

Minutes
Committee of the Whole
May 3, 2004

The Penn Manor School Board met as a Committee of the Whole at 4:03 p.m. in the Board Room at Manor Middle School. Present were Mr. DeLuca, Dr. Frerichs, Mrs. Friedman, Mr. Geist, Mr. Herr, Mr. Lyon, and Mr. Rintz. Mr. Kreider arrived at 4:20 and Mrs. Wert arrived at 4:09. Present from the administrative staff were Mr. Stewart, Mrs. Griffis and Mr. Johnston. Also in attendance were Ms. Ginny Neiss, Mr. Shawn Maxwell, Mr. John Taylor, Mrs. Rhoades and Mrs. Howard.

Mr. Willis Herr asked if there were any Citizen's Comments. There were none at this time.

Mr. Willis Herr asked the committee whether there were any additions or corrections to the Minutes of the April 13, 2004, Committee of the Whole Meeting. Hearing none, on a motion by Mr. Lyon, a second by Mrs. Friedman, and a unanimous voice vote, the Minutes were approved as printed.

After their April 13th presentation on the Health and Physical Education Program, Ms. Neiss and Mrs. Maxwell were asked to return to a board meeting to provide additional information. Dr. Frerichs stated that in their presentation Ms. Neiss suggested they would like to change the physical education curriculum to more than just sports orientated to fitness based. He asked if they were working on changing the curriculum. Ms. Neiss stated the middle school physical education schedule may possibly be changed next year from a full year to half year due to a middle school block schedule proposal. Her concern with students taking physical education for only one-half year is their level of activity during the other half of the school year. She felt that to keep the students motivated and active they should have physical education three days a week year round. Mr. Lyon asked what grade physical education starts and how often. Ms. Neiss responded the students in grade 1 receive physical education once a cycle. Mr. Stewart explained in the proposed new middle school schedule the academic classes will be grouped to help limit the number of classes that the students will be taking in the six day cycle. One of the results is that phys ed will become twice a cycle for 90 minutes for one-half a year instead of twice a cycle for 45 minutes. Dr. Frerichs asked if their concerns were addressed when the block schedule was proposed. Mr. Stewart explained that the committee was

comprised of middle school teachers involved with the change. He stated that in any type of schedule change there is compromise and gains and losses. Mrs. Friedman asked how the schedule has worked at Marticville. Mr. Stewart responded that a parent meeting was set for review and reaction to the new schedule. Only 2 parents attended. Teachers are responding positively to the new schedule. Ms. Neiss stated that it's difficult to promote fitness when the students have phys ed three times a week. She remarked that it's also difficult to promote good nutrition and teach the students to make healthy food choices with the cafeteria food. Dr. Frerichs asked if suggestions have been made to the cafeteria staff. Mr. Lyon stated that Ms. Neiss was instrumental in getting the salad bar in the cafeteria. Discussion involved if cookies, french fries and chocolate milk should be offered as often in the cafeteria. Mr. Stewart stated he would ask Randy Wolfgang to give a presentation to the board. He said by eliminating the popular items from choices in the cafeteria would impact on the cafeteria budget and profitability. Mrs. Griffis stated that in the elementary school there are fewer choices and the cafeteria monitors encourage the children to eat properly. Dr. Frerichs stated that Ms. Neiss has some valid points about the cafeteria and they should be addressed. Mr. Stewart suggested that he would ask Randy Wolfgang to come up with a middle ground proposal and ask Ms. Neiss for her input. Dr. Frerichs inquired how it will be determined in a few years if one semester of phys ed is working. Mr. Maxwell stated that at this point there is no measurable data and a goal for next year will be to have a standardized fitness test to help determine how the students are doing. Dr. Frerichs stated that he will look forward to the measurable data in the future, especially since depending on how a student has phys ed scheduled they may not have it for a year. Mr. Geist asked if the schedules could be split with another cultural arts teacher to allow phys ed all year. Mr. Lyon stated that the goal is for a student to have only a few teachers to account to during each semester. Mr. Stewart explained that students in the elementary school saw one teacher all day, in the high school the students had 4 teachers per semester, but in the middle school the students would have multiple teachers to be organized for and accountable to. Mrs. Griffis stated that No Child Left Behind has forced the hand in a lot of issues and scheduling. All curriculums want more time with the students, but at this time we are only accountable for math, reading and writing. Mr. DeLuca pointed out that because of scheduling, in some cases, students may be past puberty before they are taught the lesson on human growth and development. Dr. Frerichs said he is glad that Mr. Stewart wanted to develop a schedule that is most effective for students and will hopefully keep looking at the schedule. Mr. Rintz asked if the curriculum was

