



# Committee minutes

Community Financial Review Committee		
3.8.2016	6:30 – 9:00 PM	Brandywine Springs Teachers' Lounge
Meeting called by	Jane Rattenni, Chair	
Type of meeting	Monthly Financial Review	
Facilitator	Jane Rattenni, Community Member	
Minutes	Laura Palombo, Red Clay	
Timekeeper	Jane Rattenni, Community Member	
Attendees	Monica Henry, Larry Miller, and Jane Rattenni, Community Members;	
	Victoria Seifred, RCEA Member; Cathy Thompson, BOE Members; Jill Floore, Red Clay CFO;	
	Hugh Broomall, Red Clay Deputy Superintendent; Henry Klampett, Community Attendee	
Minutes		
	Jane Rattenni, CFRC Community Member	
Discussion:	A review of the January 2016 meeting minutes. Mr. Miller moved to accept the minutes and Ms. Thompson seconded. The motion carried. Suggestions were made to the minutes in review. See Section II attached.	
Action Items	Person Responsible	Deadline
Inclusion Presentation		
	Jill Floore, Red Clay CFO	
Discussion:	Dr. Hugh Broomall gave a presentation on the Inclusion program.	
	Dr. Broomall also spoke to the issue of Board Policy. See Section I attached.	
Action Items	Person Responsible	Deadline
Board Policy Draft to CFRC Members	Jill Floore	After BOE 3/16/16 mtg
Monthly Reports		
	Jill Floore, Red Clay CFO	
Discussion:	Ms. Floore presented the expenditure reports for the end of February 2016. See Section III Attached. Ms. Thompson moved to accept the monthly reports and Ms. Seifred seconded. The motion carried.	
Action Items	Person Responsible	Deadline
Adjusted Federal Programs sheet	Jill Floore	
Financial Position Report		
	Jill Floore, Red Clay CFO	
Discussion:	Ms. Floore presented the 3Q-2016 Financial Position Report. See Section IV attached.	
Action Items	Person Responsible	Deadline
WEIC		
	Jill Floore, Red Clay CFO	
Discussion:	Ms. Floore gave an update on the WEIC proposal. See Section V attached.	
Action Items	Person Responsible	Deadline
Announcements		
	Jill Floore, Red Clay CFO	
Discussion:	The next meeting will be held April 12 <sup>th</sup> in the Brandywine Springs Teachers' Lounge	
Action Items	Person Responsible	Deadline



# Committee minutes

## **Red Clay Community Financial Review Committee Tuesday, March 8, 2016**

### **I. Inclusion Program**

Dr. Broomall distributed a print of a power point presentation describing the progression of inclusion and where we are now. When we prepared our strategic plan for the district, one of primary points was that we were not meeting our goals in servicing the students with disabilities and our English language learners. One of the first points in our plan was to transition the students from the segregated programs into the regular schools. We had two schools, Richardson Park Learning Center and The Central School, for our students with disabilities. These students weren't able to interact with the students in our regular schools. We had a similar situation with ELL. Those students were funneled into four elementary schools and two middle schools. For instance, middle school students requiring ELL were funneled into Conrad Schools of Science or go their feeder school and not receive services. Many of the ELL students were not interested in Conrad's bio-tech curriculum. Between 2012 and last year, the Board of Education approved the inclusion plan and began integrating the students into the feeder schools. The last school year we had 25 students from the Central school transition back on their own. This year, all of the students at RPLC, Central, and our ELL students had the opportunity to go to their feeder school or apply for choice, and we would provide all of those needed services in their school. We are currently in the implementation phase.

We looked at the services to all of the students, not just those who transitioned. We looked to comply with the federal regulations for students with disabilities, we realized there were things we needed to do differently. We increased our number of paraprofessionals by about 50, and about 13 teachers. We've also had a number of new special education students coming to us from other districts, returning from charter schools, and from out of state. We've also had a number of students with complex behaviors that have entered our school system. That impacts our tuition funds significantly. These were funds we expected to use are just making it to provide the services needed.

