



Board of School Directors Committee Meetings

Wednesday, January 14, 2026

Generated by Renai Cardillo on Thursday, January 15, 2026

Members present: Ken Keith, William Formica, Kimberly Wheeler, Michael Barnacz, Alexandra Wisser, Andrew Souchet, Corinne DeGeiso, Rosemary Buetikofer, William Brong

Others present: Lauren Bauer, Nate Bender, Phil Cerami, Frank Gallagher, Christopher Hey, Katie Kennedy-Reilly, Sean Redmond, Michael Taylor, Sam Varano, and Megan Zweiback

1. Education-Personnel

Mr. Keith called the meeting to order at 6:33 P.M.

1.1 Approve Course Name Change - Heritage Spanish to Advanced Spanish

Dr. Gallagher noted three items on the Education-Personnel agenda and introduced Director of Curriculum, Instruction, Assessment & Technology, Dr. Katie Kennedy-Reilly.

Dr. Kennedy-Reilly began her presentation stating that all curriculum decisions are rooted in the mission statement of the school district, to meet the needs of students in an ever-changing environment.

Dr. Kennedy-Reilly explained the recommended High School course name change from Heritage Spanish to Advanced Spanish. She stated that during the development and implementation of the course, teachers and counselors recognized that this course would better serve students titled as Advanced Spanish. Course titles at the high school level are very relevant to post high school and college preparation.

Dr. Kennedy-Reilly also stated that this course would meet the needs of the wide array of Spanish speaking students and anticipates returning later with a revised course titled Heritage Spanish.

Comments from the Board recognized the understanding for the course name change and agreed to move the item forward for approval.

1.2 Approve High School Technology Education Course: Game Design

Dr. Kennedy-Reilly introduced Technology Education teacher, Mr. Cerami, who gave a brief overview of the current Technology Education courses at the high school. He spoke about the current Game Programming courses and how the new proposed course will enhance and serve to develop student skills and opportunities for learning.

Mr. Cerami spoke about the separation of distinct skills within game design creation. He outlined the proposed units of study within game development that include lighting and animation, visual effects, audio engineering and user interfaces.

Mr. Cerami also stated that this is an entry level course that would allow all students to take the class, not just students who have a computer or math background. He is anticipating two sections of the class for students in grades 9-12.

Mr. Cerami noted that there were no new materials needed as the current software supporting the proposed classes is free in the school district.

Positive comments from the Board agreed to move the proposed course forward for approval.

1.3 Approve the High School Visual Arts Course: Alternative Materials

High School Art teacher, Mr. Redmond, introduced the proposed course Alternative Materials. He stated that this course would offer another brand of art, along with modernizing the program and offering accessibility to all students. High School Art teacher, Ms. Bauer spoke about the use of different materials in the class and units of study that include papermaking, upcycling, weaving and punch needling.

Mr. Redmond and Ms. Bauer elaborated on the course by sharing examples of fiber works, noting that student interest would help to drive project creation. They also noted that the hands-on approach gives all students the opportunity to try art, even if they are non-traditional art students. They also spoke to the mental health rewards of creation and relaxation.

Mr. Redmond also spoke about learning stained glass, cutting, assembly and soldering, noting that it also lends itself to 3D projects, such as sculpture and jewelry making metal working - sculpture or jewelry.

The Board expressed favorable comments to the proposed course, including the possibility of learning a new hobby and possible career paths.

Dr. Kennedy-Reilly stated that having seen an earlier presentation of the proposed class, an elementary principal expressed interest in high school students sharing projects at the elementary level to encourage interest, participation and achievement in high school.

Dr. Kennedy-Reilly reviewed the proposed budget for the course noting that its cost is already built into the submitted budget for the Curriculum department. Dr. Kennedy-Reilly thanked the teachers for their presentation and praised their energy and ability to respond to the changing needs of students.

Dr. Gallagher also praised the teachers for their presentations.

Mr. Keith spoke favorably to modernizing the curriculum and asked Board members for comments. Board members praised the opportunities for students and agreed to move forward for approval.

Mr. Keith adjourned the Education-Personnel Committee meeting at 7:20 P.M.