different for the 2 semesters. Mrs. Wert asked if good food and exercise competitions could be coordinated with teachers. She said this is being done in another district and seems to be working well. Mr. Herr thanked Ms. Neiss and Mr. Maxwell for answering questions the board had about the curriculum.

Mr. Stewart stated that he had hoped to have a rocket launch demonstration for the board; however, at this time of the year the engines are difficult and hard to get because of the national competition and they are costly. He will try to arrange for a demonstration in the fall.

Mr. Johnston explained the contract for nursing services for a student, 7.5 hours per day for the remainder of the school year. Mr. Herr said that the company was from Georgia and asked if a local service could be used. Mr. Johnston stated that this company has been used before and the company is in Georgia but the nurse is local. Approval for placement of this item on the May School Board Meeting Agenda was approved on a motion by Mrs. Wert, a second by Mr. DeLuca, and a unanimous voice vote.

Mr. Johnston reviewed the results Mailroom Systems trial period. The trial period ran with waived fees, but analysis showed that the district would have saved \$280 on over 8,000 pieces on mail or an average of .03 per item over the last 4 weeks. For a small fee the contract will allow reduced postage rates, daily mail pick up, and printing, folding and stuffing services. If this system is continued, mass mailings for transportation are planned. Dr. Frerichs asked if there were any problems with the system. Mr. Johnston said a few but he plans to meet with the company to resolve the minor problems. Approval for placement of this item on the May School Board Meeting Agenda was approved on a motion by Dr. Frerichs, a second by Mr. Lyon, and a unanimous voice vote.

Mrs. Wert explained that there are no significant changes in the Lancaster County Academy budget. She pointed out that the staff salaries averaged an increase of 3.5. There was an increase for membership dues and fees because they joined PSBA save in health insurance. Mrs. Wert recommended that an approval be sent to the Academy for the budget. She stated that there was a \$1013 surplus for the 2003-04 and she is recommending that the Academy be allowed to keep the surplus. She explained that a \$3,000 refund will be returned based on 1978-79 grant that offset the budget that year. Some of the refund money will be kept by the Academy for improvements and the remainder returned to the participating

districts. Mrs. Wert explained the concept of the Lancaster County Academy, the number of students enrolled and the number of graduates. Approval for placement of the 2004-05 Lancaster County Academy budget and allow the Academy to keep the \$1013 surplus on the May School Board Meeting Agenda was approved on a motion by Mrs. Wert, a second by Dr. Frerichs, and a unanimous voice vote.

Mr. Johnston explained the Fire-X Sales and Service Corporation contract for a maintenance agreement on the ANSUL Fire Suppression system in the kitchen at Eshleman elementary. The warranty period will expire in June. He stated that Fireline services our other locations, but would like to use Fire-X because they are the distributor of ANSUL Systems. By going with Ansul we will get a five year extension on the warranty. Approval for placement of this item on the May School Board Meeting Agenda was approved on a motion by Mr. Lyon, a second by Mr. Kreider, and a unanimous voice vote.

