

**WILTON-LYNDEBOROUGH COOPERATIVE
SCHOOL BOARD EMERGENCY MEETING
Tuesday, January 19, 2021
Wilton-Lyndeborough Cooperative M/H School-Media Room
6:30 p.m.**

The videoconferencing link was published several places including on the meeting agenda.

Present: *Alex LoVerme, Mark Legere, Brianne Lavallee, Participating online: Jonathan Vanderhoof, Tiffany Cloutier-Cabral, Charlie Post and Paul White*

Superintendent Bryan Lane, Business Administrator Rob Mullin, Director of Student Support Services Ned Pratt, Technology Director Mark Kline, and Clerk Kristina Fowler, Participating online: Principals Peter Weaver, Bob LaRoche, and Assistant Principal Sarah Edmunds

I. CALL TO ORDER

Chairman LoVerme called the meeting to order at 6:41pm.

II. 6:45PM EMERGENCY MEETING

Due to not having a quorum of the Board, the meeting switched to the emergency meeting; link was posted in several places including the agenda. Those participating online were informed and link was provided to anyone requesting it.

III. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

IV. ADJUSTMENTS TO THE AGENDA

Superintendent Lane reported the following adjustments, the joint session will be moved up to the start of the meeting, an additional donation and a letter regarding the sale of property around WLC.

A MOTION was made by Ms. Lavallee and SECONDED by Mr. Legere to accept the adjustments to the agenda. Voting: via roll call vote, six ayes; one abstention from Chairman LoVerme, motion carried.

V. PUBLIC COMMENTS

The public comment section of the agenda was read. Superintendent called out all the phone numbers and names joined in the meeting for public comment.

Chairman LoVerme read correspondence from Lynne Crouse who was writing to support the MS Counselor position being increased to full time. A copy of the correspondence can be found with the minutes.

The joint session was moved up on the agenda. Joint session started at 6:46 pm. Minutes recorded below. Returned to the agenda as written after the joint session concluded.

VI. BOARD CORRESPONDENCE

a. Reports

i. Superintendent's Report

Superintendent provided an overview of his report, including how we have dealt with some COVID issues and found our way through in a positive manner. Regarding the WLCTA contract, we are in the Fact Finding stage and should have something from the Fact Finder by January 25. That should give the School Board time to consider it. He describes what Fact Finding is in his report. Professional development hours are reviewed annually for teachers and administration who are up for rectification; this year there are 19. Seven remain who need additional hourly credits to meet the requirement. Recommendations have been provided to the DOE to recertify those who have met the requirement. The Short-term Strategic Planning Committee will report later this evening. There were very few teacher absences today to report. He confirms he is still looking at February to have the information in for the curriculum plan. A question was raised if we have received the feedback from parents regarding schedule changes. He reports, we have 8 in a modified schedule who have not replied, otherwise he has a good number of changes.

FRES there are 3 moving from remote to in-school in various grades, at MS/HS one 7th grade, one in the 8th grade moving from remote to in-school, two in kindergarten moving from remote to in-school (could be a concern), one 10th grader coming in-school from remote. Students will come back on Monday although a couple have already come back in due to special needs. A question was raised if the Superintendent has any concerns. The Principals will speak to this later; he will speak regarding LCS. He was asked to clarify if the kindergarten looks like it may be a problem. He reports yes.

ii. Director of Student Support Services Report

Mr. Pratt provided an overview of his report. He provided some SPED statistics; SPED rate is 18.9%, the NH SPED rate is 15.5% and the National SPED rate is 14.9%. Our rate decreased a little from last year, less than 1%. He is not surprised that due to COVID, the referrals in the pipeline have increased. The process still remains the same; continue to look at the data and make determinations if the student meets the criteria for SPED. The number of RISE students has increased but not the number of ABA's. At LCS the SPED rate has increased (preschool is primarily SPED), there has been a slight increase at FRES and a decrease at the MS/HS, and out of district has remained the same. He will continue to watch the referral process carefully. The SPED Department is able to provide appropriate services for the number of students; with the number of staff we have now. Regarding the disability table in his report, he confirms for our purposes, it shows the primary disability although we may and often do, provide multiple services. A question was raised to provide the breakdown by school of the increased referrals. He reports there are more from LCS this year which is expected with the students being out last year, less from the MS/HS and more from FRES. He notes if you think how SPED works with the situation we had last year it makes sense to see the numbers we are seeing. Appreciation was expressed for providing the data; it shines a spotlight on why we have the budget that we do. It was noted that students in preschool do well with a mix of 50/50 SPED students and regular education students (as peer models); are we able to provide this now. Mr. Pratt reports for the 4 y/o program we already had peer models from last year and we kept that program. One of the things we were concerned about coming into this year was the number of students on IEP's in the 3 y/o program; we had decided late last spring to not have peer models in that classroom. He is a proponent of having peer models; he will look to reintroduce them next year. The teacher and the staff have noticed the program has shifted a little bit without having peer models; they are still doing a great job and are providing more intensive services with a little smaller group. A question was raised regarding the first bullet in his report relating to High Mowing; what is the dynamic there, are the 10 students placed there by us, please provided some background. Mr. Pratt explained that any student attending a school within the confines of our district who is identified as having a disability is included in our count. The piece that is important is we are responsible for providing any testing or initial referrals and triennial testing that happens; we are responsible for that. He meets with them each year, they get a piece of the IDEA grant and they use it for tutoring services and testing services (new this year); it is an appropriate use of the funds. Apart from that, they are part of our district as a census piece.

iii. Director of Technology's Report

Mr. Kline provided an overview of his report including that there are quite a few things that need to get done when school is not in session. Over the holiday break they worked on two large projects, updating and consolidating some of the remaining virtual servers and updates to the Windows Server. This is to provide increased security and consolidating reduces the amount of hardware we will need down the road. The other project was the conversion of the VoIP (voice over IP) phone system from Mitel to FirstLight. All the phone numbers and extensions were maintained; all the staff had to do for the most part was record a voice mail message. The voice messages will also be sent to their email allowing them to receive it even if they are not at their phone. There will be some long term costs savings. There was one glitch, the switch at WLC has had to be restarted on two occasions; he has made them aware of this and if it continues it will need to be replaced. He spoke of the 4 processes for eRate. We have finished the first step so far. The state technology conference was held this past week virtually for 4 days. There were only a few sessions he could attend, 4-5; it was interesting and the sessions were good although difficult to do while at school. Another project has been to work toward having documentation more accessible to staff so they can look up information on certain topics. A page has been placed on each school's website to provide access to some of this. On Sunday at 5:01am, the internet went out because of fire in Manchester under a bridge. A propane heater caught fire and burned through a conduit that had fiber optic in it. At about 10am the following day they had spliced all those connections together. It is something for us to be aware of as we become more and more dependent on technology and networks. Appreciation was voiced for making access to information more accessible to staff. Appreciation was voiced for Mr. Kline noting that we would not have been able to accomplish what we did this year without him. He doesn't (and those in IT) get credit for making the "machine run well" all the time; he has done an incredible job. He confirmed we have received all the Chromebooks we ordered. There are still 5 students who have not swapped out the old for the new but otherwise they are all out. To the best of his knowledge, there is not any student who does not have one that wants one. The struggle continues with not having quite enough; the repairs average about 3-4 per day and not necessarily for damage but need something that requires a spare device. The spare pile is limited but they

have gotten by. A question was raised if the fire in Manchester had happened during the week would it have affected the remote learners. He responded that it would have affected many teachers trying to teach remote with students. The students at home probably could have had access but if it was a Comcast line it would have been a problem.

b. Letters/Information

Superintendent reviewed the Town of Wilton has requested to use the WLC facility for voting on March 9 and the town meeting on March 11. For their town meeting, they would need to set up during the day in the gym and PE classes would not be able to be held in the gym. He assumes from the tenor of the Board in the past, we would want to continue to cooperate with the town and have the students go remote at WLC on voting day March 9. This would just be for WLC students (MS & HS), LCS and FRES would go to their buildings. There was no objection heard. WLC students will be remote on March 9.

