

A Workshop Meeting of the Board of Education, Seaford Union Free School District, was held on Thursday, March 31, 2011, in the All Purpose Room of the Manor Elementary School, 1590 Washington Avenue, Seaford, New York.

PRESENT: Mr. Brian W. Fagan - President  
Mr. Richard G. DiBlasio – Vice President  
Mr. John DelGiudice - Trustee  
Mr. Bruce Kahn – Trustee  
Mr. Michael D. Sapracione - Trustee

Mr. Brian L. Conboy  
Mr. Kenney W. Aldrich  
Mr. John Strifolino  
Christopher Venator - Attorney

The meeting was called to order at 7:34 p.m. As the first order of business, Board President Brian Fagan led the audience in the Pledge of Allegiance.

**OPEN MEETING**

Mr. Conboy advised he would prefer to come back to the Administrative Report as the majority of it is focused on the budget and that everything he would be talking about is budget related. He also advised that there were only two agenda items on the agenda.

**OPENING REMARKS**

Mr. Conboy stated that Agenda Item 5.B. as the Board was advised earlier today relates to an email received from William Jackson of Hawkins Delafield & Wood alerting us that there was a typographical error in the resolution concerning the Harbor Roadway which was passed by the Board at their March 16, 2011 Workshop Meeting. The error was a transposition of two numbers where the cost of the roadway was incorrectly listed as \$21,577,404 when it should have been \$596,719. Tonight we are just reapproving this resolution with the correct number in the right place. Essentially we are asking the voters for the permission to spend \$596,719 of unused money of the original bond project of 2007 for the purpose of creating that Harbor roadway. The number contained in the ballot portion of the resolution was correct and requires no change.

Motion by Mr. DiBlasio, second by Mr. Sapracione, to accept the donation of approximately \$13,000 from the Seaford Booster Club for a Daktronics Baseball Scoreboard for installation on the Seaford Varsity Boys' baseball field.

Thank you to the Booster Club for the scoreboard. The approximate amount reflects the cost of the board and installation.

All Ayes  
Motion Carried.

Motion by Mr. DiBlasio, second by Mr. Sapracione, to approve the following proposition approved by the Board at the March 16, 2011 Workshop Meeting, as amended to correct a typographical error:

**HARBOR ROADWAY  
RESOLUTION**

**RESOLVED** BY THE BOARD OF EDUCATION OF THE SEAFORD UNION FREE SCHOOL DISTRICT, IN THE COUNTY OF NASSAU, NEW YORK, AS FOLLOWS:

---

RESOLUTION (cont'd)

**Section 1.** At the Annual District Meeting and Election of the qualified voters of Seaford Union Free School District, in the County of Nassau, New York (the "District"), to be held on May 17, 2011, a Bond Proposition in substantially the form as hereinafter set forth shall be submitted to the qualified voters of said District. The Bond Proposition shall appear in the Notice of Annual District Meeting and Election to be held May 17, 2011, and the District Clerk is hereby authorized and directed to include such Bond Proposition in said Notice by inserting therein substantially the following paragraphs:

**NOTICE IS FURTHER GIVEN** that a Bond Proposition in substantially the following form shall be presented to the qualified voters of the District at such Annual District Meeting and Election:

	<u>PROPOSITION</u>	
YES		NO

**WHEREAS**, the voters of Seaford Union Free School District, in the County of Nassau, New York (the "District") have heretofore on December 4, 2007, approved the expenditure of not to exceed \$21,577,404 for the construction of a building addition to the Seaford High School and alterations and improvements to all District school buildings and the sites thereof; and thereafter the Board of Education (the "Board") authorized the levy and collection of \$21,577,404 taxes therefore; and

**WHEREAS**, the Board has now determined that such building additions, alterations and improvements will be accomplished at a cost of not to exceed \$20,980,685, which will result in a savings of approximately \$596,719; and

**WHEREAS**, the Board has now further determined that it is necessary to construct a new access road at the Seaford Harbor School, which can be accomplished at a cost of not to exceed said \$596,719 savings.

Now, therefore, be it RESOLVED:

- (a) That the Board is hereby authorized to construct a new access road at the Seaford Harbor School on land owned by the District, and to expend for such purpose \$596,719; (b) that a tax is hereby voted in the amount of not to exceed \$596,719 to pay such cost, such tax to be levied and collected in installments in such years and in such amounts as shall be determined by said Board of Education; and (c) that bonds of the District are hereby authorized to be issued in the principal amount of not to exceed \$596,719, and a tax is hereby authorized to pay the interest on said bonds as the same shall become due and payable.

