

**BETHLEHEM AREA SCHOOL DISTRICT
BOARD HUMAN RESOURCES COMMITTEE MEETING
MINUTES
MONDAY, JUNE 14, 2010**

Members of the Board Human Resources Committee met on Monday, June 14, 2010, in the Dining Room, at the Education Center. Present were the following school board members: William Burkhardt, Michele Cann, Michael Faccinetto, Irene Follweiler, Loretta Leeson, Aurea Ortiz, and Eugene McKeon. Also in attendance were Assistant to the Superintendent for Finance and Administration Stacy Gober, Assistant Superintendent for Human Resources Thomas K. Washington, and Interim Superintendent of Schools Dr. Thomas E. Persing.

The meeting of the Board Human Resources Committee was called to order by Mrs. Irene Follweiler at 8:26 p.m.

COURTESY OF THE FLOOR – None

BOARD POLICY 707 – LEASES DISCUSSION – Mr. Washington commented he sat in a couple of meetings with Dr. Dean Donaher and Scott Gilliland and believes they have captured the wording the board has said to them. He pointed out that as the board goes through the policy the changes are in bold and some minor changes have been made to deal with certain concerns. He indicated in the Class I especially dealt with moving the Special Olympics and the Boy Scouts and thinks Block Watch Group was also moved up, so that they would not receive charges. Mr. Washington added that they tried to redefine the language a little bit about the current roster and the 75%. He stopped at this point to address the board questions since they have reviewed it already.

Mr. McKeon had one question and somebody had just raised the question to him recently. He asked, “What is our stance on having a primary lease organization leasing and then subleasing it?” Mr. Washington asked if it was like Team A is asking Team B to take their spot. Mr. McKeon replied no somebody not connected to any of the class groups. Mrs. Follweiler then read from the policy where it states that verbal permission will not be given for use of facilities; each request must be submitted as an application lease form. She added, “Meaning that the organization that is leasing has no authority without an application lease form.” It was suggested that “*No subleasing permitted*” be added to the policy.

Mrs. Leeson stated, “We have the same issue that we have had all along. We are subsidizing the youth athletic programs that are not a part of our district, and you have now expanded this that it will now be costing the district even more money as we are continuing to try and reduce our expenses in the district; we are expanding our subsidy, and this is a subsidy of non-district programs.”

Mr. McKeon asked Mrs. Leeson what she was referring to. Mrs. Leeson replied she was referring to the Class IA – district youth athletic programs. She indicated there is no charge even if we have a cost of having a janitor in the building. She also stated the district will be covering the cost of the janitor in the building. Mrs. Leeson also added there has been many times that the janitor will be there anyway, but if it is a time period when there is not a janitor in a facility, the district will be covering that cost. Mr. McKeon referred to Class IA and stated that it indicates that the Class I fee schedule will be applied in custodial...charge one half of the calculated cost... Mrs. Leeson stated the district is still subsidizing. Mr. McKeon said his argument has been all along that he does not think the district has to keep paying site managers. Mrs. Leeson said, “Let me also clarify here... 100% volunteered administered organization... We are now expanded beyond not just the Bulldogs and the ‘canes, but we have expanded to other programs that may currently be paying our fees. We are subsidizing while we are trying to cut in other areas, and we have reduced the number of extra curricular programs that we were offering. We reduced a little bit in our athletic program in the middle school, and then we are going to subsidize outside of the district. I believe that anyone leasing our property needs to pay cost, just cost, and I have said this every time this has come forward.” Mrs. Cann said she does not understand why Mrs. Leeson is saying it is

non-district. Mrs. Leeson replied that the Bulldogs and the 'canes are not district organizations. Mrs. Cann stated they most certainly are. Mrs. Leeson insisted they most certainly are not. Mr. McKeon also said yes they are. Mrs. Leeson replied to both Mrs. Cann and Mr. McKeon that they are non-district. Mr. McKeon believes they are because they are feeder programs. Mrs. Follweiler interceded and asked for one person to speak at a time. Mrs. Cann again stated she does not understand any way in which they are not.

