



The Newport Board of Education held a work session on Wednesday, February 12, 2025, at 6:30 PM. The meeting was held at 30 W. 8th Street, Newport.

CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Ramona Malone asked for a roll call. The following were present: Ramona Malone, Sylvia Covington, Tim Curl, Ed Davis & Bobbie Stubbeman.

Ms. Malone asked everyone to stand and recite the Pledge of Allegiance and to pause for a Moment of Reflection.

PHASE II BIDS – STADIUM RENOVATION

Mr. Maines introduced Joe Hayes from Hayes and Associates. Joe was in attendance to present the 4 bids received during the bidding process of Phase II of the stadium renovation and share his recommendation as well as the recommendation of Mr. Maines.

Ms. Malone asked that the bidding process be explained so that everyone has a clear understanding of how the process of bidding fits into the overall construction process:

The bidding process for the Kentucky Department of Education involves a request for proposal (RFP) and a review of submitted bids.

The Request for Proposal process is as follows:

- Draft a request for proposal
- Review the solicitation and provide suggestions for improvement
- Incorporate feedback and issue the final RFP
- Advertise
- Bidders submit their proposals

The review process is as follows:

- Review all submitted bids against the criteria in the bid document
- Evaluate bids based on pre-established criteria, such as price, quality, experience, and compliance
- Use an objective, transparent, and consistent process
- Use a scoring system to quantitatively assess each response

The bidding documents may include:

- Approved budget for the contract
- Instructions to bidders
- Terms of reference
- Eligible requirements
- Plans and technical specifications
- Form of bid, price form, and list of goods or bill of quantities
- Delivery time or completion schedule
- Form and amount of bid security

After bids are received, they are opened and reviewed by the architect of record and the district administrators involved with construction projects. The bid they feel meets all criteria is then presented to the board of education for approval.

Ms. Stubbeman asked about next steps once the bid is approved. Mr. Hayes said the contract is signed and the construction process starts as soon as possible.

Mr. Hayes recommended John P. Tumlin & Sons be awarded the project. They submitted the best proposal amount of \$1,195,600. They also offered an alternate bid of \$61,000 to have construction completed by 8/1/25 but both Mr. Hayes and Mr. Maines did not find the alternate bid to be a cost-effective choice. As is, completion should be no later than 9/12/25.

Mr. Curl inquired whether Mr. Hayes has experience working with John P. Tumlin & Sons. Mr. Hayes confirmed that they have collaborated with the company on multiple occasions and find them to be reputable.

Ms. Stubbeman asked how we are funding this phase of the project. Mr. Maines explained that capital outlay specific to building projects is the funding source, rather than general fund dollars. Bonding capacity—the amount a district can borrow—is determined by factors such as repayment terms, available annual cash flows for debt service, and revenue sources for debt service (including the local nickel, state equalization of the local nickel, etc.). Bonding capacity can fluctuate due to legislative changes, funding adjustments, interest rate changes, and the retirement of old debt.

Ms. Stubbeman then asked if this project would push us to our bonding limits. Mr. Maines responded that it would not, as we currently have around \$10–\$11 million in bonding capacity. He also reminded the board that Dwight Salsbury from RSA Advisors is the group Newport works with to assess bonding capacity.

Ms. Stubbeman inquired about the cost of Phase III. Mr. Maines stated that it is still too early to estimate the cost for the next phase. Mr. Davis reinforced that building projects are not funded with general fund dollars.

STAFFING ALLOCATIONS

Kentucky funding regulation outlines the distribution of funds to schools. Certain sections of the KRS allocate certified and classified staff to the schools within the district. be employed in each job classification at the school. As outlined in KRS, base funding levels include the following: • 24:1 for primary grades • 28:1 for grade 4 • 29:1 for grades 5-6 • 31:1 for grades 7-12.

Each school must have an instructional leader and at least some part of a media specialist. The staffing allocation for classified staff must include kindergarten classroom assistants at a 24:1 ratio.

The tentative allocation of funds for the next budget year is due to schools by March 1 of each year with a final allocation by May 1.

Mr. Watts reminded the board that, due to ESSER funding, we have been over-staffed in recent years. Now that these funds have been depleted, staffing levels must be adjusted accordingly.

Mr. Curl requested a comparison of the cuts between this year and last. Mr. Watts proceeded to compare the allocations from last year to this. Ms. Stubbeman asked how these reductions will impact students and services. Mr. Watts explained that while some services may be reduced, the remaining staff will need to adapt and work together to fill the gaps created by these necessary cuts.

Mr. Davis asked what positions are currently funded by ESSER. Mr. Watts said intervention positions as well as building subs.

Ms. Malone said we will need to be creative in looking for community partners to help supplement services we are losing due to cuts. Other discussions centered around:

- The role of behavior interventionists and the impact of not having those positions
- SEEK shortfall
- Central office cuts

- What cuts are being considered outside of personnel
- Reassignment of duties
- Cutting the costs of hiring outside people/companies for training
- Communication with staff and community to calm mass hysteria
- Confirm the actual deficit we are trying to recover from
- Does the current environment prohibit Newport from being a viable employer?
- Has NTA been part of the staffing discussions?
- Comparison of staffing allocations from the last superintendent to current.

Mr. Davis emphasized the importance of staying focused on our core mission—educating our children—even if that requires making difficult decisions, such as reducing employee benefits or cutting programs we are accustomed to. He stressed the need to make as many cuts as necessary without compromising the quality of education. It will be essential for everyone to work together during this challenging time.

Mr. Davis asked if all full-time employees are required to work in the building now. Mr. Watts said all central office employees work in the building with the exception of an occasional day here and there when someone may have a need to work from home.

MOU WITH THE CITY OF NEWPORT – SROs

The city provided an updated MOU regarding school resource officers. The MOU mirrors the last contract with the exception of a few minor changes suggested by our staff. The changes were presented and agreed to by the city. Mr. Voelker has reviewed the contract and approved it.

The board will vote to approve this at the regular meeting on February 26, 2025.

SPECIAL MEETING – CONSENT AGENDA

1. Award bid for Phase II of the stadium renovation and corresponding revised BG-1
2. MOU with Big Brothers Big Sisters – mentoring program

On MOTION BY CURL AND SECONDED BY STUBBEMAN consent agenda items 1 and 2 were approved as presented.

1635 – MOTION CARRIED 5-0

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned ON MOTION BY STUBBEMAN AND SECONDED BY DAVIS.

1636 - MOTION CARRIED 5-0

Chairman

Secretary