare, MERS, etc). This provides a complete picture of the total cost of all employee benefits to the District. Employees who travel between school facilities and to offsite meetings in their personal vehicles are reimbursed for their mileage at the IRS mileage rate. Could we redistribute some of these funds to the field trip account and save our parents a lot of extra work? The current budget is allocated and any reduction to this line would diminish work related travel to some extent.

Also on the same page is the medical fund. My understanding was that we did not want go under a base reserve of 2.3 million with a goal of reaching 3 million as a reserve. Can we reduce this reserve to 2.5 million this year and use the \$149,000 to hire a LA coordinator and a full time first year PE teacher? This would also allow us to keep the middle school teacher and keep class sizes in grade. I know that Cheri would like to fully fund this account this year, but even with a reduced amount, the reserve is still \$500,000 more than the last two school years. We appreciate these thoughts. A couple of items factor into this decision. First, this fund and therefore its reserve, is "owned" by the 3 major entities in the pool (Town, Board, and Region 19). Any use of the reserve beyond what the individual entities have contributed in excess of their required premiums would need to be discussed and agreed upon by the 3 entities. The Board has used all of its excess contributions. In addition if there were an adjustment, it would need to be factored into the calculation of the premium itself as the employees pay a percentage of the overall premium. Lastly, we are seeing a rise in health insurance claims and need to be very judicious when it comes to use of the reserve balance as any use does have an impact on future budgets.

District	Final 2013-14 Budget Increase (%)	Supt's 2014-15 Budget (%)	BOE's 2014-15 Budget (%)	Final 2014-15 Budget (%)
Andover	3.68	1.85	1.5	
Ansonia	3.7	7.78	6.71	
Ashford	3.77			
Avon	2.78	2.77	2.77	
Barkhamsted	2.39	3.59		
Berlin	3.03	2.97	2.69	
Bethany	2.99	1.8		
Bethel	3.14	2.99	2.99	
Bloomfield	0			
Bolton	2.45	4.04	4.8	
Bozrah	1.1	2.59		
Branford	2.1			
Bridgeport				
Bristol	1.86			
Brookfield	3.4			
Brooklyn	2.5			
Canaan				
Canterbury	0	4.92	4.76	
Canton	3.02			
Chaplin	0.95			
Cheshire	1.93	5		
Chester				
Clinton	0.27			
Colchester	4.14	3.39	3.39	
Colebrook	0.8	2.7	3	
Columbia				
Cornwall				
Coventry	4.34	2.97	2.71	
Cromwell	2.17	3.84	3.49	
Danbury		3.97		
Darien	4.05	5.32	5.9	
Deep River				
Derby				
Eastford	1.44	2.2	1.14	
East Granby	4.49			
East Haddam	1.6			
East Hampton	3.07	4.7	4.27	
East Hartford	1.7	5.7	3.7	
East Haven	2.03			
East Lyme	1.76			
Easton	1.17	1.49		
East Windsor	2			
Ellington	4.43	3.52	3.52	
Enfield	1.78	4.98	2.99	
Essex				
Fairfield	1.51	3.78	3.86	
Farmington	1.96			
Franklin	2.45			
Glastonbury	3.37	4.42	4.2	

District	Final 2013-14 Budget Increase (%)	Supt's 2014-15 Budget (%)	BOE's 2014-15 Budget (%)	Final 2014-15 Budget (%)
Granby	1.2	2		
Greenwich	1.16	2.1	2.1	
Griswold	1.85	2.99	2.29	
Groton	1.4			
Guilford	2.98	3.07	2.97	
Hamden	1.37			
Hampton	-5.48	4.98		
Hartford				
Hartland	5.1	2	1.9	
Hebron	0.54	0.77	0.77	
Kent				
Killingly	0	2.73		
Lebanon	0.42	2.64	2.64	
Ledyard	0			
Lisbon	0.25			
Litchfield	1.13	4.79		
Madison	2.41	2.03		
Manchester	3.9	2.75	2.75	
Mansfield	0.49	1.68		
Marlborough				
Meriden	0	1.26	1.26	
Middletown	2.7	5.81	5.81	
Milford	2.26	1.326	0.754	
Monroe	1.32	2.037	2.22	
Montville	0	1.55	1.55	
Naugatuck	2.4			
New Britain				
New Canaan	3.8	3.4	6.5	
New Fairfield	1.56	2.54	2.67	
New Hartford				
New Haven				
New London				
Newington	4.34	4.97	4.997	
New Milford				
Newtown	5.47	0.75		
North Branford	0.28			
North Canaan				
North Haven				
North Stonington	4.97	1.49		
Norfolk				
Norwalk	1.74	3.6	3.6	
Norwich	0.21			
Old Saybrook	3.94	2.84	2.84	
Orange				
Oxford	2.26	6.16	5.16	
Plainfield	2.41			
Plainville	0.99	0.97	0.67	
Plymouth	0.53			
Pomfret	2.31	2.99		