Mrs. Leeson explained that the district has middle and high school programs and would anticipate that some of those students participated in our middle and high school basketball programs as well as the Hurricane program. She added that we have AAU programs and many of our students have learned skills in an AAU program that have benefited their skills at the high school basketball level, but we are not subsidizing the AAU program. She also added that the district has football programs, and the Steelers program that students are coming into our high school programs with has benefited the high school programs. The district also has soccer programs. The Bethlehem Soccer League and the Travel Soccer Teams, but there, again, benefited our high school soccer program, but none of them are district programs. Mrs. Leeson also stated there is a middle school athletic program and the district provides coaches and space at no cost. She reiterated that the other programs – many of them are charging the students a fee to be a part of the program and the students voluntarily – are a separate organization and not run by the district. Mrs. Follweiler said, “The crocks of what Mrs. Leeson’s point is that these programs are not administered by this school district. The school district is not responsible for the programs, we do not organize the schedule, and it is not a district-run program. It may be comprised of students, who attend our schools, and it may be comprised of volunteers that come from living within the district, but I agree with Mrs. Leeson it is not an organization run by this school district. It is someone who runs their organization and comes and utilizes our schools. All be it perhaps for the benefit of our students, but there are many other things in the community that are also for the benefit of our students that the district equally does not administer.”

Mrs. Cann commented that their description is accurate but it does not disposes of the subject. She added, “No the district does not organize these programs, but these organizations exist instead and do it. For basketball and football nothing starts until 7th grade. I’m not sure about the other sports, but it is probably the same in our district. One of the reasons they do not have to is because somebody else is teaching the kindergarteners, first graders and second graders how to play basketball. At least these volunteer organizations are doing that. If we price them out of existence, we are going to have to pick up the slack in a much more expensive way. All of these programs are so supportive that I think it is incumbent upon us to give what we can in support to them which is just facilities. It should help that it says 75% are district students, so it is not some totally foreign group coming in.”

Mr. Burkhardt thinks this a tempest in a teapot. He stated, “It is a small amount of money that is helping kids. We do not charge fall and spring if they want to use our outdoor facilities. A baseball team can use the fields. We do not charge anything for that. The only ones we charge are the winter sports because they are inside the building. We need to treat our kids equally. I think we need to look at the big picture of what we are talking about.”

Mrs. Follweiler asked, “Is it not in our policy that there is a charge if they use our fields?” She stated what Mrs. Leeson’s point is that if there is cost to the district, which would be on a Saturday or Sunday if the facility needs to be opened, or someone has to come. She also added if a field is available and nobody has to come put the bases around the field then there is no cost; if someone is coming in on a Wednesday evening at 5:00 o’clock when there is a janitor in the building anyway, there is no cost. Mrs. Follweiler thinks this is something there has been disagreement amongst the board and suggested to simply clarify this issue and see where the majority feel and move on. She personally feels the same way about this as other areas that are being looked at in the budget. She also commented that the district could not continue to grab all the cost from the property owner. The board is saying it is not much, well then it is also not

much for the organizations to pay for it. She stated, “The district is opening itself up because it is not just the two organizations that are being talked about. This policy clearly states that if it is something within the district and the students that are of school age who live in the Bethlehem Area School District from any volunteer organization can come use our schools. That is every team from any other private school or students of school age in our district. The district facilities should be open to them on a Saturday that is any organization that has students if we want to develop a lacrosse team or something like that, the Bethlehem Township Lacrosse team. It is opening the door for many other organizations. A lot of us were thinking of those two organizations only, which by the way, only provide for people who want to play basketball and football. That is a very small cross section of the students in our district, but will charge the entire population of the taxpayer. I think that anything available should be available to our taxpayers and our students but when the facilities are being opened specifically for this purpose, they should be charged at cost, nothing exorbitant over and above.”

Mr. McKeon’s thinking from day one – the operative word is “at cost.” He said, “I object vehemently to adding a site manager to the Hurricane program and to the Bulldogs when I have a custodian in there on a Saturday or something, and I do not think the Bulldogs (I do not know specifically for sure in the past) have been paying for custodial fees. The issue is adding on the managerial oversight. If you took the managerial oversight away from that and charge them the full janitorial plus, that is what they have been paying for a while. For the Bulldogs they offer softball, soccer, some use their own property, and some use the school district’s property. My main objection is adding the managerial oversight. The custodian knows what he/she is supposed to be doing.”