Dr. Frerichs explained that each year PSBA gives the board the opportunity by PSBA to submit legislative items that the board would like them to include in their positions. Penn Manor has not been active in the past; however, the opportunity is offered. He pointed out the sample resolution and legislative item and asked the board to think about items facing the board. Any suggested resolutions or legislative items for PSBA to consider can be discussed at a board meeting and sent to PSBA. He requested that any items be sent to Paula to be compiled for the June Committee of the Whole.

Mr. Stewart explained the Eshleman Elementary change order #29 for a credit of \$5,500 for not installing sunscreens. It was decided that the sunscreens were not attractive and they were not needed after they were ordered. They will be stored in the barn and efforts will be made to try to sell the sunscreens. Mr. Herr stated his opinion of things being stored in a barn tends to be forgotten. He asked if they were specifically manufactured for Eshleman. Mr. Stewart stated that they were recommended by the architect but was felt they were not needed. He said that this item needs to be settled to close out the Eshleman account so that the Plancon money can be obtained. Mr. Rintz asked what the cost for the labor was in the original contract. Mr. Johnston will research the cost of the labor. Approval for placement of this item on the May School Board Meeting Agenda was approved on a motion by Mr. Lyon, a second by Dr. Frerichs, and a unanimous voice vote.

Mr. Johnston reviewed the history Healthcare payments. He stated that over the past 5 years healthcare costs have doubled. The cost for next year is projected to increase by 20.2%. While claims and prescription costs are rising, the administrative costs have remained flat. He said healthcare costs will continue to be something that we will try to manage. A wellness program is being looked at to help prevent the number of claims. Mr. Johnston reviewed the fixed and claim costs for this year and what it is budget for 2004-2005. He explained the enrollment summary and membership by relationship charts, comparing Penn Manor to all of Healthguard clients. He reviewed the total claims chart, network benefits for inpatient and outpatient charts, top ten participating and non-participating providers list and the network and plan savings. Mr. Geist asked where the retirees were on the charts. Mr. Johnston explained they would be listed with the employees. There was some discussion about the possibility of taking the healthcare coverage for school districts to a state level. Mr. Rintz stated he would like to look at the eligible spouse rule for the next negotiated contract. Mr. Herr said that was discussed during this negotiated contract.

Mr. Stewart discussed proposed amendments to the Act 93 document. The four areas included: wording in benefit #8 to remove the word "covered" from the description of health/vision/dental care expenses; recommendation in pay for administrators who currently exceed the designated pay range, establish 3.1% as the base pay increase rate and salary range grid; and to reclassify the position of the Coordinator of Pupil Services from a 12 month to 10 month position. Dr. Frerichs asked for clarification of the wording for the medical care expenses. Approval for placement of this item on the May School Board Meeting Agenda was approved on a motion by Mrs. Wert, a second by Mr. Lyon, and a unanimous voice vote.

Mr. Johnston explained the cost analysis for contractual obligations for the automatic temperature control contracts. The contracts, currently with Trane and Honeywell, have remained relatively stable for the past several years. He stated that we are currently negotiating contracts for two new systems and negotiating the Honeywell contracts as a whole. The Honeywell portion of debt service will be paid off in 2006-07. He explained there were 2 contracts with Honeywell and they ended at different times. Mr. Coleman is looking at renegotiating a new contract with combined services. He is also looking at the feasibility of hiring a person to perform maintenance of Honeywell controls and possibly maintenance of the boilers in the buildings.

The board adjourned to Executive Session at 5:30.