• ATTORNEY LETTER-SALE OF PROPERTY

Superintendent reported he received a letter from Winer and Bennett, Attorneys at Law who represent the Babineau Trustees and Sirois Trustees who own land around WLC which we currently use for classes like Woods and Wheels, and some technical classes. According to the letter, we will no longer have access to the land as of March 1. It is not that we have done anything inappropriate in fact the letter says we have left everything “well done” but they are looking to sell the land. This is the space beyond the baseball, softball and soccer fields. Academically it will affect Woods and Wheels (9 students) and it will no longer be an option for this class. We have 45 days to make any adjustments we need to. A question was raised if there will be any alternatives for the students. Superintendent responded it will be determined what the best alternative will be. On behalf of the School District, he thanked the Trustees for allowing us to use the land for as long as we did. It was not something they had to do.

VII. CONSENT AGENDA

i. Donation-WLC Warriors Athletic Booster Club

Superintendent reviewed the donation of \$270.74 from the WLC Warriors Athletic Booster Club to WLC Athletic Program which will be placed in the student activity fund.

• Donation-FRES Swing

A donation was made to fund the replacement of 8 swings for the FRES playground by MD’s Recycle and Waste and PTO at a cost of \$1,834. Appreciation was voiced for the donations.

A MOTION was made by Mr. Legere and SECONDED by Ms. Lavallee to approve the consent agenda.

Voting: via roll call vote, five ayes; one abstention by Chairman LoVerme, motion carried.

VIII. 7:00PM JOINT BOARD & BUDGET COMMITTEE SESSION

Present: Leslie Browne, Christine Tiedemann, Dennis Golding, Kevin Boette, Bill Ryan and Participating online: Jeff Jones, Jennifer Bernet, Lisa Post and Adam Lavallee

Chair Browne called the Budget Committee to order at 6:46pm.

a. FY 2020-2021 YTD Reports

Superintendent reviewed the YTD reports have been provided and are provided on a monthly basis. He welcomed questions; none heard.

b. FY 2021-2022 Budget

A question was raised if there has been any change to the warrant articles. Superintendent confirms the WLCTA CBA has not been resolved yet. He anticipates the Board to consider any new proposal after January 25; all other articles remain the same. He added there has been 1 article requested by a Board member for consideration to increase the half time counselor to a full time position. An updated budget summary report was passed out by Mr. Mullin and an electronic copy was also provided. Chair Browne reviewed that when the Budget Committee last met they looked at each object code in detail. There had been 1 suggestion for a reduction of 1%. After the meeting the committee came up with about \$25,000 they felt that could be reduced in the budget. She clarified, the 1% reduction is inclusive of the warrant articles. In order to get to that they would be looking at potentially about \$130,000 reduction; as a group they have not talked about it fully although she is comfortable with about \$25,000-\$30,000. Chairman LoVerme noted that NHRS increases were approximately \$191,000 which we did not have control of. The committee is aware of this. Chair Browne again clarifies that they have not fully discussed the reductions but wanted to give the Board a heads up regarding this. Areas they are considering reductions in are printing, books and printed media, supplies-paper, misc., assemblies, postage and fees. She notes, with changes in behavior we can make

changes in expense. Mr. Boette expressed one of the biggest areas is supplies and paper as we have increased technology. We need to move away from printing things and change gears. Superintendent reminds the group that reductions had been made prior and a large portion of the supply accounts are for equipment; it is not just paper in the account lines of 1100-610. That is to pay for science lab equipment, lumber supplies, art supplies, music supplies, math calculators; it is for things that go beyond paper and pencils. He reviewed the reductions made last year to these accounts which accounts for the reduction in paper (MS reduced by \$2,840, HS reduced by \$3,200, FRES reduced by \$4,500, LCS reduced by \$1,200). It was noted that the actuals show \$50,000 less than budgeted; what did not get purchased in that account. Superintendent expressed that he does not have a breakdown but there are certain things that do not get purchased until the 2nd semester particularly in art and sciences plus the reduction due to COVID in the last 3rd of the year. A question was raised to see the actuals for 2019. Superintendent reviewed these. A question was raised regarding an actual expense of \$73 for postage fees however it is previously budgeted at \$900 which doesn't make sense; budget FY22 is for \$1,050. Superintendent does not have an answer as to why it is showing only \$73 expensed for 2019. He will need to look at this. He reviewed some of the expenses to this account and agrees it does not make sense, the 7 board packets that are mailed for each meeting would cost roughly this amount. A question was raised if the \$900 should be the actual. Superintendent does not know as he does not create that part of the document. Chair Browne confirmed that the committee did get some responses today to the questions they had. Superintendent reviewed what some of operational expenses are; replacement of paper towel dispensers which get damaged at times, exit signs etc. things of this nature. Superintendent confirms a prior email he sent to the Budget Committee today can be ignored-he referred to a document that was not created by them and an updated one has been sent out by Mr. Mullin a few minutes ago, the Board will receive it as well. Discussion was had regarding this updated document which shows a total of \$13,286,935 for FY22 proposed and the difference in the bottom line. Superintendent responded that the previous document did not have food service of \$251,276 included. It is an estimate currently. It was noted that typically the operational budget and the warrants are discussed separately. Chair Browne confirms that but the committee will be taking both into account (including grants and food service also) when they are determining a budget number as that is what they are taxed on. Chairman LoVerme questioned what the Budget Committee's thoughts were on the warrant articles. The committee had discussed reducing the amount from \$160,000 to \$100,000 for the Building and Roadways article and putting thought into reducing the SPED article as well. The committee has put a lot of effort into the budget going line by line reviewing it. Chairman LoVerme spoke about trying to build up the Building and Roadways warrant article as they are already behind with this. Mr. Boette and Chair Browne confirm they want to discuss these things fully. A question was raised if the Facilities Committee has met yet. Superintendent confirms they have not. A question was raised where are we in terms of the schedule and what can be moved around. Superintendent confirms the items on the CIP that are up for projects this coming school year is what the increase is for, one was for roof, he cannot remember the others. A question was raised if we delayed repairs and if so what were they. Superintendent confirms we did not except for the tennis courts. To the best of his knowledge from when he has been here, nothing has been delayed that was scheduled on the CIP. Mr. Post notes that he thinks we are pretty close to a consensus that the tennis courts need to be removed or repurposed. Superintendent responds, it is not on the docket and not part of the consideration. A question was raised regarding what are the plans for putting money in for next year; if we will be adding in positions we will need to reduce expenses somewhere because then net increase to tax payers will not be acceptable. What is planned for next year. Chair Browne reviews the projects on the CIP for next year FY 22, WLC roof \$67,046, bathrooms \$16,000, LCS boiler \$8,000, the tennis courts \$100,000, WLC LED lighting project \$64,619; a total of \$255,665. Removing the tennis courts brings it down to \$155,665. It was confirmed the LED lighting project has not been approved by the Board. Superintendent explained the purpose is to update and upgrade lighting to create a better lighting scenario at a reduced cost over time. Chairman LoVerme reviews that the cost of the tennis courts is \$100,000 and the quote to remove it was \$8,000. He confirms that quote is to take down the fencing and repurpose the asphalt. Superintendent confirms it has not been determined what will be done with the space yet. A question was raised when the Facilities Committee will meet and who is the Chair. Chairman LoVerme notes it will be discussed later in the meeting. Superintendent reviewed that the Business Administrator calls/coordinates the meetings; he does not know who is on the committee or who is the Chair of it.