Mr. Gilliland commented that was their thoughts regarding the site manager. He added, “The proposal for the site manager originally was with outside groups coming in. We have had events running Friday, Saturday and Sunday. The thought process was having somebody there because they have had a number of incidents. They are also there watching out for the district’s interest. I do not see a site manager being involved in everything, but I think it has to be at the discretion if you are going to have an outside group coming in and some of these groups are for profit.”

Mr. McKeon stated if they are for profit his response would be then yes the site managerial fees out of Class IA and insert it in there also. He sought confirmation that the district necessarily does not need a site manager for a Hurricane, Bulldog, or feeder programs that are out there, but there may be a need for somebody else. Dr. Donaher replied that it depends what the event is. If it is a practice, no, but if it is a game where there are people coming in and sitting in stands, that is where the athletic directors are saying they need someone to be there more than just a custodian because they have had situations where parents have come out of the stands and literally attacked the referee. Dr. Donaher also added it should be handled by a site manager not a custodian. The lease itself will dictate when a site manager is required even if there is no charge for the public to come in and see the game. Someone is there to maintain order.

Mr. Washington stated it seems like we are going back and forth. He asked Mrs. Follweiler to poll the board on striking out site manager and charge at half the cost under Class IA fee schedule. Mrs. Follweiler said it was two questions so she will poll the board twice.

Mrs. Cann asked, “Why are the scouts so special? Why were they moved to Class I? How did that happen?” Mrs. Leeson replied, “If I am correct, we have always allowed the scouts to use the facilities up until about two to three years ago and at that time there was an argument. Dr. Lewis argued that they had facilities, a building and an organization, but they have generally met in the school buildings prior to that. If I am correct, this covers like meetings during the week and there is no cost at the time of their meetings, but if they have an event then they would be charged.” Mrs. Cann said that is not what it says in the policy. It says they are exempt regardless of what they are doing. Mrs. Follweiler commented no it says, “*Provide non-primarily athletic programs designed to provide supplemental, activities block watch...*” She thought all of this was meeting rooms. Mrs. Cann said it is not confined during the week, if

they ask to be opened up on a Saturday... Mrs. Follweiler knows that is what she asked for the last go around. She asked if there is wording in the policy that if the building was being opened special for any group then there is a charge of cost.

Mrs. Cann does not know why boys and girls scouts are different from youth sports groups that are also nonprofit. She does not understand why they would be treated differently. She asked that it would be looked at. Mr. Gilliland commented that the intent is that those programs especially the boys and girls scouts programs are ingrained in all the elementary schools. He also added, "We have the highest concentration of scout reach to kids in the area. They also not only do the scouting but they also have an academic component. I can tell you from experience, the scouts use the building twice a year. The one day is the Pinewood Durby, and they hold a summer camp on a Saturday outside and do require a custodian because they have to open the building for the toilets in the facilities. We also have Special Olympics, which we support as a district. We have had up to this point parents actually having to rely on either denying the kids the use of the facilities or going out and having to try get a benefactor." Mrs. Cann stated, "I do not have a problem with either of those being sponsored. I just want the youth groups to be treated the same way. They should all be supported. Second thing is before anything gets changed we absolutely must notify the organizations involved so that they can come and speak. I am not exaggerating when I say that charging them full rate could be the end of these organizations, and they deserve to be able to speak before we take such an action."

Mrs. Leeson commented that the Bulldogs were being charged, there was a discrepancy, and that is where this whole thing started. It was just the Little Canes that were not being charged, and in fact she thinks the Little Canes subsidized the trip for the Christmas tournament. Mrs. Cann interceded and said that a benefactor paid; it was not the 'canes. Mrs. Follweiler said she is going to poll the board with three questions:

1. Do we have the majority that will want to see this policy as it stands on the agenda?

Mr. Faccinetto: No Mr. Burkhardt: No Mrs. Ortiz: No
Mrs. Cann: No Mrs. Leeson: No Mr. McKeon: No