District	Final 2013-14 Budget Increase (%)	Supt's 2014-15 Budget (%)	BOE's 2014-15 Budget (%)	Final 2014-15 Budget (%)
Portland	2.61	1.72	1.72	
Preston	1.86	4.7	5.4	
Putnam	1.63			
Redding	0.5	-0.64		
Ridgefield	1.97	3.34	2.86	
Rocky Hill	4.85	3.57	5.68	
Salisbury				
Scotland	2.28	3.57	1.87	
Shelton	2.83	5.34	5.34	
Salem	2.39	4.42	4.42	
Seymour	1.79	3.5	3.5	
Sherman	4.31			
Simsbury	1.89			
Somers	2.63	1.78	1.78	
Southington	2.18	3.59	3.37	
South Windsor	3.97	1.94		
Sprague	-0.5			
Stafford	3.17	4.79	4.58	
Stamford	3.53	2.37		
Sterling				
Stonington	2.51	4.01	2.96	
Stratford	1.62	4.5		
Suffield	1.89			
Torrington	1.9			
Thomaston				
Thompson	1			
Tolland	1	0	3.44	
Trumbull	2.74			
Union				
Vernon	4.8	4.79	3.19	
Voluntown	1.99	2.88		
Wallingford	1.88	3.77		
Waterbury	0	4.22	4.22	
Waterford	0.73	0.55	0.55	
Watertown				
Westbrook	3.89			
West Hartford	0.93	4.85	0.93	
West Haven	3.3	4.7		
Weston	-0.03	4.21	4.21	
Westport	3.95			
Wethersfield	2.87	4.8		
Willington				
Wilton	2.81	4.82	4.52	
Winchester		0		
Windham				
Windsor	1.52	2.88	2.88	
Windsor Locks	2.41	0		
Wolcott	0	1.7	1.6	
Woodbridge	0	2.9	2.9	

District	Final 2013-14 Budget Increase (%)	Supt's 2014-15 Budget (%)	BOE's 2014-15 Budget (%)	Final 2014-15 Budget (%)
Woodstock	1.94			
Region #1				
Region #4	1.36			
Region #5	1.98	3.1		
Region #6	1.75	2.59	2.59	
Region #7	1.82	4.59		
Region #8	3.52			
Region #9				
Region #10	1.36	2.74		
Region #11	0.98			
Region #12	1.43			
Region #13	1.42			
Region #14	4.9			
Region #15	2.82			
Region #16	3.2			
Region #17	0			
Region #18	2.36	0.7	0.7	
Region #19	1.9	2.8		
Norwich Free Academy	4.53	2.81	2.81	2.81
Gilbert School				
Woodstock Academy				
<b>AVERAGE</b>	<b>2.09</b>	<b>3.13</b>	<b>3.17</b>	<b>2.81</b>

# Connecticut Municipal Budget Adoption Experiences FY 2013-2014

This is the twenty-fourth year that the ACIR surveyed all 169 Connecticut municipalities and 17 regional school districts for their experiences in adopting their operating budgets. This information is compared with data from previous years to identify trends and establish a context. As of December 31, 2013, all 169 municipalities and all 17 regional school districts have adopted their budgets for FY 2013-2014, although one municipality's budget is subject to a referendum to be held after the conclusion of the fiscal year.

Municipal budget-making authorities generally begin to hold meetings on local budgets as early as January or February. This schedule provides a period of four to five months for the budget adoption process before the beginning of the new fiscal year. This report includes two ways of measuring whether a municipality has had difficulty adopting its budget: 1) the date of adoption and 2) the number of votes necessary to adopt that budget. If the budget is not adopted by June 30, then the municipality has to start the new year without an updated financial plan in place. Summaries of the responses from municipalities and regional school districts follow.