c. Warrant Articles

i. Full-time MS Counselor

Ms. Lavallee expressed wanting to open the discussion regarding a warrant article for the MS counselor position. She voiced that it was discussed at the last meeting and since she has received a lot of feedback from parents/community about it who are concerned over the slippery slope that could happen when putting positions in warrant articles. She has also had a lot of feedback from parents regarding concerns of the children struggling and having a hard time. She adds, we discussed last week that the pandemic is affecting people. She wanted to highlight the effect it has on children directly trickles down. She spoke of the pandemic affecting a lot of low income families and that we have a higher rate of low income families in our community. Looking at the agenda we will be discussing possible

230 appointment for a FRES counselor and if approved, she asks that the Board look at the savings from this and use it to
231 increase the MS counselor position.

232
233 *A MOTION was made by Ms. Lavallee to increase the operating budget by \$37,120 to increase the MS counselor*
234 *position to full time (not making it a warrant article). **

235
236 A question was raised, given the possibility of the Board accepting the nomination this evening which would result
237 in savings, how will that affect next year's budget number. Ms. Lavallee reviewed the numbers; the current FRES
238 counselor salary is \$71,000, the nomination is for a salary of \$40,000, difference of \$31,000. A question was raised if
239 there would be a step increase for the person for next year. Superintendent reviewed the numbers noting he does not
240 know what the benefits would be; he will do some quick math. A question was raised which Board member added
241 this; Ms. Lavallee made the request after she got emails from parents. Mr. Post questioned what statistics support
242 having lower poverty levels than other areas around us. Ms. Lavallee responded it was the same information that was
243 used in negotiations regarding the median household incomes compared to the state of NH and we are lower. She
244 notes it is a talking point discussed at many of our meetings that we need to give the tax payers a break as we have a
245 lot of lower income families. Superintendent responded to what the savings would be if the FRES counselor
246 nomination was approved, he believes roughly \$32,500 although this is not confirmed as he does not know exactly
247 what benefits would be taken. A question was raised if there are any other new hires that may be a similar situation
248 to this resulting in savings recently. Superintendent notes, the MS counselor had savings and those are accounted for
249 in the new position. A question was raised if we don't increase the position would there be a savings in the budget.
250 Superintendent responds making the assumption the nomination is approved, there would be a reduction in the
251 budget around \$12,000 for next year although he reminds the Boards he is doing quick math and these are only
252 estimates. Superintendent clarifies the differential if the positions are approved and the people continue on next year,
253 the increase to make the position full time would be about \$32,000, the reduction to the budget would be about
254 \$32,000 approximately. He notes he does not want to obligate himself to these numbers as he has not had a chance to
255 properly review them. A question was raised if he is saying "net zero", he replies essentially yes.

256
257 Ms. Lavallee and the Superintendent reviewed Ms. Lavallee's motion on the table.

258
259 **MOTION SECONDED by Mr. White.*

260
261 A request was made to split it in two, increasing the position and warrant article vs. budget.

262
263 A question was raised if the Budget Committee needed to be here for this discussion. Chairman LoVerme noted he
264 would like to have the Budget Committee's input on this.

265
266 It was noted the Board should be addressing increasing the position, the warrant article was for discussion; it was not
267 voted to be on the warrant. Superintendent also confirms it is for discussion purposes and has not been voted on.

268
269 Discussion moved back to the budget; it was noted we are quickly approaching a number that will incur some real
270 push back and we need to solve this in a way we can get it passed. Mr. Vanderhoof suggests looking to reduce the
271 number back to around 13 million as an overall budget. If we want to add things that is fine but we should look for
272 offsetting cost and get it back to the original number. It was noted the difference of FY 21 and FY 22 is \$277,381,
273 2.1% and almost \$200,000 of that was cost shifted to local tax payers from the state. Discussion continues regarding
274 this and the optics of it. Discussion included that the warrant has not been voted on, increasing the MS position
275 would either have the cost in the warrant or the cost in the budget, not increasing the position would result in a
276 decrease to the budget. Mr. Boette noted that he just received an additional budget summary that shows different
277 numbers than the one he got earlier this evening. Chair Browne expressed the summary report they just got tonight is
278 inclusive of the grant funds and draft 5 appears to not have the grant funds but yet there is a line that says grants with
279 a figure in it (\$256,442) which is the exact amount the latest version is over. Discussion ensued regarding this and
280 trying to figure out what the numbers should be. Discussion included the excel sheet they just got has \$256,442
281 added in twice, should that number be removed, isn't one of those numbers a positive and negative to eventually
282 cancel each other out, it shouldn't show up as a positive or negative. Superintendent notes the food service number
283 of \$251,276 on the summary sheet is listed as a positive, there is also an offsetting revenue of the same amount
284 therefor is a "pass-through" but it is part of the budget and doesn't affect the tax rate, either do the grant funds
285 because if we don't receive them we don't spend them. Discussions continued regarding this. Ms. Tiedemann
286 clarified where she sees in the budget summary sheet it is added in twice and notes one of those should be a negative
287 if in fact is a "pass-through"; she reviewed this with the Superintendent. It was noted, it is not a coincidence when

you take the \$256,442 off, you come up with the \$13,009,554 number. Superintendent reviews, organizing the scenario as recommended by the Budget Committee, the budget that affects the tax rate is \$12,779,217 in its current state, a 2.2% increase over the current school year. He reviews his findings, Chair Browne does not agree with it and reviews that the money allocated for the capital reserves are not put in until they are approved, the transfer to capital reserve number for FY 22 should be zero for our purposes now. Food service is then added and grants which brings the total to \$13,030,493 (number from draft 5) then warrant articles get added once determined. If approved, they are then added to the budget. Superintendent adds once a warrant is approved it becomes part of the budget. He notes that the \$13,030,493 bottom line is a 1.6%; after warrant articles being added last year and prior to having them added this year. It was noted on the budget summary it is not an “apples to apples” comparison, there is a \$250,000 variance. Discussions continued regarding the transfers to grants, food service and capital reserves. Mr. Mullin confirms the capital reserve money is coming to us via the regular monthly payment from the towns for last year. Superintendent confirms food service and grants are an estimate only. It was noted on draft 5, it does show an “apples to apples” comparison. Superintendent clarifies the potential operating budget could include, if the voters approved it, the warrant articles and if not line 32, letter G will remain zero.