Such Proposition shall appear on the ballot label to be inserted in the voting machines used for voting at said Annual District Meeting and Election in substantially the following condensed form:

RESOLUTION (cont'd)

YES	<u>BOND PROPOSITION</u>	NO
-----	-------------------------	----

**[Explanation:** *On December 4, 2007, the voters of Seaford Union Free School District (the "District") approved the levy and collection of a tax in the amount of \$21,577,404 to pay for a building improvement project (the "Project"); and such Project has been accomplished at a cost of approximately \$20,980,685, resulting in a savings of approximately \$596,719; and it is now desirable to construct a new access road to the Seaford Harbor School on land provided by the County of Nassau, (the "County") which can be accomplished at a cost of not to exceed said \$596,719 savings]*

**RESOLVED: (a)** That the District is hereby authorized to construct a new access road at the Seaford Harbor School on a parcel of land provided by the County, and to expend for such purpose not to exceed \$596,719; (b) that a tax is hereby voted in the amount of not to exceed \$596,719 to finance such cost, such tax to be levied and collected in installments in such years and in such amounts as shall be determined by said Board; and (c) that bonds of the District are authorized to be issued in the principal amount of not to exceed \$596,719 and a tax is hereby voted to pay the interest on said bonds as the same shall become due and payable.

- Brian Fagan - Aye
  - Richard DiBlasio - Aye
  - John DelGiudice - Aye
  - Bruce Kahn - Aye
  - Michael Supraicone - Aye
- Motion Carried.

Information given to board has been separated by colors: blue sheets relate to worksheets been working on for the last several works in budget planning. The first blue sheet is the state aide run printed off the State website this morning relating to the state budget passed. Seaford was given an additional \$103,611 in aid; however, our total decrease in state aid from 2010/11 to 2011/12 continues to be one of the highest percentage of decreases In Nassau County and on Long Island

**ADMINISTRATIVE REPORT**

Article in Newsday by John Hildebrand concerning Governor's Cuomo's original budget in February which included the 408,000 in federal aid which was called the Educational Jobs Fund. That money was removed from this fresh state aid run in order for it to appear a lesser decrease from state aid than it actually was. Federal money was used last year by New York State to fill in areas for moneys they were not able to provide. There is no federal money left to provide. \$1.5 million was cut

- Only one district in Nassau County has a greater decrease than ours and that is Freeport. Four Suffolk districts have a higher decrease of us. Mr. Conboy stated his intent is to point this out to our legislators and what it means to the Seaford School District  
Nothing is going to change; this is the number we need to work with when developing our budget.

---

ADMINISTRATIVE REPORT (cont'd)

If other districts are getting money for full-day conversion it would be for the first time; \$90,000 in conversion aid was received by the District the first year; we were expecting to receive foundation aid every year after that based on attendance of our kindergartners who would then be counted as full persons (rather than ½ persons when attending half-day kindergarten). We estimated that figure as somewhere between \$200,000 and \$220,000 per year which we never received for the 3 years we have successfully run full day kindergarten we have not received foundation aid because it was frozen three years ago. Prospect is that 2016 will be the year that foundation aid will be unfrozen but foundation aid funds will not be retroactive.

- Additional blue pages are updated Wave 1, Wave 2 and Wave 3 pages with slight adjustments
- Bottom of 3<sup>rd</sup> pages indicates budget-to-budget percentages with tax levy percentages
- All of these sheets include the updated aid information received today
- Revenue sheets indicating various expected revenues this year
- Pink sheets reflect work of Mr. Strifolino, Building administrators, chair people and anyone who has been involved with the planning and scheduling of our instructional program. These sheets represent some of the losses of position or partials pieces of positions which we have been talking about.
- Revenue sheet reflects both state aid and what is listed on the pink sheets

Green sheets are everything that has to do with extracurricular athletics

Discussion/Commentary on Supervision/Security at Athletic Events:

First few sheets are analysis of supervision and other positions related to athletic events

