

**MINUTES OF THE SPECIAL PUBLIC HEARING MEETING OF THE  
CARSON CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT  
BOARD OF TRUSTEES**

**Wednesday, May 15, 2013**

**5:15 p.m.**

**CALL TO ORDER**

The Special Public Hearing Meeting of the Carson City School District Board of Trustees was called to order at 5:15 p.m. by Vice President Stacie Wilke-McCulloch at the Board Room, Carson City School District Office, 1402 West King Street, Carson City, Nevada.

ROLL CALL:    Members Present  
                  Stacie Wilke-McCulloch, Vice President  
                  Ron Swirczek, Clerk  
                  Laurel Crossman, Member  
                  Steve Reynolds, Member  
                  Richard Stokes, Superintendent  
                  Mike Pavlakis, Legal Counsel

Members Absent  
                  Lynnette Conrad, President  
                  Joe Cacioppo, Member  
                  District 6 Seat Vacant

Board Member, Steve Reynolds led the Pledge of Allegiance.

**ACTION TO ADOPT THE AGENDA**

It was moved by Mr. Ron Swirczek, seconded by Mr. Steve Reynolds **that the Carson City School District Board of Trustees adopt the agenda as submitted.** Motion carried unanimously. (Mrs. Conrad and Mr. Cacioppo were not present for the vote.)

**SUPERINTENDENT'S REPORT**

There was no Superintendent report.

**BOARD REPORTS**

There were no Board reports.

**ASSOCIATION REPORTS**

There were no Association reports.

**PUBLIC COMMENT**

There was no public comment.

**PRESENTATION OF BUDGET PREPARATION TIMELINE AND INTRODUCTION OF THE TOPICS FOR THE PUBLIC HEARING ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2013-2014, INCLUDING BRIEF DISCUSSION**

Mr. Anthony Turley, Director of Fiscal Services, provided a brief power point presentation and reviewed the budget timeline for the final budget for fiscal year 2014: (A copy is included in the permanent record.)

- April 15, 2013; Tentative Budget was prepared and submitted to the Department of Taxation, Department of Education (NDOE) and Recorder's Office
- May 5, 2013 and May 8, 2013; Public Hearing notice was complete and published in the Nevada Appeal
- May 15, 2013; Public Budget Hearing at 5:15 p.m.
- May 28, 2013; Approve final budget, if not adopted at the May 15, 2013 Public Hearing; review suggested changes, if any and sign transmittal letter
- June 3, 2013; Legislative Session Ends
- June 8, 2013; Final Budget Deadline, submit to the Nevada Department of Taxation and other agencies

### **INFORMATIONAL UPDATE AND OVERVIEW ON THE FINANCIAL AND OPERATING COSTS FOR THE CCSD NUTRITION SERVICE PROGRAM FROM 2008 – 2012**

Mr. Turley provided a review of the nutrition service program from 2008-2012. Mr. Turley introduced Mr. Fred Ellis, District Manager, ARAMARK Education and Mrs. Rose Wolterbeek, ARAMARK Food Service Consultant, who were available to answer questions.

Mr. Turley reminded Board members that he would make statements; value statements that were made by the District and Board Members as Requests for Proposals (RFP) were provided by various food service companies. One of the main value statements made included keeping district employees with our benefits package. For comparison purposes, Mr. Turley selected a six year period; fiscal year 2008 vs. fiscal year 2013:

- Salaries and Benefits – for district employees, substantial increase in labor costs. 2009 audited financial statements were the amounts provided to ARAMARK. Several things took place in 2009 – 2010; request for reclassification study was completed for all food service workers, where all food service workers received an increase, retroactive to July, 2010. In preparing their evaluation, ARAMARK did not have the information. Difference in FY2010 vs. FY2013; increase in labor costs by approximately \$300,000, which includes step and column. This was outside ARAMARK's control.

Mrs. Wilke-McCulloch asked for clarification regarding the difference between \$1.3 million in fiscal year 2012 vs. \$1.4 million in fiscal year 2011. Mr. Turley explained that the reclassification would have affected the increase between fiscal year 2009 and fiscal year 2010. Mrs. Wilke-McCulloch commented on the difference between fiscal years 2011 and 2012. Mr. Turley explained that the difference between the two fiscal years pertained to efforts of trying to increase participation at Carson High School; adding stations and labor. Each station has a minimum of two employees; one serving and one cashier.

- Per Meal Basis – from \$1.78 to \$2.08. Mr. Turley explained that the food costs for fiscal years 2008, 2009 and 2010 are estimates due to conversion of a new Chart of Accounts. Mr. Turley worked with Ms. Chris Cooper, Nutrition Coordinator to confirm the established target for food costs, which was \$1.30. To verify the costs, Mr. Turley completed an analysis. The costs to ARAMARK have been lower each year; \$1.08 for fiscal year 2013. The rate is a blended rate. The other per meal costs are related to utilities, repairs and maintenance, etc.