Ms. Thompson noted that she was informed that some schools that needed a "C" setting, do not have it. Dr. Broomall stated that was not entirely accurate. In schools we offer an A, B or C setting providing different levels of intervention. A is what you see in your typical classrooms, B is a hybrid of a typical classroom and some pull out time, and C is mostly out of the typical classroom with only sometime within. When our system began to implement the change, the schools were to come up with a plan for the different settings. Schools planned in the spring, and then in the fall, a student enrolls that needs a C setting, and one was not set up in the plan. If a student comes in to a school requiring that setting, legally we are required to provide it. We then have to change our plans. That is where the increase in our paraprofessionals, teachers and tuition dollars come in. The student who needs a C setting, may be able to be in a B setting with a



# Committee minutes

paraprofessional's help. Ms. Thompson asked if it is more expensive with inclusion than with the separate school as before. Dr. Broomall stated that this year it is with the transition. He does not believe it will be in the long term. The fiscal impact this year is due to us learning as a system how best to serve the students. Ms. Floore interjected that there is also the professional development that is needed to implement the new programs. Dr. Broomall stated that the RPLC students are not the high needs we did not expect, but the complex students and students with autism. There are students returning to us from the Delaware Autism Program. They want to be serviced in their home school. There is a 300% over the last 5 years for autistic students. Red Clay still has 75 students with DAP, but they have inquired about coming back to Red Clay. We know Stanton will need 2 autism classrooms. Ms. Floore stated that when we serve the students here, we do not have the tuition bills from Christina School District for the DAP students. The problem is the numbers are up in total. Our special education students have increased. We are currently down 200 students overall, yet our unit count grew due to the high needs of the students we do have.

Ms. Seifred asked, from a teacher perspective, now that we have had inclusion for a year, what do we see needs to be changed, and what input is Red Clay receiving from those who are implementing the programs? Dr. Broomall stated there was a survey completed by parents, staff and teachers district wide. The majority of their feedback was to get the resources aligned to where the needs are. Several say we need more resources, but Dr. Broomall feels we may not need more, but need to place those resources better. We are only 6 months in, but he feels we will be much better going in to next school year. Ms. Seifred asked if we were looking at specifics. Dr. Broomall states, we are looking at specific students making sure we meet their I.E.P. needs. We have been encouraging staff to take advantage of trainings and professional development available. We have a need with ELL to assign staff appropriately particularly throughout the elementary schools. Also hiring ELL teachers which is a struggle in itself as there aren't many in the market. There was a state directive, there are required contact hours for our state that didn't exist two years ago. We have to work that into the school schedule and provided as ELL services. This impacts the schedule as you may have to remove a classroom teacher to provide those services. All of this with low class size. Ms. Floore stated that when we don't have the teacher, we contract out with Back to Basics. That, however, can be a revolving door of staffing as the person working with a school can be picked up by another school district. This lacks continuity.

Ms. Seifred asked if there is more site based management within a school. As there are idiosyncrasies within the school of what paras are working with what students. Dr. Broomall stated that each building had the opportunity to plan within their school. As an example, there were those who assigned teachers to teach ELL in the fall had a higher class size than those who addressed class size before meeting ELL services. How can we better plan in the future? It's not complete autonomy for the buildings. Ms. Floore stated that we set the tax rate once. Even if the tax rate is set by the BOE on the tuition side, the BOE is aware of the political pressures. It is set in July, and this year our tuition students increased more than expected. Dr. Broomall stated that for special needs pre-school aged children, enrollment is up to the child's third birthday prior to December.



# Committee minutes

We'll see a number of students that enroll in September. Mr. Miller asked if the cost of modification of facilities for the students came from local taxes. Dr. Broomall explained that we didn't need to make modifications for this plan on the physical building size. Ms. Floore interjected that came into the consideration of attendance zone changes. The feeder pattern changes came at the same time as our building the new school as when we started inclusion. Moving the students to their feeder schools became a consideration of capacity. Ms. Thompson, as a Board Member, stated that the Board knows they will need to increase the tuition tax to meet the needs of the students.

Ms. Rattenni asked if there was any way to analyze how many students would transfer back and how many additional would do so each year. Dr. Broomall explained that they have been working with DAP to gather information on those students. We also had students from charter schools this year. We know we will need two teachers at Stanton next year. We have I.E.P. meetings every year, and the sending district's staff participate in those meetings, so we do have information on those students within our district currently at other schools. We will have a firmer number by this summer. Ms. Seifred asked if now that we've had feeder pattern changes for a year, and there are parents who do not like the change, will there be a big change from school to school? Dr. Broomall stated they will know that in a week or so as the choice letters have gone out to families and those choices have to be accepted or declined by the parents who have applied to choice program. Ms. Rattenni stated we are expecting the alignment in the 2017 budget. Will we see the Meadowood and RPLC funding in the regular budget? Ms. Floore explained that did happen this year. We were focused on moving everything over, there was some fluctuation based on the experience of where the students went. We will not see a large transition for 2017, but we anticipate a tuition tax increase. Ms. Thompson stated that if it's justified, we should do it. Dr. Broomall stated that what was described a year ago was a broken system. We are making these changes to fix that system. Ms. Floore stated that going out to a referendum, we will need to explain that the tax increase was not voted on by the public and what it was for.