Mr. Post MOVES that the MOTION be tabled.

Discussions continued. Superintendent notes the motion on the floor is to make the counselor full time which will increase the budget by \$37,120 and later the School Board will vote on nominations that could reduce the budget by about the same amount. If the nominations are approved, we could come out with \$13,030,493 with a full time counselor.

Mr. Post again MOVES that the MOTION be tabled; as we do not have the information in front of us.

Superintendent responding to a question, confirms those reductions are from school counselor positions.

Mr. Vanderhoof expressed that type of expense should not be in a warrant and he is not necessarily supporting the request. He adds last year tough decisions had to be made. There are other things that made it back into the budget in order to do what the voters told us to do. We would need offsetting expenses in order to put it in the budget. Chairman LoVerme notes we potentially have savings in the same amount of the increase. Ms. Post voiced that this is one of those things that gets us in trouble, we need to separate the two, we say we are saving here and are spending there; we do the reduction, if there is a need for another position it is handled separately. We should not do this juggling of the two, we saw this last year and we don’t want to go down that road. She feels it is worth further conversation for all if there a real need for a full time counselor. Mr. Legere expressed he is in support to table this because if we don’t approve the nomination later this evening, we could be spending more than anticipated. It may be best to table it for tonight and get the correct numbers to work with.

Ms. Lavallee agrees we need to get the numbers right. She expressed this is important and does want it in the budget but believes it should be done in a way to not negatively affect the tax payers.

**Ms. Lavallee WITHDRAWS her MOTION.*

She requests this be on the agenda for the next meeting. She will provide additional information.

**Mr. White WITHDRAWS his SECOND.*

Mr. White notes the position was cut last year because it was a place that could cut but that was before the pandemic hit and the needs of children were very different then; if we look at where the money needs to be spent, that is a reasonable place. He supports asking for it. It was noted more specific information is needed in order to put it out to the public. Ms. Lavallee has additional information in regards to COVID and will share that information. She adds the reason the position was decreased was based on financial reasons, the need was always there. Some schools have social workers as well as well as counselors; this is not an exclusively COVID problem. A question was raised if there are any services that are not permanent but temporary that could be used. Superintendent will share a document showing the duties of the counselor and what they were prior to the reduction so you can see that information and evaluate it on your own.

It was noted this discussion has gone beyond what the Budget Committee needs to be present for and they have a lot of work to do tonight. Chairman LoVerme responds there is one more topic to discuss, the format of the annual meeting/budget hearing.

d. Annual Meeting Format/Budget Hearing Discussion

Superintendent reviews we have the ability to run the meeting at WLC and seat approximately 240 people. If needed, we can provide break out rooms and seat an additional 60-80 which would bring us over 300; we didn't have that many last year. We can create a logistical scenario to run it here with everyone able to speak publicly which would meet the requirements of the attorney general. The public hearing can be held in the gym, seat people 6 feet apart; there is no voting involved so a lot may choose to chime in online. The public hearing is a presentation from the Budget Committee and documents can be put out in advance and give folks access to the information. Anyone from the public can provide input as they can today. Mr. Jones expressed for voting, we need to think hard about a virtual option and opening up a time frame for a longer period of time. Everyone in our town feels differently and some are comfortable and some are not. Superintendent confirmed the attorney general's office has said there is no limit to the number of people for a public meeting around a meeting of this nature. It was suggested even with a mask mandate; we should have alternatives for those who want to wear them and those who don't. Superintendent suggested that the larger group will be those who will wear masks and those people can be set up in the gym and those without masks can go in the cafeteria. We could have separate voting lines, provide separate bathrooms at opposite ends of the building. We can have separate entrances and exits. Childcare will not be provided. For voting, he suggests if there is a paper ballot vote the Board can choose to have a 30-minute window to vote and if it is a hand vote, then it's a hand vote. Once you have received your voting card he doesn't believe you can leave with the voter card and come back in, you would need to be present to vote and not leave. It was noted other towns have done drive through voting; open up a voting period for 30 minutes, have register confirmation outdoors and it does open up the opportunity for those to vote regardless of their personal choice regarding the pandemic. Chairman LoVerme notes we do not run the register voter verification; it is done through the towns. He adds, we could set it up outside, one in the cafeteria, one in the gym but that is 3 different sections and we would have to see if the town could supply that. It was noted we can make recommendations but it is really up to the Moderator. It was noted, this can be a slippery slope as we are not an SB 2 town, we have one meeting to come up with a budget, if we put it to a vote and it gets turned down we continue to vote on the budget. If people leave, they have to come back, can't be registered again. If we want people to just walk in and vote on the budget, and there is a process for that at the state level, we can do that in the future but the way we are set up we are supposed to have a meeting and come to an agreement at that meeting. It was noted we are giving people the opportunity to wear a mask or not wear a mask.

IX. PUBLIC COMMENTS

The public comment section of the agenda was read. Superintendent called out all the phone numbers and names joined in the meeting for public comment. There was no public comment.

A MOTION was made by Ms. Tiedemann and SECONDED by Mr. Boette to recess the Budget Committee meeting at 8:28pm.

Voting: via roll call vote, all aye: motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Vanderhoof departed to join the Budget Committee meeting and asked that if discussion or any action takes place with the Board regarding anything that is not on the agenda, he would like to be notified.

X. ACTION ITEMS

a. Approve Minutes of Previous Meeting

A MOTION was made by Mr. Legere and SECONDED by Ms. Lavallee to approve the minutes of January 5, 2021 as amended.

Voting: via roll call vote, Mr. Post voiced no.

Mr. Post expressed on line 217, (he realizes this is taking a step back) there was no mention of him asking to have that discussion stopped. "As you recall, Chairman Browne made several statements and I said is this a budget issue or is this a School Board issue and it was immediately stopped". He does not think that is characterized in those lines. Superintendent questions if Mr. Post would like to make an amendment. Mr. Post responds he had not given it any consideration. He does not think it reflects what happened. He asked if there is a tape. Ms. Fowler responds, I don't know, probably; I would have to look. Superintendent responds she said yes and we would have to find it.

Mr. Legere WITHDREW his MOTION, Ms. Lavallee WITHDREW her SECOND.

Chairman LoVerme suggests to table this until the next meeting.

A MOTION was made by Mr. Post and SECONDED by Ms. Lavallee to table it until the next meeting.

Voting: via roll call vote, four ayes; two abstentions from Mr. White and Chairman LoVerme, motion carried.