Mrs. Wilke-McCulloch asked for additional information regarding purchases in fiscal year 2011 vs. 2012; increase of approximately \$200,000. The area of commodities is being reviewed. Mr. Turley noted a slight improvement this year. In preparation of breakfast in the classroom at Empire Elementary School, carts were purchased. Also included in the totals, were some Capital Project purchases for nutrition services.

Mr. Cacioppo arrived at approximately 5:30 p.m.

- Total Cost per Meal – 2008 was \$3.36; 2009 was \$3.53, largely due to labor costs; 2010 was \$3.68; 2011 was \$3.76; 2012 was \$3.84, with projections for 2013 at \$3.55. The full-pay lunch price for a student at Carson High School is \$2.75; the government provides a small reimbursement of approximately .20 cents per meal. The cost is \$3.55 per meal vs.

approximately \$2.90 for a full-pay meal. The reimbursement from the National Lunch Program is approximately \$2.94 for a free lunch. The average revenue for the Nutrition Services Fund is approximately \$2.90, which is a blended rate between breakfast and lunch. At this time, a transfer from the General Fund is needed.

- General Fund Transfer – transfer prior to ARAMARK was \$700,000 in fiscal year 2008, down to \$260,000 in fiscal year 2010. The average is approximately \$455,000 per year. The transfer amount has stabilized over the last three years, averaging approximately \$440,000.

#### Participation comparison to surrounding counties:

- Carson City School District: enrollment – 7,400; elementary participation – 61% vs. 2010 numbers; enrollment – 7,537; elementary participation – 61%. Compared to other districts in the area, Carson City School District has the highest elementary participation rate. Middle School level is 47%, which is the 2<sup>nd</sup> highest. In 2010, the middle school participation rate was 39%. The participation rate at the high school level has increased from 7% to 20%. Carson High School has closed the campus in an effort to increase participation.
- Lyon County School District: enrollment of 8,300; high school participation rate is 29%; for three high schools.

#### Break Even Analysis:

- Projection in 2013 of serving 810,000 meals, with a transfer of approximately \$470,000
- Labor Costs – as participation increases, labor projected to increase approximately 2.5%
- Meal increments equal 500 additional meals served per day
- 810,000 equals approximately 4,500 meals served per day
- 7,500 meals served per day, equals 100% participation
- 100% participation with variable costs, labor increasing by 2.5%, costs would still not be obtained, nor would the district “break” even

Mr. Turley stressed the District’s decision of maintaining the labor costs; continuing to give step and column increases. At the time of negotiations and organization presentations, ARAMARK had the lowest cost per meal. Another area of importance was to have better nutritional value for our money; healthier foods and greater variety.

#### Menu comparisons:

- Elementary
  - May 4, 2010 – chef salad or pepperoni pizza, canned green beans, canned orange slices and milk vs. May 7, 2013 – sweet & sour chicken w/brown rice, hot dog on whole grain bun, chef salad with a whole grain roll, fresh fruit/vegetables, French fries, lettuce/spinach salad, fresh cucumber, banana, apple juice/milk
- Middle School
  - May 4, 2010 – chef salad or bean & cheese burrito, taco sauce pack, corn, fruit cocktail, brownie, powdered sugar and milk vs. May 7, 2013 – General TSAO chicken w/brown rice, popcorn chicken w/whole grain roll, Hawaiian pizza, cheese pizza, peanut butter & jelly sandwich, fresh fruit/vegetables, lettuce/spinach salad, French fries, cucumber, banana, apple juice/milk
- High School – hot lunch was not the only option; local businesses offered lunch items for students to purchase
  - May 4, 2010 – French bread pepperoni pizza, potato wedges, spinach/lettuce salad w/Italian dressing, pineapple, gingerbread, powdered sugar and milk vs. May 7, 2013 – Grille: hamburger, cheese burger, chicken patty, chicken nuggets, corn dog; Pizzeria: sausage, cheese or pepperoni; Deli: made to order sandwiches or peanut butter sandwiches; Nacho Station: beef/bean burritos, chicken/beef soft tacos and nachos; Asian Station: orange chicken, beef/broccoli bowl, Chow Mein, fried brown rice, Asian chicken salad, Thai noodle salad, sweet & sour chicken, General TSAO chicken w/brown rice, fresh fruits/vegetables, lettuce/spinach salad, tater tots, steamed broccoli, celery, banana, apple juice/milk

Mr. Turley highlighted the variety of choices and a healthier menu. The grille, pizzeria, deli, nacho station and Asian station at Carson High School are open daily. In addition to the fresh fruit/vegetables and salad, there are now 21 offerings at Carson High School vs. 2 in 2010.

