

## 2022-2023 Proposed Budget Quick Facts

### June 15, 2022

#### 1. The Basics

- The May 17 proposed budget did not pass. It was \$55.8M and had an increase of 5.68% from 2021-2022.
- The revised budget proposal that will be presented to voters on June 21 is \$55.3M and has an increase of 4.68% from 2021-2022.
- The current proposed increase in the budget is \$2,469,644 over 2021-2022. This represents a \$528K decrease in spending over the first budget proposal.
- The change in the tax levy compared to the 2021-2022 school budget has decreased from 3.1% (as presented in the May 17 budget proposal) to 1.92% (as presented in this second June 21 proposed budget). The tax levy is the amount of money received from taxpayers to fund district expenditures.
- The district operates under contractual and mandated cost increases. These increasing costs must be met by an increase in spending. It is our legal obligation. Any budget that does not include a spending increase to meet these obligations will result in cuts to the services, programs and opportunities that students receive.

#### 2. How has the revised budget proposal been reduced?

\$528K in reduced spend came from three areas:

- **Curriculum and development, instructional expenses and professional learning (\$360,257)** - This includes reductions in professional development including project-based learning, and literacy work, as well as cuts in supplies and equipment.
- **Facilities and maintenance (\$82,500)** - This includes reductions in maintenance improvements and architectural services for master planning, as well as cuts in overtime and summer cleaning plans.
- **Governance, supervision and management (\$85,406)** - This includes cuts in contractual services, memberships, supplies, and conferences, and reductions in substitute coverage for offices.

#### 3. What is driving the \$2,469,644 increase in this budget?

- **Bond debt service payment (35%) – \$864K**
- **Salary and benefit obligations (39%) – \$963K**

- **Utility and contractual service increases (21%)** - \$519K. These include energy costs and special education and technology services.
- **Transportation cost increases (5%)** - \$124K

**4. Refresh my memory: What was the total cost of the 2019 Bond Referendum and what areas does it address?**

The total cost of the 2019 bond was \$18.3M. The results were 58-42% by a vote of 823-588. It includes:

- **Hillside Elementary School:** a 12,000 square foot addition for a cafeteria/multi-purpose space; four new classrooms, and a new roof.
- **Farragut Middle School & Hastings High School Complex:** a renovated state-of-the-art middle school auditorium; a renovated and upgraded Music Suite for the middle school and high school music program, and a new boiler and roof for the Farragut Complex.

**5. Can you give a historical perspective of budget increases in Hastings?**

Below is a budget summary of the last 25 years:

Year	Budget	\$ Change over previous year	% Change over previous year
1998-99	\$19,442,661	\$1,380,698	7.64%
1999-00	\$20,596,902	\$1,154,241	5.94%
2000-01	\$22,151,916	\$1,555,014	7.55%
2001-02	\$24,288,673	\$2,136,757	9.65%
2002-03	\$26,473,213	\$2,184,540	8.99%
2003-04	\$28,763,590	\$2,290,377	8.65%
2004-05	\$31,963,654	\$3,200,064	11.13%
2005-06	\$34,501,182	\$2,537,528	7.94%
2006-07	\$37,340,850	\$2,839,668	8.23%
2007-08	\$39,837,564	\$2,496,714	6.69%
2008-09	\$41,633,422	\$1,795,858	4.51%
2009-10	\$42,624,795	\$991,373	2.38%

2010-11	\$42,441,795	(\$183,000)	-0.43%	
2011-12	\$42,028,394	(\$413,401)	-0.97%	
2012-13	\$42,708,466	\$680,072	1.62%	
2013-14	\$43,895,492	\$1,187,026	2.78%	
2014-15	\$44,601,912	\$706,420	1.61%	
2015-16	\$46,493,447	\$1,891,535	4.24%	
2016-17	\$47,082,130	\$588,683	1.27%	
2017-18	\$48,454,314	\$1,372,184	2.95%	
2018-19	\$50,518,586	\$2,064,272	4.26%	
2019-20	\$51,283,825	\$765,239	1.51%	
2020-21	\$51,660,159	\$376,334	0.73%	
2021-22	\$52,823,911	\$1,163,752	2.25%	
<b>2022-23</b>	<b>\$55,293,555</b>	<b>\$2,469,644</b>	<b>4.68%*</b>	<b>proposed</b>

**Note: Current proposed increase would be 3% without bond payment.**

## 6. How does our spending compare to other local districts?

Another important metric the Board pays attention to is our cost-per-pupil. While it is an inexact measure, it reveals how our district fits in with regional trends. The median proposed per-pupil spending level across Westchester/Putnam districts is \$35,800.

Note: Hastings-on-Hudson per-pupil costs are beneath the Westchester/Putnam median values and, likewise, compare favorably with other nearby/adjacent districts. The median per-pupil cost amongst our six adjacent districts is \$35,068.

If our district's June 21 budget proposal passes, our per-pupil spend would rank #6 out of the 7 districts which make up our highly local area. As per the chart below, the total cost per pupil is \$33,510.

