

**WILTON-LYNDEBOROUGH COOPERATIVE
SCHOOL BOARD MEETING
Tuesday, December 20, 2022
Wilton-Lyndeborough Cooperative M/H School
6:30 p.m.**

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

Present: *Jim Kofalt, Brianne Lavalley, Alex LoVerme, Jonathan Vanderhoof, Dennis Golding, Matt Mannarino (online briefly), Tiffany Cloutier-Cabral, Charlie Post (attended the Budget Committee Mtg. arrived at 6:58pm) and Darlene Anzalone*

Superintendent Peter Weaver, Business Administrator Kristie LaPlante, Principal Sarah Edmunds, Director of Student Support Services Ned Pratt, Curriculum Coordinator Samantha Sappet, and Clerk Kristina Fowler

I. CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Kofalt called the meeting to order at 6:32pm.

II. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

III. ADJUSTMENTS TO THE AGENDA

A MOTION was made by Mr. LoVerme and SECONDED by Mr. Golding to remove agenda item IJL (under policies) from the agenda without further discussion.

Mr. Vanderhoof voiced the policy is that any board member can ask for anything to be added to the agenda and thinks it should be discussed and members should be allowed to discuss it.

It was noted the agenda is determined by the Board, at the will of the Board.

Voting: via roll call vote, five ayes; two nays from Mr. Vanderhoof and Ms. Anzalone, motion carried.

IV. PUBLIC COMMENTS

Superintendent called out all the phone numbers and names joined in the meeting asking if they wanted to comment.

There was no public comment either present or online.

V. BOARD CORRESPONDENCE

a. Reports

i. WLCTA Report

Becky Hawkes gave an overview of her report, which included a number of WLCTA members volunteering to bake and sell items at the PTO craft fair. They raised \$225 for their scholarship fund that goes to a graduating senior. Holiday concerts were held and well attended. Ms. Hall and others had a successful art show at the town hall in Wilton. Students were able to sell their art. The group going to Italy held its first fundraiser and they raised \$2,200. Auditions have started at WLC for the Wizard of Oz. Middle school advisory classes have decided to take a stance on bullying by developing an action plan. Eighteen staff volunteered to take the LETRS training, which is supported and funded by the DOE. It is focused on how you learn to read. She was visiting in Merrimack School District, they are twice the size of our district, and they have the same number of teachers, 18, attending training. We are crushing it, it is incredible for our little district and the students are getting the benefit immediately. Ms. Anzalone would like to hear more from the MS group. Ms. Hawkes will reach out to them. It was noted that 18 teachers taking LTRS training is a lot but hearing how that compares to a larger district puts it into perspective. It is all self-initiated. Ms. Lavalley commended them for creating the drive and getting it done. Ms. Hawkes confirms it is an 18-month commitment. She has finished her first unit and was awarded 18 hours credit. It is a mix of online, Zoom classes, taking tests, and classroom work. Her students know reading is not a natural process we are mapping their brains. She invites the Board to come into her classroom and see a Heggerty lesson. She was thanked for her report and enthusiasm.

VI. TRANSPORTATION BID

Ms. LaPlante reviewed the current bus contract expires in June 2023. We followed the district policy to send it out for bid; it was advertised in the Telegraph, the website and did direct solicitation to a few in state transportation vendors. Only one bid was received for to and from regular transportation from Butler Bus Services, which was a 49% increase and one for SPED transportation, which was from Durham School Services at 30% increase. She feels this was a fair process; we have 45 days from the bid due date to award or deny the contract. She is looking for the Board's feedback on the contract costs and a motion from the Board to either accept or reject the contracts. She confirms she sent the bid packet to 5 bus companies; there was no

response from the other companies who did not bid. She confirms we received 2 bids a few years back for the last contract one from Butler Bus and one from Steve's Bus.

A MOTION was made by Mr. LoVerme and SECONDED by Mr. Golding to accept the transportation offers from Butler Bus Service and Durham School Services as presented.

A question was raised if we will be using Durham solely for SPED transport as opposed to what we are doing this year. Has there been any feedback on how they will remedy what was happening last year. Mr. Pratt responded Durham has gotten a lot better this year, they changed staff around and we have not had any blips in the school bus transportation. As you know, we are still using LA Limo for a couple of out of district trips. We will evaluate that vs. Durham as we go through the rest of the year and see if the consistency continues and gauge the interest of LA Limo. When there has been an issue with them, they rectify it within minutes. We like working with them. It is a good thing to keep both if we can but will look at cost comparison as well.

Voting: via roll call vote, seven ayes; motion carried.

VII. TENNIS COURTS

Ms. LaPlante reviewed there has been significant discussion since July about the funding placement in the budget to remove the tennis courts. We received 2 bids to properly patch the tennis courts to make them usable is about \$71,000. Voters approved \$20,000 in the budget last year, the cost to actually take care of this with crack repair, site work and fence repair is \$71,000. We are trying to figure out what to do if this is something we will remove or are we going to pause the project and somehow find additional funding whether it is through a warrant article or not. Unfortunately, for us the time has come where we need some direction. Mr. Vanderhoof questioned Ms. LaPlante when she said to "properly fix the tennis courts", what is the warranty on that fix. Ms. LaPlante confirms it is to properly take care of the site work and fencing, the crack repair has no warranty and that portion is \$41,850 (fix surface repair), there is no warranty or guarantee on that. She confirmed if the cracks show up we would be paying for those repairs. She confirmed they will do some subsurface repairs for the court remove the heave concrete, reset 7 tennis posts, dig out and clean 825 linear feet of cracks which average 1-2 inches deep and fill those with cracks with court patch binder. Ms. Anzalone questioned if we are asking if we want to create a warrant article for the \$70,000 is that what she is asking. Ms. LaPlante responded it all depends on what the Board chooses to do, we have \$20,000 in the budget and the Board would need to determine how to pay for the rest. Ms. Anzalone recommends to not spend the \$20,000 and present it to the voters as a warrant article. Let voters know the \$20,000 will not fix it all. Ms. LaPlante asked if this was a motion or topic of discussion. Ms. Anzalone responded a motion I guess unless someone has more to discuss. She repeated her explanation, to take the full amount to the voters vs. spending the \$20,000. Let the voters decide if it is something, they want to spend their money on.

