

Finance Committee Meeting Notes
June 9, 2015
7:00 p.m. High School Principal's Conference Room

The Finance Committee met on Tuesday, June 9, 2015 at 7:00 p.m. in the High School Principal's Conference Room. In attendance were: Chairperson Mark Dehnert and Committee Members Thomas DiBello, Bernard Pettit and Kelly Spletzer. Board Members Joseph Ciresi, Will Cromley and Clinton Jackson were also present. Diane Fern – Board Secretary was present. Administrators present were Dr. David Goodin - Superintendent, Dr. Allyn Roche - Assistant Superintendent, Timothy Anspach - Business Manager, Mary Davidheiser - Acting Assistant Business Manager, Beth Leiss - Director of Human Resources, Kimberly Bast – Assistant Director of Curriculum & Instruction, Lora Sanderson – Coordinator of Transportation, Daniel Currie and Christine Raber – Special Education Supervisors, Dr. Robert Colyer, Mary Pat Long, Mark Moyer, Heather Nuneviller, and Douglas Reigner – Building Principals. Christina Melton, Julie Mullin, Dennis Rees, Anne Wilhelm, and Colleen Zasowski – Residents were also in attendance.

1. Review of Minutes – May 2015 Meeting

- May 12, 2015 minutes were accepted as presented

2. Executive Monthly Reports (ending April unless noted)

- Executive Reports were not reviewed in order to move onto the budget discussion.

3. 15-16 Budget Development – Interactive File (Separate file)

- Mr. Anspach explained the Fund Balance History. Mrs. Spletzer raised a question regarding the amounts being presented and the amounts that were on the Financial Statements she pulled from the district website today. She indicated that the reports she had showed a \$9 million surplus. A lengthy discussion took place to determine exactly what figures Mrs. Spletzer was looking and explain to her that the numbers presented tonight were the correct figures and should be in line with the AFR that is posted on the district website. Mrs. Spletzer agreed to study the AFR in order to understand the figures more clearly. If she has any questions she will follow up with Mr. Anspach or the Board at or prior to the next board meeting.
- Mr. Dehnert made a comparison of the budget from 2014-2015 indicating that \$133 million had been spent and the 2015-2016 budget which is at \$145 million. He then questioned the difference of \$12 million and why there was this large of an increase.
- Mr. DiBello pointed out that the budget of \$145 million was not a final approved budget but still a working document. Mr. Dehnert argued that the board approved the proposed final budget at the May Board meeting to which Mr. DiBello again pointed out that it was not a final budget yet.
- The next topic discussed was the new personnel listing. The Board moved onto the interactive budget worksheet. Mr. Anspach gave an overview on how the worksheet could be manipulated to include personnel or delete personnel positions from the sheet which in turn would add or delete the costs associated with these new positions from the budget figures.

- Mr. Ciresi asked administration to go through each personnel item to discuss the need and the priority of the positions.
- Dr. Roche began with those positions that were deemed as “must haves”. He provided the rationale for the positions.
- Dr. Roche next spoke about those positions that were deemed as “high priority” and provided rationale for the positions.
 - Mr. Ciresi questioned the difference in the salary of the Curriculum Supervisor and that of the Special Education Supervisor with regards to the Curriculum Supervisor being lower. Mrs. Leiss explained the reason was due to the certification needed for a Special Education Supervisor and the fact that the candidate pool for this position is very limited.
 - Mr. Dehnert questioned the need for the secretarial support for the additional Special Education Supervisor. The question was raised if the secretarial support would still be needed even if the Special Education Supervisor was not approved. The response was yes.
 - ❖ Mr. Currie explained the amount of data entry required for PIMS for each special education student and that the help is needed as well to stay in compliance.
 - ❖ Mr. Ciresi questioned what secretarial positions could be moved around so that this position could be potentially be filled by a current district secretary. The discussion on this became heated.
 - ❖ Mr. DiBello bluntly asked if the special education secretary was needed and the response was yes. He replied put an * in the column and move on.
 - Mrs. Spletzer raised concern over the Public Relations position and felt this should be put off so that an extra teacher could be brought on. She stated that this position is easier to trim than a teacher.
 - ❖ Mr. Dehnert asked what additional services would be provided that is not being provided now. He questioned the need for marketing the district and if our students were struggling to get into college.
 - ❖ Mr. DiBello commented that the district wants to be the best and marketing helps to us gain notoriety and get the Spring-Ford Area School District on those “best of” lists.
 - ❖ Mr. Pettit stated that marketing helps enhance the reputation of the district.
- Dr. Roche presented those positions that were deemed as “requested and/or under consideration”
 - Discussion took place on the 6 Instructional Support Teachers, the Guidance Counselor positions, the 6 Math Support Teachers, the additional Curriculum Supervisor and the additional High School Teachers (Math, Social Studies, Language).
 - ❖ Mr. Mark Moyer spoke in support of the Instructional Support Teachers saying students are needier now and many are in desperate need of support. He also spoke in support of the need for additional guidance counselors as currently there is one counselor per elementary building for 600 students.
 - ❖ Mrs. Heather Nuneviller also voiced support of the Instructional Support Teachers saying that students coming into the 5/6/7 building are showing evidence of a curriculum deficit.
 - ❖ Mr. Dennis Rees questioned the ratio for the recommendation of administration to direct classroom expenditures. He questioned the

need to go from 0 to 6 Math Support Teachers and the addition of the Public Relations position as a salaried employee. Mr. Rees stated that if we do not have them now then why do it now and are they absolutely necessary. Mr. Rees felt that the school board should be the driving factor behind the district's excellence and not looking at what our neighboring school districts are doing. Mr. Rees commented that with his company, if he wanted to expand, he could not go to his customers and raise prices in order to expand. He felt that the district was looking to expand and was doing so by raising the cost to the taxpayers so that they would be the ones financing it. Mr. Rees concluded by saying that he did not feel these new positions would impact the district today so he did not see any reason not to put them off for a year or two.

- Discussion on the need for Math Support Teachers, the range of 0-6 being listed and whether there could be a compromise of possibly not doing all 6 but some now and some in future years. The decision was made that the Instructional Support positions were needed now and the Math Support positions could be added next year.
- Dr. Roche provided an overview on the "other staffing" positions listed for 2015-2016 which pertained to extra-curricular contracts and "other positions" which are part of the 4-year expansion piece.
- The interactive sheet was then brought back up which revealed that the tax increase after adding and omitting the various personnel recommendations by the Board now reflected a 1.79% as opposed to 2.72%.
- Mr. Dehnert stated that the only position he is not crazy about is the Marketing Director which would reduce the budget by \$70,000 - \$80,000.
- Mr. DiBello reminded the Board of the \$3 million in savings that the district will realize as a result of the bond refinancing which recently took place. He presented to the board the option to take the cost for new books out of the budget and instead use the bond savings to pay for the books. This option would result in an additional \$537,090 reduction in the budget. The board was in favor of this option.

The ending tax increase that the 8 board members who were present agreed upon was 1.21%.

Meeting adjourned at 9:09 PM. The Board went into an Executive Session to discuss personnel.