

A Special Meeting of the Board of Education, Seaford Union Free School District, was held on June 29, 2011, in the Seaford High School Band Room, 1575 Seamans Neck Road, 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 Striffolino  
Mr. Christopher Venator - Attorney

The meeting was called to order at 7:35 p.m. As the first order of business, Board President Brian Fagan led the audience in the Pledge of Allegiance.

**OPEN MEETING**

Mr. Fagan welcomed everyone and briefly spoke about the failed budget on June 21<sup>st</sup> and the need to now make cuts to reach the contingency budget level.

**OPENING REMARKS**

Topics covered in Mr. Conboy's Administrative Report dated June 24, 2011 included:

**ADMINISTRATIVE REPORT**

Contingency Budget:

Need to cut \$95,394 from the budget to get to contingency level  
If the Board wishes to go below contingency then discussion would be needed to determine where those cuts would be made  
District's are restricted from purchasing equipment on contingency budget  
In order to buy any equipment on a contingency budget we have to make a salient argument that the equipment is necessary and is only being purchased because we cannot carry out our educational purposes without that equipment.

Total equipment budget - \$172,113

- Reviewed all equipment listed in the budget and the only justified pieces of equipment is a Blade Server and the other is a special use printer used for students at the High School in the Publications class
- Cost of printer and server is \$37,761

Additional cost in transportation due to the cost of living increase raised by New York State last week presented us with an increased transportation cost of \$36,719

The additional transportation cost and technology equipment added up to \$64,480 leaving us with a budget reduction of \$97,633 which is \$2,239 more than we needed to reach contingency level.

We also needed to reduce the administrative component of our contingency budget so that it does not exceed the 8.31% we proposed in the budget defeated on June 21

Reduced Administrative component by \$5,529

Recommend putting the \$2,239 from equipment and the \$5,529 from Administrative component (totaling \$7,768) into unemployment compensation for the 2011/2012 school year.

At Mr. Fagan's request Fred Kaden, Director of Technology, explained why the Blade Server and printer are equipment necessary for this school year:

Over the past 2 years the district has lost 6 servers that they have been unable to replace. Cost to repair would be approximately the same cost of purchasing a new server

Current servers are running multiple functions when they should only be running one which overloads capacity of server itself

---

2011-2012 CONTINGENCY BUDGET PLANNING DISCUSSION

Have two primary domain controllers which are responsible for the basic function in any network

- We have only two this year (had four previous year)
- The Admin domain crashed which resulted in moving all administrative function over the servers where the rest of the faculty and the students reside.
- Had some lab issues where some specific classes which needed a very specific dedicated server which crashed
- This resulted in our two remaining servers to be overtaxed and become unreliable.
- Also there is no fail safe solution if these servers were to die.
- The functions that these servers provided were then put on our two remaining domain controllers.

Mr. Kaden also described other problems for certain classes and security concerns over exploration of the network servers by students and went on to detail what has now been placed on the two remaining servers - Seaford DC-1 (Primary Domain Controller) and Seaford DC-2 (Secondary Domain Controller)

Mr. Kaden explained ways that someone would have the ability to sniff around the web, the network which would lead to security issues. He also stated that we should have a server that would allow a share on the web that would let students put files on if they wanted to

Mr. Kaden further explained:

Need for the blade server because we have the initial two domain controllers running six functions with absolutely no back-up and being taxed beyond their fullest limit

- Only capable of running 64 bit older software
- If current servers go down, no one will be able to access WinCap
- 6 servers have gone down over the last two years (originally had 18 servers; now down to 12 servers)
- We have had a change in curriculum for several classes in the High School and if they were to go down it would be days before anything could be operational again
- If one blade failed on the blade server the others would kick in
- The average individual server costs approximately \$8,000 and for us to make up for what we need the cost would be in excess of the \$37,000.

Blade servers are significantly cheaper than individual servers

Cloud servers are in the infancy stage

- Considering the type of information contained in our records feel it is too early to move to the Cloud system

Since we cannot purchase new computers this year do we want to lease the server over two years which would carry the cost to next year and limit our ability to purchase computers next year

- There is a computer in every classroom

Mr. Conboy stated that while he encourages interest, exploration of the network server by any student is not allowable and would be an immediate administrative referral and would be dealt with in the most severe way possible.