Mr. Post voiced he will send proposed language and let you decide.

b. Memorandum of Understanding

Superintendent reviewed the MOU for both WLCTA and WLCSSA expire on January 31; there has been no change in legislation at this time from the Federal Government. We do not know what will happen in the next several days. The representative from both bargaining units has reached out to look at negotiating again; it was felt we should get through the other pieces first. He is looking for a recommendation to reach out to WLCTA and WLCSSA bargaining units to reopen negotiations for IMPACT bargaining. He questions, is it something he can be directed to do to help coordinate. He notes, the extension would be up on January 31, you can still negotiate after that but it would expire at that time unless you choose to create an extension before the 31st, this is an option. Considering when this was discussed we did not know where we would be regarding COVID. Superintendent expressed Mr. Vanderhoof may want to be part of this discussion. At this point the question is, do you want to extend or enter into negotiations. They contacted us in December and we were in the middle of a lot of things. Chairman LoVerme commented, we definitely have to negotiate it. He asks if the Board wants him to reach out to Ms. Hawkinson and have her coordinate a time for discussion. Chairman LoVerme responds yes. It was noted some legislation may be passed, it depends on how quickly. A question was raised what their stance was, do they want a response from us? Superintendent responded yes they want a response on opening up negotiations again. The FFCRA was not extended. A question was raised if that was the only thing. Superintendent responded it was the key piece, he does not know what else. He adds with the Board's permission he would extend an invitation to Ms. Hawkinson.

A MOTION was made by Ms. Lavallee and SECONDED by Ms. Cloutier-Cabral to reach out to Ms. Hawkinson to start negotiations (for MOA/MOU). *

Chairman LoVerme noted he does not want an additional offer/extension until we have come to an agreement.

*Voting: via roll call vote, five ayes; one abstention from Chairman LoVerme, motion carried.

c. Modification to Transportation Contract

Superintendent reviewed with the past 2 contracts that we have had with Mr. Brown from the bus company, the School Board has waived the Indemnification Clause and he is asking for that to continue in the one-year extension. Since it is a contract voted on, we would need a motion, a second and roll call vote to approve it. A question was raised what would be the cost. Superintendent responded the cost for Mr. Brown would be approximately \$6,000. The question was clarified, what would be the cost to the school district to obtain additional insurance (as noted in the memo from Mr. Mullin). Superintendent confirms there would not be a cost to us, it is a potential cost to us. He reviewed hypothetically, the reason for the indemnification clause is if Mr. Brown's bus service went out of business, we would be stuck without transportation. This holds him liable.

A MOTION was made by Ms. Lavallee and SECONDED by Mr. White to waive the indemnification clause.

Voting: via roll call vote, five ayes; one abstention from Chairman LoVerme, motion carried.

It was noted when we discussed the contract Mr. Brown did not have any reservation increasing the cost to us. Superintendent clarified he gave us a level contract for daily bus service and an increase in field trip/athletic trip costs. He confirmed he did not give us a mileage increase for daily service.

XI. COMMITTEE REPORTS

i. Budget Liaison

Mr. Vanderhoof was in the Budget Committee meeting at this time.

ii. Superintendent Search Committee

Mr. Post reviewed that the committee has a meeting tomorrow night; the first meeting of the group. They have a proposed advertisement ready to go out, he asked Chairman LoVerme to double check it. Requested suggestions

were added; it is ready to go out. They also have a proposed plan going forwarded to discuss at the meeting tomorrow night. There are a lot of positions in the region (southern NH) being advertised but not as many across the greater region. Superintendent Lane had suggested to use SchoolSpring for the resumes which makes sense; Mr. Post asked if anyone had an objection to that. Superintendent added that the advantage to using it is that it is a national data base and we can get applications from other areas. We have gotten teaching applications from China, Africa, Europe; that is how he knows it extends beyond our area. The job description would narrow it down. We would also use the NHSBA site which is free. We already pay the fee for SchoolSpring. Mr. Post confirmed the meeting is posted and it is a public meeting. Tomorrow is the first meeting. Ms. Lavallee thanked him and the other committee members for volunteering. She asked if she could listen in on the meeting. It was confirmed she could, (5 members constitutes a meeting). Chairman LoVerme asked that Mr. Post do him a favor and personally invite Ms. Browne and Mr. Boette; Superintendent will send an invitation and make sure they are aware. Mr. Post, questioned; as members of the public? Chairman LoVerme confirmed yes. Chairman LoVerme commented "those of you who have not seen the work that went into this it is pretty impressive". He has covered pretty much everything, he appreciates Mr. Post and the teams work.

iii. Short-term Strategic Planning Committee

Mr. White reported the committee got together on the 12th to discuss the possibility of tutoring sessions, the effectiveness of long-term substitutes, and social distancing issues and return to school models. There was a short discussion about the tutoring sessions but we need more information. Principal Weaver is reviewing semester grades to determine what the need is and who would be interested. They cannot do a lot with that right now until the numbers to come in. Once in, the committee is planning to review the numbers, figure out a cost analysis and come up with some sort of plan to present to the Board for consideration. The committee talked about peer tutors as well but again still need the numbers; it is a work in progress. The committee asked about the use and effectiveness of the long term substitutes. They found out they are being used FRES and WLC to their fullest extent; juggling their schedules around, not being used for extra things like tutoring. They are being used and are appreciated. The hope is, is that the regular substitute pool will increase once the contracts are up. Mr. White reports the bulk of the meeting was spent discussing the current space available for social distancing. With the anticipation of the students returning to school we know the 3 buildings are at a critical point (we don't have the physical space for social distancing) if the numbers get any higher. That is something that will need to be looked at and we need the numbers the Superintendent presented tonight, they did not have those at the time of the meeting. They were asked by Administration to ask the Board to vote to remove the hybrid model from the offerings in the upcoming selection for next week. They want to have only two options, in-school or remote. They feel the hybrid model is causing some problems, the kids are not doing well, grades are suffering. The administration, parents and teachers at the meeting agree the hybrid model is something that is not working out. The Board voted to offer 3 models in the beginning and no one knew what work and what wouldn't work, what was sustainable and what was not. They asked if the Board would discuss that tonight and also discuss making this a final choice for the year; choose what you want to do now until the close of school. Every quarter the numbers are increasing, teachers have to break down their rooms and some have been moved into other rooms and it takes time and effort. If we do this, we can get things set and squared away without hopefully disrupting the students and teachers anymore. The committee voted unanimously to present it to the Board as a discussion and hopefully a vote to remove the hybrid model and to make this the last change of the year. Mr. White reached out to Principal Weaver this morning who reported as far as the hybrid model there are 9 students in the MS and 9 in the HS. It is substantial work to incorporate the hybrid students into the class because the level and content changes, engagement is difficult. There are additional obstacles for students trying to navigate with 2 different learning models. The changing of who is in the room on a daily basis changes the climate of the room and that inconsistency is affecting everyone in the class not just the student who is coming in and out of the classroom. At the HS 57% of hybrid students have a "D" or "F" (D-14%, F-43%) in the classes they are taking vs. full remote students at 24% (not 29% as clarified by Principal Weaver) (D-4%, F-20%); the failure rate is almost double. Hybrid students at the MS are at 20% (6%-D, 15%-F) and the remote students are at 17% (6% "D", 11% "F"). Principal Weaver spoke of this being a reasonable request; it is more dramatic at the high school. It is a significant disruptor. A question was raised if Mr. Vanderhoof would want to be part of this discussion; they will reach out to him. A question was raised if we pull the 9 out of this hybrid program will it overload the classrooms and push us into full remote. This will be answered after Mr. Vanderhoof returns. A question was raised, because the Board has had these discussions before, voting and discussing things that were not on the agenda or being on their action items; what is the opinion on waiting to discuss it to formally put it on the agenda to give anyone that may be affected a chance to chime in. Mr. White spoke that he reached out to the Chairman to ask this and the Superintendent put out an email to parents that this was a possibility and it would be discussed so they were aware this was coming. It was noted it was also part of the Board Packet. It was clarified, the information was just sent out today, it was not in the original