Mr. Johnston introduced Mr. Todd Forgione, Mr. Dan Burton from RBC Dain Rauscher and Mr. Matthew Kirk from Access Financial Markets. Mr. Johnston explained the chain of events that must occur to pursue the Interest Rate SWAP plan. A financial analysis was done by RBC Dain and reviewed by the administration. The school official study evaluation, education analysis and decision making has been completed with several visits from RBC Dain to the board and a board committee. A board resolution to move forward on this approach was passed. The Interest Rate Management Plan will be presented and reviewed by Mr. Kirk, Mr. Burton will answer questions and Mr. McCarty is the legal counsel for the arrangement. Mr. Burton explained that PA Act 23 requires that an independent financial advisor prepare an interest rate management plan and give his opinion. Mr. Kirk, the independent advisor from Access Financial Markets, explained the swaption opportunity. He reviewed the ten year graph of the long-term average of the fixed rate bond and the variable interest rate bond. He explained that Penn Manor would essentially sell an option to RBC Dain Rauscher. RBC would then have the right, at a prescribed point in the future, to convert a portion of the outstanding indebtedness from a fixed rate to a variable rate. The district will sell an option to RBC, in return for the option RBC will make an up front payment of \$500,000 and RBC would retain the right at the one year waiting period to convert approximately 13.7 million dollars of the fixed rate debt to a variable rate. The method is known as an interest rate swap. It will be converted by the following method: Penn Manor will continue to pay 4.23% to bond holder as is; however, RBC will commence an interest rate swap after one year and the transaction will begin. RBC will begin paying Penn Manor 3.65% which can be used to pay bond holders. Penn Manor will also be required to pay RBC a floating rate, the BMA index plus 58 basis points. Mr. Kirk reviewed the savings analysis at BMA 10-year average and 1-year average charts. Mr. Geist asked if he has worked with RBC on any of the non-district interest rate swaps.

Mr. Dan Burton, RBC Dain Rauscher, reviewed charts in the packet of information he distributed. He explained the chart for the yield on the 10 year Treasury Note for the month of April. He stated that if the rates stay where they are for the one year and then immediately go to the ten year average thereafter plus 100 basis points and stay there for the life of the trade the district would break even. He felt that a more likely scenario will be that rates will rise over a period of time. He stated that every transaction has a risk and reward. He is trying to offer a transaction that would be a

decided advantage for the district. He said based on all of the data available the worse case scenario would be a break even situation. The best case would be making a considerable amount of money. He felt that the short term will considerably out perform the long term rate. There was some discussion about the strike price figure. Mr. Kirk suggested that at the time of the voting meeting on May 10 to identify what the current rate is at that point, and rather than setting a level the districts would want to reach, set a level below which the board does not want to go.

Mr. Bill McCarty, Hartman, Underhill & Brubaker, reviewed the SWAP resolution as required by the Act for a SWAP agreement. He explained that the ACT now permits school districts to enter into SWAP agreements. The resolution contains all the minimum requirements for a SWAP agreement. The Act requires that the district commits to pay amounts that are due under a SWAP agreement. It also requires that there must be a provision in the agreement that is done that if there is a change in the credit rating of the RBC Dain Rauscher that some provision must be made for remedies. The term of the SWAP cannot exceed that of the underlying bonds that are being worked on. The resolution presumes that there will be final interest rate management plan. There will be an actual SWAP agreement containing the interest rate RBC is willing to pay as a fixed rate and the dollar amount they will pay up front. The school district will be required to advertise that the board is considering the resolution and a notice of adoption of the resolution if it is adopted. A certified copy of the resolution will be filed, the interest rate management plan and the agreement. It will be filed with the state but there is no approval by the state. There was discussion about the rate and if a figure had to be decided before placing on the agenda. It was decided that current rate information would be provided on May 10 and a rate decision would be made at that time. Approval for placement of the Resolution and the Interest Rate Management Plan on the May School Board Meeting Agenda was approved on a motion by Mr. Geist, a second by Mrs. Wert, and a unanimous voice vote.

