Sands, Jeffrey

From:

Sands, Jeffrey

Sent:

Friday, January 18, 2019 3:22 PM

To:

Polito, David; Lee, Gene; Jeanise Bertrand; Gertz, Kerry; Wolczik, Peter; Stacey

Metternick; Michelle, Bailey; Harvey, Michael

Subject:

Responses #2 > FW: BUDGET WORKSHOP

All,

Please see my responses (in red) to Stacey's FY20 Budget questions below.

As you think about the Budget, please remember the following:

- 1) We have executed a new CBA with the Teachers Union and the FY20 Budget reflects the terms outlined in that agreement; and
- While we don't yet have a new CBA in place with either the Office Personnel Union or the Custodial/Maintenance Union our FY20 Budget still incorporates key assumptions for COLA increases, etc. for all personnel covered by these units.

Regards, Jeff

From: Stacey Metternick

Sent: Tuesday, January 15, 2019 3:05 PM

To: Polito, David

Cc: Gertz, Kerry; Lee, Gene; Wolczik, Peter; Jeanise Bertrand; Bailey, Michelle; Harvey, Michael; Sands, Jeffrey

Subject: Re: BUDGET WORKSHOP

Importance: High

- 1. Administration is up 8.6% = \$101,460, why this increase.. Primary drivers of the increase includes \$73,000 for a new School Resource Officer, \$13,459 for Sick Day Buy Back (See January 16th Written Response), and budgeted COLA increases for the 2.0 FTEs in the Superintendent's Office and the 6.5 FTEs in the Assistant Superintendent's Office.
- 2. HS up 4.89%? What is making this increase so high? All 74.8 FTE HS personnel are budgeted to receive a COLA increase, plus 21 of the HS teachers are budgeted to receive a STEP increase, plus 6 of the HS Teachers are budgeted to receive a Salary Advancement / Degree Change adjustment. Additionally, 3.0 FTE TAs were reassigned to the HS from the MS see January 16th Written Response. You will see an offsetting reduction of 3.0 TA FTEs and related expenses in the MS budget.
- 3. Athletics up \$5.12%, how come? Primary drivers include COLA increases for all coaching positions, a COLA increase for each AD staff (Genualdo and Muzio), a 2.5% increase in all Transportation, Field Lining, & Ice Time costs, a \$13,500 increase in Tennis Program Transportation (Boys and Girls), and a \$4,000 increase in Tennis Program Court Rental costs.
- 4. Central office up 8.22%?? See January 16th Written Response

5. Fringe benefits up 13.66% what does this include and why so high?? This account category includes increases for Essex Retirement Pension at \$78,350, OPEB Trust Fund at \$250,000, and Healthcare at \$198,159.

Increase cost %

6. Can you explain extended responsibilities: See January 16th Written Response. See New Teacher Contract

a.	Buker	\$1417	10.93% increase
b.	Cutler	\$1417	10.93%
c.	Winthrop	\$1417	10.93%

- 7. Librarian Can we combine, when library is shared? There is nothing to combine. There is only one HS/MS Librarian (Davis). See January 16th Written Response.
 - a. Buker, Cutler, Winthrop-none

b.	MS	\$15,861	21.33%
c.	HS	\$15861	21.33%

8. Professional salary – extra curricular.. why such a jump See January 16th Written Response. See New Teacher Contract

a.	Buker	\$2914 or up	165.85%
b.	Cutler	\$2914	
c.	Winthrop	\$2914	
d.	MS	\$4114	15%
e.	HS	\$15861	21.33%

- 9. Preschool team chair (Winthrop) \$1118 15.22% increase? This account category includes the PreK Coordinator position (Cheney) only, which is a part time, hourly, school year only position with a total line item budgeted expense value of \$8,465. The budget includes a COLA increase for the Coordinator plus a modest increase in the total annual hours for the position as compared to FY19 Budget. For the FY20 Budget we set her hours equal to the actual number of hours (266) that she worked in FY18 as we felt that this was more representative of her schedule in FY20. On a budget to budget basis we increased the annual hours for the position by 36 (266 vs 230). The combination of COLA and the 36 hour increase resulted in a higher than average increase year over year.
- 10. Winthrop related services OT, PT, SLP same FTE \$16,804 up 6.12%? Why? This account category includes 5 positions. The positions remain the same in the FY20 budget as compared to the FY19 budget. That said, some of the people filling these positions have changed; two of which are at modestly higher pay rates. Add in the COLA increase for the other 3 and the result is a higher than average increase.
- 11. Guidance counselors; why these increases?
 - a. MS \$9482 6.67% Both MS Counselors (Hortie and Merritt) are budgeted to receive COLA and STEP increases which generates a higher than average increase

12. MS Director of SPED \$2563

13. School nurses, why the inconsistencies? See January 16th Written Response

a.	Buker	\$4,461	7.18%
b.	Cutler	\$849	2.51%
c.	Winthrop	\$1,556	2.25%
d.	MS	\$4197	7.17%
e.	HS	\$7943	7.29%

