

**InTech Collegiate High School
Board of Governors
Meeting Minutes for May 12, 2009**

The InTech Board of Governors met on May 12, 2009, at InTech Early College High School from 4:00 pm until 6:00 pm.

Board Members Present: Debora Seiter (Chair), Jim Dorward, Mike Liechty, Nancy Kennedy, Gayle Bowen, Jim Peterson (Treasurer), Deborah Hobbs (Secretary), J.R. Dennison

Staff Present: Jason Stanger (Executive Director), and faculty member--Jim Baker

Next meeting: June 1, 2009 from 4pm until 6pm at InTech Collegiate.

Debora Seiter, Board Chair, called the meeting to order. She welcomed everyone and thanked them for their attendance. She especially thanked Jim Baker who was present and invited them to future meetings. She then led the attendees in the Pledge of Allegiance.

A few corrections were made to the April minutes. Jason made the changes right then on his computer. Nancy Kennedy moved to accept the minutes as corrected. Jim Peterson seconded the motion. The InTech minutes for April 21, 2009, were unanimously approved as corrected.

Treasurer's Report

Jim Peterson reported that he had met with Jason last Friday to conduct the internal audit. The bank reconciliations are completed. The cash-flow reported is up-to-date. In June InTech should be \$10,000 in the black. Jason has done an excellent job in righting InTech's financial ship.

Debbie Hobbs moved that the report be accepted; JR Dennison seconded the motion; and motion carried unanimously.

Action Items

Approval of the FY 09 FY10 Budget

Jason reviewed his draft of the budget with the Board at the last meeting. He had not made any changes since that time. If InTech has 175 students next year, that would mean a \$1.1 million budget for the school.

Jim Peterson noted that IDEA monies cannot be used for other purposes. Jason added that InTech has more expenses in that area than revenue.

If InTech has 175 students next year, we could pay our debt plus \$29,000 in interest and penalties. Jason reported that we did have some of the penalties waived but that the IRS

always makes you pay interest. To-date we have paid \$18,000 in penalties. Jason feels that an expenditure for a tax attorney would be well worth the expense.

Jim Peterson further commented that Jason FY10 budget reflects conservative estimates. Hence, Mike Liechty moved that the FY10 budget be approved; Gayle seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously..

Approval of Employee Leave Policy

At the last Board meeting, a Board sub-committee (Jim Dorward, Jason Stanger, Mike Liechty, and Deb Seiter) was formed to investigate the pros and cons of a change in the employee leave policy.

Jason's recommendation was the following: "New policy proposal made by employees (from the March meeting) which limits accrued sick leave, but allows 12 "personal leave" days a year (the rough equivalent of three weeks paid leave).

Discussion began. One Board member commented that we won't be competitive if we reduce the above proposal. Too, this would be a perk. Another Board member asked Jason if we could afford the above policy. Jason said that it would cost \$5,000 a year and yes we could afford it.

Jim Dorward reported that people he has talked to have commented that the above policy is too rich. What is it that parents want? Shouldn't we as a Board be concerned about quality instruction? We all know that when a teacher is out of the classroom, the quality of instruction diminishes. Jim continued to point out that at InTech there are other incentives such as smaller class size, contract policy, and possibility of working on an advanced degree.

Jason asked that the Board make a decision because he wanted to be able to tell the faculty what next year holds for them. Deb Seiter pointed out that since we don't have money with which to reward InTech faculty, perhaps a "richer" package here would be something that we could do for the faculty. Jason added another thought. Yes, InTech faculty have smaller classes, but the down side of that is that faculty have more than one prep each day.

Jim Baker asked if there wasn't a possible compromise. Perhaps the policy should have 12 days but the days that are not used can be cashed out at the end of the year, but not to exceed 20 days. Deb Seiter had offered a similar solution during the sub-committee meeting with Jim D., Mike, and Jason.

The question then was: Can we afford this? Jason said that right now accrued leave is not a problem but it could be a risk. Jim D. suggested that we keep the current policy but add the cash out possibility and the limiting of accrued days to 20 days.

The question was then raised: Can faculty loan days to each other? The Board said yes they could so Jim amended his motion to include this addition to the motion. The

bereavement days were reduced from five to three. JR Dennison seconded Jim's motion and the motion carried unanimously.

Insurance Discussion

A discussion on insurance was tabled until the June meeting in order for more information to be collected.

Red Dotting of Salaries

Jason reported that he had brought those up to scale who were not. He wanted to know what the Board wanted to do about those individuals who were above scale. Mike Liechty moved that the Board adopt option #3 which reads: Hold employees harmless at their original salary level for FY 09, less a QTB reduction (roughly 5%). Debbie Hobbs seconded the motion and it carried unanimously.

Adjournment

Debbie Hobbs moved that the meeting be adjourned. Nancy seconded the motion and it was approved unanimously. The next meeting will be on June 1, 2009, at InTech from 4pm – 6pm.