A MOTION was made by Ms. Anzalone to create a warrant article for the full repair cost of the tennis courts.

Mr. Vanderhoof spoke that this was discussed extensively last year and it was clear what the \$20,000 would cover and what the material would be used for. He doesn't think we should take the \$20,000 and reallocate it. He doesn't think spending \$71,000 on patchwork that has no guarantee is a good idea either. He thinks we should move ahead with the original plan of removing the tennis courts. Otherwise, we will be spending money to fix the cracks every year. It is the underneath that is the problem. He started to make a motion however, it was noted we have a motion on the table already.

MOTION SECONDED by Ms. Lavallee.

Chairman Kofalt reviewed the motion before us right now.

Ms. Lavallee feels it is a good idea; we should spend taxpayer money wisely. She reviewed that we had heard from some community members that had not heard we were going to remove them and they were upset. She doesn't think spending \$20,000 is not a good idea but it is not the full scope of the project. Sending it back to the community, asking them what they want is the way to do it. Ms. Anzalone questioned if we could present options to them to fix it, tear it down, or get a brand new one. Ms. LaPlante responded it wouldn't be the \$70,000 to fix it; it would be \$45,000 about each year for the surface repair. She spoke of another option if it goes to a warrant article, voters will vote mid-March and we will have some direction. If the warrant is voted down, the Board can move forward with the \$20,000 that has already been allocated and complete the project. Another thing the Board could do and she recommends is rather than do a warrant for the full value, do a warrant for \$50,000 as we already have the \$20,000 and can do the site work and complete part of it in the spring. If the voters deny it we can still use the \$20,000 to remove it. She is looking at what will be most agreeable for the voters. Mr. Vanderhoof expressed doing that sounds like a bait and switch. Mr. Golding expressed we have been talking about this for years. We finally came to a resolution last year, we finally decided, brought it to the voters and later on we had a couple of people come up and ask us not to. The money has been already been allocated, let's stick to the plan, disperse the courts the way we were going to up the hills to the soccer fields but get rid of the tennis courts. Mr. LoVerme felt that removing the tennis courts was almost like putting the wheels in motion to start getting rid of things, next it will be the track, the soccer field because it is so much easier to remove it than maintain what we have properly. Shame on us, it is the districts fault for not maintaining them through the years, the community and students

should not be penalized for this. We should move forward and fix them. We don't know what it will cost in the future if anything. If they do it properly the first time, it may last longer than people think. If a crack appears, fix it right the first time. We let FRES go by the way side, Wilton spent a million dollars just to get the kids back in school in September and then how many years later did we finally do the renovation. He thinks we owe it to the district to maintain them properly and get them up to speed. A question was raised if the \$20,000 even covers the cost to remove them now. Ms. LaPlante assumes it would because the quote came in at \$17,500 and feels the \$20,000 would be adequate. Chairman Kofalt reviewed the Motion and options discussed. The Motion is to put forward a warrant to repair the courts. When we get into discussing warrants, we can then discuss what that looks like. Ms. Anzalone asked if we can word it to say an additional \$50,000 to fix it and if that were not approved, we would remove them. It was expressed by Mr. Vanderhoof we could not do that. Chairman Kofalt reviewed the Motion for Mr. Post who just arrived.

Voting: five ayes; three nays from Mr. Post, Mr. Golding and Mr. Vanderhoof, one abstention from Chairman Kofalt, motion carried.

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

Present: Jeff Jones, Leslie Browne, Bill Ryan, Lisa Post, Caitlin Maki, Jennifer Bernet

Mr. Jones called the meeting to order at 7pm.