Mr. Turley believes ARAMARK has fulfilled their proposal regarding nutritious value and quality of food. At the time that ARAMARK made their presentation, Mr. Turley had been with the district for less than a month and was not familiar with the nutrition service program. In reviewing their proposal, Mr. Turley looked to make sure that there were no obvious errors that would cause their cost per meal price to be different than their projected amount. A break-even analysis was not completed at that time. Mr. Turley reiterated that the nutrition program will not break-even by the way it is currently being operated.

Mr. Turley is pleased with the working relationship the district has with ARAMARK and recommended the continued use of their services. ARAMARK will be presenting a proposal to continue their use for next year.

Mr. Cacioppo commented on the number of healthy choice offerings. He also asked if there was a way to track the number of items wasted. Mr. Turley explained that production records are kept on a daily basis. Ms. Cooper explained that production records of what is made vs. what students take, are required. High school students must be offered a full cup of fruits/vegetables. Students are required to take a ½ cup, not the full cup; it must be on their tray when they walk away. Ms. Cooper confirmed that they do have wasted food. Ms. Cooper complies with the requirements set forth by the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA). Mr. Cacioppo asked if the district has the ability to alter the menu based on the student's likes and dislikes. Ms. Cooper explained that the Cafeteria Managers meet monthly to discuss the menu for the next month. Pizza is the most popular item sold.

Mr. Reynolds expressed his understanding of the discussions that took place several years ago; however, he believes the numbers pertaining to the growth in breakfast, etc. should be looked at. In addition, Mr. Reynolds believes other factors need to be considered; schedule at Carson High School, etc. Mr. Turley commented on the increased breakfast participation at Empire Elementary School; 61% due to "breakfast in the classroom". Mr. Reynolds would like to see another presentation on ways and additional steps that can be made to increase participation throughout the district.

Mrs. Wilke-McCulloch asked if there has been any feedback about going to two lunches at Carson High School. Mr. Turley explained that at this time, the current Principal is opposed to having two lunches. Mrs. Wilke-McCulloch confirmed that changes have been noticed with having the free/reduced lunch applications available online.

**DISCUSSION AND ACTION ON THE NUTRITION SERVICES PROGRAM APPLICATION FOR FUNDING AND SUBMISSION OF THE STATE AGENCY SPONSOR AGREEMENT TO THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION FOR SCHOOL YEAR 2013-2014**

Ms. Chris Cooper requested Board approval of the Nutrition Services Program application for funding the 2013-2014 school year. Each year a weighted average of meal prices is provided from the Department of Education. Ms. Cooper entered the meals served in October, 2012, along with the meal prices, in order to determine if meal prices need to be changed. There will be a price increase of \$.15 for elementary schools for 2013-2014, which is based on information provided by the federal government to ensure that adequate funding is provided to food service accounts for paid lunches. The prices at Carson High School will remain the same due to the campus closure during lunch.

Price matrix for 2013-2014:

• Elementary	Breakfast - \$1.50	Lunch - \$2.55
• Middle School	Breakfast - \$1.50	Lunch - \$2.65
• High School	Breakfast - \$2.75	Lunch - \$2.75
• Adults	Breakfast - \$2.00	Lunch - \$3.75

Ms. Cooper presented data comparing meal pricing to other outlying counties, representing their current meal rate.

Mr. Turley presented projected revenue sources for nutrition services:

- \$502,080 from cash sales; students paying for breakfast and/or lunch, a la carte sales
- \$1.7 million from federal programs
- (\$138,000) commodity foods
- \$474,000 transfer from the general fund, based on needs and expenditures

It was moved by Mr. Steve Reynolds, seconded by Mr. Joe Cacioppo **that the Carson City School District Board of Trustees approve the Nutrition Services Program application for funding and the State Agency Sponsor Agreement to the Department of Education for the 2013-2014 School Year.** Motion carried unanimously. (Mrs. Conrad was not present for the vote.)

### **DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION OF THE CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN FOR FISCAL YEAR 2014, INCLUDING THE OPENING BALANCE IN FUND 300; CAPITAL PROJECTS**

Mr. Turley provided information on the Capital Improvement Projects for fiscal year 2014 through 2018. The carry forward amount from fiscal year 2013 is \$1,959,512. The other primary funding source for Capital Projects is the Government Services Tax (GST). The Capital Projects budget for fiscal year 2013 includes the following:

- Government Services Tax - \$408,000, which gives a total available revenue for 2013-2014 of \$2,370,000
- Beginning Fund Balance, carry forward from fiscal 2013 - \$390,000
- Total resources for fiscal year 2013 - \$2,370,512
- Budgeted - \$1,468,000
- Designated Ending Fund Balance for 2012-2013 of \$902,512
- Projecting \$700,000 from Pay As You Go (PAYG), for remaining four years of five year Capital Project Plan

In previous years, a designated amount has been determined for a specific facility. As adjustments were made to the Master Plan and bond project listing, some of the items have been included in the listing of Capital Projects.

Mr. Stokes explained that money has been identified to modernize and address needs at the district office; safety, security and improved floor plan.