2. Site Manager at the discretion clause under Class IA

Mr. Faccinetto: Yes Mr. Burkhardt: Yes Mrs. Ortiz: Yes Mrs. Follweiler: Yes
Mrs. Cann: Yes Mrs. Leeson: Yes Mr. McKeon: Yes

3. Do you agree classification IA charging half of the calculated cost to be appropriate?

Mr. Faccinetto: Charge Cost Mr. Burkhardt: Half Cost Mrs. Ortiz: Charge Cost
Mrs. Cann: Half Cost Mrs. Leeson: Charge Cost Mr. McKeon: Charge Cost
Mrs. Follweiler: Charge Cost

Mrs. Cann commented that before this is actually on an agenda, she really thinks the board needs to... Mrs. Follweiler said it is only a reading and any person from the public is welcome to come to any courtesy of the floor to speak on the subject. She agrees that they will probably be plenty of people to come to speak on behalf of it. Mrs. Cann asked how is the district going to get the word out, and who can be the person in charge of notifying the organizations of that change. Mr. Washington thinks it will get out through the athletic directors.

Mrs. Leeson noted that in the pool it had something about the site manager being a lifeguard. She stated this has not always been a part of the manager being a lifeguard; that is not always true. The policy reads, "*Pool manager must be a certified life guard.*" Mr. Gilliland agreed it is not and did investigate it, and

feels this is something the district needs to consider. He added, “The public bathing law states there has to be a certified lifeguard on site. What we were worried about was that we insist that the group supply us with the name of the individual they will be using as the lifeguard, we do not, however, know if those people are actually there. The thought was that we would control that, and that particular site manager has to have specific qualifications, i.e., a lifeguard certificate. That was the athletic director’s reasoning for that because they are not sure, and we certainly have to comply with any regulation.”

LIBERTY HIGH SCHOOL TENNIS COURT UPDATE – Mr. Gilliland said, “What typically happens in these courts is over time we get depressions. It is getting really bad with the tennis courts and Mr. Senneca asked if we would go and look at them, which we did. I did some investigating today and found that we have had this on there for quite a while actually almost four years that we have had this. We did Freedom’s courts, and we said that we were going to try to do Liberty’s courts the following year, but economically we just never got around to it. It is at a point that over time you get the divots from the balls and the racks hitting the surface. It needs to be resurfaced. There are probably a couple of areas that we could probably flash patch, but we are talking about a lot of areas. It may cause us more problems.”

Mrs. Follweiler asked if it is in the budget for either this current year or next year. Mr. Gilliland said, “We never put projects “like this” in the budget because again that was the big capital improvement project that had been paid for out of bonds or capital reserve. I do not have it in my budget. I do have funds for projects that we do throughout the year. It is \$120,000.” Mr. McKeon stated, “My concern is that there is a deeper problem than just this. What is causing that to drop in certain areas, which could then entail a major project, which may or may not be justified? I am concerned that there is something underneath that is causing the primary surface to... now we are spending \$35,000 that could cost us \$350,000 in two years.”

Mrs. Follweiler asked when was the last time it was resurfaced. Mr. Gilliland replied he really does not know. He said, “It has not been done since I have been here and that is going on six years.” Mrs. Follweiler would like to see when was the last time it was resurfaced and how long a span typically is between surfacing. She assumes these courts are used for gym class as well as the tennis team. It is not just that the district would need to find a facility for the tennis team to have their matches.

Mrs. Cann said this is not a new issue, and has been “as needed to be done” for some time. She thinks it has been two years now since she went out and looked at it with Mr. Gilliland. This has been put off for a while. She thinks it is time. Mrs. Follweiler thinks those are factors that add into it because if the district is going to be spending \$35,000 when is it that it will have to be done again. She stated this was the same with the buses. There was a cycle that the district knowingly chose not to follow and now along with everything else that is going on with the economy, the district is getting to the point of no return.

Mr. Gilliland stated all he can say is when he talks to Arif Fazil about this now, (he can certainly get specific answers to Mrs. Follweiler’s questions) he knows Arif’s comment will be if you do not do something now you might get to the point where we have to rip the entire thing up and then we are talking really big dollars. Mr. Gilliland explained, “Basically what they do is they come in and they have a patching substance and basically level the playing surface. In other words they skim it off, level it, and then recoat that entire surface.” Mrs. Follweiler thinks the board needs to understand the big picture. She also wanted to know where are the funds going to come from.