a. FY 24

i. Prior Meeting Follow up

Mr. Jones reviewed there are quite a few items to cover tonight. Ms. LaPlante provided an overview of recent meetings; she met with the Superintendent, they both met with administrators and both met with the Budget Committee and proposed some changes. She sent out a summary of changes and handed it out before the meeting tonight. The top lists the last number given at the last meeting for a bottom line of \$13,887,870 proposed which both groups saw. She did a deep dive and made some changes since. Previously she included a 2.25% for increases for the WLCSSA staff because negotiations were underway but it appears the CBA will be moving forward and has now removed this, which has in impact also on FICA, Workers Comp etc. She reduced the long-term substitute funding by \$10,000, reduced the district wide plan change allowance for insurance by \$8,000, discovered an error that she budgeted the athletic director twice and corrected this, she removed a one quarter position that has been in the business office where the funding is used to fund other projects and corrected an error resulting in a reduction of \$58,044. Chatting with Mr. Pratt and looking at current enrollment for SPED he felt comfortable in reducing out of district tuition by \$35,000. She reviewed past budgets and reduced \$5,925 in various accounts that have not been spent or the funding did not match prior expenditures. In reviewing CTE funding for FY 24 she flat funded this, they had requested a \$5,000 but she would like to keep it flat funded and use this as a basis to figure out where we are at with student enrollment. If we have students interested and we are exceeding current funding we will always allow them to access those courses. The School Board requested to increase the legal by \$7,000. Making those changes, digesting the lists of wants and based on the meetings we had, the Superintendent, administrative team and Budget Committee and I feel that the part time custodian is integral to the success of our buildings and the IT support position is integral with our continued success as a district. The Facilities Committee met and looked at the CIP and projects on the plan in the past and made a commitment if approved by the Board and Budget Committee to approve the funding to complete projects within the operating budget for the next 3 years, which totals about \$50,000 each year. We added back in the \$50,000, IT and custodian positions. We looked at the technology budget and Instructional Pathways, which is part of iReady and is really a supplemental program for learning loss for K-8 students. We feel that \$35,000 in the budget can be moved to ESSER with the Board's support. IXL is an enrichment program, really geared to K-8 but they have modules for grades 9-12 to access additional learning and can be moved to ESSER if Board allows. We looked at class enrollment and teacher roster; it appears we can probably not fill a position at WLC based on current student and class load. That would be about an \$85,000 savings. We would not be reducing positions; we would not be funding it for next year and possible future years depending on enrollment. Another topic that came up is potentially eliminating the nursing position at LCS, which is currently a .80 position. The Superintendent has information on the number of students seen there. Adding back in \$26,400 for the Budget Committee request for track improvements. Our November 29 amount plus and minus the things she spoke of if all approved would bring our bottom to \$13,809,691, a 5% increase over FY 23. The two things we originally discussed on wants lists, the gifted and talented program at FRES; we believe that could be an ESSER request for students who need enrichment but didn't receive it. The other she didn't budget is year 1 of 3 for the basketball pulleys/backboards and baseball scoreboard are not included because we still lack clarity of where that cost comes from and the true scope of the plan. Chairman Jones reviewed the proposed changes individually asking for questions. Mr. Golding questioned regarding the legal increase, he did not recall the \$22,000 coming up. Ms. LaPlante reviewed her notes from the discussion that was had, she has a consensus of the group being \$22,000, and Mr. Post would bring that to the Budget Committee. A question was raised regarding the .80 custodian is the purpose to help with the projects needed, is that why we are increasing that. Ms. LaPlante confirmed yes, in looking at the projects coming up and Mr. Erb having to cover when staff is out we feel that position could help support the facilities people during times we have additional cleaning, and help with deferred maintenance that probably could have been addressed over years and help during summer cleaning outside. She confirms the intent is the person would float between buildings. She confirms we do not know if this will be a permanent position but a good year will give a good base line to determine future funding. Chairman Jones asked since the position is to catch up on deferred maintenance due to COVID could it be funded through ESSER. Ms. LaPlante responds she does not think it would qualify. There was a discussion about Instructional Pathways