Ms. Floore explained that there is no limit on the tuition tax. On the operating side, there are limits, as CPI. There are no property reassessments, so we are flat on that issue. For the first time legislators are talking about a change. Dr. Broomall, stated that last week there was a meeting with legislators and the district superintendents regarding the tax discussion. Some sort of change has to happen. Ms. Floore states that it pits child against child. Some children need more services but at the cost of the other students. Ms. Thompson stated there needs to be a communication plan regarding budgetary issues to the public to make it understandable.

## **Board Policy**

Dr. Broomall spoke to the issue of Board Policy 9004 – Advisory Committees to the Board, drafting a change in language that addresses the Community Financial Review Committee and its selection of committee members in reference to the legislation regulation. The draft will be presented at the next BOE meeting and open it up to public comment. There will be a meeting April 7<sup>th</sup>, in the district offices, for the Board Policy



# Committee minutes

Committee reading and discussion of public comments to see if changes need to be made prior to the BOE meeting. A second reading would be at the May BOE meeting for a vote. Ms. Floore will send it to the CFRC members after it is submitted at this BOE meeting. Dr. Broomall mentioned there are two other policies to be discussed at the April 7<sup>th</sup> meeting regarding Choice and Suicide Prevention.

Ms. Floore explained that the policy will recommend a selection committee for the members, not a subcommittee of the CFRC. The bylaws for this committee were established well before there was a State regulation requiring this committee exist. Our committee was grandfathered in and the Department of Education approved our bylaws.

Dr. Broomall was thanked for his presentation.

## II. Minutes

Ms. Thompson suggested that the minutes be emailed out to the members prior to the meeting as they are extensive and time consuming in the meeting. Ms. Floore agreed. Ms. Seifred suggested that the minutes are more like a transcription in their present form. Possibly an overview could be voted on at the meeting and the transcription be posted to the web page. Ms. Rattenni explained that she, as Committee Chair, writes a summary for the BOE every month. It's possible that the summary be our minutes while the transcription be posted to the web page. The summary is currently a public document as well.

Ms. Floore explained that the front page of this document is the format requested by the district for minutes. Ms. Seifred explained that we would be voting on the minutes, front page, and comment on the transcription. The Committee agreed.

Mr. Miller made a motion to accept the minutes in their present form, and Ms. Thompson seconded. The motion carried.

## III. Monthly Reports

Ms. Floore presented the monthly reports of February 2016. We are 2/3 through the year, therefore we expect to be at 66%. Expenditures follow that closely, revenues are on a different cycle. We are 99% local revenues received. We will continue to receive delinquent taxes. There has been some questions about the rate of delinquent taxes. Every year, we will see the current amount is higher than the previous years. The County collects within that year, but they don't always. Because tax rates increase, the delinquent amounts will always be higher even though the percentage of households delinquent may not increase.

State salaries are Division 1 is at 72%. Not much different than last year. Our salaries went up due to transitions over from tuition. The State has funded the same as they did last year, but due the increase in salaries, the percentage is less. There is not enough



# Committee minutes

State salary for the next payroll, so they will make another transfer soon. It will be transferred incrementally while the State manages their cash flow through June.

The Division 2 and 3 are slightly over 100%. Our units stayed the same, but the total revenue is 86%. This is right on track for local and State salary support.

On the expenditures, we are looking at some very closely. Some schools save their funding to have a summer project of computer lab, etc. Schools are the only place we allow a carryover so a combination of two years' budgets can be used for a larger project. The other departments cannot carry over. If a department does not spend 100%, the funds go back to the bottom line, not back into that department budget.

