

11.14.13

John LycarsThe Hooksett Banner

2 hours ago ·

Would You Support Paying Over \$20,000 a year per Hooksett High School Student?

I would not and I won't.

Let me explain.

For reference so you can read yourself, you can find the 2003 Manchester high school maintenance agreement here

<http://hooksett.k12.nh.us/manchester.html> (Under Agreement to Receive Students)

The reason I was against Manchester's argument with regards to the 2003 contract and their claim that "ALL" Hooksett public high school students were supposed to attend Manchester, was because they were neglecting the details of the contract which also stated in the same sentence "with the exception of those students who petition a sending district school board to attend a different and are approved for such attendance on a case-by-case basis."

We just paid over an estimated \$1.2 million dollars to get out of this contract and remove Manchester's claim that we could not send Hooksett high school children to other public schools.

Fast forward to the talk of now entering another long term contract. It doesn't matter which school we are proposing a contract with....I am against anything except Memorandum's of Understanding at this time for the following reason and upholding my fiduciary responsibility to this Town.

Just about any long term contract will have a minimum head count that the sending district will guarantee. To point out the silliness of Manchester's claim, they were claiming ALL students must attend. What they were really saying is that Hooksett must pay Manchester for ALL 650 kids, at \$8,500 a kid, no matter if the kid went to a Manchester school or not. Sounds ludicrous, right?

Fast forward to what is going on right now in front of your noses.

The majority of this Board has publicly supported entering into another long term contract, even though we just paid huge bucks to get out of

Handwritten notes at the top of the page:
- "Violated confidentiality of - now - mt" (with "VIOLATED" written above "violated")
- "Similar TO CONTRACTOR W/ HAD."
- "ED CALLED 3 DIFF HOSP SITES"

our Manchester contract to give freedom to the Hooksett parents and children to choose which school is best for their child's learning style.

For discussion purposes, let's use a number that is in our current agreement with Manchester as a baseline tuition number of \$10,200 per student. This is the money that Hooksett will pay towards tuition whether the student attends Manchester or any of the proposed MOU schools.

Now say a high school wants a long term contract instead.

And say that school wants a guaranteed payment on a certain number of seats (like Manchester's ALL count, let's just say 50 seats is the number agreed upon in the contract.)

At \$10,200 per seat, multiplied by 50 seats, or \$510,000, which is the amount Hooksett needs to guarantee to the receiving school for the term of the contract (roughly half a million bucks for this example).

Wait, it gets better.

Say only 25 kids want to attend that school one year.

Hooksett still pays the half million bucks.

However the fiduciary irresponsible part about a long term contract at this time is that Hooksett would ALSO have to pay for those 25 to attend another school of choice (say Manchester, Londonderry, Bow or Pembroke for example.)

For those 25 kids, their tuition for that year would be:

\$10,200 - the cost guaranteed to the receiving high school

+

\$10,200 - the cost for the tuition where the child actually attends school

\$20,400 - the total cost of tuition that each of these 25 kids would cost the Hooksett tax payer!!

I am not an alarmist.

I am a logical thinker that has a fiduciary responsibility to look out for the Hooksett tax payer's best interest, while also offering affordable opportunity for school for the great children of Hooksett.

For budgeting purposes, we would have to plan for the worst case scenario each year of the contract, where you would have no attendees to the receiving school, so

Guaranteed Number X Base Tuition Cost X 2

so for our little example

$50 \times \$10,200 \times 2 = \$1,020,000.00$ (Yes over a million dollars) and you must add this to the rest of the student tuition count, so for roughly 650 children at \$10,200 (subtracting the 50 you just accounted for) is \$6,120,000.00.

$\$6,120,000 + \$1,020,000 = \$7,140,000$

In comparison, an example of all MOU schools, with a Manchester base, with no guaranteed minimums for any of the schools, the calculation is straightforward:

$\$10,200 \times 650 = \$6,630,000$

which amounts to a savings of \$510,000 which is over a half a million dollars of real money that stays in Hooksett to help the Hooksett K-8, program, purchase a generator for our schools, hire more staff, purchase more computers.....the sky is the limit with what Hooksett can do with it's money.....

Besides giving it to a receiving school district that does not want to change with declining enrollments, competition from charter schools and the changing business climate for schools in the great state of New Hampshire.....

Which do you prefer Hooksett.....using Hooksett's money wisely or wasting it?