and IXL. A question was raised if we are using Instructional Pathways now. Ms. LaPlante reviewed yes; it is free the first year. It was questioned if ESSER had to be new things; with IXL, we have not used it in a while. Ms. LaPlante is confident that it would qualify. If it were not funded this year, we would not continue with it. A question was raised if the \$35,000 for Instructional Pathways would need to be funded annually. Ms. LaPlante responded yes it is something that would become part of future budgets. A question was raised to clarify that we are switching from something that cost \$2,000 to something that costs \$35,000. Superintendent confirms yes. It is part of iReady. We replaced STAR 360 with iReady and Instructional Pathways is directly linked. The IXL would be HS students have additional resources in math. Instructional Pathways stops at grade 8. For us it was an easy move to IXL and funding Instructional Pathways through ESSER is an investment we have to make. If we find in 2 years it is not effective we would reconsider it. He confirms we would continue with the testing part of it. Instructional Pathways identifies student strengths and weaknesses. It is a good resource for teachers. Our job is to be all in, with iReady and implement it consistently. We are fortunate to have ESSER but that runs out September 2024. We want to use a substantial amount of that to help kids. He confirms that Instructional Pathways currently is not for HS students. Our teachers feel IXL is a good resource. Principal Edmunds noted there are some 9th and 10th graders using Instructional Pathways and there is a plan to extend into the HS. Ms. Dignan spoke about Instructional Pathways (My Path); you start by taking students diagnostic assessment finding their strengths and weaknesses and what they need to work on. It assigned independent tasks to work on to increase their abilities in those weaker areas. Teachers can work with them and see quizzes and what they are working on. It gives a pass or fail on every assignment they do. There is significant data behind iReady's "My Path" which she can share that if students use My Path for about 30-49 minutes per week that scores will increase. If they are not scoring 70% on all of their quizzes, they will be flagged. Teachers are looking at this once a week to be sure they don't have those flags and if they do they are stopping and will do small group instruction with those kids. For the most part, elementary is using it during W.I.N time. A group will work on it for about 15 minutes and rotate through a session, not doing 45 minutes in one day. This year we are focusing on math and if there is extra time will work on reading. She confirms it has only been done at school but they can do it at home. It was noted that the original cost around instructional pathways, for what it is worth the iReady platform was substantially less expensive than STAR 360. We are seeing an increase that is accompanied by a decrease elsewhere. Discussion was had regarding the proposed staff reduction at WLC through attrition. A question was raised what is the position. Superintendent responded we don't have it yet but believe we have a position we can eliminate. It was expressed we should have an idea of what that will effect and courses we are offering. Does it mean that there are courses we won't offer or is another staff member filling that role. Superintendent can give more details but we are not in a position to identify it yet and want to look at the number of students taking classes, we are looking at math as a critical issue for us and looking at the certifications we have, we have teachers that can teach outside of their content areas as long as it is less than 50%. We want the best decision with the least student impact but at the end of the day, it does affect courses. He gave examples including we may offer courses just not every year but the students can take it over a 4 year period. A question was raised if we are looking to work with Milford or other places they can take it. Superintendent responded we want to make sure our kids have access to courses like those that they have in Milford, but it is challenging for a small district. We know we may not be able to offer all of that. We have to look at options and want to be sure if our seniors want to take a course we have it for them. We have a few variables to consider. We want to be very sensitive to our staff. He thinks it is a reasonable decision to make in this budget cycle as a cut including the nursing position; we have given this careful thought consideration as well. Chairman Kofalt informed the Budget Committee that the Board had voted prior to the joint session to move forward with a warrant article for the tennis courts. He is curious what is included in the line item for the track and is there other work that needs to be done around that. He puts the question forward if it makes sense to put it forward as a warrant and/or why it is in the budget at this point. Ms. LaPlante reviewed the quote put forward by Ms. Browne is \$26,460 and involves regrading a significant section of the roadway to the baseball and track surfaces, re-graveling the roadways with 3 quarter inch hard packed gravel, trim and chip brush along the sides, build a parking area at the top for 7-8 cars with drive capabilities, clean out all swale ways along roadsides, regrade 1400 feet in track and replace with stone dust, cut brush back 10 feet and remove stumps and chip brush. It was suggested to consider if we are putting forth a warrant for the tennis courts we probably should in the interest in giving people a clear choice on whether they want to spend the money, we should consider putting this as a warrant article as well. Chairman Jones responded the Budget Committee felt we could do that track and rejuvenating that space, tennis court road, upper field, track altogether. It could be a nice and pretty area and make people feel comfortable going to it. Chairman Kofalt noted he is still not clear why you would not want to put it forward to the voters. Ms. Browne spoke her personal view is how we classified warrant articles in the past, things that are not necessary. She felt we talked about improving our facilities, it is important to do, and bringing it back up to original condition, we never maintained it. That is her general argument. She understands the warrant on the tennis courts but coming into this meeting, we felt it was something important to put forward and include it in the budget. A question was raised how many students go out for track. Ms. Browne responded about 10 last year and about 5 years before that we had maybe 20. A question was raised what damage is being done to students running on a subpar surface. Ms. Browne responded our track has not been maintained, you can't do hurdles and it is rugged, the surface was originally stone dust. Runners won't get their fastest times but it would be usable and if fixed we could host meets. Mr. LoVerme voiced support. A question was raised if it would solve the soaking wet problem. Ms. Browne responded Chris Carter provided the quote, he would address the drainage issues and it would probably help the soccer field as well. A question was raised if we could make the information on the quote available to see what is included. Ms. LaPlante responded she is apprehensive to do that because if we will send it out to bid, competitors would have the information. She confirmed it had not been sent out to bid this is preliminary information. Discussion was had regarding the proposed cut of the LCS nursing position. Ms. Lavallee would want to look at some of the discussions had this year around not having a principal or guidance counselor and having the same principal at FRES and LCS. She has some concerns about the

administrative staffing we have there. She is not saying she doesn't agree with it but would like to see a clear plan from a budget perspective and administrative perspective on how we will address needs we have at LCS for the staff. What is the plan next year? We switched things around and had the SAU cover it before and that didn't work, we went back to having the Principal from FRES doing it. She would feel better to know what that is going to look like for students and staff there. Chairman Jones noted he doesn't know if the Budget Committee is ok with this as it was just presented on Thursday. They have concerns around student safety, we know there is not a big need but when there is it is big. They wanted School Board input. Mr. Vanderhoof spoke that a couple of years ago there was discussion of moving the classes to FRES or WLC to get them out of LCS. There were pros and cons and it is something we should look at. That may not be the only savings there. Superintendent voiced he would be open to that conversation, he has been clear about concerns with maintaining 3 buildings. Moving them is doable. There is redundancy, we have 3 buildings, and we are a small district and can't afford everything. These decisions are not easy. Are there other options we are avoiding conversations about? It is not about saving money but about making the best decision for our district. It was noted in the past when there was a significant changes we were debating she believes a committee would be formed. It was noted we have the Strategic Planning Committee. We would need a lot of input from families and communities. Ms. Browne noted when we built the kindergarten with grant money, she believes we had to use it as a kindergarten for a number of years, 10 maybe. Ms. Browne noted as far as the nurse, we would need to get guidance from legal. Superintendent responded there is no requirement to have a nurse, but if you do have a nurse, it needs to be an RN. The issue is, is there enough where there is proper response beyond first aid and CPR from the ambulance to the WLC nurse. At the end of the day, that position is seeing 1-2 students on average a day and that is costly as a district. He is open to hearing ideas. Mr. Post voiced he thinks the Superintendent brings up a good point, how can we be more efficient with the 3 schools we have. There was a plan for growth within the student population every year. We are doing a little better than most communities in NH are. I don't think we should gloss over the fact of what the Superintendent is saying, move the 5th grade to WLC and moving students out of LCS. We have a smaller student body than we planned for. He suggests researching the 10-year kindergarten stipulation. The roof is having problems now and that may have been when it was done. We have redundancy in the schools; we could be spending money on other things. It is time we look at it. We are tasked with managing the facilities and it is a challenge. He is glad the Superintendent brought it up. A question was raised if that recommendation was brought up because of where we are with the budget or the needs of the students. Superintendent spoke about the position cut noting it is based on a number of things such as student/teacher ratio. We have classes of 3-5 kids, is there is a way to build our program of studies so kids can have what they need but maybe not have it all the time. If the community is Ok with those class sizes, he is ok with it but this is a place we can propose a cut that will not impact the quality of learning. He wouldn't propose a cut if he didn't think it could be done. He would not propose staffing cuts unless he was directed to without serious thought. It does have a positive impact on the budget and we want a budget that both Boards are comfortable with but wants to be sure that it is a good decision for kids. The discussion regarding the proposed staffing cuts continued. Ms. Post noted it was discussed at the last Facilities Committee meeting and one of the things the Superintendent outlined that gave her confidence was he will have people in place to know what to do in the absence of a nurse. It is important we get that out to the public so that people feel comfortable with that scenario. A question was raised if the Board spoke about a contingency plan regarding the tennis courts if the warrant does not pass. Chairman Kofalt reviewed the approved plan at this point is we have \$20,000 allocated to remove the tennis courts if the votes decide they don't want to repair them we would presumable move forward with removing them. A question was raised if you would do that this year before the end of the fiscal year. Chairman Kofalt voiced if the voters do want to repair them there is a question of what that warrant article will look like, we didn't make a firm decision on that. It could be a warrant for \$70,000 for the total repair cost or a warrant for \$50,000 where we are spending \$20,000 out of this year's budget. There is some discussion on whether or not that is the appropriate action. We did not get into debating that in detail. The decision was to put the question before the voters. The decision to not fix them is de facto plan A, which is to remove them.