- He also verified with Mr. Kaden that the proposed server would allow for greater security

---

MR. KADEN (cont'd)

Mr. Conboy:

Board needs to decide this evening if these purchases should be made.

Need to establish the need for student computers without piercing the contingency cap

Several months ago Mr. Kaden shared with us his concerns over the District's infrastructure and student computers; that concern was established as we planned both iterations of the budget which failed

As Superintendent, if the Commissioner asks why Seaford, on a contingency budget, purchased that equipment, he would need to have all the information as to why we considered this an emergency situation.

State Superintendent's convention this fall is on Technology

As a Board you identified the need because you had two budgets both of which failed which had significant technology purchase and lease within

We have established that these two pieces without them essentially the whole district or many of the functions of the district could melt down pretty quickly

Have to keep in mind that the voters have spoken twice – we were not given their endorsement for the plans we put together so right now we are just doing what is absolutely essential to keep us going

We cannot afford in any way to be on a contingency budget two years in a row

Ultimately required to make sure the District runs

From this point everything we do now has to be to get a passed vote going forward with the tax cap

Mr. Conboy stated his recommendation was that the District needs the printer and server, needs to increase the transportation because of the cost of living and nothing further. Those things take us to the \$95,000+ to get to contingency budget

If there is something we can do within that \$37,000 where we can spread that payment out over three years

- Unsure if it is legal or even the right thing to do – hooking ourselves up for more payments going forward,
- If there were essential computer equipment that needs to be in the hands of our students we can make a decision as to what those purchases should be
- We have some old computer equipment which is not the fastest but it works

Mr. Conboy advised that what he calls core instructional program is everything that we offer our students – our whole instructional mosaic from Kindergarten to Twelfth Grade which is very different at every level.

- Elementary and Middle Schools is a basic program with a few enhancements
- High School is basic New York State program with some elective classes that are very important to our students and we have reduced all of that over the last two years to the point where he is calling our instructional program bare bones
- Mr. Conboy and Mr. Strifolino are responsible for the instructional program which is the business we are in – that's why we are here
- and will not endorse one more cut to instructional program

Computer situation we have and the number of computers students have to work on has been the same situation we have had for the last several years

Board:

Goal tonight to determine if we can move forward with this equipment

Decision needs to be made if technology equipment needed meets State criteria

Concerns over ability for students to get into and/or explore our servers

If exploring students got into our system how much would it cost the district above the \$37,000

Is it the right thing for the district to do at this juncture to spend \$37,000 on the cusp of changing our technology such that this will be a redundant server

Brief discussion on previous discussions concerning future technology within the District

Option of leasing (financing) of equipment vs., purchasing equipment concerning obtaining necessary equipment

- Do we have the option of leasing rather than purchasing this equipment

Trying to maintain this year

Can we adopt a budget this evening allocating the \$37,000 to a budget category and come and decide whether we want to lease it over two or three years or do an outright purchase

Language leaves too much discretion; open to interpretation – written in a vague manner

Feel computers for students are needed in the classroom to enhance their education and meet their educational goals

Keep taking away from the technology department reducing every year

Don't know why we are not being presented with the purchase of computers

- Some of the computers in classrooms are very old and are constantly being updated and at what cost

Where are we going to find the money to purchase the computers; what else could we cut or take away

What was kept in place that took away the money for computers

We are going to do what we believe is the right thing for the students

Did the voters vote it down because of specific line items in the budget or because of the tax levy rate

Did the Board not get their message out as to how important education is to our children

Brief discussion concerning the community, Board getting the information out to the community, reasons budget were not passed, cuts made in the district, history of the district, tax levy increase, challenges facing the district, etc.

No one saying we are going to cut any electives or any curriculum

\$37,000 is coming from equipment

Do we have any classrooms that require computers or should have computers and don't right now?

Losing focus on what kids need; we are here to education our students - concentrating too much on the penalty or what may come down

Believe we should get the computers and take the chance but there still has to be a place where that money has to come from

Christopher Venator:

Mr. Venator stated that Mr. Kaden reviewed all of the originally budget technology items and determined that these two pieces of equipment were necessary in order to maintain the educational program.

