

COLORADO SPRINGS SCHOOL DISTRICT 11
Dr. Terry N. Bishop, Superintendent
Division of Business Services
Glenn E. Gustafson, CPA, Deputy Superintendent/CFO

DAAC Budget Committee

Wendy Chiado, Chairman
John Gartin, Vice-Chairman

Minutes

February 26, 2008
6:00 p.m.

Members Present: Wendy Chiado, Katie Freidel, Suzy Gingrich, John Leary, Pete Lee, Jim Mason, and Bob Miner

Ex Officio Members Present: Becky Kluck, Ken Wieck and Becky Moore

Guest: Jamie Cushenberry-Mitchell High School Faculty

Wendy opened the meeting at 6:10 p.m. She explained why there was a change in the agenda from what had been previously decided upon. She thanked Jim, Pete and John L for their input into the committee's draft of the preliminary report to the Board of Education that will be reviewed with the entire committee later this evening. There was nothing to report from the DAAC. The minutes were briefly reviewed and Bob made a motion to accept the minutes, seconded by Pete and unanimously approved.

Before review of the IBRs, Becky Kluck clarified the master electrician's salary reported at the last meeting. She indicated that the electricians are hired at mid-range which is approximately \$17 per hour and not at the beginning salary of approximately \$13 per hour.

The Preliminary Budget Development Assumptions (PBDA) review began with a review of income resources first and with Becky providing a brief look at the process of developing the budget and where the PBDA fit into that process. Becky explained the role of the Denver-Boulder Consumer Price Index (CPI) in school financing. She told the committee that it came in lower than expected at 2.2%. This, coupled with the Amendment 23 1%, will give school districts across the state a 3.2% rate increase in funding.

Becky explained to the committee that this year Glenn has asked her and Ken Wieck to develop a list of possible budget reductions from the various district departments. Becky indicated that asking the departments to reduce their budgets themselves has not been very successful in the past.

Becky also described the General Fund – Fund Balance line as a possible fund balance that could be used for additional funding should there be money there at the end of the fiscal year. This would allow for possible June modifications to the proposed budget before adoption by the Board of Education.

Katie asked how the 368.8 pupil FTE reduction was figured. Becky gave a brief explanation of the Cohort Model (also found on page 375 of the 2008 adopted budget book). Katie also wanted to know if the charter schools are receiving the maximum amount the district is obligated to give them. Becky replied that they still get 100% of their PPR but that out of that the district is paid for agreed upon services it provides to the charters.

Pete wanted clarification as to who is funded in the employee compensation parameter and was it just administrators. Becky explained that the parameter includes all district employees. Also discussed was the elimination of health insurance for retired district employees paid for by the district and savings that come from it. Katie guessed that the parameter does not pay for steps increases or educational increments. Becky stated that there is a teachers' salary differential (difference between retiring teachers' average salary and

new teachers' average salary) used to help cover those amounts as they relate to teachers salaries and that they are not included in the parameter.

The committee then began a review of IBRs. Becky pointed out to the committee that the IBRs are not in any priority order as given in each of the priority categories (Priority One, Priority Two and Priority Three). The IBRs were placed in their priority categories by the Superintendent's Team, which includes the Division Heads. The Priority One IBRs were basically requests that will have to be funded. Priority Two requests are of the most concern to the Superintendent's Team and there appears to be enough money to fund them. Priority Three requests are requests that may or may not have any money left for funding and were felt to be of the least urgency by the team.

Priority One Budget Requests

1. The employee compensation parameter was explained and pointed out as taking up the largest share of the new money for FY08/09. Katie asked if the preschool portion taken from that was based on a state requirement and it is.
2. Becky explained that the money the district saved with closing East Middle School for this year was used to fund several one-time requests for this year (non-recurring). With East opening for the 2008-09 school year, money will be needed to reopen the school. An initial amount of \$400,000 was given to this request but upon further review, it may increase to \$700,000. Becky explained that some budget requests were not needed by the school as it is reopening with only one grade. John L asked about the math/science grant for the school and what it was paying for. Becky indicated that the project manager, curriculum coordinator and one clerical support were being funded from the grant money.
3. There was little discussion about utility rate hikes.
4. Katie had a question that involved clarification of what the bond money and MLO money are used for. The MLO would not fund this IBR as it has a specific spending plan. Bond money is not used for maintenance, and this IBR is for maintenance.
5. There was little discussion about bus fuel price increases.