Ms. Floore explained that Ms. Bewley, Manager of Information Systems, gave us a presentation regarding the purchase of technology. Many schools asked for the technology as soon as the referendum was passed not realizing that we don't receive the tax money to purchase the technology until October. Then, there is also the professional development needed for the teachers to effectively use the technology in the classroom. Ms. Seifred added that she was one of the teachers to receive one of the 5 pilot programs from last year. The organization alone within the classroom management took quite a while. And she was working with 90 devices, not a schoolwide program. Every school's need is different as well as differences within classrooms. Teams within the school come together to decide how the devices will be implemented. There is quite a bit to learn. She is in year two and she feels she's using 15% of what the device can do. She has eighth grade students showing her how to use the paperless flow. She would not want to put this program in the hands of a teacher that does not have strong classroom management skills. The teacher must also take close attention to what the students are looking at. They can find back doors and games almost anywhere. Ms. Thompson asked what it is used for in Ms. Seifred's classroom. Ms. Seifred explained that her social studies text books were from 2001. The students weren't allowed in the library due to testing. The librarian and she purposely purchased these as they cannot be used for testing. The devices are used as a resource for specific current events, tying in current events to history as well as the textbook is online. She sets up modules where the Meadowood students can be a part of the same lesson at their own pace while the college level student is getting a much more advanced version. And each student doesn't know what the other student is receiving. Ms. Henry asked if she had the software to monitor what the students are looking for. Ms. Seifred said she did not, but she tells the students that she does. Ms. Thompson asked if anyone has it. The answer is no as it is a cost. Ms. Seifred has whatever was free at the APP store. Otherwise, the app is \$1.99 on 90 devices. Ms. Henry asked who was doing the upkeep, district or the school. Ms. Seifred stated it is from technology in the district. Ms. Seifred also found tests online the students can take. She can be at DSEA in Dover, and she can see who is answering what and send messages to them. The students get immediate results and explanations. The students do not take the devices home. The students will air drop things to their smart phone. Eventually, she would like to have it all online. The students love the immediacy of it. And she, as a teacher, feels renewed by the uses in the classroom. Mr. Miller stated that this information should be brought to the Board. Ms. Seifred stated that there



# Committee minutes

was a debriefing in April for the pilot. The 5 teachers in the pilot feel they should be a part of the discussion on the rollout. Ms. Floore asked if being in a building where you can safely assume that students have multiple devices at home and assume there are those who have none. Ms. Seifred explained that there are very few who have none partly because of smart phones. Most of what they do is in the classroom. Ms. Floore asked if there will be a problem with the Chromebooks as they don't act like a tablet. Ms. Seifred feels it will. If a student was absent, she can have him catch up as they have block scheduling. If a student is in in school suspension, she is not sending them with a device, she has paper assignments.

Ms. Floore stated this is for 3<sup>rd</sup>, 6<sup>th</sup> and 9<sup>th</sup> grade. Line 68 for Technology is for the devices. 90% has been encumbered but only 36% is expended. The devices are ordered and in process. This could not happen until the teams could prepare for the devices. Ms. Seifred believes it is all Chromebooks. Ms. Floore explained that the iPads could be pilots and through a grant. It is being decided school to school whether the students would be able to take them home. Ms. Seifred likes that she can assign an iPad to a child. All the work on that iPad is that student's work. If there is something on them that should not be there, she knows who is responsible. If the student is using it improperly, Ms. Seifred gives them the social studies book to use instead for a few days.

School Board is at 97% due to the school board conference encumbrance and the school board association membership.

There is a -15% expended for the copy center. The copy center is at Brandywine Springs but is utilized by all of the schools. What is billed back to the schools may be some prior year expenses. They have billed out more than their budget, but the schools have paid. The copy center does have its own expenses.

Minor Capital is at 1%. Minor capital does get loaded until halfway through the fiscal year. Therefore, are often still spending the prior year funds. Large repairs fall under minor capital but they have to be under \$500,000. We are in the process of recoding some expenses that have been charged to the Maintenance budget to minor capital. Maintenance is currently 77% expended but 107% expended and encumbered. This won't change the encumbrances. Those are maintenance contracts for things such as elevator service, security camera maintenance, etc. This is really a timing issue on when we receive the funds. Normally, we do this earlier in the year, but our Supervisor of Accounting has been out.

Special Education is over encumbered but not over budget at this time. We are looking at the contracts for contracted therapists as that is where our highest encumbrances are.

Student Services is the same situation. That is 96% expended. There is very little room, but we will be looking at the encumbrances.



# Committee minutes

62.9% expended which is a little higher than last year. However, we hadn't passed the referendum at this point last year, so we were in a lock down mode on expenditures. We are right on track for this time of year.