- Reflects work done by Mr. Conboy, Mr. Condon, Mr. Ward and Mr. Barto
- Attempted on the spreadsheet to look at all athletic events we have and what is required of any adult but a coach
- Coaches receive coaching stipend but every time we have an athletic event there are other people assigned to supervision, timing, video, PA announcing and/or scoring
- Also took into account that adults are sometimes sent to away events
- Examination of amount of contests where more than 1 fee is paid; about 15% of contests go beyond 2 hr 15 minutes where we have to pay an additional fee
- A 15% factor was added when figuring out the estimate of what this costs
  
- Based on 2010/11 program, 337 contests (home and away) where we had to send an adult other than a coach;
  - 762 separate positions were assigned for the 337 contests;
  - 395 of those positions were for supervision only
  - 367 were all other

---

DISCUSSION/COMMENTARY ON SUPERVISION/SECURITY AT ATHLETIC EVENTS

- That information was used to make a determination of what kind of savings might be had from using teacher supervisors or security
  - Supervision costs v. security costs
  - Estimated 34 weeks of the school year where some kind of athletic contest takes place
  - Fall and Spring have many outdoor contests; Winter has only indoor
  - We know a security guard will not and should not be taking part in any scoring, timing, announcing, etc.
  - If we had Security each weekday afternoon that could cover our entire program outdoor - 1 by VSB and 1 by Lacrosse working a 4-hour block ; to cover every weekday
    - 21.46 per hour guard top step 10/11 approximately 848.00 per weeks ; on weekends 2 guards necessary for an eight-hour shift – worst case scenario
  - Cost using different models;
    - Security model 40,000 – 41,000
    - Just supervisors 36,362 using teacher model
- Winter season – HS /MS Gym – envision 1 guard at each gym
- Hours could be adjusted according night events
- Estimated 85% of events are a single event payment
- Memo to board outlining compensation teacher supervision
  - Additional time up to three hours = an additional ½ payment
  - Additional time up to four hours = another additional ½ payment
  - Additional time up to five hours = another additional ½ payment
- Claim for payment sheets =includes date, sport, job, start time, end time and approval signature lines
- Sheets contain many lines
  - Some teachers only work 1 or 2 events and submit sheet after each event
  - Other teachers work many events and submit sheet after it is filled
  - Need to standardize sheet
- Supervisors are paid once per month for sheets turned in

Sheets with current expenditures for all athletic areas including supervision  
Decrease in supervision was requested due to less sports

Fall season most prominent

Based on current numbers spent and depending on how many sheets have not been turned in, there is a chance we could go over budget

Spring sports are not as intensive as fall or winter sports for supervision

Final sheets are athletic expenditure sheets with cuts discussed

Cuts to \$598,551 athletic budget:

- MS 7<sup>th</sup> grade Girls and Boys Basketball:
- 7<sup>th</sup> grade girls volleyball
- 1 season of cheerleading to be determined
- Varsity winter track
- No new uniforms except for emergency purposes
- Does not include safety equipment such as goggles, helmets, pads, etc.
- Reduction in transportation

---

ADMINISTRATIVE REPORT (cont'd)

Explanation of emergency purposes for uniform purchases and safety equipment

We can apply any sort accounting which makes things clearer or makes more sense going forward

Further discussion on budget process should take place in the future

Sports mentioned were listed with a reduced but not eliminated intent still giving athletes an opportunity to participate in those sports

- If we don't want those cuts then we need to find something of equal value to take their place

No cut policy In track; volleyball and basketball would still have the same number of kids

Mr. Conboy stated that if it was up to him he would cut nothing but that is an unrealistic thing to say in this economic climate. Everything that has been talked about being cut we helped build. We've added more athletics in recent years than ever. We have added more academic programs including Full-day Kindergarten. Anything that shows up on any of these lists is with deep regret. Decisions are not made lightly and with a great deal of heartache. In the coming days we are going to have a great deal of people who are going to have to be given some very stark information to because they are not going to be employed by the Seaford School District any longer and it has nothing to do with athletics. We are talking about basic academic program that we are offering here at the Seaford School District. This is happening in other school districts not just Seaford. But comparatively we are not in the same shape as other school districts for a lot of different reasons – they are getting more State aid than us, they have other opportunities for revenue streams that we do not have.