2. Policy Committee

Assistant Superintendent and Director of Human Resources, Dr. Hey called the Policy Meeting to order.

Dr. Hey reminded that the district has entered into an agreement with the Pennsylvania School Boards Association (P.S.B.A.) to overhaul all the school district's policies. He noted that of the 500+ school districts in the Commonwealth, many also utilize P.S.B.A. as a policy review resource. Dr. Hey stated that approximately ten to twelve policies will be reviewed this evening and that the entire process of reviewing all policies may take upwards of a year.

Dr. Hey also stated that revisions are often simple language updates and/or updates to state regulations.

Dr. Hey, thanked the Board members for taking the time to read the policies and for submitting their questions and revisions.

Dr. Hey reviewed the following policies and commented.

2.1 First Reading of new Policy 000 - Board Policy/Procedure/Administrative Regulations

A new policy that clarifies the purpose of policies and administrative regulations, outlines limitations and rules of construction for interpretation, and reflects the format and contents of the web-based policy manual.

2.2 First Reading of Revisions to Policy 001 - Name and Classification

The Administration is recommending a minor revision.

2.3 First Reading of Revisions to Policy 002 - Authority and Powers

Added language to Authority to better reflect applicable federal and state laws and regulations.

2.4 First Reading of Revisions to Policy 003 - Functions

Added a provision stating that proposed changes to Board procedure or policy at a second reading will cause that procedure/policy to be in first reading status, unless the change is a minor editorial revision.

2.5 First Reading of Revisions to Policy 004 - Membership

Added language on the Superintendent having a seat on the Board and being able to speak on all matters, but not the right to vote, in accordance with School Code.

2.6 First Reading of Revisions to Policy 006 - Meetings

The policy clarifies Board practice regarding meeting matters, minutes and agendas and voting requirements, in accordance with School Code and the Sunshine Act.

2.7 First Reading of Revisions to Policy 006.1 - Attendance at Meetings Via Electronic Communications

The Administration is recommending retiring existing Policy 006.1 and adopt a new Policy 006.1 – Attendance at Meetings Via Electronic Communications, due to technology advances since original adoption. This policy will have a new title and policy language.

2.8 First Reading of Revisions to Policy 006.2 - Broadcasting Board Meetings

The Administration is recommending a minor revision to Policy 006.2 – Broadcasting Board Meetings.

2.9 First Reading of Revisions to Policy 007 - Policy Manual Access

The Administration is recommending a minor revision to Policy 007 – Policy Manual Access.

2.10 First Reading of Review of Policy 008 - Organization Charts

The Administration is recommending a review of Policy 008 – Organization Charts.

Dr. Hey stated that while it had appeared on the agenda, the Board and Administration have elected to remove Policy 011 from review at this time. He indicated that it needs clarification before reading.

Upon the end of first readings, Mr. Keith reiterated that if after a second reading, there are policy revisions, the policy would revert to a first reading.

Ms. Wisser inquired about the language on Policy 000 and public compliance with administrative regulations.

Dr. Gallagher stated that often regulations are built directly into a policy. He also stated that Administration could provide examples of administrative guidelines that support policy.

Ms. Wisser thanked Dr. Hey for the review and expressed appreciation for the removal of Policy 011 at this time.

Ms. Wheeler commented on the reiteration that Board members do not receive payment for their work and must declare any financial stake in board decisions.

Mr. Souchet had several questions regarding policies and their development and implementation. Dr. Hey responded that policies are based on School Code and screened by P.S.B.A., and our Solicitor, before readings.

Dr. Hey acknowledged Mr. Souchet's questions on Policy 002 and responded that it is the spirit of the policy that all criteria; consistency with the law, legitimate purpose of the Board and supports the school district, will be met.

Mr. Souchet asked that Policy 003 be edited to include that revisions to policies would cause a policy to return to a First Reading. Mr. Souchet also inquired about Policy 004 regarding Board vacancies and Policy 006 as it relates to participation of the full board and a 2/3 majority. Mr. Souchet also inquired about Policy 006.2 and whether a provision exists for a legal definition of defamation.

