

May 17, 2010

The Marshall County Board of Education met in special called session on Monday, May 17, 2010, at 6:30 p.m. in the Board Conference Room at Jones School to discuss the organizational chart, budget and to hear a federal budget presentation from Federal Programs supervisor Linda Williams-Lee.

Members present were Curt Denton, Kristen Gold, Harvey Jones, Barbara Kennedy, Mike Keny, Craig Michael, Delinda Owens, Randy Perryman, and Ann Tears. No members were absent.

Prayer/Pledge

Ms. Kennedy made a motion, seconded by Ms. Tears, to move Ms. Williams-Lee's presentation to the beginning of the meeting to accommodate a board member who would be late to the meeting. The motion passed 8-0.

Ms. Williams-Lee distributed notebooks containing documents which showed where the federal monies are spent, as well as a sheet of "notes for budget review". She explained what duties/areas Title I, II-A, III, IV, and VI cover, and how her allocations are used in each (and what areas her department has taken off of General Purpose). Ms. Williams-Lee emphasized that the Director of Schools and the Federal Programs Director can't determine how the money is to be spent (committees at the schools make that determination); she added that her and Director Dukes' job is to make sure the funds spent are in compliance with Federal law.

In answering questions, Ms. Williams-Lee explained that the spreadsheets showing zero dollars budgeted/spent are areas her federal money does not fund.

Ms. Tears asked what would happen if the school system were out of compliance; Ms. Williams-Lee answered she would be issued a finding and we could lose our funding. She added that when federal funds are used to supplant GP funds, the statement Mr. Dukes read in the previous week's meeting must be read.

Mr. Jones asked what will happen when the stimulus money runs out (currently funding 100% at CHES); Ms. Williams-Lee said this time next year she will look at the allocations in hopes her department will receive more funds to continue the funding.

Ms. Gold asked about the carryover funds; Ms. Williams-Lee said the carryover is an estimate, and that the funds are still being used for various purposes, such as professional development/travel. Ms. Gold urged board members to look more closely at the fairly significant amount of funds budgeted for professional development, and if that is the best use of those funds.

Ms. Kennedy wanted clarification concerning the statement in “Notes for Budget Review” which indicates Ms. Williams-Lee and the Director of Schools cannot determine how the money is spent. Ms. Williams-Lee said that statement pertains only to Title I funds, and not to Titles II, III, and VI.

Ms. Kennedy asked if the carryover funds would be divided proportionately among the schools in which federal programs funds; Ms. Williams-Lee said yes, but the committees do not determine how to spend the carryover funds because they had already been allocated in the budget. She added that what she likes to do with the carryover funds is to pay Title I and Title II payroll for July and August.

Regarding the statement Ms. Williams-Lee made about this being the last year Title II funds will be available for classroom reduction teachers (losing \$184,000 from federal funds), Mr. Michael stated that those funds would have to come from GP. Ms. Williams-Lee said the \$184,000 would still be in federal funds, but just could not be used for classroom reduction teachers.

Mr. Michael asked, in referring to the spreadsheets showing all zeroes, if other school systems use federal dollars to fund these areas. Ms. Williams-Lee answered that the larger systems (Memphis City, Metro, Hamilton County) use those sheets. She went on to say that in order to fund anything that has not been funded in the past, she would have to go back to the table with the state consultant and ask if funds could be used for those previously unfunded items, and if so, would we be in compliance.

Ms. Gold asked if Ms. Williams-Lee’s department has the flexibility to pay for indirect costs incurred by the system (electricity, water, utilities), as Special Education does. Ms. Williams-Lee said she could not pay for indirect costs; she had already tried. She added that the only indirect costs she could pay would be for expenses incurred by her own office, not for the Central Office as a whole. Ms. Williams-Lee concurred with Ms. Gold’s statement that hers was not the same allocations as Special Education.

Ms. Kennedy asked who determines how Title III funds are allocated; Ms. Williams-Lee answered the ELL teachers.

The meeting recessed for a five-minute break.