Priority Two Budget Requests

6. Because some committee members were not familiar with what the AVID (Advancement Via Individual Determination) program is Katie gave a brief overview of the program and how it works. Note taking is standardized throughout the entire school that employs AVID. Katie thought it a good program but not worth the money paid to AVID developers. Also, she was convinced that once teachers are AVID trained, the techniques could be taught to other teachers and used without paying for the AVID name and training. Doherty and Wasson currently have AVID and Coronado is to embark on AVID next year. The committee would like to see some hard data as to how AVID has proven itself to improve student achievement. John L stated that Wasson has had the AVID program for a few years and should have some data. Doherty is in year two and should have some; and there was information contained about this within the IBR.
7. More discussion on AVID. The committee questioned why the IBR asked for 1.0 FTE and the IBR summary has 2.0 FTE. Also, if Coronado is just beginning in the AVID program, perhaps Doherty could be cut of one of its FTE request to save money and give Coronado one FTE per its IBR request. Also questioned was if the introduction of AVID to Coronado was eliminating some other program offered at the school.
8. The committee discussed the 9th Grade Academy IBRs as a whole. Four of the five high schools are asking for more budget in order to continue the valuable program at their schools. Jamie was able to give a description of the Saturday Schools to the committee.

9. Ninth Grade Academy discussion (see #8).
10. Ninth Grade Academy discussion (see #8).
11. Ninth Grade Academy discussion (see #8).
12. The committee discussed the Saturday School IBRs as a whole. Katie asked if there was grant money for the schools as she thought there had been some grant money in the beginning.
13. Saturday School discussion (see #12).
14. This IBR was discussed and the committee expressed shock and dismay that it was not a Priority One IBR.
15. Both **15a.** and **15b.** were reviewed by the committee. The committee wanted to know what the hard to fill positions that signing bonuses were needed for. They were told primarily speech pathologists and other SIED teachers. John L commented it should be more money with inflation etc. The committee was informed that the request was in addition to the budget already in place for signing bonuses.
16. There was little discussion regarding this IBR.
17. Suzy indicated that the ESP Council was passionate about not funding this IBR. She told the committee that SPED aides were being moved around and stretched farther. They are being told there is no money to hire additional aides and yet the SPED office is asking for another facilitator (this would be a fifth facilitator). The number of SPED students is increasing but the aides are decreasing which puts the district in danger of leaving SPED obligations unfulfilled.

In summary of the Priority Two Category, IBRs **6, 7** and **17** require more information and further discussion. IBRs **8-13** were fine as Priority Two. IBRs **14-16** should be moved to Priority One (unanimous vote).

Priority Three Budget Requests

18. This IBR had little discussion although Jim was in favor of moving it up from the Priority Three list.
19. The committee was surprised that this IBR was not a Priority Two and felt it should be. With only one "no" vote, the committee decided to change this IBR to Priority Two from Priority Three. One member would like to have moved it to Priority One. He spoke out strongly about hiring quality teachers for district students, even the substitutes.
20. This IBR brought about another round of dismay from the committee. Bob asked if it had been misplaced into the Priority Three category. The committee decided that if any IBR should be a Priority One, it was this IBR! It was unanimously moved to Priority One.
21. The committee would like to know what the current rate of pay is. While realizing the value of the trainers to the schools, the committee opted to keep this IBR as a Priority Three.
22. There was little discussion of this IBR but the committee felt it was well placed.
23. The committee questioned the prioritization of this IBR with the district's growing ELL population. Becky thought that perhaps it was due to the fact that ELL received 12.75 new FTE last year.
24. This IBR was also placed in the right priority according to the opinion of the committee.
25. The committee was in favor of the concept of this IBR. John L would like a presentation on this one if time would allow to better understand the program being introduced.

26. The IBR was reviewed by the committee in its three parts. While there was not objection to the elementary and middle school teacher and aides or supplies there were questions surrounding the coordinator position. If the coordinator is paid as a consultant, the committee questioned what the consultants already being utilized at \$100,000 per year are doing.

27. There was little discussion about this IBR and the committee felt it was well placed.

In summary of Priority Three IBRs, the committee emphatically recommended moving **20** to Priority One and also moving **19** to Priority Two. The remaining Priority Three IBRs would remain in this category.

The committee examined their draft preliminary report to the Board of Education. Wendy inquired if she could present it at the March 19 Board meeting instead of the March 12 Board meeting. The budget office will find out. A few items were discussed and will be changed, particularly Long-Term Recommendation b. Also the committee will add something about the district transportation and would like to include their prioritizations of the IBRs if the later date can be met. The report will continue to be edited through email.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:40 p.m. with plusses and deltas.

The next meeting is March 11, 2008 in the administration building boardroom at 6:00 p.m.