- Can make legitimate argument that these items are necessary to maintain the educational program and they are supportable in terms of being able to be purchased despite being on contingency budget

There is the ability during the year to make purchases for emergency unanticipated purchases.

- If you needed to make an emergency purchase during the year you would pass a resolution that it is an emergency

The only time the Commissioner really gets involved in this issue is to the extent that someone in the community disagrees with the Board of education's decision to purchase the equipment and files an appeal to the Commissioner. If that occurs then the Commissioner is required to weigh in on it.

Money does need to be allocated for specific equipment

Can make a legitimate argument that the equipment is necessary

Budget must be set this evening

If Commissioner denies purchase before equipment has been purchased then the District cannot go forward with purchase

If District decides not to go forward with purchase after it has been included in the budget, that money cannot be used for anything else. It would become fund balance.

Discussion continued concerning additional computers, leasing v. purchasing, specific equipment necessary to the district, lack of areas to be cut and need to remain at or below contingency budget.

After lengthy discussion it was determined that the blade server and printer in the amount of \$37,761 is necessary in order to maintain the educational program and the District will go forward with the purchase of that equipment. It was also decided that \$36,719 would be used to cover the increased transportation costs in that amount.

Comments, Questions and/or Concerns Raised by the Public included:

**PUBLIC COMMENTS**

- Budget failed because people are ignorant and because of the tax levy  
Misinformation being passed around and believed  
Board does their job with all these open meetings  
Financing always ends up costing more; wiser to just purchase  
Shouldn't create expenses which will carry over to next year  
2% cap next year – will contractual obligations eat up the 2%
- Heard in the community that a large part of problem this year was the tax levy number and resentment that the teachers union did not give back like in other districts  
Needs to be more dialogue between the Board, teachers, administration and community to work together because we are all in this together – for the kids
- Status of the MTA Tax and its effect on the school district
- Sounds like we are one bad virus away from having the entire system shutting down  
Pretty compelling case to purchase server; believe it would be irresponsible not to do it

PUBLIC COMMENTS (cont'd)

- Hear much about server, printer and infrastructure in relation to staff and teachers but not about classroom equipment for students  
Any way we could repair current system with a less expensive patch to last for the next couple of years
- Grants within the District

2% Cap can be pierced if you have passage by 60% of those voting in that vote

If two budgets fail then the budget put in place is 0% - no increase from the prior year

Mandate relief committee being formed this summer

No district can afford to be on a contingency budget two years in a row

Over the course of the last several years in an effort to save program we have taken money from technology

We have budgeted for the MTA tax; have not heard anything about it being repealed but will look into that

Members of Central Office Administration will be attending Grant workshops at Hofstra University

Motion by Mr. Kahn, second by Mr. DelGiudice, to adopt the following resolution:

**BE IT RESOLVED**, that the Board of Education of the Seaford Union Free School District hereby adopts a contingency budget for the 2011/2012 school year in the amount of \$54,824,663 which represents a spending increase of \$1,209,701 from the prior year's budget. The Seaford Union Free School District's budget for the 2011/2012 school year be approved by this Board in the amount of \$54,824,663 with a budget-to-budget increase of 2.26% and a tax levy increase of 8.12%.

Mr. Sapricono asked about the \$95,394 reduction needed to bring the budget to contingency level and clarified his understanding of same.

Brian Fagan -	Aye
Richard DiBlasio -	Aye
John DelGiudice -	Aye
Bruce Kahn -	Aye
Michael Sapricono -	Aye

Motion Carried.

