Subject: Raw Graphical Data of School Budgets from 2007-2008 through 2015-2016.

This analysis is brought to you courtesy of Vicki Hyatt, the liberal-hack News Editors running hit-pieces in Haywood County, who wrote the hit-piece on John Wall, Legislative Assistant for Michele Presnell, entitled:


Bill Nolte responded to a Request for Public Information (triggered by Vicki Hyatt) -

http://haywoodtp.net/publl/160224HyattHitPiece.pdf

which contained budget and salary information for the years Annual Daily Membership (ADM) started to decline. See www.haywoodtp.net for a complete copy of that information (contained in a ten part series dated 2/25/2016).

No one, except a bean counter, likes to look at 400 pages of budget information. I find it a lot easier to analyze information through the use of graphs, as I did when I cracked the code for the Funding Formula.


This document contains, among other things, the best tally of ADM numbers for the period of time from 2007-2008 through 2014-2015.

[Editor’s Note: Obviously, 2015-2016 numbers were not available at that time. There were multiple categories and sources for ADM numbers throughout this period, and all are documented in “Cracked the Code”. It is these ADM numbers that will be used to assist to analyze the Budget information provided by Bill Nolte.]

Budgets for each year contain six (6) columns of data:

- Beginning Budget / Beg Balance
- Budget Adjustments
- Current Budget / Balance
- Year-to-Date Exp / Rev
- PO’s & Encumbrances Outstanding
- Remaining Balance

At the bottom of each year’s budget, there are totals for each of these columns. These titles are cryptic, and there was nothing supplied in my Request for Public Information which defined what each of these meant.
Great. What does that do for you? It doesn’t do anything for me. Here is where you get to use your brain.

[Editor’s Note: This is about the point in time with this as I was starring at Julie Davis’ PPA values in the Funding Formula. I could only piece things together if I viewed this information graphically.]

I can plot this data from each column for the years 2007-2008 through 2015-2016, but what do you compare it to? Ah-ha! ADM. We know that ADM numbers started tanking in 2008. So, in a perfect world, given a starting point budget of 2007-2008, if nothing else changed, each subsequent year should reflect a reduction of the budget based on declining ADM numbers. Of course, there will be fluctuations, but generally speaking, subsequent years budgets should show this decline.

I created a spreadsheet which started with ADM numbers per year, starting with the year 2007-2008, and created a normalized factor of ADM, starting off with 1.0. Each subsequent year, that factor decreases by the reduction of ADM for that year.

The following table represents computed values of normalized ADM, all six columns of data in the budget information from Bill Nolte, and those values normalized using the ADM factor for that year.

ADM starts off with 8013 students in 07-08 and ends with 7536 in 14-15. [Norm] is the next column, the ADM factor. The next column is the Begin Balance (raw data from Bill Nolte). The next column is that number with the ADM factor applied. And so on ...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yr</th>
<th>ADM</th>
<th>Norm</th>
<th>Balance</th>
<th>Adjust</th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Yr to Date</th>
<th>PO's</th>
<th>Remain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>07-08</td>
<td>8013</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>65.8</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>65.8</td>
<td>84.4</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>77.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08-09</td>
<td>7904</td>
<td>0.9864</td>
<td>70.3</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>76.6</td>
<td>85.3</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>73.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09-10</td>
<td>7742</td>
<td>0.9662</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>75.6</td>
<td>81.5</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>74.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-11</td>
<td>7663</td>
<td>0.9563</td>
<td>62.9</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>76.4</td>
<td>80.7</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>73.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-12</td>
<td>7636</td>
<td>0.9530</td>
<td>62.7</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>80.4</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>73.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-13</td>
<td>7567</td>
<td>0.9443</td>
<td>62.1</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>73.3</td>
<td>79.7</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>73.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-14</td>
<td>7584</td>
<td>0.9465</td>
<td>62.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>71.6</td>
<td>79.9</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>73.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-15</td>
<td>7536</td>
<td>0.9405</td>
<td>61.9</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>77.1</td>
<td>79.4</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>71.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-16</td>
<td>68.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>70.4</td>
<td>41.8</td>
<td>5.100</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This information forms the basis for six graphs, that we can look at and see what is happening.

[Editors Note: This information is plotted on my personal stash of green engineering graph paper. It is very expensive and hard to get. When I have to dip into this, you know that someone has really [expletive deleted] me off, and is in trouble. Thank you very much, Vicki Hyatt.]

Here we go...
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The red line are raw values from each year’s budget.

The green line starts with the year 07-08 and is Normalized to ADM.

In a perfect world, if nothing else changed, the green line would represent what the budget should be, based on the decline of ADM. But no! It had increased around $5 Million a year. What the ... ?

The differential of what is was and what it should have been is even greater.

Are we starting to see the foundation of “Gross Mismanagement”?

By the way, the School Board would not be in the predicament they found themselves in if county commissioners and Julie Davis had adhered to the original Funding Formula. But no, Julie Davis cooked the books, falsified the PPA values, and we are off to the races.

Let’s look at some more data...
Again, no information was supplied that gave an indication what “Budget Adjustments” encompassed. It does seem clear that after 07-08 that several million dollars worth of adjustments were included.

Make note of the last year, 15-16, as remaining graphs have similar unexplained gyrations.
Current Budget / Balance. What does this mean? Oh, if only Robin Black, current candidate for county commissioner who knows all this stuff, and Rhonda Schandevel, current school board member who voted on all this stuff and candidate for Representative, District 11, running against Michele Presnell, were here to explain all this stuff.

The normalized curve indicates what the current budget should look like, based on a declining number in ADM. However, the drop is more severe, like several million dollars. At this point, these are simply observations. Again, a gyration in the last year.
This graph follows closely with the normalized prediction, although actual values are again several million dollars below what they should have been.

What the [expletive deleted] happened in the last year? Oh, for the assistance of Robin Black and Rhonda Schandevel.
I can excuse the perturbations in this graph, as year to year fluctuations are only in the order of several thousand dollars, but what happened the last year when it reached $5.1 Million?
This also follows closely the expected normalized curve, with the exception of the last 3 years.

**Conclusion.**

Too early for any conclusion. This is only a presentation of actual raw data, and nothing directly suggests why Central Elementary School had to be closed. Neither the School Board, School Administration, nor either newspaper has suggested why CES had to be closed, other than pounding on Michele Presnell.

Next... Time to look at salaries over these couple of years.

Sigh, it looks like I will be using additional green graph paper.

Monroe Miller
Haywood County Taxpayer.

p.s. All of you folks that are now going to be placed under the microscope can thank Vicki Hyatt, News Editor of the Mountaineer, for her hit-piece on John Wall, Legislative Assistant to Michele Presnell.