We've made a change to the report. Eric Loftus in our offices helps prepare this report. When the state gives us an appropriation, they establish a fiscal year. Division 1 salaries is fiscal year 2016. Division 2 is 2016. Some categories, major capital is the largest one so far, are assigned the year. When we received our funding for the building of Cooke Elementary, it was fiscal 2013. That fiscal year never changes regardless of the payment of the project. In other cases, we make a purchase encumbrance in a fiscal year in May, but the invoice is paid in July. It is expensed out in 2016 against a 2015 appropriation. It is captured on this report as a "prior year expense". That runs about \$5.4 million without major capital. With major capital it runs about \$30 million. We have decided to separate them.

We are early in the federal fiscal year. The last transactions are going through before we go to the next year funding.

Ms. Seifred asked what a secondary RTI at McKean that is not at the other schools. Ms. Floore explained it was a State grant. Ms. Thompson asked why on Page 4, line 14 is \$325,000 for homeless in FY2014, but in FY2015 it is \$6,611, and in FY2016 it is \$412,000. Ms. Floore explained the \$412,000 is PERKINS funding. The reason for the decrease in expenditures in 2014 vs. 2015 is now the funds are captured as a subcategory of Title 1. It was formerly broken out. You can see in Title 1 how the budget has grown. Which is also in part because our poverty has grown as well. Ms. Thompson stated that the Title 1 budget did not grow as much as when it was broken out. Ms. Floore will check into the report as she notices the 1003G for Lewis is incorrect. She will follow up on this. Ms. Seifred asked about balances on 2014 grant money. Ms. Floore explained that it reverts back to DOE. If you don't use the money, you lose it, even though we try very hard to use every penny.

Tuition funds revenue is over 100%. We build in a delinquency factor in the revenues. The good news is the delinquency is less than 1%. The State revenue for private placement is 103% as those placements have increased. Ms. Seifred stated she would be interested to know how the tuition tax would increase. Ms. Floore stated, she agreed with Dr. Broomall that it will increase and then level off. It's comfort in transition. If your child was in RPLC with small class size and instructional support paraprofessionals. The child did not have a one-on-one. Transitioning to a building with no small class size, now needs a one-on-one para. The environment is new, different, we need more paras. The para may not need to stay forever once the adjustments and transitions have been made routine. Ms. Seifred sees that now as paras that were needed in the start of the year, are not as necessary now.

Debt service is higher this year than it was last year. It is actually higher than the 66%. There are set schedules on payments on debt service. These are the bond repayments.





# Committee minutes

Meadowood is looking good at 61% expended at 67% expended and encumbered. However, the district wide services is significantly over budget, substitutes. There is a high absentee rate. The substitutes are contracted out to Kelly Services for teachers and Delta T for paraprofessionals. It is more expensive. They are over budget by \$78,000. That makes the percentage up to 154% of budget. We are working with the schools to encourage better attendance through the contracts. Ms. Thompson asked how we come up with the budget to begin with. Ms. Floore explained that we look at past experience. Ms. Seifred asked if it specifically one or two people out and that's what happened. Ms. Floore stated that she will be investigating the circumstances at the end of the year when looking to make the new budget. It could be extended leaves. Meadowood's staff is so specialized due the students' needs. Ms. Seifred stated that they see the need for substitutes rise in schools with more discipline problems as teachers are out due to the stress. Ms. Floore stated that the fill rates for the city schools are lower than in the other schools. Which means, we call for a substitute in the city, but the contractor cannot fill the spot. It is in the 90's, but not 100%. Mr. Klampett asked if the Meadowood program listed here is speaking to the one Meadowood building or the programs spread out in the other schools. Ms. Floore explained that it is an inclusion based cluster program. The pre-school is at the Meadowood building with the programs located at Forest Oak Elementary, HB Middle School and McKean High School. RPLC is attached to Richardson Park with a preschool at Warner Elementary.

We are on target for our substitutes in the regular schools. \$1.5 million in substitutes. Ms. Seifred stated the teachers like a bonus for attendance.

Ms. Thompson asked how insurance could be off. Ms. Floore stated it was because she set the estimate last July and the quotes came in December with the rate renewals.

Ms. Seifred moved to accept the monthly reports, and Ms. Henry seconded. The motion carried.

## **IV. Financial Position Report**

Ms. Floore distributed the 3Q2016 Financial Position Report. This report is required by DOE. It was due February 1, 2016 based on information from December 31, 2015. The projection is for the remainder of the school fiscal year. The reason for these reports is so that DOE, as well as our Board, knows that we are fiscally sound for the remainder of the year. Our BOE voted on this at their February meeting. We are reviewing it late due to our February meeting being cancelled due to inclement weather.