Board Packet. Superintendent confirmed he did send out an email and asked for those who have not responded that the schools to reach out to them individually. There are still 8 people who have been left messages but have not responded back. There was one parent who expressed they would like this model to continue because it gives them flexibility. It was again noted there was a spirited discussion last time and we want to be sure everyone is good with moving forward. Superintendent confirms he sent the email to parents last Wednesday and it did say the School Board would be discussing this and making a decision tonight. Mr. Vanderhoof rejoins at 9:26pm. Mr. Weaver spoke regarding the HS and if all the hybrid students came back into the classroom he believes we are in good shape; desks are 4-6 feet apart. Ms. Edmunds spoke regarding the MS and that today there was an issue when there were 23 students in a class but only 19 desks and the class was moved to the music room. They have had quite a few students come back from remote this semester, at least 3 in 7th grade, 3 or 4 in 6th grade and sometimes they come back without notifying the school and they need to have a place to seat them. Ms. Edmunds notes it will be difficult in all 3 grades but especially the 8th grade. It was noted that with the hybrid students, you need to have an open seat for them. Principal Weaver expressed that at the MS they are tight, even without COVID/social distancing. We will need to do some scrambling and will have to make some worst case scenario assumptions. Consistency allows us to make strong decisions and with the hybrid model, it does not. Some hybrid students are not keeping a consistent schedule; they come in 3-4 days a week or don't come in and join in remotely; maybe the teacher had assigned them to do group work, it becomes an issue. He was clear that he doesn't know what to do about the spacing issue. Superintendent reviewed the changes he knows of, grade 6 there are 2 additional coming in from remote, in grade 7 one student coming in and one going out, grade 8, 2 students coming in and 1 going out. The hybrid model consists of 5 in 8th grade students, 3 in 7th grade students and 1 in 6th grade. Superintendent confirms there are seats for the hybrid students. At the MS, 2 or 3 times a week they anticipate them to be in the building. Mr. White reviewed the percentages of students failing that he provided earlier. A question was raised if there is any opportunity to add some type of Plexiglas shield; would it help the cause by using strategically placed barriers. Superintendent responded we have 10 or so but it becomes more difficult at the MS because they are changing classes. It was also noted that we could not block off certain areas as it could be a fire hazard. Superintendent would need to speak to the fire chief regarding egress areas. Principal Weaver noted, the way the seats are, you are still surrounded on all 3 sides even if you sit on the outside of a row; it would eliminate some direct contact but does not necessarily eliminate it on all sides. A comment was made that the comparison of hybrid and remote D's and F's is unfair unless we know the in-school grades as well. Testing (STAR 360) was done last week but the data is not analyzed and will be brought in February. Grades are being captured tomorrow and the information will be updated and will include in-school grades. Discussions continued on the issues relating to the hybrid model. Principal Weaver confirmed we will have to be open minded to some exceptions. Ms. Lavallee expressed that one of the issues the committee will be discussing is the tutoring program; a student could be doing well in 1 subject area but not others, how can we get them in school where they feel safe and provide some 1:1 instruction. It has been a tough year for the staff, they did an amazing job but if you really look at it, we keep asking for more and more. It was recommended by the DOE to not have some of our solutions as long term solutions. Removing the hybrid model will provide some consistency for staff and allow them to plan a little better instead of just putting out fires and adjusting to the day. She was asked to explain what she said regarding that we are not following the DOE recommendations. Ms. Lavallee clarified one of the recommendations/concerns identified by the DOE was the multiplatform teaching and they recommended that it not be a long term solution; we have been using that up at the HS. There are teachers teaching remote and live at the same time and since we can't necessarily fix that, we are doing what is best for our district and that is why the DOE gave us leeway. She notes, there are some students who necessarily do not follow the schedules of when they are coming to school or not as previously mentioned by Principal Weaver; this can throw off the dynamic of the classroom. Long-term subs are busy covering classes all day and cannot jump in and help out in a regular classroom. Mr. Post noted it is his understanding the Governor and Secretary of Education are telling people they want students in school and the description of being "not a long term solution" was to do the best you can through this year and hopefully we won't have to do it next year. Ms. Lavallee was referring to the guidelines put out by the DO; she clarified that she is not saying we are necessarily doing something wrong. Some other districts consider a hybrid as half of the students go 2 days and the other half go the other 2 days. We have had since the beginning, the option for in-school 5 days a week plus other options; if we look at the big picture how far can we keep pushing. Principal LaRoche spoke that it is a little different at the elementary level but with the same result; it doesn't really work. He looks at it in terms of, what is best academically and what is best to maintain one's health. He notes, the students in the hybrid model do not benefit from the remote teachers at the elementary level and the class room teacher has to create an extra day or two or three of work for those students and it is not the same as being in school. A desk is maintained for them; it would not add anything to the space issue. If the hybrid model was removed, he thinks it would be helpful. He spoke of trying to maintain continuity between all the schools with the hybrid an older sibling may watch the younger sibling. He does not believe the hybrid model is useful at the elementary level and that should be part of the discussion as well. Superintendent confirms there are 3 students at FRES in the hybrid model.

Mr. Post notes it is a math problem; if you cannot balance/accommodate the students coming into the space and it tips the district into going to full remote; he does not think it is an appropriate solution. The community will not accept the 2-1-2 model. Mr. White confirms the students who are hybrid always have a desk (empty at times); the space issue does not go away even if we remove the hybrid model, the challenge is the consistency. Principal Weaver also expressed the issue is the consistency. We are looking at every angle to make sure we can have social distancing. We are trying to avoid the gym and cafeteria as a classroom. There are a number of students coming in without the school being notified, at 8:05 this morning he received a call that there were 3 students standing without a desk. The hybrid decision is a small decision at the end of the day; he understands it will affect some families, but if we can eliminate one issue that is creating conflict in the school, we should. Discussions continued regarding this including if a student is hybrid and decides to go remote this will free up a desk. The committee is not discussing a 2-1-2 model, that is off the table; it is about how can we keep students in school and social distance. A question was raised how do you reach the students who go remote, do they fall farther behind by going full time remote. Ms. Lavallee responded that is why we are looking at a tutoring model but are waiting on the data. She also believes the choice of not having a hybrid seemed to have the least impact with the most return right now and once we can see the data we can further discuss how to help them so when they return to school they are not behind. A question was raised how you recover from having a D or F now with half the year gone. Principal Weaver spoke regarding competencies and it is about demonstrating enough competency to pass the class; we are giving kids hope and that is what is needed. Ms. Edmunds spoke about attendance with the hybrid model. She reports it is incredibly difficult to keep track of these students; she has had more attendance issues this year than any in the past. Students are not following a structure of when they are coming in and when they are remote. She agrees students would be worked with who have special circumstances. Superintendent confirms out of the 21 students in the hybrid model, we have not heard back from 8. Three have chosen to go remote and the other 10 have chosen to come into the buildings. Superintendent confirms he sent a letter to parents and told them the Board would be discussing this; if the Board chose to remove the option, which would you choose. One parent was specific that they prefer to stick with the hybrid model. Mr. Vanderhoof spoke that in the beginning when this was voted on before school, he had expressed not being in favor of giving 3 options but to take that away now; they have had the option all along of full remote or full in-school learning. Ultimately he feels it should be left up to the families to decide; he does not support taking it away now. Superintendent confirms if the hybrid option is removed, it would take effect on Monday January 25. It was noted this is not a lot of notice. Discussion continued. Ms. Cloutier-Cabral spoke and understands that it has been hard for the teachers; it was something we had to try. She feels Monday may be too soon to make this change but changing it will be beneficial. She has heard from some parents who said that the work is hard to keep up with in general this year. She feels consistency is the key now, and having a consistent schedule and more structure will help the students. Mr. Legere expressed we have asked a lot of teachers and administration this year and they have not heard a lot of complaints. They are coming to us asking for something that affects a small number of people; if there are childcare issues, or job related issues or safety concerns etc. we have the option of remote or in-school. Discussions will be forthcoming about tutoring, probably at the next meeting and Principal Weaver did say they will have the ability to be flexible in a limited capacity. He is in support of this and believes it will be easier overall. He had voiced concern previously about giving notification to parents and it seems the consensus was we gave ample notification for those who may have wanted to voice their opinions.