Discussion/Commentary on Supervision/Security at Athletic Events

Discussion continued concerning submission of timesheets, structure of timesheets and effect on budget line for board information on monthly runs, concerns about oversight and accuracy of timesheets and timely submission of sheets

762 separate positions with a 15% factor because we estimated that 15% of the events go beyond the single fee

Mindset envisioned for 11/12 school year

Have the actuals for 2009/2010; was given to Mr. Kahn to look through

Result of analysis is that we might save money using security; used worst case scenario in this analysis

Unknown how many sheets are currently being held on

All we need to decide on right now is how much money we will be planning to spend related to supervision and athletic contests next year

First we have to decide how many athletic contests we are going to have and the way to do that is to decide how many competitive teams we will have

Board

Too many lines on sheet; if you only had one line on a sheet they would submit sheets on time

Do we have capability of submitting these sheets electronically

Board budget runs will not reflect supervision numbers accurately if sheets are not submitted timely

Did athletic department request an increase or a reduction in supervisor budget line for 2011/2012 school year

---

DISCUSSION/COMMENTARY ON SUPERVISION/SECURITY AT ATHLETIC EVENTS (cont'd)

---

Are we anticipating going over budget for supervision

Issue of not turning sheets in on time

Breakdown of supervision - 454 supervisory positions at 80.00 – 36,333.

Are all those position only paid \$80.00

Any reason why we are estimating

Actuals now don't include sheets not yet submitted and that number is unknown

Any Wincap runs could be created in PDF which could then be emailed to board

While it would be great if we save money, the whole discussion about supervision was for safety

Is this something we need to decide on now to go with security instead of supervisors

What is the \$1,807.20 for girls soccer uniform

Add additional budget categories to breakdown lines for basic uniforms, safety equipment, supplies, fees, etc.

Perhaps we need to look at having a full-time Athletic Director

Board had budget questions that needed to be answered but couldn't be

Will we be opening up the other seasons of those sports to more kids costing us more for the additional students

What would we need if we were to put winter track and cheerleading back but eliminate 7<sup>th</sup> grade volleyball, 7<sup>th</sup> grade basketball and 7<sup>th</sup> & 8<sup>th</sup> grade cheerleading

2011/2012 Budget Discussion:

**WORKSHOP TOPIC: 2011-  
2012 BUDGET PLANNING**

Revised Wave 1 Budget/Cuts:

\$55,821,097 = Budget-to-Budget: 4.11% - Tax Levy:

Staff cut dollar amounts listed are now actual numbers based on actual people;

Explanation of accounting/budgeting/payment process concerning ERS/TRS, social security and medical, cash flows and accruals

Report from Susan Unnold today concerning amortization of ERS will be supplied to Board

IF our External auditors had issues believe we would have giggered on the manner in which we list TRS and ERS

While some detail work does need to be sorted out we need to find the target point of where we want to be for May 17th

Preserve as much as we can preserve but a decision needs to be made as to what number we will be giving on May 17<sup>th</sup> to the voters to speak on

Board:

Not as much money saved on staff reductions

Amounts listed for ERS/TRS, cash flow and savings listed

Will be paying next year to TRS based on salaries at the end of this year

- Reducing teachers next year does not reduce what we owe TRS next year

Suggest we discuss where we think this whole budget is going rather than talk about individual items

---

2011/2012 BUDGET PLANNING (cont'd)

Review:

First Budget Rollover:	7.12% Budget-to-Budget
First Wave:	4.11% Budget-to-Budget
Second Wave:	3.28% Budget-to-Budget
Third Wave:	3.00% Budget-to-Budget
Contingency:	2.26% Budget-to-Budget

Over the last six years we have given back 6.4 million dollars back to the voters to pay down the tax levy. We do not have the money to do that now; if we try to do that it will affect our bond rating.

Contingency level 2.26% - only use contingency level after two failed votes  
If on contingency after two failed votes:

- Not allowed to buy equipment; money allotted cannot be used for equipment but remains in the budget
- Not allowed to have free use of buildings even for community groups; required to charge
- If the community passes a contingency level budget you are not on contingency; just on a regular budget that happens to be at contingency level

Mr. DiBlasio

- Would like to hear from Budget Advisory Committee and what numbers they looked at

Budget Advisory Committee

- Uncomfortable with such a high tax levy but that's the reality

Discussion among Board as to whether a Plan A, B and C should be established. Depending on the result of first vote will determine next steps.