Ms. DeGeiso thanked Dr. Hey for his time in discussion regarding the policy revisions. Ms. DeGeiso expressed concern for Policy 004 and if a vacancy occurs on the Board, that community input should be required along with thoughtful discussion.

Ms. DeGeiso also stated her desire to see students have a seat at the table for Board meetings. Dr. Gallagher responded that this is a suggestion that he would be interested in considering.

Ms. DeGeiso also questioned Policy 006 as it relates to board members adding items and being included in agenda preparation. Ms. DeGeiso also requested that draft minutes be made available to the public prior to Board approval. Ms. DeGeiso also requested that 006 be amended to include the opportunity for public participation in a virtual environment.

Ms. Butikofer also thanked Dr. Hey for his time in answering and explaining proposed policy revisions.

A member of the audience inquired about conflict of interest and disclosure of same. Dr. Gallagher responded that all Board members and Administration are required annually, submit a Statement of Ethics.

A member of the audience asked about public review of draft meeting minutes.

The Policy Committee ended at 8:00 PM

3. Operations

3.1 Approve Proposed 2026-2027 School Year Calendar

Dr. Hey introduced the school calendar for the 26/27 school year noting its annual approval. He stated that the calendar is consistent with those approved in past years, the start of the school year before Labor Day and a traditional winter break of approximately a week and a half.

Dr. Hey stated that the administration has received requests and comments from the community to add holidays to its calendar. He noted that the administration is considering a survey which will permit those suggestions for consideration in future calendars.

Dr. Hey did state that a major change to the proposed calendar is the addition of two early dismissal dates to allow for Teacher in Service: October 7 and February 3. He stated that the school district does not take an early dismissal lightly, recognizing the extra coordination for parents. However, he stated the demand for more Professional Development time.

Director of Curriculum, Dr. Kennedy-Reilly, reiterated the importance of the two early dismissal dates which have been chosen intentionally to occur immediately after testing when fresh data will be available. She stated that these dates would be very different from regular professional development schedules. These dates will allow for building specific review and actionable planning on the results of the data.

Board members thanked the administration for considering the addition of other holiday observations to future calendars. Mr. Souchet asked for the specific dismissal times and Dr. Hey responded that they would be either 11:00 AM and 11:45 AM or 11:15 AM and 12:00 PM.

Ms. Wheeler commented about the last day of school occurring on a Monday. Dr. Gallagher responded that albeit short, it is valuable time for moving up ceremonies.

A member of the community thanked the Board and the administration for their consideration of adding the Diwali holiday to the calendar.

It was agreed to move the proposed 2026-2027 calendar for approval.

3.2 SiteLogiQ GESA Amendment Discussion

Director of Business Affairs, Mr. Taylor stated that the GESA Amendment to Indian Crest and Salford Hills is being recommended for approval. He introduced Kasey Kollar of the construction management firm, SiteLogiQ.

Mr. Kollar reviewed the amendment to the GESA agreement by sharing a slide deck that itemized the scope of the proposed work. Mr. Kollar stated that these items were identified during the construction process and it makes financial sense to make these improvements and corrections at this time.

Mr. Kollar reviewed the scope of work for Salford Hills, Indian Crest and Indian Valley. He reviewed the individual costs at each school and the breakout prices. Highlighted items at Salford Hills included roof replacements, water filtration system, and sewage ejection pump system. Indian Crest included a water softener system, kitchen HVAC demolition, Spray-fire resistant materials, and gym exterior wall repair. The Indian Valley improvements include the removal and replacement of previously recalled fire-sprinkler heads.

Mr. Kollar outlined the individual details for each school on the slide presentation and listed the school totals: Salford Hills \$311,889, Indian Crest \$172,969 and Indian Valley \$86,236 for a total GESA amendment of \$599,803.

Mr. Kollar reviewed the pricing and award schedule which would approve the amendment at the January 22nd Board Action Meeting.

Board President, Mr. Keith acknowledged the awareness of the items revealed during construction. Mr. Brong also reiterated the unforeseen conditions found during renovations.

Mr. Barnacz expressed concern about the roof condition and Mr. Kollar responded that the specific area requiring repair was in an inaccessible place, revealed only during construction. He also stated that new drone technology will assist in serving all areas for future roof maintenance.