When the meeting reconvened, Ms. Gold requested the board discuss the organizational chart first, since that may have an impact on the budget; the board agreed.

Mr. Dukes distributed documents showing central office positions he is proposing to eliminate (budget savings), the organizational chart, duties of the Assistant Deputy Directors, and salaries (over past three years) of the central office staff. He explained the two deputy director positions, indicated with asterisks, will be assigned to existing supervisors, who will take on those duties in addition to their own responsibilities with no additional salary.

Mr. Michael made a motion, with a second by Mr. Jones, to approve the organizational chart.

In discussion, Ms. Gold stated she had sent Mr. Dukes a list of questions about the organizational chart the previous Monday, Wednesday and Friday and did not receive a response. One of the questions was in regards to a statement Mr. Dukes made following the regular board meeting that in eliminating the part-time position in payroll, there may be a need in that area during the year to use a consultant. Ms. Gold asked the cost Mr. Dukes anticipates when using the consultant or outsourcing of duties for any of eliminated positions (budget savings); Mr. Dukes responded that after consideration, there will be no consultants, and he believes one payroll person can absorb the duties of the part-time person.

Ms. Gold stated that according to the duties of the Deputy Directors, whoever is appointed will be absorbing some of the responsibilities of the eliminated positions, but she questioned who would take on the extra duties of the remaining positions indicated on budget savings. Mr. Dukes explained that the Assistant Deputy Directors will absorb the Human Resources Department's responsibilities, while the Budget Director will pick up the Federal Bookkeeper's duties.

Concern was expressed that if the organizational chart is passed by the board, once a current supervisor is moved to the Deputy Director position the chart will no longer be the chart approved.

Suggestion was made, instead of dividing the assistant director responsibilities among two positions, to eliminate the deputy director positions and divide the responsibilities among the eight supervisors. Ms. Owens questioned if that were done, who would be in charge when Mr. Dukes is out of the office. Ms. Kennedy stated that could be addressed in a job description. Mr. Denton reminded the board the organizational chart has to be approved yearly, and if this chart is ineffective it could be changed next year.

Ms. Gold wanted clarification that there will not be any additions to the budget (with outsourcing and consultation fees) and \$309,722 is being eliminated with this organizational chart; Mr. Dukes confirmed that statement, adding that all part-time positions, with the exception of grant writer, are being eliminated.

Ms. Tears made a motion to end discussion. Mr. Michael seconded the motion and the motion passed 6-3, with Ms. Gold, Ms. Kennedy, and Mr. Perryman voting no.

The roll call vote on the motion to approve the organizational chart was as follows:

Mr. Denton	Yes	Mr. Michael	Yes
Ms. Gold	No	Ms. Owens	Yes
Mr. Jones	Yes	Mr. Perryman	No
Ms. Kennedy	No	Ms. Tears	Yes
Mr. Keny	No		

The motion passed 5-4.

In discussing the budget, Ms. Gold pointed out an updated (through April) Summary Financial Statement Budget Director Janet Wiles had placed at each board member's seat. She went on to state that she has not received any new information (such as insurance charges) that would change the budget, with the exception of the eliminated positions reflected on the new organizational chart and the budget savings sheet which accompanied the organizational chart. Suggestion was made to invite supervisors to a meeting to provide cost savings measures in their departments. Mr. Denton announced there would be a transportation committee meeting on May 25 in which cost saving suggestions

will be discussed. Ms. Tears stated the policy committee would be meeting on Thursday, June 3 at 6:00 p.m. After discussion, the board scheduled the policy committee meeting for June 3 at 5:00 p.m., immediately followed by a meeting with department heads.

Mr. Keny read a thank you card from Chapel Hill Elementary School for conducting a board meeting in that school, and from Katy Gold, Salutatorian at MCHS, for hosting a reception in honor of the county's Valedictorians, Salutatorians and Perfect Attendance students. He also reminded everyone of the upcoming graduations, and the MCEA end-of-the-year luncheon.

The meeting adjourned at approximately 9:10 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

---

Mike Keny, Chairman

---

Roy Dukes, Director