*A MOTION was made by Mr. White and SECONDED by Ms. Lavallee to remove the hybrid model option as one of the options for the upcoming (education model) decisions. **

Mr. Vanderhoof expressed he feels this is the wrong way to go about it, having the School Board vote to eliminate it. Given letters were sent to families, he questions if there was any indication that we may have a large reduction of hybrid students organically. He feels it would go better for administration and teachers to talk to the parents of those students who are struggling and falling behind. Superintendent reviewed that he has not heard from 8 parents yet and reviewed the other requested changes parents have made. A question was raised from an administration view, if we didn't remove the option for hybrid but if we enforce a stronger rule set would it be more manageable. Ms. Edmunds spoke she believes we made the guidelines pretty clear, they are not really being followed, more often the student doesn't come in and they appear remotely and the teacher does not like to mark them absent and marks them remote. If you are supposed to be in school and you are not but you are showing up remotely, we should mark you absent. Chairman LoVerme noted he thought that was what was going to be done. Ms. Edmunds responds, it has been. Chairman LoVerme adds, moving forward he does not want to hear they are not marking student absent when they should be. Ms. Lavallee reviewed in terms of how the committee handled this, we had a meeting, we posted the meeting and she personally reached out to parents in November who have expressed concern letting them know they can attend and some did, a letter was sent to parents, phone calls were made, and the letter clearly states the changes would be active on January 25 and at some point we need to have the parents own the responsibility of advocating.

At this time, we have only heard back from one parent who does not agree with it. She feels a lot of the conversation is a “what if” because there has been a conservative effort by the committee and administration to get the information to the parents. It was also noted it will make administrations job a lot easier if they don’t have to chase people around for attendance. Mr. Post noted he was really disappointed this did not work.

**Voting: via roll call vote, five ayes; one nay from Mr. Vanderhoof, one abstention from Chairman LoVerme, motion carried.*

It was confirmed the hybrid option is no longer an option effective January 25. Superintendent commented that if there are parents who need more time we would work with them. A question was raised if there needs to be a motion to make it the last change for parents through the remainder of the year or can administration determine that. Chairman LoVerme asked to wait on that and see how the marking period goes and address it in 3 weeks.

iv. Negotiations

Chairman LoVerme spoke that we entered Fact Finding and Ms. Lavallee represented for Chairman LoVerme. Superintendent added, the Fact Finder will develop a report, deliver it to the attorney who will distribute it to the team as well as the Board. Most likely if we get it by the 25th it would be good to have a non-meeting sometime next week if it can be scheduled. Warrants are needed by the following week. Discussion was had regarding when to have a meeting. If the Board chooses not to support it and the Union does, it would go as a warrant article with the School Board not to recommending it. Chairman LoVerme suggests to wait to schedule this and see when the report comes in. Superintendent noted we also need to give the Budget Committee enough time to determine if they support it.

XII. RESIGNATIONS / APPOINTMENTS / LEAVES

a. Resignation-Susan Halloran-Personal Care Assistant

Superintendent reviewed the resignation; this position will not be filled unless there is a need in the future.

b. Appointment-Aimee Gelineau-FRES School Counselor

Superintendent reviewed the recommendation for appointment.

A MOTION was made by Mr. Legere and SECONDED by Ms. Lavallee to appoint Ms. Aimee Gelineau, FRES School Counselor.

Voting: via roll call vote, six ayes; one abstention from Chairman LoVerme, motion carried.

Superintendent confirmed the vacancy was created by a resignation and salaries are prorated for the balance of the year.

c. Appointment-Alice Bartoldus-WLC MS Counselor

Superintendent reviewed the recommendation for appointment.

A MOTION was made by Mr. Legere and SECONDED by Mr. White to appoint Ms. Alice Bartoldus, MS Counselor.

Voting: via roll call vote, six ayes; one abstention from Chairman LoVerme, motion carried.

XIII. BOARD BUDGET DISCUSSION

Mr. Boette informed the Board that the Budget Committee is pretty much in agreement they would not support the \$64,000 for the LED lighting project (on CIP). It was acknowledged there is a short window for discussions and providing this information now is helpful. The Budget Committee would vote against this article (Building & Roadways) and would reduce it. The original CIP had the tennis courts (\$100,000) and LED lighting project (\$64,000). A question was raised if they would support an article for \$100,000 (removing tennis courts and LED lighting), is that the number they are looking for. Mr. Boette responds, if you bring it down to \$100,000 he would talk to the Budget Committee.

Discussion was had regarding the MS counselor including a motion being brought forward as a warrant article, concern was raised that this is not an appropriate way to do it, it also memorializes that position to be there permanently or not at all once something like that is passed, and the community has made investments into curriculum coordinators and RTI without being in a warrant but were in the budget. It was noted that this was not being considered any longer. Consensus was given by the Board that it (increasing MS counselor to f/t) is no longer being considered as a warrant article. Ms. Lavallee clarified that she brought it forward because of Chair Browne’s comment at the last meeting but has done some research over the week and changed her position regarding having it be a warrant even though she still supports increasing the position.

688 Superintendent reviewed he believes the question from the Budget Committee is would the School Board want to
689 change the dollar figure for the Building & Roadway capital reserve article prior to the next meeting. Discussion
690 was had regarding this and a suggestion was made to reduce it to \$100,000.