Mrs. Crossman clarified that Capital Project Funds are different than Bond Project Funds. Mr. Turley explained that the difference is the source of the revenue. Bond revenue is generated from the sale of bonds, with projects being funded by the identified revenue. The source of revenue for the Capital Project Fund is an identified amount from the GST assigned to every motor vehicle registration, which is given to school districts for Capital Projects. In 2010, the roll-over bond question set the tax rate at .43 cents per \$100 dollars of assessed valuation. The passage of the bond allowed the district to use the dollar amount of revenue received from property tax valuation, identified toward debt service, not needed to pay the debt service or to keep reserve requirements where it needed to be, to be removed from the PAYG money and placed in the Capital Project fund.

Mrs. Wilke-McCulloch compared Capital Projects to routine maintenance on your home.

Mr. Turley explained that the PAYG allows the district to take money as an additional source of revenue. There are no PAYG funds included in the Capital Plan. The carry forward balance from the previous year; \$1.9 million does include some PAYG funds.

Mr. Swirczek asked for additional information regarding plans associated with the district office. Mr. Turley explained that this is a proposal and at this time, there are no conceptual plans. Conceptual plans will be considered after July 1, 2013. Mr. Swirczek commented on the timeline and amount of money identified for plumbing upgrades associated with the Culinary Arts program at Carson High School. Mr. Turley explained that the project list was reviewed with Mr. Keith Shaffer, Projects Manager and Mr. Mark Korinek, Manager of Operation Services. They reviewed the critical necessity of projects at each site. Mr. Turley deferred to Mr. Shaffer.

Mr. Shaffer commented on previous discussions regarding how the focus changed to security improvements and enhancements for each school. There were several projects at certain sites across the district where the funding was re-evaluated. In addition to security enhancements for Carson High School, there is approximately \$470,000 noted for projects, not yet identified.

Mr. Swirczek asked how the scope of work and decision was made to modify the administrative building. Mr. Turley explained that the project has been previously identified on the Capital Project list; however, it has been postponed for several years. Last year, \$100,000 was identified for use on the initial design, which was not spent and rolled into the new year. Mr. Turley referenced several needs at the building; baseboard heating in Board Room, secure entry, etc. Mr. Shaffer added that as a Committee, they decided what would be spent using the Capital Funds budget for the next five years. Mr. Shaffer highlighted several areas regarding the district office; maintenance costs continue to increase, etc. Mr. Korinek explained that the project has been postponed for 5 to 6 years and heating costs during the winter months have doubled.

Mr. Swirczek asked for clarification on how projects were prioritized and how they will continue to be funded; 1:1 mobile technology project. Mr. Turley explained that the district has a limit on what can be funded by Capital Project funds for the 1:1 project, as it does not meet the criteria. Mr. Turley is working with Mrs. Janice Towns, Manager of Information Technology on continuing the roll-out of the 1:1 project using Capital Project funding; \$100,000. Mr. Swirczek asked for specifics associated with the \$100,000. Mr. Turley explained that it will cover part of the hardware and equipment, purchase tablets, etc. However, it does not cover reoccurring costs; one-time purchases. Mr. Swirczek asked how much is needed to purchase tablets, notebooks, etc. for all students. Mrs. Towns explained that the cost for one year, beginning in 2013-2014 for all 7,800 students would be approximately \$3.4 million; leveraging the E-rate to purchase laptops at a cost of \$50.00. If purchased outright without the broadband, the cost increases by an additional \$2 million.

Mr. Reynolds inquired about the inclusion of the applications. Mrs. Towns explained that the applications are "cloud based"; therefore, there have been no reoccurring costs.

Mr. Swirczek confirmed the fact that \$100,000 will not cover many students.

Mr. Reynolds confirmed the purpose of providing the 5 year Capital Project plan to the Department of Education and that the district has the flexibility to change how the funds are spent. Mr. Turley explained that Board approval is needed to change the spending on Capital Projects during the first year. The Board is voting to expend the identified amount in the first year of a five year plan.

It was moved by Mrs. Laurel Crossman, seconded by Mr. Steve Reynolds **that the Carson City School District Board of Trustees approve the Capital Improvement Plan and the Opening Balance, Fund 300; Capital Projects for Fiscal Year 2014.** Motion carried unanimously. (Mrs. Conrad was not present for the vote.)

**DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON THE FINAL BUDGET, INCLUDING ADJUSTMENTS TO THE TENTATIVE BUDGET, FOR THE CARSON CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2013-2014, INCLUDING ADOPTION OF A RESOLUTION APPROVING THE FINAL BUDGET AND TRANSMITTAL LETTER**

Mr. Turley explained that the first draft of the Distributive School Account (DSA) allocation was received after the final budget was provided to the Nevada Department of Education (NDOE). The presentation will also include recommendations from staff, along with information on how the DSA could potentially impact the budget.