ii. Warrants

Ms. LaPlante reported the Facilities Committee is making a recommendation for a warrant article for the Building and Roadways Capital Reserve for \$190,000. We have 2 boilers to replace at WLC and there is consideration of a warrant for \$100,000 for one of them and a possible ESSER request to replace boiler #2. We have \$61,476 dollars for the WLCSSA CBA if it goes through. We still have the roof at LCS and siding we have not figured a funding source for and looking at the tennis courts at about \$71,000 or \$50,000. These are the warrants the Board will be reviewing language on at the next meeting. The deadline for warrants is February 9 but feels it is the intent of the Board to have that wrapped up before going to the public hearing. She is looking for direction; this is the time to discuss it. Our last budget meeting is January 10 as a group unless we need another. She would like to start wrapping this up on January 10. A question was raised if we will talk about the kitchen equipment, it was noted it is a large project, \$250,000-\$300,000 potentially and perhaps should be a warrant before the tennis courts or track. Ms. LaPlante noted it was a request from the Budget Committee to provide a list. She confirms it is a comprehensive list, does not say what should be replaced now. There was discussion around the replacement of WLC kitchen equipment including there needs to be a total renovation, a list of maintaining the equipment was not provided, we need to find out if we will have any donated items, some items appear to be more urgent than others, and we need to hear from Mr. Erb, Mr. Mercier and Ms. LaPlante regarding the needs. It was suggested to see if we could determine if there will be any donated items before the next meeting. Ms. LaPlante will have a presentation at the next Board meeting. Chairman Kofalt noted we need to hear how urgent these things are and have a conversation to triage to figure out what is most urgent. Mr. Vanderhoof suggested instead of hobbling it all together just gut the whole thing, provide a total cost and put it in a warrant. If it is not spent, give it back to the taxpayers. Mr. LoVerme suggests putting it on a warrant and getting it all fixed. Ms. LaPlante will come back at the next meeting, provide images, and make a presentation on what the most urgent needs are for the next meeting.

Chairman Jones spoke that the Budget Committee had discussed the transportation costs being up 49% on one bid and one follow-up from the Budget Committee is to have the reasonability of the cost be checked with Steve's School Bus. Ms. LaPlante noted we didn't do that. Ms. LaPlante explained it would not change the outcome of the number of bids we get. If Mr. Brown (Steve's Bus) does say he wouldn't charge that then perhaps it is too high. We would have gotten a mixed message without clarity to come back to the Board with. We followed the policies we have regarding the bid process. She felt after speaking with the Superintendent, she owns the decision but felt it would be misleading to go back to Mr. Brown to ask him to reconsider for one year or ask him for his perspective. He received a copy of the transportation bid that day as well. A question was raised if the school board accepted the bid. It was confirmed they did. Mr. Post expressed he feels we should go back to them and ask to revisit that, what can we cut and what can we change. It doesn't hurt to ask. He confirmed go back to the one bidder and ask if there is room to change something. It was noted that should have happened before we got this far with the bid. If you ask now, they may pull out. They reviewed what happened in the past when Butler bid. If we do, we may not have transportation. Discussion was had whether to go to Butler or not. Ms. LaPlante confirmed he couldn't pull the offer already made. It was noted the Board already voted to accept it this evening. Chairman Jones asked if there was any guidance on what has been discussed tonight either for or against items on the list. Ms. Bernet raised some concerns about cutting the nurse position, she wants to see specifics on what will be done if the position is cut, it is not just about volume there are a lot of safety issues, injuries, viruses etc. She is concerned with untrained people and wants specifics on who will be doing what and who is trained in what. She wants to see what it will be replaced with before she makes a decision, she does not feel it was explained sufficiently. Ms. Anzalone agrees. She does not see the justification. Ms. LaPlante noted we would provide that at the next meeting. Ms. LaPlante confirmed she would like the gifted and talented program to be funded through ESSER; she would like the Boards support for this and will have a proposal for the next meeting. Ms. LaPlante spoke regarding the bus bid; there is a clause within the bidding requirements that the Board reserves the right to negotiate with a bidder when all bids exceed the budgeted appropriation. We don't have a budgeted appropriation but in absence of the Boards directive to do so is why she has not gone back to do that. She feels it is a Board decision and until the Board saw the totality of the contract, she did not want to act in the absence of Board guidance. That is the "PS" to Mr. Post's concern. If the Board wants to withdraw their motion to approve it and the Board want to ask for changes that is absolutely something we can do it appears. Mr. Vanderhoof spoke that based on the history a motion to withdraw the approval would be wise but doesn't think there is any harm to see if they can lessen it, maybe change routes etc. They know that we only got one bid and know we want them to do the job but if there is any room for change to reduce cost it would be worth asking. Ms. Post asked for clarification that it could be withdrawn you can go back to the bus company and ask for any change to reduce the cost. Ms. LaPlante responded with in policy DJE, it says the Board reserves the right to negotiate with a bidder when all bids exceed the budgeted appropriation.