Budget Adoption Body	Budget Adoption Body					Total Number of Votes			
	2010	2011	2012	2013		2010	2011	2012	2013
Town Meeting	47	47	45	43	<b>1 Vote</b>	145 (86%)	150 (89%)	148 (88%)	142 (84%)
Referendum	77	75	75	77	<b>2 Votes</b>	12 ( 7%)	9 ( 5%)	10 ( 6%)	14 ( 8%)
Town Council	31	34	35	35	<b>3 Votes</b>	8 ( 5%)	10 ( 6%)	7 ( 4%)	9 ( 5%)
Rep. Town Mtg.	4	6	7	7	<b>4 Votes</b>	3 ( 2%)		3 ( 2%)	3 ( 2%)
Other	10	7	7	7	<b>5 Votes</b>	1 (<1%)		1 (<1%)	1 (<1%)
					<b>6+ Votes</b>				

The number of municipalities adopting their budgets by referendum, 77, is similar to the previous few years, following what had been a steady increase in the number of towns adopting their budget by referendum. Only 48 municipalities, for instance, adopted their budgets by referendum in 2000. The long-term increase in referendums is balanced in large part by a decline in the number of municipalities adopting their budget by town meeting. That number was 43 this year which, while only a slight decrease from recent years, is a considerable decrease from the 74 municipalities that adopted their budget by town meeting in 2000.

Of the 77 towns adopting their budgets by referendum, 56 approved their budget on the first vote. Considering the multiple referenda in numerous towns, there have been 118 municipal budget referenda this year, 12 more than in 2011, but 42 less than the high of 160 referenda in 2007, when only seven more towns adopted budgets by referendum.


Whether adopted by referendum, town meeting or other budget adoption body, the number of votes needed to adopt a budget might be an indicator of division within a municipality. In 2013, thirteen municipalities needed three or more votes to adopt a budget, an increase of one from 2012. Only five municipalities needed as many as three votes in 2009. 2009 and 2011 are the only years since ACIR began tracking budgets that no municipality needed more than three votes.

**Intervals Between Votes - 2013**  
(For budgets adopted after June 15)

<u>Town</u>	<u>Votes</u>	<u>Dates</u>			
Beacon Falls	2	6/6, 6/26	Bethel	1	7/1
Canterbury	5	5/30, 6/20, 7/31, 9/24, 11/12	East Haddam	2	5/21, 6/27
Hampton	4	5/23, 7/30, 9/4, 10/15	Killingly	3	5/14, 6/11, 6/25
Mansfield	2	5/14, 6/19	New London	3	5/21, 8/6, 9/16
Sterling	1	6/18	Thomaston	1	6/19
Watertown	2	5/21, 7/2	Windsor	4	5/14, 6/4, 6/25, 7/16
Windsor Locks	3	6/4, 6/18, 7/2	Woodbury	4	5/30, 6/27, 7/25, 8/22

In the previous five years, only a relatively small number of municipalities have failed to adopt their budgets prior to the July 1 start of the fiscal year. In each year during 2001-2008, no fewer than eleven and as many as 23 municipalities adopted their budgets after July 1. Only three did so in 2009, followed by six in 2010, five in 2011, seven in 2012 and eight this year. The change in the last few years is too small to be definitive, but might signal a return to more difficult budgeting.

**Number of Budgets Adopted after Beginning of Fiscal Year**



### Dates of Adoption

Budget Year	Before	Dates of Adoption						Not Adopted as of Publication
	June 1	June	July	Aug.	Sept.	Oct.	Nov.	
2000-2001	140	24	2	2				1
2001-2002	131	27	5	4	1			1
2002-2003	118	34	6	5	2			4
2003-2004	119	27	10	4	4			5
2004-2005	121	33	4	3	6			2
2005-2006	126	29	8	1	1			4
2006-2007	131	26	8		4			
2007-2008	127	25	6	5	4	2		
2008-2009	126	27	6	4	3			3
2009-2010	144	22	1	1				1
2010-2011	132	31	3		1	2		
2011-2012	134	29	2	1	1	1		
2012-2013	138	24	3	1		3		
2013-2014	133	28	4	1	1	1	1	

Note: For towns belonging to regional school districts, the adoption date listed here is the date the town adopts its general government budget, except when the regional school budget is not adopted at the time of publication. When that happens, those towns are included on the list of those not adopting their budgets at the time of publication.

June 15 is considered the latest date a town can adopt its budget and still have time to issue its tax bills in a timely manner prior to the beginning of the fiscal year. Fourteen municipalities adopted their budget after June 15 in 2013, which is four more than in 2012 and one more than in 2011. However, 2012 had tied with 2009 for having the fewest municipalities adopt their budget so late since ACIR started tracking this in 1990. As recently as 2008, 23 municipalities adopted their budget after June 15 as recently as 2008, and the the largest number to do so was 34, in 2003. Previous editions of this report have attempted to interpret the relationship between economic indicators and municipalities' timeliness in adopting their operating budgets, but the relationship is complicated.