Mr. Turley presented historical student enrollment data from fiscal year 2006 to fiscal year 2013; drop from count day through May, 2013, down approximately 69 students. In summary, the district typically sees an increase in students from May until count day at the start of the new school year. The budget is based on assumptions that there will be no significant decrease in the number of students for fiscal year 2013-2014. Due to the anticipated student enrollment, the district will receive funding under the; "hold-harmless" category. The budget was created using the per pupil allocation from the 2013 count day.

Mr. Turley reviewed revenue and expenditure assumptions that have been made since the presentation of the tentative budget:

April Revenue Assumptions included in 2013-2014 final budget:

- Governor's budget plan included a 2% increase, equal to \$122 increase in per pupil DSA allocation; \$6,231 per pupil
- Ad Valorem tax decrease of 10%
- Local School Support Tax (LSST) increase by 6.1%; based on Department of Taxation revenue projections
- Motor Vehicle Tax increase of 0.8%
- Other appropriations remain the same

Revenue Changes to General Fund from Tentative Budget:

- \$231,556 beginning fund balance adjustment
  - Race to the Top impact to the district for fiscal year 2013 operating expenditures
  - Savings due to hiring of staff for the remainder of the contract for April, 2013 – August, 2013
- \$231,556 increase in available resources
  - Suggested use is to fund the contingency account, which is based on the recommendation by auditors

General Fund Revenue Summary; FY2012 actual vs. FY2013 estimated actual vs. FY2014 budget:

- LSST; declined from fiscal year 2012; \$16,463,239 to \$16,072,751 for fiscal year 2013, increasing for fiscal year 2014 to \$17,044,381. Dollar for dollar offset; every dollar increase in LSST equals decrease for DSA
- 1/3 Ad Valorem Tax; fiscal year 2012 equals \$3,509,354, decreased to \$3,368,491 for fiscal year 2013; continuing to decrease for fiscal year 2014 to \$3,024,161
- State portion of DSA is the guaranteed per pupil amount, minus the LSST and 1/3 Ad Valorem Tax = \$25.2 million for fiscal year 2014
- Total DSA = \$43.6 million for fiscal year 2012; \$44.4 million for fiscal year 2013 and \$45.3 million for fiscal year 2014
- 2/3 Ad Valorem = \$7 million for fiscal year 2012 vs. \$6 million for fiscal year 2014
- Transfer from Alternative Compensation Fund for fiscal year 2013 = \$1.4 million
- Other appropriations/miscellaneous revenue = \$1.8 million for fiscal year 2013
- Total General Fund Resources = \$53,250,344

Expenditures Assumptions:

- Increase in health benefit costs of 15%
- Textbook adoption; 1:1 Mobile Project and Success for All (SFA) district wide - \$700,000
- Freeze to Step/Column - \$1.3 million
- Voluntary Separation Incentive Program (VSIP) Savings - \$1.45 million
- Reduction of 2 work days - \$480,000
- Other reductions outlined in the Superintendent's proposal - \$1.18 million
- Establish a contingency fund - \$231,556

Mr. Turley summarized total expenditures for fiscal year 2013, which includes salaries, VSIP, etc.:

- Salaries and benefits - \$41 million
- Services and supplies - \$8 million
- Transfers to other funds - \$6.6 million
- Total - \$55.7 million; reduced from \$59,538,620 in fiscal year 2013

Fund Balance:

- Projected ending fund balance - \$6.8 million
- Revenue - \$53.2 million
- Total Resources - \$60.1 million
- Expenditures - \$55.7 million
- Contingency - \$231,556
- Ending Fund Balance - \$4.1 million; 8.35% of expenditures in General Fund

Mr. Turley explained that on May 10, 2013, DSA projections were received from the NDOE, which were different than the Governor's proposed budget.

- Per pupil amount increase to \$6,537; \$306 increase from what was included in the final budget as presented
- Final DSA allocation will not be known until the Legislature closes the NDOE K-12 Budget
- Approximately \$2,250,000 in additional revenue to the general fund, which was not accounted for in the final budget

Mr. Turley presented staff recommendations for enhancing the budget based on discussions amongst administrative staff.

Mrs. Wilke-McCulloch asked for additional information regarding the librarians and elementary counselors. Mr. Stokes explained that the December 10, 2012 plan was brought forth in the final budget. For planning purposes, certified librarians will be at the secondary schools, with classified staff covering the duties at the elementary level. Three certified librarians at the elementary level were placed as a teacher or given the opportunity to apply for a secondary library position within the district; they did not lose their jobs. In reference to elementary counselors; two were given Reduction in Force (RIF) notices, one was hired at Carson High School using Race to the Top grant funds, creating a third vacancy. There were two least senior counselors that did not receive contracts for the 2013-2014 school year.

Mr. Swirczek stressed the importance of having elementary school counselors.