IX. PUBLIC COMMENT

The public comment section of the agenda was read. Superintendent called out the list of those online asking if they wanted to comment. No public comment was heard.

Ms. Browne asked about the YTD reports. She looked them over and thinks some of the building maintenance has quite a bit still unencumbered. Ms. LaPlante reviewed we have \$76,711 unencumbered, 13.77% of the budget remains. We locked up all the energy cost, and heating cost. It appears the bulk of the projects will be coming in the spring she believes repairs, and maintenance. Ms. Browne responded there is still a lot in equipment and replacement furniture. Ms. LaPlante confirms yes under repairs and maintenance and have some projects coming with the heating system, which are separate from the boiler replacements and have not been submitted for encumbered amounts. Ms. Browne noted looks like we are over on snow plowing. Ms. LaPlante responded that is a budget adjusted entry that she needs to make; it appears it is only being taken out of WLC and not at FRES and LCS.

A MOTION was made by Mr. Ryan and SECONDED by Ms. Browne to adjourn the Budget Session meeting at 8:22pm. Voting: all aye; motion carried.

Chairman Kofalt voiced wanting to wrap up the conversation regarding the transportation contract. He questioned if the Board wanted to entertain a Motion. Mr. Post voiced concern regarding the cost, he spoke about asking for an adjustment to the cost and concern that he was notified of the vote happening (he was in the Budget Committee meeting). Chairman Kofalt asked if there is a desire to bring forward a Motion. Mr. Vanderhoof voiced under normal circumstances he would be however, he was at that meeting of the last bid a few years back, he was not on the Board but expressed concern for what happened. He does not suggest doing it although noted this is a different Board. Ms. Lavallee voiced she also was not on the Board and Mr. Post brings up a good point, the possibility of asking, and would it hurt to ask if they can't back out of their bid. Ms. LaPlante expressed her opinion is questions are theoretically free, the best-case scenario is they make an adjustment. She is willing to have that conversation. Ms. Lavallee noted she is apprehensive given what others are saying happened in previous years. Mr. Post voiced, they voted to accept it, he thinks it is ill advised and we are stuck with it.

X. YTD REPORTS

Ms. LaPlante reviewed at the last meeting there were questions about amounts remaining for repairs and maintenance. She segregated things out in repairs and maintenance by object. She can dig in more about those accounts and wanted to provide some specific transparency about those specific accounts.

XI. POLICIES

i. EHAB-Data Governance and Security-3rd Read

Ms. Lavallee reported this is the 3rd read; there were no suggested edits at the last meeting.

A MOTION was made by Ms. Lavallee and SECONDED by Ms. Cloutier-Cabral to accept and adopt policy EHAB-Data Governance and Security as written

Voting: via roll call vote, seven ayes; motion carried.

Mr. Mannarino is no longer online.

ii. IHAM-Health Education & Exemption From Instruction-3rd Read

iii. IHAM-R Health and Sex Education Exemption/Objectionable Course Material: Opt-Out Form-3rd Read