## **V. WEIC**

Ms. Rattenni asked if there were any updates other than what was in The News Journal. Ms. Seifred mentioned that there has been no response from the Board other than they were not changing the budget language for passage of the proposal.



# Committee minutes

Ms. Floore's understanding is there will be another meeting next week on the commission. They are struggling with language that will satisfy the State Board as well as the Commission. Ms. Thompson asked how the district will make a decision if the language has not been set. Ms. Floore explained that our Board does not make a decision. We would be asked our opinion. Ms. Thompson stated that the Board was not asked their opinion. Our district administration was asked. Ms. Thompson stated that she is concerned that the WEIC is not making a recommendation not to go forward if the language doesn't remain that the State "will" fund the changes rather than "may". The first indication is that this is significantly underfunded.

Ms. Floore stated that the determination must be made by July 1, 2016 or the program will not proceed.

Mr. Miller explained we have the focus on New Castle County and local. However, these issues are state-wide. If we don't address it on a State level, it will be very difficult to be approved. The elected officials in Kent and Sussex Counties would have a hard time selling it to their constituents. Ms. Thompson stated you could do a weighted funding for poverty state-wide. Ms. Floore explained that there it's also been discussed to do a pilot for one district in each county. Indian River is struggling with their ELL population and poverty. The worry is if the Governor put in \$4 million in the budget for WEIC, and then we change it to a 4 county pilot, the money isn't sufficient for the one district nevertheless 4. The program will then continue to be watered down. The Governor's budget is the starting point.

Ms. Seifred stated that there is a level of trust due to the way the changes were made to the poverty schools. To put all the time and effort to put into place a plan based on the funding projected, and to have it cut, does not instill trust in the system.

## **VI. Public Comments**

There were no public comments at this time via email.

Mr. Klampett commented that he understands why WEIC wants "shall" instead of "may" in the funding language. However, there is no number attached to what it will cost. It's asking the State Board to agree to a blank check. The numbers are there to give an estimate. Downtown, there is a \$6 million gap between the taxable properties and the expense to educate the children. That will transfer to Red Clay as an expense with a benefit to Christina School District. There is 138 units in Red Clay before you move the districts. It is roughly \$14 million, with about \$5 million local. We are already in the red for \$11 million before you even begin. He's not saying we should not go forward, but we're not selling it as an expensive program. He feels it will be reasonable to say how much it is going to cost. He also states it will be more when you move the down town piece of Christina into Red Clay, it will come \$12-13 million of local money in the hole. That is a large percentage. That's not what comes from the State to fund the rest of the units. Christina makes \$2 million on the deal. Colonial pushes back as they also have



# Committee minutes

the port industry money coming in and they don't want to lose that. The legislature needs to know this.

At Deborah Hudson's town hall meeting, Mr. Klampett attended, attendees wanted to know how much. No answer was there.

Ms. Floore stated that finance committee gave WEIC the information. Also, there was a distribution of the latest version dated February 11, 2016, with a compendium which lays out WEICs version. Mr. Klampett stated the problem is larger than anyone knows. Along with our tuition, this is a big problem. The plan states the \$6 million disappears in 2 years. Ms. Floore stated that the plan noted that the plan states the \$6 million is in the plan and we have to receive that money from Christina. There are several ways of obtaining that. Mr. Klampett stated the lines of Red Clay should be drawn right down Route 95 including Christiana Mall. Ms. Floore stated the part where Christina benefits and Red Clay fails is what is being planned out. The lines are not redrawn until school year 2018. A yes vote now doesn't mean it happens. Bench marks need to be met.

Ms. Thompson expressed her concerns about all of the funding pieces and reassessments and new buildings. Then school year 2019 and it can all change.

Mr. Klampett feels the Board should know what the money costs are.

Ms. Floore explained that we are given more flexibility with the taxes within the budget. Mr. Klampett feels that we will not be doing our jobs for the children. The talk of budgets and risks. A shortfall of funding and units. Ms. Floore stated that the committee, with input from Mike Matthews, stated that 138 is the number of shortfall of units. Other districts pushed back and stated they needed the flexibility if we cannot pass the program.

Mr. Miller added if we had a proper funding for the school districts, why would you need a referendum, outside of major capital.

## **VII. Announcements**

The next meeting will be held Tuesday, April 12<sup>th</sup> in the Brandywine Springs School Teachers' Lounge at 6:30 PM.