### Per-Pupil Spending (From Revised 2022-2023 School Budgets)

District	Per-Pupil
Irvington	\$39,300
Elmsford	\$38,330

Dobbs Ferry	\$33,890
Edgemont	\$33,630
Tarrytown	\$33,600
<b>Hastings (Proposed)</b>	<b>\$33,510</b>
Ardsley	\$32,900

**7. Is the proposed budget below the tax cap?**

It is roughly \$500K below on the budget that did not pass, and roughly \$1M below for the current proposed budget up for vote on June 21.

**8. What is the total number of administrators in the district?**

The total number of administrators in the district is 14 including the Superintendent. Below is the breakdown:

- (3) Principals
- (3) Assistant Principals
- (1) Director of Special Education
- (1) Assistant Director of Special Education
- (1) Athletic Director
- (1) Business Official
- (1) Director of Guidance
- (1) Director of Facilities
- (1) Assistant Superintendent
- (1) Superintendent

Note: the number of administrators depends on the number of schools in a district.

**9. Are salary increases negotiated as part of the proposed budget? Are they for Curriculum & Instruction or Administrative purposes?**

The salary increases are for Curriculum & Instruction and Administrative purposes with the bulk being Curriculum & Instruction. They are contractual and not negotiated as part of the budget. These reflect agreements the district made with the HTA, HAA and CSEA.

As mentioned above, we have 14 administrative positions. We have 179 contractual teachers and approximately 80 CSEA members, who provide classroom and administrative support. Therefore, the bulk of the salaries are for instruction. At the same time, it is essential to understand that 11 of the 14 administrative positions (all but the Superintendent, Business Official and Director of Facilities) have a direct impact every day on students and instruction through supervision, coaching and guidance of curriculum, academic plans, and teachers.

This year, the HTA, HAA and CSEA contracts expired. We just passed a 3-year contract for the administrators and we're in the process of negotiating the contract with the teacher's union and CSEA.

**10. Is the proposed Assistant Director of Special Education adding additional cost to the budget?**

Adding a second Assistant Director for Special Education has no additional cost to the budget.

Through modification of two existing staff roles and the addition of targeted grant funds, we can reduce the budget for SPED management and facilitation by approximately \$30,000.

**The budget efficiencies are obtained as follows:**

- The district currently has a teacher on assignment as an Inclusion Facilitator that was established last year. The salary of this position as a teacher on assignment is approximately \$135,000 for a ten-month position. We would not reappoint this position, and have the Inclusion responsibilities led by the Director, current Assistant Director, and proposed Assistant Director.
- There is a chairperson of Special Education, who is also a teacher, at an approximate cost of \$27,000. We would not reappoint this Schedule B position.
- We are also able to fund part of this position by using Federal funding targeted to a special education program which will pay for part of this position moving forward.

We believe that hiring an Assistant Director at a salary of \$140,000 for 12 months will better help support the development of Special Education programming within the district.

**11. If the June 21 budget proposal does not pass, we will have to move to a contingency budget. Can you clarify what this means and the implications?**

The biggest impact of moving to a contingency budget is we cannot raise the tax levy over last year. This means that we will have to reduce an additional \$854K from the budget (the size of the currently proposed tax levy increase).

It's a challenging task given that most of the increases outlined in Q3 above are contractual obligations and/or tied to inflation. Therefore, they cannot be reduced. As such, we would have to reduce spending in other areas.

The administration has spent several weeks looking closely at how to do this and has proposed the following reductions if we move to a contingent budget:

- Eliminate 1.0 Music Position \$146,000
- Reduce Library District Wide 0.5 FTE \$50,000
- Reduce Asst. Director (net) \$145,000 (Current Inclusion Facilitator Role)
- Eliminate Modified Sports \$80,000
- Reduce clubs/theater \$10,000
- Eliminate Equipment/Furniture \$30,500
- Reduce technology lease \$100,000
- Reduce Communications Position \$90,000 (Leave \$20k for required)
- Eliminate Occ Education for Gen Ed and busing \$55,000
- Reduce Interfund \$70,000
- Cut Portrait of a Learner \$25,000
- Reduce Reading and Writing Professional Development \$30,000
- Reduce secretarial support (share staffing) \$35,000
- Reduce Professional Development Workshops \$20,000

**Additional Implications of a Contingency Budget include:**

- A reduction in facility and field usage for community and external groups. The outside groups would need to pay all expenses for the use of the space including field maintenance and upkeep.
- A lower base for next year. This means that it would be difficult to reinstate any of this year's reductions in subsequent years without a supermajority vote to override the tax cap.

**12. Based on your feedback and questions, we've provided other clarifying information below:**

It has been posted on flyers and social media that the proposed budget includes a 30K increase in Superintendent pay. This information is false.

*We hope you found that this Quick Sheet of information demonstrates the transparency of the Board and Administration, adds clarity to the proposed budget, and helps you in making your decision.*