Mrs. Griffis reviewed the results of the PSSA writing scores. She said that grades 6 and 9 took the test in October and grade 11 in February. The students in grade 6 are required to write 2 essays with 3 paragraphs. They have about 60 minutes to respond to a prompt, they are not allowed to use dictionaries or thesauruses. There are three kinds of writing they are to respond do – informational, persuasive and narrative. Grade 9 also has 2 essays, 5 paragraphs each and 60 minute prompt. She explained the Domain Scoring guide based on focus, content, organization, style, conventions, and

on a 4 point scale. She said this is how the writing is being taught beginning in grade 1 which is what the state requires. She explained the chart listing the percentage of students below proficient and stated there are mixed results. She stated students will need to be worked with individually and look at them longitudinally over time. She reviewed an individual student report from grade 6 and said this child was part of the academic support process and scored in the proficient level. The child's mother wrote a note saying she was thrilled with her scaled score and felt she is finally ready for middle school. She said the state will no longer report scaled scores to the district but they will give that information to individual students. She stated that in the PSSA booklet it states that the scores are not to be used to compare schools but every year the schools get ranked. She said that the state is now releasing assessment anchors, which are lesson plans that tell exactly what standards are going to be tested. Dr. Frerichs asked if the district will be planning to compare a student's score in grade 6 and then again in grade 9. Mrs. Griffis explained that the district has purchased Dimensions software which will allow students to be tracked longitudinally and to query information. It will also allow a teacher to enter data, set parameters and look at student scores. Dr. Frerichs inquired if the guidance counselors or teachers will be using the program. Mrs. Griffis said it is teacher friendly and that it will also report intervention. She said that training will begin in June and two buildings will be trained by August 23. The rest of the teachers and administrators will be trained over the next 2 years.

Mr. Johnston reviewed the Spectra Flooring Contract for carpet installation at Marticville Middle School. He stated that the contract for flooring services came through the Joint Purchasing Council so that no formalized bidding was needed. Upon approval, work should begin by June 7 and completed by the end of the fiscal year. This is not part of the asbestos abatement project or the floor tiling. Approval for placement of this item on the May School Board Meeting Agenda was approved on a motion by Mr. Lyon, a second by Mr. Rintz, and a unanimous voice vote.

Dr. Frerichs stated that he would like to limit the board's consideration to permit non resident students and attend Penn Manor. Dr. Frerichs offered a motion that the sentence on page 27 be amended to read as follows: "Although the district will generally permit only students who reside within the School District to attend the district's schools, the Board may consider requests to permit non-resident students to attend the district's schools, if the student has previously attended a school in the Penn Manor School District."

Mrs. Wert seconded the motion. Dr. Frerichs explained his motion by saying, if we have a student that is not living in the district but would like to attend a school in the district we could consider it only if they were previously a Penn Manor student. We wouldn't allow someone to come in if they never had any affiliation with the district. He said that the Standards for Persistently Dangerous Schools and the Standards for Victims of Violent Crimes Policies both state that one of the local education authorities' responsibilities is if there is not a safe school in the district than the local school district is encouraged to establish an agreement with a neighboring school district to accept the transfer students. He said he didn't feel this would cause a great influx of people but didn't want to put the district in that position. He didn't feel there was a real benefit to the district accepting people from the outside. Mr. Rintz questioned how the new wording was different from the way the policy currently reads because the students would be considered on a case-by-case basis. Dr. Frerichs replied by saying that the students would not even be considered if the students never went to Penn Manor. After further discussion a voice vote was taken on the amendment presented by Dr. Frerichs: Mr. DeLuca, no; Dr. Frerichs, yes; Mrs. Friedman, no; Mr. Geist, no; Mr. Herr, no; Mr. Kreider, no; Mr. Lyon, no; Mr. Rintz, no; and Mrs. Wert, no.

Mr. Stewart explained that a number of items in the budget are fixed and unchanging and the board does not have a great deal of influence on them. He stated that there are 4 items that affect each other; the new programs that the administration is requesting, the tax burden to our constituents, the extent to which we utilize the fund balance this year to balance the budget, and the long-term impact on our budget by dipping into the fund balance.