### FY 2013-2014 Budget Data

Municipalities: Cumulative Adopted Budget Total - \$12,819,561,108 (overall increase of 2.3%)

Median increase: 2.0%	Largest increase: 8.9%*	Lowest increase/largest reduction: (-3.5%)
2 Towns had a budget increase above 8%		46 Towns had a budget increase between 1 - 1.99%
0 Towns had a budget increase between 7-7.99%		23 Towns had a budget increase between 0 - 0.99%
2 Towns had a budget increase between 6-6.99%		7 Towns had a budget reduction between -0.01 - -0.99%
7 Towns had a budget increase between 5-5.99%		3 Towns had a budget reduction between -1 - -1.99%
14 Towns had a budget increase between 4-4.99%		2 Towns had a budget reduction between -2 - -2.99%
22 Towns had a budget increase between 3-3.99%		3 Towns had a budget reduction between -3 - -3.99%
38 Towns had a budget increase between 2-2.99%		


\* - not including a larger increase inflated by a large capital expenditure

Regional School Districts: Cumulative Adopted Budget Total - \$486212747 (overall increase of 2.1%)

Largest increase: 4.9%	Lowest increase/largest decrease: -1.34%
1 Districts had a budget increase between 4-5%	9 Districts had a budget increase between 1-2%
2 Districts had a budget increase between 3-4%	2 Districts had a budget increase between 0-1%
2 Districts had a budget increase between 2-3%	1 District had a budget reduction

The number of municipalities adopting a reduced budget continues to decline, with only 15 doing so, a decline from 19 last year, 24 in 2011, 30 in 2010 and 88 in 2009. However, it is important to note that even the 15 budget reductions of 2012 represents a sizable increase over the 5 and 8 municipalities that reduced their budgets in 2008 and 2007, respectively. As noted last year, it is difficult to repeatedly reduce budgets.

### 2012-2013 Municipal Budgets, by Amount of Increase



### Regional School District Responses

Most regional school districts adopted their budgets with relative ease but, unlike recent years, one district began the fiscal year without a budget. Sixteen districts adopted their budgets by referendum, using a total of 25 referendums, which was six more than last year, but five fewer than 2008. It must be noted that one district by itself accounted for seven referendums. Only one budget was adopted at a district meeting, a decline of one since 2012 but consistent with previous years. Combined, the districts' budgets increased 2.1%, higher than the 1.4% and 1.7% of the previous two years although, as in those years, only five districts adopted an increase exceeding 2%. One district, the one having having seven referendums, reduced its budget by 1.34% relative to the previous year. As has been noted previously, there was a clustering of increases just below 2%, with no corresponding increases just above that threshold. Three districts had increases of 1.94% to 1.98%.

**Adoption Body**

	<u>2002<sup>a</sup></u>	<u>2003<sup>a</sup></u>	<u>2004</u>	<u>2005</u>	<u>2006</u>	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>	<u>2012</u>	<u>2012</u>
District Meeting	3	2	1					2	1	1	2	1
Referendum	13	14	16	17	17	17	17	15	16	16	15	16


**Number of Votes**

	<u>2002<sup>a</sup></u>	<u>2003<sup>a</sup></u>	<u>2004</u>	<u>2005</u>	<u>2006</u>	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>	<u>2012</u>	<u>2013</u>
1 Vote	12	9	11	9	15	14	11	15	16	15	14	14
2 Votes	1	5	3	5	1	2	1	1		1	2	1
3 Votes	2	2	1	3	1		4	1		1	1	1
4 Votes	1	1				1						
5 Votes							1					
6 Votes			1									
7 Votes	1											1

**Date of Adoption**

	<u>2002</u>	<u>2003</u>	<u>2004</u>	<u>2005</u>	<u>2006</u>	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>	<u>2012</u>	<u>2013</u>
Before June 1	12	12	13	12	15	16	12	16	17	16	16	15
June	2	4	2	4	1		4	1		1	1	1
July	1		1	1	1		1					
August			1			1						
Sept. or later	2	1										1

**2012-2013 Regional School District Budgets, by Amount of Increase**



ACIR Special Report: Vol. 24, No. 1 February 2014

[http://www.ct.gov/opm/lib/opm/2013\\_Municipal\\_Budget\\_Adoption.pdf](http://www.ct.gov/opm/lib/opm/2013_Municipal_Budget_Adoption.pdf)

Prepared by the Connecticut Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations

450 Capitol Ave., MS# 54ORG, Hartford, CT. 06106-1379 (860) 418-6323 [www.ct.gov/opm/acir](http://www.ct.gov/opm/acir)