Mrs. Ortiz asked if there are any safety concerns for our students at this point. Mr. Gilliland replied that it is to the point where he would have to say yes because those surfaces are supposed to be flat and this one is not. He also added that right now it is an irregular surface, and if somebody steps on it they can twist an ankle. He said you could see white spots of the original surface have come up and now it is exposed to the elements.

Mrs. Leeson asked if the district has funds in the bond. She asked, "Do we have enough funds to cover this?" Mrs. Gober replied, "There is a balance remaining in the bond fund that will pay for this project, but going forward the board needs to be mindful that these kinds of smaller projects really ought to be planned according to the long ranged capital improvement plan and some of these smaller projects should be rolled into the general fund on an ongoing basis rather than using bond proceeds to pay for small normal repairs. This we would categorize as normal repairs and maintenance of the facilities." Mrs. Leeson stated she understands that, but the board can also consider this a capital improvement because usually it does last for a number of years. Mr. Gilliland said this would have to be a bid because of cost.

Mrs. Follweiler asked Mr. Gilliland if he just needed the authority to send the bid out. She said she could take a consensus to see if the board is okay with sending the bid out. She would like the additional information before the board actually votes. She asked the board if there were any objection to sending it out for bid to find out what the actual cost would be. No objections. She also added, "Before the board votes on it, we need to know where the money is coming from exactly and how long will this investment last." She asked about the safety issue, "Is there a way to make sure that they are not utilized if it is a safety issue?" Mr. McKeon asked if the board would be interested in seeing what the total rebuilding it vs. temporary cost/regular maintenance cost. Mr. Gilliland said Arif could give the board an idea. He will send the board the information next week. Mrs. Follweiler said that is fine just as long as the board has the information before voting so they know all the factors.

LEHIGH VALLEY DUAL LANGUAGE CHARTER SCHOOL REQUEST – Dr. Donaher stated he was notified this morning that they are withdrawing their request to reopen the contract to go to grade five.

AGENDA ITEM FOR JUNE 21, 2010, REGULAR BOARD MEETING:

VITALISTIC THERAPEUTIC CHARTER SCHOOL RENEWAL – Mrs. Leeson wanted the board to have the history on the Vitalistic Therapeutic Charter School. She stated, "I just wanted the board to know that it was never approved by the board. It was approved by the state. It was ten years ago when it was adopted, and when it came up for renewal it was not approved either." Mr. Burkhardt asked why was it not approved. Mrs. Leeson said, "The board ten years ago felt that the services being provided was also provided within the school district. They did not see the difference with the services that were available through the Vitalistic Therapeutic Charter School and the services that were available for the emotional needs of disturbed students in our district, and therefore they did not approve it. At that time, there were some other smaller things but that was the major reason as I recall, but then the state overruled that and they put it into place anyway."

Dr. Donaher said, "The original charter that was adopted ten years ago, and reaffirmed five years ago by the state was what I have been told by our solicitor this would be called generic charter. In the mean time, the Allentown School District is also a part of this charter, and they actually did what we have done with the Lehigh Valley Dual Language Charter School, they crafted their own charter. I was able through working with our solicitor and through the solicitor for the Vitalistic Therapeutic Charter School for them to agree to grant us the same charter that they have in Allentown, which is a more detailed and requires more reporting, which they are doing anyway for Allentown, but because our original charter was generic it did not have some of the requirements that Allentown did, so we now have what I would consider it to be a more detailed charter requiring more feedback. Although we do not send very many students to the Vitalistic Therapeutic Charter School, I felt in that regard perhaps it could be in our best interest as a district to actually approve the charter since it is different and it is something that is more specific. It is the board's decision."

Mrs. Leeson asked, "When this originally came up, Vitalistic was located in our district and I think since then they have moved physically into the Allentown area. Is that correct?"

Mr. McKeon stated Vitalistic always had two locations – one in Allentown and one in Bethlehem. They had moved from St. Francis. A piece of their business has really never left our district. They have always maintained another facility.