Ms. Wisser asked about how many of the listed projects have already been completed. Mr. Kollar stated that approximately four and a half items have already been completed. Mr. Taylor added that while some of the items may not have been listed on the original 2020 Facilities Feasibility Study, it quickly becomes evident which items need immediate attention and administration strongly recommends those improvements.

Ms. Wisser inquired about payment for the projects and referenced discussion from an August 2025 Committee meeting in which Board approval was requested for construction. Mr. Taylor confirmed that work is under the same GESA amendment.

Ms. Wisser also inquired about the Water Filtration System and when it was discovered that the water levels no longer were acceptable. Mr. Kollar explained that in September 2025, Suburban Water Technology, the district's licensed well-operator, was notified of new expectations from the EPA, at which time the district was made aware. Mr. Taylor added that these levels were not included in the 2020 Facilities Feasibility Study, and as the federal guidelines were announced, the district is being proactive on its correction and improvement.

Mr. Kollar also noted that it was during the renovation project that the water softer at Indian Crest was identified as being close to its useable life and therefore deemed in need of replacement.

Mr. Souchet asked about Suburban Water Technologies and Mr. Taylor responded that they are the licensed well-operator and a trusted source for all DEP applications. Mr. Souchet also inquired about the cost of the extra projects and Mr. Taylor responded that the bond issuance does include provisions for changes to the GESA.

Ms. DeGeiso asked about the percentage cost for each project as it relates to the total cost of each individual project. Mr. Taylor responded that the estimated cost of Salford Hills and Indian Crest was \$60M, these changes are approximately 1% of both projects totaling \$600K.

Ms. DeGeiso asked about the recalled sprinkler heads and if any of these devices currently exist in other schools? Mr. Taylor responded that a software program is being created that will follow and track all equipment in the district. Mr. Taylor stated with confidence that no other faulty sprinkler heads exist in district buildings.

A member of the audience asked if the faulty sprinkler heads were revealed in the original construction plan. Mr. Taylor stated that they were not revealed in the KCBA facilities study.

A member of the audience asked about the laterals at the Indian Crest project and Mr. Kollar responded that unfortunately, it was an existing issue because of incorrect information on site.

The Board agreed to move forward for consideration and approval.

3.3 Middle School Tracks & High School Tennis Courts Proposal

Mr. Taylor introduced Brian Shanahan Tarkett Sports. He spoke about refining the projects and updated contingent pricing.

Mr. Taylor asked for details on the post-tension concrete proposed for the High School Tennis Courts. Mr. Taylor stated that the revised pricing is \$200K less than originally proposed as the manufacturer is enthusiastic about using the technology in this area to showcase the properties of this type of project. Mr. Shanahan spoke to the advantages of the Post Tension Concrete (PTC) versus asphalt and the advantages of concrete in a freeze-thaw environment.

Mr. Taylor also stated that regardless of which option would be selected, the existing fencing would have to come down for the project to proceed.

Mr. Keith stated that the project has been packaged for best price. He also acknowledged that the post-tension concrete is a new type of construction for consideration. Mr. Keith asked where the administration lands on its recommendation for tennis court reconstruction. Mr. Taylor responded that smart money is on long-term thinking with concrete which comes with the 50-year warranty.

Ms. DeGeiso asked about the process to select the vendor for this project. Mr. Taylor responded that there are two ways to procure; Public bid or Cooperative purchasing. He explained that Tarkett Sports are Keystone Purchasing Network COSTARS approved. Mr. Taylor also explained the trusted partnership that the district has established with Tarkett. He noted that the district did reach out to other vendors, and they either did not respond or did not submit a bid that met our specifications.

Ms. DeGeiso asked about the 50-year warranty vs. the one-year warranty for asphalt. Ms. DeGeiso asked about the popularity of tennis. Dr. Gallagher responded that the high school has approximately 60 student athletes who play tennis, also noting the past successes of these students. He also noted use of the courts by the High School Wellness classes and Community Education Summer camps. Ms. DeGeiso asked for the locations/schools that have the PTC

construction?