Ms. Lavallee reviewed the last time we discussed differences between the opt-out form, what we currently have and an opt-in form. She did more research on this specific RSA. Per the RSA, part of the state requirement to graduate is to include the health and sex education, HIV and AIDS information. The policy is required to provide the provision that requires the parent or legal guardian to notify the school principal or designee in writing of this special material in which they object and the provision requires an alternative agreed upon supplement between parent and school district at the parent's expense that is sufficient for the child to meet the state requirement of the child's education in that particular area. We can obviously have more discussion about it. She gave her personal opinion, (they did not discuss this in the committee meeting, they have not met since), is the more she researched it the more she thought having an opt-in would potentially create some unnecessary hurdles for parents specifically because some of the issues mentioned like some parents are not always paying attention or don't know and what would happen is the parent would have to be contacted. The parent would have to give rationale for the student not being in class and have to come up with an alternative if it just gets misplaced. Her personal opinion is parents who are concerned and may not want their child to participate in sex education still have that ability by opting out of it. There are also the families that are paying close attention to the curriculum. She feels the opt-in form could be an unnecessary burden for families. Ms. Cloutier-Cabral agrees with that. She feels we as parents, when we have some hard and fast objection about some materials we are really sensitive about looking at that and we know as our kids are approaching junior high they will be approaching sex education. If there are certain things, we don't want our kids to learn about in school we will ask questions and talk about it. In public education, we are tasked with providing public education and a lot of parents of children going to public school are working 2 jobs and are not able to opt-in to every single program we are offering. They already opted in by sending their kid to school. I would be frustrated if I had to opt-in for everything. I would be objectionable to that. Mr. Vanderhoof pointed out at the "intro night" one of his kids was taking health, there wasn't much of a syllabus, and the description was we will go over this, this and this and we might do some sex education stuff if we have time. He doesn't think that is appropriate. If you are going to make it opt-out, you need to get a lot more specific about what you are covering and when you are covering it as opposed to if we have time we will talk about it. Discussion continued regarding this topic including what is going home needs to be more specific, the syllabus is just class rules, and sex education is legally required. It was noted even if the syllabus goes out; still the parents or guardians will be notified by email or other means 2 weeks before. It was noted, our district is legally bound to follow that. If a student opts-out they are allowed legally to do that but if we make a requirement that someone has to opt-in it may create an unnecessary burden. Discussion continued including if it is legally required there needs to be more detail given to parents such as what is exactly being presented, the policy states what you are asking for, it says they will tell you 2 weeks in advance of use of the curriculum course to be used, and you want the teacher to be held to the policy (to provide it). Ms. Anzalone noted she is not getting that. Mr. Post proposed a change to the 3rd paragraph to strike the words "of use" that will solve that issue. Provide the parents the curriculum. Ms. Lavallee clarified what he was asking for. Mr. Post voiced right now it is notice of curriculum, if I am a parent how do I get the curriculum, no one provides syllabuses for classes, he has to question if we are doing our role here. How would a parent know, just say provide the curriculum. It was noted the paragraph below that does this, it was read. Ms. Lavallee noted if they are using a chapter in a book are they required to photocopy the whole chapter and send out, I think they should be ready to do that but is that the standard practice for every child. Mr. Post expressed that there are people who have concerns; we are trying to address parents with concerns and trying to keep them from pulling their children out of the district. Ms. Lavallee expressed anyone who wants to see the curriculum can and she encourages them to contact the school and encourages the school to be open to address those concerns with parents. She questions if changing the wording are we locked into sending the actual course material is being sent home with the notice vs. saying these are the subjects we are covering if you want to see it come in. Discussion continued including where does it say these are the subjects we are covering, it is not easy to copy all the course material, is it better to say this is what we are covering if you have a concern come to us, you have the option to opt-out, if we know an issue is affecting a lot of people we should devote time and effort to it if we don't have a process in place to help people. Ms. Lavallee voiced not understanding the purpose. Discussions continued including what are you teaching in sex education class, are you teaching biologically what is a male, how are you going to teach that, what is a woman, how are you going to teach that, there are different types of sex, there is a lot being pushed in other schools not saying here but it's in the

news and you can clearly understand why a parent may question what their kid is being taught, how deep are you going to get into these subjects, a parent should know with more specificity more than just the syllabus, no detail was provided at all, I don't see the harm sending something home, parents then have the information to know if they want to have their child participate, it may be easier if we see it as a Board, more detail should be provided. Ms. Anzalone noted she is just asking for more detail sent home.

A MOTION was made by Mr. LoVerme and SECONDED by Ms. Lavallee to accept policy IHAM-Health Education and Exemption from Instruction as presented.