In reviewing the current year budget, Mr. Johnston explained that what we are doing this year with the budget will affect next year and the coming years. He said that the fund balance needs to be reduced by either doing it all at once or by gradually sloping it down in the next five years. He said that the current year estimates were compiled in February and revised in late April, and every expense category and revenue line item was examined. Revenue estimates show projections at nearly \$750,000 over what was budgeted for 2003-2004. Federal Programs increased by \$75,000 over what was originally reported that the district would receive. There is a \$400,000 rental subsidy that was unanticipated in state revenues. Local revenues were up due to the low interest rate and the effect on transfer taxes and interim taxes. He reported that real estate taxes were up \$135,000, interim taxes up \$140,000, real estate transfer taxes up \$135,000 and delinquent taxes up

\$200,000. Mr. Herr questioned the percentage of delinquent taxes. Mr. Geist asked for clarification on the taxes up terminology. Mr. Johnston stated that there will be nearly \$500,000 that will remain unspent in the 2003-2004 budget coming from the Administrative/Functional areas, and salaries and benefits. Increases in grants and programs allowed for savings in the budget. Dr. Frerichs asked for clarification in the unspent budgeted amount and money received.

Mr. Johnston explained that the 2004-2005 budget has limited new initiatives. The emphasis is on maintaining appropriate class size, focusing on technology, reading, writing and math improvements from K-12. Mr. Stewart reviewed the enhancements that are in the proposed budget including additional staff due to the schedule change in the middle school and increased enrollment. Mrs. Wert asked for clarification of the social worker position and the role of an additional social worker. Mrs. Griffis explained that Mrs. Meckley was originally hired for the high school emotional support class but she has been stretched and working in all the buildings. Mrs. Wert questioned if the students needing speech services, above what the current speech teachers can service, could be contracted through the IU rather than hiring a speech teacher. Mr. Johnston stated that overall expenses in the 2004/2005 budget increases 3.4%, the building level budgets increases 2%, the administrative/functional decreases 3% but the actual increase is 2.8% because the current year there was an interfund transfer. Salaries and benefits budgets increases 5.1% and grants and programs budgets increases 77.7%. The overall revenue increases by 3%, local revenues increases 2.8%, state revenues increases 3.2%, federal revenues 4% and other revenues increase by \$10,000. Dr. Frerichs asked for clarification of the increase in local revenue. Mr. Johnston explained with the 2004-2005 budget of 2.7 million dollars more will be spent in expenses than collected in revenues. This is caused in part by use of the fund balance to balance the 2003-2004 budget. Expenses are increasing at a higher pace than revenues which is due to the flat growth in real estate assessments and the uncertainty in state funding. Mr. Geist asked for clarification of the flat growth in real estate. Mr. Johnston explained that the current year estimates will allow for an addition to the fund balance, and additional monies are designated and used to offset rising healthcare costs. He said that 17.6% of the total fund balance will be used to offset the need for a larger tax increase and he is recommending a 5% increase in real estate taxes. By doing this the objectives have been met for an educationally sound budget, prudent lowering of fund balance level, and the percentage increase is in line with surrounding districts. Dr. Frerichs asked for clarification of the percentage

of the fund balance. Mr. Herr expressed concern about lowering the fund balance too much. Mr. Johnston said the goal is to prudently manage the declining fund balance. He said the 2003-2004 fund balance started at 13.94%. The November Resolution designated almost 3 million dollars leaving an 8% undesignated fund balance. The revised resolution that Mr. Johnston is seeking will designate a total of 4 million leaving a 5.9% undesignated fund balance after five years. Mr. Johnston clarified questions about lowering the fund balance. He explained that the downside of using the fund balance to offset the tax increases is that at some point you run out of fund balance. When you use the fund balance to lower a tax increase, you only delay the increase and eventually programs may need to be cut. Dr. Frerichs asked if the budgeted amount for Cyber/Charter School was adequate. Mrs. Griffis responded that it was plenty. Mr. Johnston prepared a list of 5 year budget projection assumptions for the board to review. He reviewed the 5 year projections using 3 scenarios; 4%, 5% and 6% tax increase. Mr. Johnston clarified various budget related questions. Mr. Stewart explained that the tax increase could be cut to 4% . To achieve that the administration would have to cut some of the proposed enhancements, building budgets, salaries for administration and classified staff, field trips, conferences, memberships, funding for some of the athletic programs, summer programs, and some other small items. Mr. Geist asked for clarification about the amounts that will be received from the federal and state governments. A 5% millage increase is being recommended for next year reducing the undesignated fund balance to 7.6%.