Mr. Formica stated his preference to look at long-term expectations. He also asked about how often color coating is performed. Mr. Shanahan stated that expectations are approximately 5-7 years. Mr. Formica also asked about the bond issuance and interest that will impact on the actual budget to cover the cost of these projects. Mr. Taylor responded that future borrowing would be less.

Mr. Souchet asked about the exclusions and conditions of the project and if any bond fees are anticipated? Mr. Taylor stated that these prices are all inclusive. Mr. Shanahan reiterated there are no additional charges.

Mr. Souchet asked about potential damage to surrounding parking lot. Mr. Shanahan stated that no damage is expected, however they would work with the district in the event of an incident.

Ms. Wheeler acknowledged that the Post-Tension Concrete project makes sense financially and inquired if the public would still be allowed to use the tennis courts and tracks? Mr. Taylor responded that rental use of the new multipurpose field by the public was a township restriction in Land Development. The public would still be able to use tennis courts and the track at Indian Valley.

Ms. Wisser asked about when the last recoating of current tennis courts was performed. Mr. Ball answered approximately 2012/2013 and stated that touch up and patching are done annually. Ms. Wisser asked if the Post-Tension-Concrete method is installed, does it still need to be recoated? Mr. Shanahan stated that it needs annual maintenance but not re-coating.

Mr. Barnacz asked about the third-party warranty holder and if there were any concerns. Mr. Shanahan said they could provide that information. Mr. Barnacz expressed concern about the ongoing maintenance regardless of choice of material.

Ms. Buetikofer said she is leaning toward a long-term solution (PTC) for the tennis courts.

Mr. Brong expressed concerns about storm water management. Mr. Shanahan said the existing stone base will remain and there are no new requirements. Mr. Brong asked for confirmation that no storm water management is needed for the project. Mr. Brong also asked about a design of the court that would allow the fencing to remain in place.

Mr. Keith also reiterated the storm water management concern and inquired about where the asphalt is sourced. Mr. Shanahan stated that trusted sources are used and acknowledged the importance of quality materials.

A member of the public asked about cultivating youth participation in the sport of tennis. Dr. Gallagher responded that it would have to be explored.

Another member of the audience also asked about the cost of repainting courts. Mr. Shanahan responded that in approximately 8-10 years, repainting would cost approximately \$10K - \$15K.

Another member of the audience asked about number of projects in the area. Mr. Shanahan said they could provide a list of locations of recent projects.

TRACK PROJECTS

Mr. Taylor explained the revised proposal which includes the cost of the goal posts being moved, which was a safety recommendation. He also noted that the Indian Valley track's price has been revised and the new price is \$113K less.

Mr. Brong stated that the proposal would make the IV track an official competition track. Ms. Butikofer and Mr. Barnacz agreed the project is necessary. Ms. Wisser asked about the current transportation costs to transport students from Indian Valley to Indian Crest. Mr. Taylor responded that the cost to transport is not as significant as anticipated, as the Indian Valley student athletes are practicing at Indian Valley and are only being bused to Indian Crest for competitions. There would not be significant savings on transportation.

A brief discussion occurred about the scheduling of use with only one middle school track. There were several questions on fencing for the Indian Valley track and Mr. Taylor reported that a survey of other middle schools found that they do not have fencing around their facilities. He noted that the track at Indian Crest has a fence because upon its origin in the early 2000's it was serving as the varsity competition track for the high school.

Ms. Wheeler asked about bleachers at Indian Valley and Dr. Gallagher stated they are not included in this project.

Mr. Formica offered his agreement for the track project at Indian Valley.

Ms. DeGeiso asked for the life expectancy of the track top layer and Mr. Shanahan responded approximately 7-10 years. Ms. DeGeiso also asked if the track at Indian Crest had been resurfaced and Operations Director, Mr. Ball responded that it has never been re coated. He also added that the current High School track only required a recoat after 10 years of use.

Ms. DeGeiso inquired about the current condition of the track at Indian Crest for competition and Dr. Gallagher stated that while P.I.A.A. has expressed their concerns about its condition, the district would like to make the improvement and upgrade to avoid any limitations of its use in the future.