691
692 *A MOTION was made by Mr. Post and SECONDED by Mr. Legere to reduce the amount of the Building &
693 Roadways capital reserve fund article to be \$95,000. **
694

695 It was noted that Mr. Boette agreed to reduce it by \$60,000. Mr. Post will inform a member of the budget committee
696 member who is online in the budget committee meeting. A question was raised if a motion is needed to adjust a
697 warrant article that has not been voted on yet. Superintendent said this would be your recommendation if you
698 approve the warrant or not. It was voiced that the tennis courts have been eliminated but the demolition was not
699 added back in of \$8,000; suggestion for it to be \$108,000.
700

701 A question was raised how much is in the SPED capital reserve. Mr. Mullin can send that out tomorrow to the Board.
702 Mr. Vanderhoof suggests making the warrant article for \$50,000; support was expressed for this. Chairman LoVerme
703 reviews that the tennis court amount, \$100,000, was removed but the demolition was not included of \$8,000. Mr.
704 Vanderhoof expressed if you are adding and spending an expense in the same year it should be in the budget; (not
705 CIP) it is more transparent. A question was raised if Mr. Post received any feedback from the budget committee
706 member; he did not get a clear answer. Mr. Vanderhoof spoke that as he understands it, they do not support the
707 lighting project, therefore they want to reduce the warrant article by the amount of the lighting project. Chairman
708 LoVerme expressed when Mr. Boette came in, Chairman LoVerme suggested to have the warrant article be an even
709 \$100,000. Mr. Post notes he is getting thumbs down. It was noted we can change it. The motion is to make it
710 \$95,000. Mr. Vanderhoof spoke in an effort to make this smoother, he suggests withdrawing the motion, coming up
711 with a number, have a discussion about it and then take a vote on the warrant article. It is not a finalized warrant; we
712 don't need a motion to finalize it. Superintendent reviewed for Ms. Cloutier-Cabral the lighting project was a part of
713 the CIP and it will not be removed but will come up later on. She wanted to be sure we were not going back on any
714 promises that were previously made. Chairman LoVerme responded no. Mr. Vanderhoof questioned how much is in
715 the account and what are the total expenses we will have come out of it over this year and next year. This
716 information is not available tonight; he will not support it. He adds this CIP has been going on for years and there is
717 no plan.
718

719 **Voting: via roll call vote, five ayes; one nay from Mr. Vanderhoof, one abstention from Chairman LoVerme, motion
720 carried.*
721

722 It was confirmed the Building & Roadway Capital Reserve Warrant Article will be \$95,000.
723

724 A question was raised if the Budget Committee discussed the SPED fund. Mr. Vanderhoof responded they probably
725 discussed it after he left. Ms. Lavallee reviewed that it was suggested to decrease the SPED warrant to \$50,000; in
726 regard to a tax burden it may be better to spread it out. Acknowledgement was made that one student can wipe out
727 the fund. Superintendent believes it was \$280,000 that was spent previously. It was noted that we want to get it up to
728 about \$300,000 but do not need to rush to get there. Mr. Post expressed he is still hearing from members of the
729 community that are mad that budget was spent 2 years ago and the beginning of last year, over 2 different years.
730 They are still asking for the original documents that established that fund which we still can't seem to find despite
731 many inquiries; there were things that it could and couldn't be spent for. There are a lot of hard feelings in the
732 community that that money was spent over other problems. Chairman LoVerme responded it was spent on SPED and
733 it can only be spent on SPED. Mr. Post expressed it was spent retroactively so how could that be. He would like to
734 see the documentation and 3 members of the public want to see it as well. Superintendent responded we can look
735 back at the minutes from when the monies were approved and he can get that to Mr. Post on Thursday. It was noted
736 the other request that was made around that time frame was for the original document that established that fund.
737 Superintendent responded the original warrant was prior to the school district consolidation, he believes it may have
738 been a Wilton piece and he is unsure if there was a Lyndeborough piece also. It does not become clear in the articles
739 of agreement how it would combine. A question was raised if it even meets the requirements for a fund.
740 Superintendent responded, yes it does according to the Trustees of the Trust Fund as well as the DOE. Mr. Post
741 reviewed it was spent in a way that upset people. Superintendent will provide the documents. Mr. Legere recalled
742 that he believes it was around the time when Ms. Baker was starting and trying to close the books for the year before.
743 There were encumbrances we did not have money for. We were past July 1 and took out funds from the reserve fund
744 to pay it but he is not 100% sure. Mr. Post believes that was correct but the thought was it could not be used toward
745 expenses from the previous year. Discussion returned to determining what the SPED warrant amount would be. Ms.

Lavallee expressed she agrees with reducing it but wants to know the amount in the fund as well as Mr. Pratt's input. The group was reminded Mr. Boette came in because it was a timing issue and we have not voted whether we recommend the warrants or not, we are just putting numbers to it. He questions if we wait to do this if there will be enough time for the Budget Committee to vote. Mr. Vanderhoof clarifies he is unsure if the committee voted to approve warrants or not but looks like they will meet on Thursday. Superintendent clarified at the next School Board meeting at the latest, the warrant articles needed to be voted on before the Budget Hearing. Mr. Vanderhoof doesn't believe it gives the Budget Committee enough time. Mr. Post confirms the Budget Committee meeting has ended, they want information for their next meeting; they want to know a number for the CBA and where we stood on the warrant articles. Discussion continued around the SPED article amount. Mr. Vanderhoof believes there is about \$100,000-\$150,000 in the fund now. Support was expressed for reducing it from \$100,000.

A MOTION was made by Mr. Vanderhoof and SECONDED by Mr. Post to make the SPED capital reserve account warrant article at a request of \$50,000.

Voting: via roll call vote, six ayes; one abstention from Chairman LoVerme, motion carried.

It was confirmed the warrant article for the SPED capital reserve account will be for \$50,000. Superintendent will send out updated documents.

XIV. PUBLIC COMMENTS

The public comment section of the agenda was read. There was no public present, none to report.

XV. SCHOOL BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS

Ms. Lavallee voiced that although the discussion was lengthy she was happy with the constructive conversations between the members tonight and thanked them.

Ms. Cloutier-Cabral thinks it was a good meeting and is glad Mr. Post is feeling better.

XVI. UNSEAL NONPUBLIC MINUTES

A MOTION was made by Mr. Legere and SECONDED by Ms. Lavallee to unseal the nonpublic minutes of January 5, 2021 for review in nonpublic session.

Voting: via roll call vote, four ayes; three abstentions from Mr. White, Mr. Vanderhoof and Chairman LoVerme, motion carried.

XVII. NON-PUBLIC SESSION RSA 91-A: 3 II (C)

- i. Review Nonpublic Minutes
- ii. Student Matter

A MOTION was made by Mr. Legere and SECONDED by Ms. Lavallee to enter Non-Public Session to discuss a student matter and review nonpublic minutes RSA 91-A: 3 II (A) (C) at 10:57pm.

Voting: via roll call vote, six ayes; one abstention from Chairman LoVerme, motion carried.

RETURN TO PUBLIC SESSION

The Board entered public session at 11:11pm.

A MOTION was made to seal the non-public session minutes of January 5, 2021 (inclusive of both sessions) by Ms. Lavallee and SECONDED by Mr. Legere.

Voting: via roll call vote, five ayes; two abstentions from Mr. White and Chairman LoVerme, motion carried.

XVIII. ADJOURNMENT

A MOTION was made by Mr. Legere and SECONDED by Ms. Lavallee to adjourn the Board meeting at 11:12pm.

Voting: via roll call vote, six ayes; one abstention from Chairman LoVerme, motion carried.

*Respectfully submitted,
Kristina Fowler*