

APPROVED



## Great Oaks Charter School - Bridgeport

### Minutes

#### GOBPT May Monthly Finance Committee Meeting

---

##### **Date and Time**

Monday May 8, 2023 at 1:00 PM

##### **Location**

Great Oaks Charter School - Bridgeport  
375 Howard Avenue  
Bridgeport, CT 06605

---

##### **Committee Members Present**

Bob Carlson (remote), Corey Sneed (remote)

##### **Committee Members Absent**

David Zieff, Eva Vega

##### **Guests Present**

Benjamin Chan (remote), Janay Garrett (remote), John Scalice (remote), Latoya Hubbard (remote)

---

#### **I. Opening Items**

##### **A. Record Attendance**

##### **B. Call the Meeting to Order**

Janay Garrett called a meeting of the Finance Committee Committee of Great Oaks Charter School - Bridgeport to order on Monday May 8, 2023 at 1:17 PM.

### **C. Approve March Finance Meeting Minutes**

Bob Carlson made a motion to approve the minutes from GOBPT April Monthly Finance Committee Meeting on 04-17-23.

Corey Sneed seconded the motion.

The committee **VOTED** unanimously to approve the motion.

## **II. Financial Overview/Administrative**

### **A. Current Cash Position**

Before diving into the financial overview, C. Sneed asked B. Chan if he received the email about getting the 990 signed/approved for filing. It was included in the finance committee docs for the board review and will be included for Wednesday's meeting as well.

B. Chan reviewed the current cash position

Checking account: \$895,000

Food service: \$600,000 He is waiting for 2 months of meal claims to be funded into the account and it had been reconciled recently

Reserve account: \$44,260

Total: 946,000

Credit Card Balance: \$1300

## **III. Financial Review**

### **A. April Dashboard & Financials**

End of March - funding for last quarter. In April it was down to 1M . There was a lot of catchup in terms of expenses that needed to be paid out, so cash/burn was a little higher.

On the current ratio of spending, when the state DOE funds the school for 3 months and its April, May/June are technically liabilities because they've paid for services we haven't yet performed - so it goes into a liability account. That liability account is current liability which inflates liability side and deflates the ratio.

Next month, end of May, we take 695,000 out of liability account and put it in recognized revenue.

In terms of expenses, when there is a negative on the revenue side, it means we haven't drawn much. ESSER is a plug, if we need as much it goes into next year within reason. We had budgeted about 1.6 and we are currently at 1.25, so that's why there is the negative 342,000 - it hasn't been recognized.

B. Chan also reviewed the target funding set out at the top of the year.

Summer payroll accounts for the lower spending in salaries, as teachers are paid out in July though funding comes from FY23.

Facilities spending is much higher this year because of a lot of facilities repairs, utilities spikes, janitorial needs/fluctuations, etc.

B. Carlson asked for clarification on the 429,000 spent on facilities, how much of that cost was specific to utilities. B. Chan reviewed what was budgeted for utilities (105,00 through end of April, and we are at 170,000 or 65,000 more than expected, which is significant). The rest of the spending is janitorial (we budgeted 187,000 we are at 323,000). Part of it is that we used some of their staff for kitchen support, but they also increased their rate significantly this year during the year, which hurt our budget projections. We had more building repairs than expected as well (80,000). Last major expense is security, \$50,000 YTD.

L. Hubbard noted that the school discussed putting the janitorial contract out for bid given the extremely high increasing cost for the contract; they're in the process of vetting other vendors now to see if they can reduce the costs for next year. We did use them in the past for cafeteria support and summer work around the building in the past, but just in general the cost is significantly high, particularly considering we haven't been the happiest with the service. We aim to reduce the cost and hopefully receive better service.

C. Sneed asked if it would be better to have a full-time staffer. L. Hubbard noted that in past conversations, the biggest concern was liability and a desire to avoid taking on the liability associated with having an in-house janitor and/or janitorial services.

B. Chan noted that the janitorial invoices began to grow significantly since October 2022 and it's an opportunity to reduce costs/mitigate any future increases.

C. Sneed flagged that if we go to bid for other vendors for janitorial services, to keep in mind that they'll likely include costs for materials, and depending on costs and number of clients, they could be spreading out the total cost for materials across clients rather than charging by usage and it's not something that we can control, versus someone who is in-house, including the purchase of materials, we'd be more able to control costs by aligning them with needs. C. Sneed is mostly interested in the indirect costs the school may be subject to, but is not directly benefitting from through our agreement.

#### **B. April Credit Card Statement**

#### **C. YTD federal grant cash availability**

### **IV. FY 24 Budget & 5 yr. Projection**

## A. Review of FY 24 budget and 5 yr. projection

B. Chan reviewed the FY 24 budget plans (working draft)

- No growth in per-pupil
- Estimated about the same number of Sped students with 3 paraprofessionals - that funding comes through Bridgeport public schools
- Whatever we don't use this year in ESSER funds would flow into next year, approximately 1.1M
- Erate is an in-kind reimbursement (3,000 for the year)
- Private Grants/Donations, for now is at \$100,000 - a yearly need to seek out donations. B. Chan noted the value of unrestricted dollars. C. Sneed reiterated, being cautious about utilizing limited funding for consistent costs
- B. Chan reviewed personnel, non-personnel, salary and fringe, school operations, and CMO support from the foundation.
- Rent is going up by 1% for the schools and 2% for fellow costs.
- Slight decrease in total revenue for FY24 - that's a result of ESSER, personnel alignments/adjustments, and leaning out operations expenses (contracted services - CMO). Tutor fees are included in contracted services line.
  - Bump in facilities (rent, utilities, etc.)
  - C. Sneed noted that in the past, fellows fees were front loaded - but moving forward, the school is not necessarily in a position to do this, particularly with ESSER funding wrapping up and the current status of our funds, we'd have to fund the fellows based on funding coming in.
- 5 YR forecast is there for everyone's review

## V. Additional Items

### A. Recurring

Engagement Letter from PFK O'Connor for the employee retention credit, \$250/hr. (fees) the budget is about \$8,000 - some folks emailing about the ERC are lawyers trying to get a portion of the fees; we provide PFK (Audit firm) the numbers and do most of the legwork, but they'll rubber stamp it and file it officially for us. They file it with Trinet, a PEO who will make the tax adjustment, receive the refund on our behalf and then disburse.

At the upcoming board meeting the board will vote to authorize C. Sneed to sign the engagement letter from PFK O'Connor.

L. Hubbard noted that she's reached out to EnergizeCT to see if someone could come out to take a look at our meters, but she's had trouble with their responsiveness.

C. Sneed asked about new vendors and asked that they be added to a consent agenda for Wednesday's board meeting

## **VI. Closing Items**

### **A. Adjourn Meeting**

There being no further business to be transacted, and upon motion duly made, seconded and approved, the meeting was adjourned at 2:00 PM.

Respectfully Submitted,  
Corey Sneed