A member of the audience stated their concern for fencing around the Indian Valley track for protection as well as crowd control. He thanked everyone for the consideration of the Indian Valley track for both competition purposes and for gym classes.

A member of the audience asked about cost of both projects and the response was given of \$2.5M, as a maximum cost for the upgraded post-tension concrete courts and the two tracks.

Mr. Brong asked about the timing of all projects and Mr. Shanahan said approximately 75 days for the Indian Crest track and High School tennis courts. The Indian Valley track would be approximately 90 days.

Mr. Keith stated the proposed projects as they will appear on the agenda at the action meeting. He asked for contractual language to be included regarding storm water. Mr. Taylor clarified that both options for tennis court renovations would be made available for the vote.

Mr. Brong expressed concerns about unsuitable soil and Mr. Shanahan responded that there really is no way of knowing what could be underground until the ground is disturbed.

Dr. Gallagher requested that the Board be able to make its decision on the tennis courts separately. Mr. Keith stated that all the projects will be on the agenda for approval, and an option will be presented to allow for approval of the tennis court material separately. Mr. Taylor also stated that the items could be separated from the agenda for voting purposes.

Operations Committee adjourned.

4. Finance

4.1 2026-2027 Preliminary Budget Presentation

Mr. Keith opened the Finance Committee Meeting stating that the budget was being presented this evening in a different format, to comply with the Act One Index timeline.

Dr. Gallagher noted that while it is very early in the budget process; by presenting information it gives the district the opportunity to apply for referendum exceptions in the Act 1 Index budget if it is determined they are needed.

Mr. Taylor stated that Act 1 Index requires the Board to approve a Preliminary Budget proving its need to possibly apply for exceptions. Mr. Taylor explained that the current budget deficit with an Act 1 Index increase of 3.5% is \$6,461,310. He stated that the presentation this evening will show how the budget preparation will be refined over the next several months. Mr. Taylor also stated that upon the approval of the Preliminary Budget it would be on the school district website for review.

Mr. Taylor reviewed a slide presentation which outlined Local, State and Federal Revenues. The presentations showed the approved budget categories from the current 2025-2026 budget as well as the collection of these revenues through December 2025.

Initial calculations were shared for each category for the preliminary 2026-2027 budget.

Mr. Taylor also reviewed expenditures for Instruction (Programs), Support Services, and Non-Instructional and other expenditures. A slide outlining the Special Education expenditures was shared.

Mr. Taylor discussed the Future Considerations for expenditures which included the review of medical benefits, charter school costs, special education costs and the review of staffing positions and potential staff retirements.

Mr. Taylor reviewed a slide that listed the district's Debt Service over the past 5 years as well as a 5 Year Forecast. Mr. Taylor stated that debt-service remains around \$10.2M through the 2047-2048 school year.

Mr. Taylor shared a slide that depicted the impact of millage rate increases on the Preliminary Budget. He also stated that the administration will continue to work on the budget, refining all the expenditure and revenues.

Ms. DeGeiso expressed a desire to meet with Mr. Taylor to discuss the budget in further detail.

Mr. Souchet asked when more information regarding Act 1 Index expectations and response would be shared publicly. Mr. Taylor responded that the information would be provided in March.

Mr. Souchet also inquired about how the budget is balanced with a deficit. Mr. Taylor answered that the Fund Balance may be used, however Mr. Taylor cautioned of that method of budgeting.

Mr. Souchet also asked if it would be worthwhile to show the Fund Balance in a presentation. Mr. Taylor responded that the goal is not to plan to use Fund Balance but to create a surplus.

Mr. Keith suggested a future presentation that outlines the legal limitations of Fund Balance use.

Ms. Wisser also stated that she had a lot of questions and expressed a desire to discuss the budget further. Mr. Taylor acknowledged and said that a meeting would be scheduled to do so.

A member of the audience asked if the school district used a Top Down or Zero-Based Budget process. Mr. Taylor responded that it is a little bit of both types of methods.

Mr. Keith adjourned the meeting at 10:22 P.M.

Respectfully Submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Michael Taylor".

Michael Taylor, C.P.A.
Board Secretary / Director of Business Affairs