Areas included:

- Cost per house at each level \$543 per house at contingency - \$632 per house at 3.28%
- Disagreement as to whether community looks at dollar amount per house, tax levy percent
- What a voter values concerning percentage numbers
- Approximately \$16,000 difference between 3.02% and 2.99% budget-to-budget and 2.99%
- Difference between 3.0% and 2.85% budget-to-budget is approximately \$90,000
- Desire to find a number

Mr. Sapaicone:

- Suggest we should pick a number which we would like to be at
- Pick a budget-to-budget percentage  
Past practice concerning outside use of facilities when district was on contingency budget  
Do not believe any of us will be happy with any tax levy number  
Suggest we look at something between 3.0% and 3.28% Budget-To-Budget increase (Tax Levy between 9.09–9.45 %)  
\$543.00 per house – contingency level (2.26% Budget-to-Budget)  
Job is to sell programs to parents to get our kids through to their next level  
Never want to start low with less programs  
Education well-rounded  
Do everything we can to cut as little from each area as possible



---

2011/2012 BUDGET PLANNING (cont'd)

Mr. Sapraticone (cont'd):

- People in Seaford seem to manage
- Willing to decide how low we are willing to go and build a number from there; Would prefer to pick a number and start working with that
- People ask what are we losing and what does 9.9% mean in reality
- Asked to take average of three 2.85% and two 3.28% to come up with high of budget-to-budget increase
- 3.02% is average
- Believe 2.85% budget-to-budget is too low

Mr. Fagan:

- Debating between 3.0 and 3.28 = tax levy over 9%  
Split the difference - 3.15% Budget-to-Budget  
Talking about putting over a 9% tax levy  
Why would we start at somewhere between 3.0–3.28 % vs. 2.75%
- In analyzing if for community cannot go by the per house alone; residents look at percentages
- If we go to a 9+% tax levy and that does not pass what would our plan be in terms of cuts – what would we look at
- When we put our budget brochure out it will have 3 numbers – the budget, budget-to-budget increase and tax levy
- Controlling the percentage is very important
- Don't believe in the brochures we get into details of value of cuts

Mr. Kahn:

- What is program
- Economy is bad; people are not happy-struggling
- Barely passed last year's budget
- Don't feel we need to discuss a Plan B until we know the results of  
All unhappy with tax cuts  
Would definitely like to see tax levy under 9%

Mr. Conboy:

- Does anyone feel that we should be developing a budget which is less than contingency level (2.26% budget-to-budget – 8.12% tax lev7)
- Results of the vote on May 17<sup>th</sup> will direct us as to what Plan B should be
- Mr. Sapraticone wanted to pick something between 3.28% and 3.0%; everything on Wave 2 or something of equal value brings us to 3.28% right now
- To get to 3.15% - approximately \$75,000 back in to Wave 3

Mr. DelGiudice:

- Can we all agree that Plan C is contingency budget (failing 2 budgets)  
We seem to have an upper boundary; hoping to find a lower one
- Plan B would be somewhere between Plan A and Plan which we don't really need to decide about until we know the result of Plan A  
Have upper and lower bound for budget-to-budget increase  
Tax levy upper and lower bound is 8.12 and 9.45% Tax Levy  
All going to find these numbers distasteful
- Based on what we would lose on contingency would prefer 3.28% budget-to-budget would at tax levy of 9.45% which I do not believe anyone will be happy with

---

2011/2012 BUDGET PLANNING (cont'd)

Mr. DelGiudice (cont'd):

- Unique year that it does not help you looking at your neighbors numbers due to differences between fund balance and state aid
- No matter what number we come up with is going to alarming
- As soon as we arrive at our number we will still need to discuss if the cuts that we made are the ones that will stay or find something else
- Important discussion will be needed as to when, where and how we educate our voters and who we get to help us in getting that information out
- If we were going to go with the 2.85% budget-to-budget we would need to see what that \$90,000 represents in cut

Mr. DiBlasio

- We have the right to go below contingency level but if that fails we cannot put up a higher number for the next vote
- We might bring it down below contingency
- Residents look at whole picture; where other districts are at; what the tax levy is and what the budget-to-budget is
- When they start looking at anything near a 10% they will be very frustrated
- It is our job to come up with numbers that we think they will accept; must deal with reality and the economy
- We need to give our children the best possible education we can
- At this point we are dealing with numbers that \$49,000 is only effecting 1/10<sup>th</sup> of a percent
- Bottom line – we are giving less services but asking for more money
- Must educate the community
- Not used to these high numbers
- What is the dollar amount difference between 3.02% budget-to-budget and 2.99%

Discussion continued trying to find a budget-to-budget percentage that everyone could live with while keeping the tax levy under 9%. Contingency Level would be a 2.26% Budget-to-Budget with an 8.12% Tax Levy.