Mrs. Ortiz expressed that the Vitalistic services are needed in our community. Mrs. Leeson asked Mrs. Ortiz if she has seen the program in our schools and the emotionally disturbed program in our schools. Mrs. Ortiz replied yes she has.

Mrs. Follweiler asked the board if there were any additional questions or comments. She asked if there were any objections to put Vitalistic Therapeutic Charter School Renewal on the agenda for June 21, 2010. No objections.

This item will be placed on the June 21, 2010, Regular Board Meeting Agenda.

TUITION RATES FOR CHILD CARE PROGRAM – Mrs. Follweiler asked if there were any objections to put on the agenda. No objections. This item will be placed on the June 21, 2010, Regular Board Meeting Agenda.

AUTHORIZATION FOR REVISION TO SOLAR GRANT SUBMISSION – Mrs. Follweiler asked if there were any objections to put on the agenda. Mr. McKeon questioned adding facilities to expand... Mr. Gilliland explained, “Originally we had estimated 1.7 mega watts, but once Arif got the engineer and they went out and looked, there is probably 4 mega watts of opportunity there. That is really what this whole thing in the Solar Revision is to build the system up 4 mega watts, which would obviously then also up the grant money that we are supposed to get from them to subsidize.” No objections.

This item will be placed on the June 21, 2010, Regular Board Meeting Agenda.

AUTHORIZATION FOR CONDITIONAL APPROVAL OF SOLAR POWER PURCHASE AGREEMENT – Mrs. Follweiler asked Mr. Gilliland if this was the same thing as the previous item. Mr. Gilliland explained, “With the conditional approval one of the things that we were told was that it would look favorably for a shovel ready project. What had happened was that districts and other organizations that had signed the letter of intent, but never entered into a conditional agreement based on whether the grant was approved or not. Some have had problems with that, so what they have told us is that they want to make sure we are committed to doing this project not so much as doing a conditional approval if the grant money comes through. No objections. This item will be placed on the June 21, 2010, Regular Board Meeting Agenda.

APPROVAL OF THE SUBSTITUTE PLACEMENT SERVICES AGREEMENT WITH AESOP – Mrs. Follweiler asked, “So is this the service that when we need to substitute, they provide the service and we do not do that ourselves?” Mr. Washington explained it is a computer type service where the teachers log in when they are off and the substitutes log in – they match them up. Prior to that there were two people making the calls. No objections. This item will be placed on the June 21, 2010, Regular Board Meeting Agenda.

APPOINTMENT OF BOARD SECRETARY – No objections. This item will be placed on the June 21, 2010, Regular Board Meeting Agenda.

APPOINTMENT OF BOARD TREASURER – No objections. This item will be placed on the June 21, 2010, Regular Board Meeting Agenda.

TUITION WAIVER STUDENTS – No objections. This item will be placed on the June 21, 2010, Regular Board Meeting Agenda.

2010 HOMESTEAD AND FARMSTEAD EXCLUSION RESOLUTION – No objections. This item will be placed on the June 21, 2010, Regular Board Meeting Agenda.

COURTESY OF THE FLOOR – None

OPEN FORUM – Mrs. Follweiler stated there is executive session as soon after open forum this evening – legal and personnel for this evening.

Mrs. Leeson went back to the Vitalistic Therapeutic Charter School discussion and added, “I just want to share with the board that the former board ten years ago spent hours and hours going through documents like this and also going to the site and viewing the program and viewing our program. I also want everybody to understand that when we send a student there I think it cost us around \$14,000 for a special education student, and any student in our own district that is identified as needing those services are given those services within our district and that cost to us is not a full \$14,000. In other words, we lose \$14,000 we do not recoup that by sending a student to those services. Just so you are aware that this is a program that will cost our district money with approval. Again, I would encourage anyone to do your own investigation and to go and look at the different programs. We did take an extensive period of time to look at those before denying it.”

Mrs. Cann said, “If indeed it is still the case that their work is duplicative; they should not be a charter school. That is the definition of and the purpose of having a charter school, but if the state is going to override and approve it anyway then we are better off with this charter.” Mrs. Leeson stated to let Allentown do it. Mrs. Cann said our district would still have it. Mrs. Leeson replied only if our students go there from Bethlehem. Mrs. Ortiz said it is going to be the same thing, and it is going to go back to the state so if the board has the power to push anything then they should. Mrs. Leeson said, “Then we need to take the time we need to get the documents, and you need to review them to go see the two programs and to really go through the documents.”