Mr. Turley reviewed the prioritized listing of staff recommendations for budget enhancements:

- Priority Level 1:
  - Based on Memorandum of Understanding (MOU); re-open contract discussions to restore step and column for fiscal year 2014 - \$1.3 million
  - Restore district wide administrator for English as a Second Language (ESL) program and Department of Justice (DOJ) report - \$122,000
  - WIFI hardware upgrades at all sites for implementation of 1:1 mobile project; - \$500,000
- Priority Level 2:
  - Restore custodial staff, which is needed to cover increased square footage - \$135,000

Mrs. Wilke-McCulloch inquired as to where custodial staff reductions were made. Mr. Turley explained that there were two elementary positions and one associated with a RIF. As it pertains to a RIF, classified staff does not have the same restrictions as certified staff. Mr. Stokes explained that they look at the total full-time employees (FTE) vs. the site location positions. If three FTE's were not included in the budget, modifications to cover the sites would need to be made; one custodian would not be left at a site. District staff would review the types of adjustments needed to cover the needs at each site.



- Keep district cell phones to address safety and security - \$50,000
- School Resource Officers - \$35,000
- Eliminate pay to participate, in response to comments provided during community meetings - \$50,000
- Total Recommendations - \$2,225,000
- Balance to be placed in the contingency account - \$25,000

Mrs. Crossman asked for clarification regarding the pay to participate revenue amount of \$50,000 vs. \$25,000. Mr. Turley explained that the amount of \$25,000 was only for sport activities, but when expanded to all extra-curricular activities, requiring transportation, the amount was approximately \$50,000.

Mrs. Wilke-McCulloch confirmed that the \$50,000 was already included in the initial plan as presented.

Mr. Turley reviewed the options regarding fiscal year 2014 final budget:

- Approve and submit final budget as presented, without including the increased DSA amount
- Upon completion of the Legislative session, the district has 30 days to amend the budget, which would include the additional \$2.25 million
- Direct staff to make changes and approve the final budget at the May 28, 2013 Board meeting; sign transmittal letter and budget resolution at that time

Mr. Turley reminded Board members that there are no Board meetings between the May 28, 2013 meeting and the June 8, 2013 deadline for submitting the final budget. He also noted that, if necessary, a meeting could be scheduled.

Mrs. Crossman noted, that with the meeting on May 28, 2013, the budget could still be submitted, with changes being made following the Legislative session.

Mr. Swirczek suggested that no action be taken tonight until final numbers are available. In addition, Mr. Swirczek believes there needs to be another discussion regarding elementary counselors. Mr. Swirczek referenced the minutes from the March 26, 2013 Board meeting regarding comments made by Mr. Warren Wish; is it important for schools to reach out to students and families and respond to the teachers when students come to school with problems. Mr. Swirczek questioned who would have the time and/or skills to make a difference. Mr. Swirczek asked several questions of administrative staff; does the district have a coordinated elementary school plan or is it determined by each Principal, does the district have a Behavioral Specialist, does the district keep statistics and what does the district evaluate things on? Mr. Swirczek stressed the importance of the elementary counselors. Mr. Swirczek commented on information shared by the elementary counselors regarding 4 components; student issues dealing with depression, suicide, abuse, etc. In addition, Mr. Swirczek referenced several community beliefs within the Strategic Plan; every student must have the opportunity to excel. Based on research and information from across the country, Mr. Swirczek is troubled that the district is not planning on having 3 elementary school counselors. Another belief; students must be empowered to achieve a healthy, physical, emotional and social life style. Based on comments provided by elementary counselors, not all students have a good home life. Mr. Swirczek commented on the staff recommendations and believes other things could be done in some areas. From an administrative point, Mr. Swirczek asked for reasons as to why the district would not have at least 3 elementary counselors in the district.

Mr. Stokes explained that in September, 2012, administrators were polled and a plan was developed. Mr. Stokes noted that the recommendations also deal with and are significant for students. The plan also included having a Vice Principal at each elementary school. Mr. Stokes recognized the important work that counselors do and have done.

In support of comments made by Mr. Swirczek, Mr. Cacioppo asked if there was a “middle ground”; roaming counselor. Mr. Stokes explained that one suggestion provided during the public hearing was to split the time of one elementary counselor between two schools.

Mr. Reynolds expressed his appreciation for the comments made. He also commented on previous discussions that took place with site administrators regarding the needs for their sites and the net effect received by each school by having a Vice Principal at each elementary school. Mr. Reynolds expressed his respect for elementary school counselors, but also agrees that every teacher, librarian, administrator, etc. does similar work, as presented by the elementary counselors on March 22, 2013. Mr. Reynolds noted one area associated with the counselors; due to certifications, they cannot be used for testing, etc. Mr. Reynolds also commented on how the job duties varied from school to school. As presented by the counselors, they were performing many other duties; leaving teachers and others to complete some of their work. Mr. Reynolds reiterated comments made by Principals’ on how they could better use a Vice Principal vs. having an elementary school counselor. At this time, Mr. Reynolds sees no reason why he would change suggestions made by staff. Prior to including elementary counselors back in the budget, he would need to know that a particular role of the counselor is not being performed.