Areas covered in the discussion on Use of Facilities under Contingency Budget included:

When under Contingency Budget District required to charge outside groups for usage of facilities with the exception of school related groups such as the PTA's and SEPTA

List of groups that pay traditionally pay and do not pay

Speed Camp – High School athletes take part in summer (football related)

Board:

What about the Seaford Library and Booster Club

We have traditionally charged groups who earn money and charge fees such as summer camps and men's basketball leagues

Haven't charged those groups such as PTA and CYO who area community groups who help the community

Need to be more specific in the future about what pay or no pay means

**ADMINISTRATION/BOARD  
COMMENTS**

**ADOPTION OF CONTINGENCY  
BUDGET FOR THE 2011/2012  
SCHOOL YEAR**

**ADMINISTRATIVE REPORT**

---

USE OF FACILITIES DISCUSSION (cont'd)

How did we come up with an increase of 5% each year

- Is that an actual increase of our costs
- Need to determine new rates for this year
- Need to determine what is considered one field usage

Need rates for new turf field and lighting of field

Deadlines for request of usage; bidding process for multiple requests for same time frame – permit going to highest bidder

Ramifications of not charging groups while under contingency budget

Need for this discussion

Outside use of facilities charges while on contingency budget in 2005

Determination of what the additional cost to the district is for usage by outside groups (heat, lighting, custodial, security, supplies, etc.)

- Different expense to district on a Saturday or Sunday than 3:00 o'clock on a school day

Need to define:

- Who we are going to charge – who will pay; who will not
- How rates are determined (based on cost of current expenses)
- What constitutes usage of a field (2 hours, 3 hours, etc?)
- What constitutes usage of a room
- Cost of lighting turf field

Board has no choice – we need to follow the law

- Need to charge groups for outside use

Is Scope affected by this

Law states when on contingency budget must charge; when not on contingency it is up to the discretion of the District

Would hourly rates be reduced if security opened and closed and no custodian would be present

Costs are different for a group coming in on a school day than on a Saturday or Sunday

Board had decided that it did not want outside groups in our buildings without supervision

- It was an issue for Saturdays and Sundays; not really for afternoons or weeknights where custodians were in the buildings

When groups apply for permit should know what the rates will be

Need the definition of what is a "field usage"

- Cost different with lights
- Cost of wear and tear of fields

Christopher Venator, Attorney

Law states that when on contingency budget must charge all outside groups for use of your facilities with the exception of school related groups such as the PTA and SEPTA

- Board members take an oath to uphold the law
- Reasonable determination of what fees should be
- Have to charge at least the very least; need to determine actual costs

Administration:

Rates are currently raised 5% each year

The groups we are talking about are the students who come to our schools every day – Daisies, Brownies, Girl Scouts, Cub Scouts, Boy Scouts – groups that are not used to paying

- Are we charging each of these groups the current rates or are we coming to the Board with each application to determine pay or no pay

OUTSIDE USE OF FACILITIES DISCUSSION (cont'd)

SCOPE would need to be charged  
Need to come up with rates which make sense  
Buildings are not required to be closed on Saturdays and Sundays while on contingency budget  
Will revisit the rates on the Reorganization Meeting

Comments, Questions and/or Concerns Raised by the Public included:

**PUBLIC COMMENTS**

- Will charges be those that are on current sheets
- Charges for groups using buildings in the afternoon and evening should be less than those on weekends
- Do buildings need to be closed on weekends while on contingency budget
- Need to be very clear when setting the charges as to what a usage means –an hour, two hours, etc.
- Board needs to set rates
- When will discussions start concerning ways to obtain revenues for the District

None

**CLOSING REMARKS**

Board President Brian Fagan asked to have a motion to adjourn the Special Meeting and enter into Executive Session for the purpose of discussing contracts.

**ADJOURN SPECIAL MEETING**

No action will be taken.

At 9:43 p.m., a motion was made by Mr. Kahn, second by Mr. DelGiudice, to adjourn the Workshop Meeting and enter into executive session for the purpose of discussing contracts.

**EXECUTIVE SESSION**

No Discussion  
All Ayes  
Motion Carried.

There being no further business, at 11:11 p.m., a motion was made by Mr. Kahn, second by Mr. Sapricono, to adjourn Executive Session.

**ADJOURN EXECUTIVE SESSION**

No Discussion  
Brian Fagan - Aye  
Richard DiBlasio - Aye  
John DelGiudice - Nay  
Bruce Kahn - Aye  
Michael Sapricono - Aye  
Motion Carried.

Respectfully submitted,

Carmen Ouellette,  
District Clerk

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