Mr. Conboy:

If the budget passes and the transportation referendum passes, tax levy would increase;

If budget fails but transportation referendum passes, we are raising that tax

If budget fails second time and we are going to contingency budget, and we have a passed transportation referendum, we will need to find \$130,000 additionally in our 2.26% budget-to-budget

Outcome of transportation referendum vote will play into Plan B strategies

To reduce tax levy we need to raise revenue

Should we be looking at ways to raise revenue

If charging scouts and PAL is not palatable and we needed to raise a \$100,000 in revenue how would we do that

Mr. Sapraine: We could establish a fee for camps based on their margins

Meeting recessed at 9:45 p.m.

**MEETING RECESSED**

Meeting resumed at 9:55 p.m.

**MEETING RESUMED**

---

2011/2012 BUDGET PLANNING (cont'd)

Mr. Conboy:

- Now zeroing in on a range we can work with
- Not intention to adopt budget tonight ; we have another week to crunch numbers and look at what we have so far  
Is it the direction of the Board that we are looking at a tax levy of less than 9% even if it is 8.99%  
To get from a 3.28% to 3.0% budget-to-budget = \$149,377
- If \$103,000 is used to save a position the tax levy would have to be raised in that amount  
When we built we built with teachers – Administration and custodial are not whole; we've looked to share positions within clerical  
When we built it was given to students and given to program  
Also looking at enrollment related to program which has an effect  
Some units we are down to essential personnel  
Eliminating supervision and assigning security is not a savings.  
Analysis showed it could garner savings not that it would; it is just moving money from one group to another group  
Not in favor of having events with no supervision; events without supervision give districts big problems they then have to deal with  
Section 8 specifically says supervisors  
For high profile games we bring security in  
Supervision of a team particularly if you are the only coach can sometimes be challenging. Teams are usually kept on one side and spectators on the other  
Supervision is keeping people from encroaching on sidelines, preventing people from saying nasty things to umpires and referees;  
Can only think of one event in the last six years where we had any strong issue at an athletic event
- It may have cost us some money but we did something right

Mr. Fagan:

- Are we going to determine what groups get cut or touched based on the ratio of expenses of the total budget
- Look at this where we could be more efficient in making cuts; consolidate positions  
If you took a non-instruction position from full time to part-time  
What if Mr. Kaden obtained 90 computers the first year, 75 the second year and 65 the third year, save money this year and still significantly improve our technology  
We are trying to find savings – Have an idea for technology, at savings in athletics, technology, supervision – why wouldn't we look potentially eliminating supervision and assigning it to security  
We have a good relationship with the Seventh Precinct  
We are trying to save money; if we feel that we can save money by eliminating supervision – we have coaches, assistant coaches, parents in the stands – if something were to happen there are more cell phone technology at a football game or event to call 911  
We have some gaps we have to fill without hitting core (bringing education to all our children) areas; supervision is a non-core thing – maybe you have one – you don't need ten; We also have the Police Department.  
If you eliminate the supervision and have security for those events we feel are contentious we can give them a heads up

---

2011/2012 BUDGET PLANNING (cont'd)

Mr. Kahn:

- Do we have a proportion of what the total percent of the budget that is teachers; percent that is custodians, etc.
- We keep going round and round on the supervision issue; why don't we put it to a vote of the board or make a decision rather than bringing this back up each week and make a decision on it

Mr. DiBlasio

- Any savings on Occupational therapist, Physical therapist and Speech Therapists

Mr. Sapracione:

- Are we going to try to get under 9.00 just for the sake of saying it's under 9%
- Does the additional \$103,000 help us in any way; perhaps to save a position or some ½ positions  
Is there anything we could do that is not contractual  
Could we have both full day and half day kindergarten program; parents could choose which they want  
It would be difficult to have a coach be responsible for something that happens in the stands  
If they are taking the POP officers out of the community they are showing we are not that important; they will send cars in a priority level

Mr. DelGiudice:

- In a narrow range between 2.92% and 3.02%; need to know what is the difference in what has to go
- Some people will round it up to 9% and others will say at least they kept it under 9%
- Wave 1 & 2 – only people who lose jobs are teachers; since school is here to do teaching feel pain should be distributed out differently; value education - should not all be teachers
- All I am suggesting is that all the cuts should not come from one unit
- Maybe we could have some kind of alumni fundraiser to bring in revenue
- What about Social Workers, Psychiatrists, Guidance Counselors, Assistant Coaches
- Is social worker mandated and if not, is it something we could provide and have parents pay for it
- Is there a time of the year when guidance counselors are busier than others
- Just trying to turn over every rock
- Isn't supervision mandated
- POP Officers are being eliminated