Mr. Faccineto said the board received a memo on June 4, 2010, about an update with the code of conduct and what Tom Doluisio has been doing. He asked if this is still something that is going to be on the agenda. Mrs. Follweiler said the board has not discussed that at all and was not aware that it was going to be on the agenda. Mr. Faccineto said the memo stated it is going to be on the agenda on June 21, 2010. Mrs. Follweiler polled the board on whether they wanted this item on the agenda or not:

Mrs. Follweiler: I do not want it on the agenda

Mr. Faccineto: I do not want it on the agenda

Mrs. Cann: No. Mr. Doluisio has specifically asked if there is a salary involved and was told that there is not and that was why it was fine. Free help why not. I do not think we should be paying another layer of help.

Mr. Burkhardt – I am not sure how this is going to be accomplished without having somebody involved. I am not against going forward.

Mrs. Follweiler thinks the memo indicated that the board would be voting on the hiring of a consultant that the board has to approve.

Dr. Persing stated, “Well you hired a consultant [Tom Doluisio] in a sense without any charge.” Mrs. Follweiler replied, “Correct we hired one consultant not two.” Dr Persing added, “This person would be helping with the program that Mr. Doluisio has asked for, and it would be funded through a grant without it coming through the general operating budget. By the way today, they held a program, which was at Northeast and it was Mr. Perfetti, and he did an excellent job. Elementary principals came up to compliment on the presentation, some of the principals said since they were hired, they have not had this type of introduction. They were very happy that they finally had their staff development that they needed and that they would hope that it would continue, so I pass that onto you.”

Mrs. Follweiler asked, “Where else could have that money been used for out of that same grant? Are we missing something where we are paying for this out of the grant but we did not pay, or something else went into the general operating budget?” Dr. Persing answered no because all these things have to be determined on a yearly basis, so it does not mean that something else was taken out. Mrs. Ortiz said she did not know if the board had a clear picture on the basis of what was provided, and now the discussion is on bringing on a second person and using grant money to pay for the salary, which was not previously discussed. She also added that the only thing discussed was Doluisio not those two other items.” Dr. Persing said, “It is up you as a board. It is your decision. If you as a board really do not want someone to help with the programs specifically for any reason certainly I would not want to go against your wishes if that is not what you want. I am telling you that in my opinion and my recommendation is that this is a good program that is proceeding properly. It is information that your principals do want. It is information and a procedure that even the union has got behind and thinks that it is proper and that it is essential. If you as a board do not feel that way, that is your privilege. I can only give you my best advice.”

Mr. Faccinetto asked, “Did we not have somebody else offer their services at a charge, and we said no because we did not want to pay somebody else previously?” Dr. Persing replied that is correct. Mr. Faccinetto responded, “That is one thing; now that is an insult to that person, to me as I look at it – well we do not want to pay you, but we will (I do not know who this Monty Perfetti is; I understand he has a history in the district). The other thing is that if Tom Doluisio volunteers time to do this why does this guy not volunteer his time to do it?”

Mrs. Leeson stated, “It has been a district goal – I believe this is our third year – to get the code of conduct back on track. I think I have turned that over to you Dr. Persing to implement. I know you have asked for Mr. Doluisio to help because there is an awful lot going on in our district right now and he did it for free. Am I correct that Mr. Perfetti has already performed the services, and we have used him already?” Dr. Persing replied yes. Mrs. Leeson asked if he was told that he was going to be paid. Dr. Persing answered no, he was told that he would be paid obviously from the grant and naturally that meant that the grant would have to be authorized – the utilization of the funds for that.