Mr. Swirczek asked if the district has a district wide plan and job description that is used in evaluating school counselors or is it up to the site administrator. Mr. Swirczek believes elementary counselors should be focused on students and preventative services. Mr. Swirczek asked if the district employs a Behavior Specialist. Mr. Stokes explained that the district hires individuals that have Special Education credentials that work in behavioral areas. The district also employs school psychologists. The elementary school counselors have served in a functional role, having their own areas of interest, training and skills. They work under the direction of the Principal. The evaluation document is used by all counselors. There are a number of items counselors are responsible for and evaluated on. At this time, the district does not have a specific curriculum for elementary counselors.

Mr. Swirczek responded to comments made by Mr. Reynolds; time sensitivity to address student concerns, ability to provide immediate assistance, etc. Mr. Swirczek would like to reinstate the 3 elementary school counselors to be shared amongst the elementary schools. In addition, he would like to see the counselors get together to develop a uniform district plan to address issues and problems faced by students.

Mrs. Crossman asked if each school has a school psychologist. Mr. Stokes explained that the district does not employ school psychologists for each school; they have a case load and travel amongst the schools. Mrs. Crossman expressed concerns with students feeling comfortable to approach Vice Principals. Mr. Stokes explained that school psychologists don’t typically handle the same type of work load as a counselor. Mr. Stokes provided additional reasons to have a Vice Principal at each elementary school; Principals’ will be expected to be educational leaders, complete teacher evaluations, etc. School Psychologists function in a different capacity; have clinical responsibilities, which in most cases is associated with Special Education.

Mrs. Wilke-McCulloch reminded Board members of comments previously made by Mrs. Conrad; if there was a contingency fund, she would like to see elementary counselors added back to the plan. Mrs. Wilke-McCulloch commented on personal experiences her children had with their elementary school counselors. Mrs. Wilke-McCulloch would also like to see the plan include keeping 3 elementary school counselors.

Public Comment:

Mrs. Casey Gilles, Principal, Fremont Elementary School responded to comments regarding Vice Principals being approachable. In working at 3 elementary schools, Mrs. Gilles hasn’t seen that as a concern, as students see everyone as a team; Vice Principal, Counselor, Principal, Nurse, etc.

Mr. Jeff Greb, Ormsby County Education Association (OCEA), Vice President commented on the districts acknowledgment of the possibility of reopening negotiations based on the negotiated agreement, following the outcome of the legislative session. Mr. Greb commented on the possibility of discussing staffing during the contract reopening; members may look to identify if the money should be reinstated specifically or for staffing levels in general.

Mrs. Laura Austin, Principal, Mark Twain Elementary School commented on how the responsibility of counselors has changed over the last several years. The role of a counselor includes providing assistance to families, in addition to student. As a Principal, Mrs. Austin commented on some of the difficulties she's had with parents after having to discipline their student. Mrs. Austin has been an advocate for having a part-time counselor.

Dr. Jose Delfin, Associate Superintendent of Human Resources explained that as a way to bridge the gap with families, the district has other staff members that provide assistance in many areas; English as a Second Language (ESL) Para-Professionals, McKinney-Vento Advocate, etc. There are also Parent Home Advocates, in addition to other staff throughout the district that assists with emotional situations.

In lieu of a motion, Mr. Swirczek recommended that staff come back to Board members with the inclusion of 3 elementary school counselors, to be shared amongst the 6 elementary schools. Mr. Swirczek also commented on the possibility of going below the 8.3% ending fund balance.

Mr. Turley reminded Board members of the auditors' recommendation to establish a contingency account and asked for clarification; include 3 elementary school counselors in the plan and forgo establishing the contingency account. To her knowledge, Mrs. Wilke-McCulloch believes the direction was to establish a contingency account, however, that was prior to knowing that there might be additional funding.

Mr. Pavlakis commented on several possibilities the Board could take regarding the budget and the contingency account.

Mr. Swirczek clarified that contingency funds have been available, but included in other accounts. The current recommendation by auditors is to remove it from the line items and establish an identifiable account.

It was moved by Mr. Ron Swirczek, seconded by Mr. Steve Reynolds **that the Carson City School District Board of Trustees direct the Superintendent and staff to come back with a final budget presentation with reinstating at least 3 elementary counselors to be shared with all elementary schools and continue the discussion at the May 28, 2013 School Board meeting.**

Mr. Cacioppo would like to have it open for creativity and options.