14. Custodial, if we haven't settled contract why so high? Custodial staff are not salaried, they are paid on an hourly/daily basis. Our FY20 budget reflects two (2) additional workdays as compared to FY19 (262 vs 260). The FY20 Budget includes COLAs for all staff plus the additional two (2) days of pay for each member of the custodial union which results in a slightly higher than average increase. From a budgeting perspective, the fact that we haven't settled the Contract yet is irrelevant. Our FY20 Budget still needs to include a set of placeholder assumptions for COLA, Differential and anticipated STEP changes for Custodial/Maintenance personnel otherwise we run the very real risk of having a budget variance once the Contract is settled.

a.	Buker	\$3297	3.29%
b.	Cutler	\$3297	3.29%
c.	Winthrop	\$3297	3.29%
d.	MS	\$4870	3.3%

- 15. Clerical at Culter went down .01 FTE but up 3.76% \$1613, reasoning behind this? This account only includes the Cutler School Secretary (Parker) position which is budgeted to a receive COLA and STEP increases which generates a higher than average cost increase
- 16. Gas service, and why the inconsistency in increases?: See January 16th Written Response

a.	Buker	-\$4020	-11.78%
b.	Cutler	\$10,380	70% Why did this jump so high??
c.	Winthrop	- \$1320	- 5.38%
d.	MS	\$7981	21.48%
e.	HS	\$1830	3.29%
f.	District	\$1692	16.68%

17. Salary Dept. heads HS \$5398

8.53% See January 16th Written Response

Why do we have department heads and curriculum leaders.. where they have such a large increase. Maybe we don't need the curriulum leaders where we have department heads.. Our student population is declining. There is nothing to eliminate. We don't have Department Heads and Curriculum Leaders; they are the same people. The titles are interchangeable.

18. Athletics:

- 1. Office & other personnel \$1082 14.37% Increased the budgeted costs for Simultaneous Game Athletic Trainer Coverage by \$800 to reflect current market rates for Trainers
- 2. Other incl league & MIAA \$200 20% This line covers expenses for the AD and other District personnel to attend CAL and MIAA Meetings throughout the year. The AD has estimated an increase of \$200.
- 3. User fee reduction & scholarships \$23387 6.79% See below in #5
- 4. Tennis transportation is expensive at \$10k+ for each boys and girls. Now we are taking to Ipswich CC and that cost is crazy... What about Gordon, myopia, or paying for fixing tennis courts in good faith to Wenham? We had several internal planning meetings in the fall to discuss the tennis program with a primary goal of identifying a home court for the program for the spring 2019 season. We explored over a dozen local venue options during this detailed review process including the two you mention above. Given the circumstances, the cost isn't crazy at all; we pay ~\$30,000/year for ice time for 26 hockey players because we don't have our own rink, is that crazy? Ipswich CC was the clear cut best option for the tennis program in the short term.

As far as fixing the Pingree Courts goes I would encourage you to include the Tennis Courts in your Capital Planning Subcommittee recommendation on Capital Projects. I'm not sure the folks in Hamilton will appreciate the "good faith" comment when they have to foot 65% of the bill to repair public courts that are owned by the Town of Wenham.

5. We voted in 50% reduction of user fees, but this looks all over the board and it says 59%?? Nothing is "all over the board" as you are suggesting. We are using the same exact formula to develop the FY20 Athletics Budget that we used to develop the FY19 Athletics Budget; nothing has changed. Based your comments it would appear that you don't fully comprehend how the District's Athletic Budget is developed and how User Fees are calculated. I'm happy to go over it again, in a group setting, if that would be helpful.

19. Central office:

- a. Sick day buy back \$13459
 Written Response
 108.64% why is this? A lot more retirements? See January 16th
- b. Cont. Serv. Bus & Finance \$73k
 75.26% What is this, another contract person?? We don't have any Contract Staff in the Business Office so I don't know what you are referring in your "another contract person" comment. This is the \$73,000 for the new School Resource Officer. See January 16th Written Response
- c. PD course reimb teachers \$10000 33.33% Is this a new anticipation for more teachers? This is an increase in Teacher Course Reimbursements that was specifically bargained into the new Teacher Contract. See New Teacher Contract
- d. District extended responsibilities?? What is this? \$3694 8.82% Related to Stipends. See New Teacher Contract

20. District maintenance programs:

- a. Salary maint. Dir and staff \$14194 16.07% See January 16th Written Response
- 21. How can we manage our out of district placements better? See Director of Student Services (Bucyk) presentation to the SC on January 2nd. Can we do a co-pay? Absolutely not. I would encourage you to familiarize yourself with the 6 Major Principles of the Individuals with

Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), in particular the Free Appropriate Public Education (FAPE) principle. There seems a lot of dropped co-pays where we use to have this in place.. I don't know what you are referring to here.

Thanks, Stacey

On Jan 11, 2019, at 6:51 PM, Polito, David < D. Polito@hwschools.net> wrote:

All,

I am writing to gauge interest in scheduling a Budget Workshop and if there is interest what specific items you would be interested in working on.

Adding another meeting for a workshop was brought up at our last school committee meeting and while Jeff has said he would be happy to work with the school committee on their budgets questions and needs.

So please respond if you would like a budget workshop to be scheduled and what specific items you would like to have worked on. I will treat all non-responses as you not feeling there is a need for an additional budget meeting to be added.

David

David Polito, Ed.S.
Chair
Hamilton-Wenham Regional School Committee
d.polito@hwschools.net
He/Him/His