Christopher Venator:

- People in the community can donate money for sports programs with some conditions
- All of the money for a particular season must be in place before that season starts
- When you cut sports programs or add sports programs, accept donations, etc. you must be cognizant of Title 9 considerations because you cannot have inequity in terms of male vs. female

---

2011/2012 BUDGET PLANNING (cont'd)

Christopher Venator (cont'd):

- Board could choose not to budget for a particular sport and the community could say we are going to give you money and ask you to accept that money to add that particular sport
- We cannot charge parents for services we provide during the school day
- 2.93254% budget-to-budget is exactly a 9% tax levy
- Problem with no supervision is that the district pays liability insurance, etc. and there is a certain expectation from those that insure the district that there is a certain level of supervision that you are going to have; to the extent that you don't have supervision and to the extent that that results into a fight, altercation or someone gets hurt, then you get sued you are going to be sued under a negligence theory of lack of supervision. Then you are going to be held responsible for it your insurance costs will go up. Potential cost for not having adequate supervision.

Mr. Conboy/Mr. Strifolino/Mr. Aldrich/:

- Talking about what is mandated, not mandated and what is required to keep a safe and vibrant educational program
- Had one guidance counselor in each of the elementary schools but they were cut
- Then hired a social worker who works ½ week in one elementary school and ½ in the other – 1,200 students
- Social worker has become very vital part of the elementary program
- She is also involved in CSE, 504, CPS cases, etc.
- We have been cutting clerical – one woman is working in three departments
- Have developed some efficiencies with computer technology; have not replaced position only cut
- We directed Mr. Kaden to investigate leases based on the number we gave him which was \$180,000
- Leases with apple would provide 180 computers the first year; 150 year 2 and 120 year 3 which would help update all of our computers for our students which would put us in pretty good shape
- It was hoped that any money not used for equipment would be used for wiring, servers, etc.
- Term of lease and lease information would have been provided to the voters
- OT, PT and Speech are mandated services
- One guidance counselor (650 students), one social worker and one psychologist in Middle School
- Each building has one psychologist – role multi-faceted
- If an Elementary psychologist were brought to a .9 then the least senior Psychologist would be the position reduced
- Consider psychologist integral positions based on the need
- 4 High school guidance counselors for 830 students

Mr. DiBlasio

- In the analysis presented to us for comparing supervision with security, numbers are rounded up for one area and given higher numbers than the other
- With all computer technology we should know what we have, what we spent, what it was given to, how much, how many blocks – maybe we should visit those areas – are we giving more blocks than we should; may we could use less

---

2011/2012 BUDGET PLANNING (cont'd)

Mr. DiBlasio (cont'd):

- If scorekeepers are also working as a supervisor then maybe they should wear the yellow jackets and may we don't need as many
- When I compare numbers I want to make sure I have accurate numbers; this looks like I have been given the best estimated accurate number vs. more of a specific number saying that I need 4 guards x 34 weeks. Average for supervisor for one session is \$80.00
- For all these games we are using one supervisor for \$80.00 but when we do the math its \$40,000 to have security guards for 34 weeks
- Discussion as to whether we could approach the guards and have an agreement where we bring them in for a couple of hours – not the mandated four –hour block
- Obviously it is going to come up a higher number if we say 4 hour minimum for 4 guards.
- Talking about safety first but we could have a savings too
- One person gets paid \$80.00 to be there 2 hours and 15 minutes; another gets paid \$84.00 for four hours but yet we are coming up with averages that it costs more to have the \$21.00 per hour person there (using less people and more hours) than the \$80.00 per hour per person
- Appears one set of numbers is estimated and one is given a more accurate number which comes out higher
- Could have 2 securing guards walking around covering 3 events rather than 6 supervisors

Mr. Conboy:

- Put best mindset, with no bias, over several days to try to put sense to the question of security v. supervision and create the analysis Mr. DiBlasio requested
- Analysis shows worst case scenario numbers with the highest dollar amount for the maximum amount of coverage on any given day
- There is an analysis that makes some sense – on the green sheets: If we make a decision that the preponderance of security related to our athletic events we want handled by our guards and anything above and beyond what the guards can do has to be assigned judiciously (one person per game or two at most), what that kind of savings would that give us.
- That would take an analysis of how many games we have on a given day because we may need two or three security on a given day and nobody on another day
- Don't believe you can say eliminate it for teachers and give it all to the guards; don't believe the guards want that; don't believe it is practical because we don't have a big enough guard staff
- Believe we can get some savings there but unsure how much
- We have 4 calm buildings

Summary of Budget Discussion:

Mr. Conboy/Mr. Strifolino/Mr. Aldrich:

We know the neighborhood we need to be in

We need to go back to the people who help us decide these things – our Principals, Mr. Condon, Mr. Kaden, Mr. Ward and Mr. Barto and share with them the things we discussed and see where we can find additional savings

- Is my understanding correct that you do not want us to go near Full-Day Kindergarten

---

2011/2012 BUDGET PLANNING (cont'd)

Mr. Conboy/Mr. Strifolino/Mr. Aldrich (cont'd):

- Harbor Kindergarten 25; Manor Kindergarten approximately 20
- Impression from discussion that Board feels we are still “fat” in supervision
- Reason put analysis together because Mr. Conboy wanted to know if we had fat in that area
- When we are at the football field we are not just watching the game; we are watching the crowd making sure things are safe
- We’ll take a close look at supervision and likely reduce our proposed expenditure in that
- We need to be able to take some time to look at other pieces of these things to see if we can preserve program
- Understanding
- By this time next week number has to be: 2.93% Budget-to-Budget – 8.99% Tax Levy

Mr. Fagan:

- Room for efficiency in supervision
- Not suggesting hidden fat all over the place; John made a comment about why we were just cutting teachers; if we wanted to save teachers and programs where else could we look to save
- Looking in areas that we don’t necessarily see the expense being warranted beyond a shadow of a doubt

Mr. Kahn:

- Why are we talking about Full-Day Kindergarten; leaving it in we are at 3%

Mr. DiBlasio

- Where are we with Kindergarten class size?  
If you increase class size is it worth it to salvage Full-Day vs. Half-Day Kindergarten?
- Supervision not fat; there’s just a better way to manage it

Mr. Sapraine:

- Do not feel fat in supervision
- Mr. Sapraine stated that he did not agree with the proposed 2.93% Budget-to-Budget Increase with a 8.99% Tax Levy
- Believed could go a little higher

Comments/Concerns by the Public

- ◆ Send child to school for education; job at home to round child  
Sports important at high school level; many opportunities outside of school for sports in the other grades  
Need teachers, educators and technology in our schools
- ◆ Need for psychologists for all students  
Past cuts in psychologists, guidance counselors, social workers and assistant principals at the elementary level never been replaced  
Board took oath to provide first and foremost an education  
Core curriculum and a free and appropriate education is mandated; sports and extracurricular activities are not  
Can’t keep increasing class sizes; cut class sizes and make sure they are getting an education  
Hire a grant writer

**PUBLIC COMMENTS**

---

PUBLIC COMMENTS (cont'd):

- ◆ Cheerleading is to girls as football is to the boys  
Cheerleading not just about cheering for school teams any more  
Without a fall season they cannot prepare for Competition  
Competitions extremely important  
Option of paying for season  
Abusive comments made to girls for not cheering at games  
Girls have to carry mats from the Middle School to the Manor
- ◆ Ask all sports to cut back  
If everybody makes sacrifices the public would be more willing to accept the budget

Board/Administration:

Which season more important to Girls  
If they do not have a fall season can will they be prepared for competition  
Closing remarks by the Administration and Board  
Need to change the way people think of cheerleaders – still think they are only there to cheer for the boys  
Athletic Director should be told about comments to girls  
Cheerleading has come so far – most competitions this year  
Lack of communication that girls were not doing basketball games because they were doing competitions  
Board asked who made the decision as to which Cheerleading season listed  
Working on better solution for mat situation

There being no further business, a motion was made by Mr. DiBlasio, second by Mr. Sapricono, to adjourn the Workshop Meeting at 11:27 p.m.

**ADJOURN WORKSHOP  
MEETING**

No Discussion.  
All Ayes  
Motion Carried.

Respectfully submitted,

Carmen T. Ouellette  
District Clerk

Richard G. DiBlasio,  
Vice District Clerk and  
Board of Education Vice President