Mr. Stokes reminded Board members that on May 1, 2013, the district had to provide Letters of Intent to certified staff. There were two counselors that did not receive Letters of Intent. Mr. Stokes explained that to lay-off staff at this time would create an unwelcome situation. The district has taken steps to account for staff retirements, people leaving on their own accord, etc., and not filling vacant positions. At this time the easiest thing to do is to wait until funding is certain and then begin the recall process, which is a part of the negotiated agreement. Mr. Stokes also commented on the uncertainty associated with the negotiation process. As an additional reference, Mr. Stokes asked everyone to view the timeline that was available for consideration.

Mrs. Crossman confirmed that teaching staff also received Letters of Intent by the May 1<sup>st</sup> deadline. Dr. Delfin confirmed that staffing identified in the budget plan were not offered Letters of Intent. Based on the budget, Mrs. Crossman inquired about the possibility of hiring staff members back. As it pertains to RIF notices, only 2 counselors were affected. However, several teachers did not sign their Letters of Intent due to personal reasons. Mr. Stokes also noted that student teacher ratios were increased. Mr. Stokes explained that the district did not hire back

teachers that accepted the Voluntary Separation Incentive Plan (VSIP) or those deciding not to return to the district. The budget plan as presented is the plan that was followed. The number of teachers needed was based on the staffing standard for grades 1 – 3 and grades 4 – 12. At this time, staffing is in place that meets the budget as presented, keeping the 8.3% ending fund balance.

Mr. Reynolds commented on the number of other positions that will not be available in the coming years; do other positions have the same value as the counselor positions. In addition, Mr. Reynolds commented on the possibility of receiving additional funds; not knowing the amount or how much due to reopening negotiations. Once funds become available, additional decisions will need to be made regarding how they might be spent. These items will likely take place after the budget has been submitted to the DOE. If the proposed budget is confirmed based on the information presented, no set commitments will be made for funding that the district doesn't have. Mr. Reynolds confirmed that at this time, if the budget is approved, that nothing has been set that would prevent revisions from being made once additional funding becomes available.

Mr. Stokes reminded Board members that the Department of Education reminded district's that the figures are preliminary. Mr. Stokes believes the most conservative method is to proceed with the current budget plan, modifying as additional information becomes available. Mr. Stokes commented on having a district philosophy of having one counselor per two schools at the elementary level. In moving forward, the district would budget for that now and in the years to come.

Mrs. Crossman confirmed the procedure and asked if there was a deadline as to when adjustments could be made to the budget. Mr. Stokes explained that amendments have typically been made prior to the end of the calendar year. Mr. Stokes reminded Board members that the district is currently working to establish staffing, set procedures and secure employment for people that have been laid off. Mr. Turley explained that Nevada Revised Statute 354.598005 provides information regarding amending a budget. Amendments can be made during a legislative session; 30 days following the session for revenue or expenditures. As a school district, based on the impact of count day, the budget can be amended until December 31<sup>st</sup>. There are other times that budget amendments can be made, which are typically adjustments in revenue; property tax revenues come in higher than projected. The adjustment would need to be brought before the Board, prior to the last Board meeting in June.

As a reminder, Mr. Turley referenced the Fund Balance; the ending fund balance will be reduced by \$2.7 million, which means that revenues and expenditures are still out of balance by the same amount. During the budget process next year, the ending fund balance will not be available to supplement revenue; therefore, additional reductions will need to be considered for next year.

Mr. Swirczek believes it is important to include a minimum of 3 elementary counselors in the budget plan by using the amount for the proposed contingency fund account.

Following the discussion, Mrs. Wilke-McCulloch called for vote; 2 yeah, 3 Nay, motion died.

Prior to making another motion, Mr. Reynolds commented on some of the points made about keeping the 3 elementary school counselors. Mr. Reynolds doesn't believe that including the elementary school counselors is off the table, as the proposed budget presented by staff is not final. Mr. Reynolds would like to see the budget transmitted as presented, knowing that changes can be made and presented in the future.

It was moved by Mr. Steve Reynolds, seconded by Mrs. Laurel Crossman **that the Carson City School District Board of Trustees adopt the Final Budget for Fiscal Year 2013-2014 to be transmitted to the State by approving the Resolution and the Transmittal Letter and further instructing the Director of Fiscal Services to file the necessary documents to comply with NRS Chapter 354, with the understanding that this does not designate how the funds will be expended that may be received in addition to the planned budget.** 4 yeah, 1 Nay, Motion passed. (Mrs. Conrad was not present for the vote.)

**APPROVAL OF CONSENT AGENDA**

There were no consent agenda items for consideration.

**REQUEST FOR FUTURE AGENDA TOPICS**

Present agenda items to Mr. Richard Stokes or President Steve Reynolds.

**ANNOUNCEMENT OF MEETINGS**

The next regular meeting of the Carson City School District Board of Trustees will be on Tuesday, May 28, 2013.

**ADJOURNMENT**

There will be no further business to come before the members of the Board in public meeting; Vice President Stacie Wilke-McCulloch declared the meeting adjourned at 7:47 p.m.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Ron Swirczek, Clerk

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date