Mrs. Leeson stated that Monty Perfetti was used for staff development not for the whole implementation or anything, and the district brought other people in for staff development in other areas. Mrs. Leeson asked, “I think we used Horacio Sanchez this year for a lot of staff development and that came out of grant money. Did the board approve Horacio Sanchez coming in? I am just confused here.” Dr. Persing answered no, but you knew about it. Mrs. Leeson reiterated what he said, “That is right we knew about it.” Dr. Persing added, “You could have stated that you did not want them, but yes that is correct. He was brought in through grant money, and it was part of the staff development.” Mrs. Leeson followed with, “Because we told you we wanted staff development and so you went out and got Horacio and used the money that was set aside for staff development right?” Dr. Persing replied right, through grant money.

Mrs. Leeson continued, “Next question is the money; is this from staff development grant money?” Dr. Persing answered yes. She asked, “Can it be used in any other way?” Dr. Persing responded it could be used for other staff development. Mrs. Leeson asked, “Do we have any other staff development that we are going to do before the end of June that we would use that money for? Is there any other way we would use this money right now?” Dr. Persing answered “No, but I am quite sure that in honesty to your answer, if we wanted to we could find ways of using that money, it is just priority.”

Mrs. Ortiz commented she was very supportive of everything that Dr. Persing does, and the issue was not about the code of conduct but the process. She said the issue that exists is that the board thought it was one person coming in to be a volunteer, the board voted, and then the board did not know anything else until now that they are learning about using grant money to pay for a salary. She also added that she is not against it, but bothered that she did not know this during the process. Dr. Persing replied, “That is why I am bringing it to you; I did not want you to find out any other way. I wanted to make sure, as I have tried

with everything, to bring it to you regardless of whether I have the authority to do it or anything else. I do not want you as the board to be surprised by anything.”

Mr. Faccinetto stated, “This was not clear that it was staff development or professional development so that changes my opinion totally. It just says that he is a consultant.” Mrs. Follweiler stated, “That makes a difference for me because I felt that the objection I had in the last meeting was that we needed to see the plan before making the offer even at a no charge for salary and now we were having a salary. I was afraid how we were going to do this if we had a specific plan as the meetings outlined with Dr. Donaher. It is staff development and training so it makes a lot more sense.” Dr. Persing said, “I am sorry. It was kind of clear, but obviously it was not. I have tried throughout my whole career to make sure that everything that I have accomplished is complete and above board and sometimes when you are doing that you stumble. I should have said it was staff development.”

Mr. Burkhardt asked, “Procedurally you are not bringing that to us for a vote?” Dr. Persing answered, “No, I am not doing that.” Mr. Burkhardt said, “You are informing us”. Dr. Persing said, “I have the authority as the superintendent to use this money in staff development. Once you accept the grant, then I administrate it, but I do not want to do it that way. That is not my style. I just want the board to understand what is going on, so that you do not receive the information second hand.”

Mrs. Leeson commented on the code of conduct, and said, “I was amazed at all of the things you are doing right now and I am turning to you Dean because I am amazed at everything you have done so far, and you have already inserviced the administrators. It has been such a short period of time, and I did hear back today that you did a wonderful job and so I just want to say congratulations to you and now I am going to ask you to continue to keep us updated on what is going on.” Dr. Donaher responded that the administrative team was very receptive, very complimentary, and really appreciated it and also conversations held with teachers, hall monitors and everyone else indicated it was a welcomed opportunity for some people.

Mr. McKeon said, “I saw one of the districts as they are finalizing their budget implemented a program to charge admission for any facility that is used for their interscholastic athletics where you turn the lights on which that would be all the gyms and the football stadium. When I say the stadium, when we are running soccer, field hockey, and volleyball and we put the lights on, we should be charging admission at that level. I am not saying at the middle school level. I think we need somebody to tell me what is it going to cost me to administer that, which is what we think the revenue is going to be, and maybe we ought to go that route. We should weigh that possibility if we can. That becomes a budget issue because you are adding revenue to the budget that is not in the current format for Monday night. Am I correct that if you add revenue you have to factor that in, and millage wise it is minimal?” Mrs. Gober answered, “It would not have a sizable impact in order to require a revision to the budget at this point.” Mr. McKeon commented that maybe the board needs to look at the pros and cons of doing that.

Irene Follweiler adjourned the meeting at 9:36 p.m.

Minutes prepared by: _____
Nitza S. Yerger, Confidential Secretary to the Assistant Superintendent for Human Resources