Mr. Stewart explained that the preliminary budget would be approved on May 10, 2004 for final budget adoption on June 10, 2004 after the 30 day waiting period. Mr. Stewart is proposing that the budget hearing meeting be held on May 24, 2004 at the Committee of the Whole meeting. The review of the preliminary budget will be Item 1 on the agenda. Approval for placement of the budget process on the May School Board Meeting Agenda was approved on a motion by Dr. Frerichs, a second by Mr. Kreider, and a unanimous voice vote.

Mrs. Griffis reviewed the Professional Development offerings for 2004-2005. She told the board that her budget for professional development has remained the same for the past 5 years. She stated that the professional development plan is submitted to PDE for approval. Act 48 affects all educators with a teaching certificate or educator in the state of Pennsylvania. Act 48 required that all professional educators obtain 6 credits of collegiate study or 180 hours of continuing professional education programs. The

school district has had to implement the professional development plan and do the accounting for Act 48. She said if Penn Manor educators take all of the required inservice days they will have more than enough hours for the five years. Mrs. Griffis reviewed the PDE professional education page on the website. Educators are able to check the status at any time by entering their social security number on the PDE website. She stated that she asked all Penn Manor educators to check their status. With very few exceptions they have all completed their requirement one year in advance. Mrs. Griffis reviewed the professional development plan for the inservice requirements for next year. She explained how the educators sign up for the inservice hours on Lettergrade. Mrs. Griffis clarified questions about the inservice offerings. Dr. Frerichs stated that from the independent study courses or internships for principals that he does look at Penn Manor as the epitome of what a professional development array of courses should be like. They marvel that Penn Manor teachers teach it all because there are very few districts that do that.

Mr. Johnston explained the ACCESS Leader contract. Lancaster Lebanon 13 will continue working to obtain reimbursement for special education related costs regarding OT, PT and speech. Mrs. Campagna has instituted a process that will have Penn Manor doing the legwork and getting all the rewards in the future related to IEP's and medical services. Expenses that are in those areas, if they qualify, will be submitted to the ACCESS program and they will be reimbursed. Part of the guidelines of ACCESS funds call for our IEP's to be reviewed by a medical doctor or a CRNP. He said Mrs. Bender and Mrs. Musser have been working hard to bring some reimbursement of our special ed costs back to the district. Approval for placement of this item on the May School Board Meeting Agenda was approved on a motion by Dr. Frerichs, a second by Mrs. Wert, and a unanimous voice vote.

Mr. Johnston updated the board on the student and athletic activity accounts. He stated that the accounts can be reviewed on the website. He did point out that most expenditures will occur between now and the end of school. The largest balances belong to the classes, yearbooks, plays and FFA. He stated that in the athletic accounts the gate receipts are comparable to last year, expenses are up in the areas of entry fees and officials pay. Plans are to transfer \$10,000 from this account next year to offset additional equipment purchases for the athletic department.

Mr. Stewart thanked the board for the time spent at the long meeting this evening.

Mr. Herr thanked Mr. Taylor for staying for the entire meeting. He stated that Mr. George Mann, also in attendance, just won the election last week for Committee person for the Manor new district. Mr. Herr said that he had a verbal thank you from a community person for remodeling Eshleman School.

The Committee of the Whole adjourned at 8:57 p.m. on a motion by Mrs. Wert, a second by Dr. Frerichs, and a unanimous voice vote.