Ms. Cloutier-Cabral asked how far are we out from the health unit. Superintendent does not know. He expressed it behooves our health teachers to send information home. What he doesn't want as a teacher is to have a 100 questions within a 2-week window. First, there should be a syllabus and if it doesn't have sufficient detail I encourage parents to reach out to the teachers but also as administrators we want to work with teachers to improve the syllabi. The better off the communication will be and parents can make the decision if they want to opt-out early. We don't want to be answering these questions 24 hours before unit 1 is implemented here. Everyone is correct here. I accept the fact this is a sensitive topic for many. We need to improve our communication on both sides so we don't have an issue of distrust. I encourage our administrators to review the syllabi; I don't want to create more anxiety for parents, the questions are reasonable to know what we are teaching their kids at home. If there are areas we need to improve on, we need to do that. Ms. Cloutier-Cabral agrees with that and asks given that and if the syllabus is complete do we agree with the policy. Ms. Anzalone thinks the policy should be updated to clarify that. Mr. Post reminded the Board putting forward a controversial policy, once it is in place it is not the end of that, we saw this at the last meeting. By pushing this through without vetting out the issues he thinks will be the same path and you will have another room through of people. He suggests a 4th reading and withdraw the Motion to approve it. Chairman Kofalt pointed out this is not a new policy it is a revision, in place since 2010 and is required by law. He doesn't believe we are as far apart as we may feel we are. The policy as it stands now makes it very clear that parents have the right to come to school and inspect the curriculum course material in detail that means every bit of it. The concern he was hearing before is if we argue that the district is required to send the curriculum not a summary, not a piece of it but the curriculum to every parent then we could be sending a lot of material, and books, to every parent. He acknowledges that was not the intent and not what was being asked for. He thinks what is being asked for is that we have a reasonable summary that really captures the high level essence of what is being taught so we can communicate clearly and effectively with parents. This is what is being taught and if you have concern, we are available for you to come in and inspect the materials. Mr. Post suggested adding "a summary of the curriculum". Ms. Anzalone is good with that. Chairman Kofalt asked if Mr. LoVerme was agreeable to amending his Motion to include "a summary of the curriculum", although he believes we would have to go a 4th reading. Mr. LoVerme does not want to go to a 4th reading. Ms. Lavallee noted prior practice with this Board is that we have done a 4th reading. She addressed one comment. The comment regarding pushing through a policy. She spoke specifically to this policy, this is our 3rd reading, we have talked about it, she has done the research behind it, the questions being brought up have been brought up by board members with the exception of Mr. Post, that both attended Policy Committee meetings where we discussed this extensively as well. She feels the determination of pushing through a policy she feels is inaccurate because the members of the committee have discussed this extensively; she agrees we have to flush out the details, which is why we have Policy Committee. She feels firmly onboard for making changes when it comes to the Board as well. She doesn't feel by accepting the policy or seconding Mr. LoVerme's motion that she is pushing through a policy. She feels the language in it is doing what we want but we need to be sure everyone is following the policy. It serves the purpose legally and of being open to families asking questions and coming in and reviewing material. I think it is us trying to be transparent she understands the concerns and encourages parents to approach the staff but if they are not is it fair to say the staff is doing something wrong. If there is not a systemic problem, we are seeing she doesn't see the point of this. Ms. Anzalone responded it is not being followed; she didn't get the information she needed and doesn't think it is asking a lot to ask that proactively we will send parents the information. She has brought this concern up several times and feels like it is the first time. We need to change the wording so a detailed syllabus will be sent home and keep the rest of it. Mr. Post questioned if there a meeting of the Policy Committee between the second reading and this meeting. Ms. Lavallee responded no. Mr. Post noted you didn't discuss the concerns we had the last time with the committee. Ms. Lavallee voiced the opt-in vs. opt-out, the last meeting we had the second read was the first time opt-in vs. opt-out was discussed. The discussion at the first read was around the curriculum and she pulled up the meeting minutes so she could be clear about what was discussed. We did not have another meeting and we did not discuss the opt-in vs. opt-out. In regard to the board members who were on the committee, this was discussed and both members voted to move it forward to the Board as an opt-out policy. *The statement was inaccurate and later corrected to indicate Ms. Anzalone was not present at the meeting.* Mr. Post commented the concerns Mr. Vanderhoof and Ms. Anzalone brought up were not discussed at the Policy Committee. Ms. Lavallee agrees they were not but there were several changes made during the meeting and they made all the changes Mr. Vanderhoof suggested. Mr. Post expressed this is a minor change; it is not being done. He suggests to make the minor change and move on. Mr. Vanderhoof commented just because you are on a committee and vote to move something forward doesn't mean you are not willing to revisit it. In no way shape or form do I think we have a perfect policy, there is always room for improvement if we get new requests to look into it he thinks it should be done. In regard to pushing a policy forward, he thinks the comment was made about this and the fact we were in the middle of a discussion and the vote was made when there is clearly more that people want to talk. Chairman Kofalt reviewed the Motion is to approve the policy as currently drafted. Mr. Post asked the Chairman to record his vote.

494
495 *Voting: via roll call vote, five ayes; three nays from Mr. Post, Ms. Anzalone, and Mr. Vanderhoof, motion carried.*
496

497 **iv. IHAM-R Health and Sex Education Exemption/Objectionable Course Material: Opt-Out**
498 **Form-3rd Read**

499 Ms. Lavallee the question with this was the same as the one prior opt-in vs. opt-out. Her opinion is the same as before although
500 she thinks it may behoove us that we send out the information saying this is what we are presenting we include this form so
501 families do not have to go searching for it. That is her recommendation. Mr. Vanderhoof questioned if that is a change to the
502 policy. Ms. Lavallee responded no. Mr. Vanderhoof questioned how is that enforced and communicated to the SAU that this
503 should be done. Ms. Lavallee responded we can direct the Superintendent to do it. Mr. Vanderhoof noted it is a good suggestion
504 but feels it should be in writing in the previous policy just passed.
505

506 *A MOTION was made by Ms. Lavallee and SECONDED by Mr. LoVerme to accept IHAM-R-Health and Sex Education*
507 *Exemption/Objectionable Course Material: Opt-Out Form as written*

508 *Voting: via roll call vote, seven ayes; motion carried.*
509

510 **v. JI-Student Rights and Responsibilities-3rd Read**

511 Ms. Lavallee reported this policy had minor changes, no changes since the first and second read.
512

513 *A MOTION was made by Ms. Lavallee and SECONDED by Mr. LoVerme to adopt policy JI-Student Rights and Responsibilities*
514 *as written*

515 *Voting: all aye; motion carried.*
516

517 **vi. GBCD-Background Investigation and Criminal History Records Check-3rd Read**

518 Ms. Lavallee reported this is the policy that we made changes to last year and there were additional changes for this year.
519 Nothing has come up in the last couple of readings.
520

521 *A MOTION was made by Ms. Lavallee and SECONDED by Mr. LoVerme to adopt policy GBCD-Background Investigation and*
522 *Criminal History Records Check as written*

523 *Voting: all aye; motion carried.*
524

525 **vii. IJL-Reconsideration**

526 This was removed from the agenda earlier in the evening.
527

528 **XII. ACTION ITEMS**

529 **a. Approve Minutes of Previous Meeting**

530 *A MOTION was made by Ms. Lavallee and SECONDED by Mr. LoVerme to approve the minutes of November 15, 2022 as*
531 *written.*

532 *Voting: six ayes; one abstention from Mr. Vanderhoof, motion carried.*
533

534 *A MOTION was made by Ms. Lavallee and SECONDED by Mr. LoVerme to approve the minutes of November 29, 2022 as*
535 *amended.*

536 *Voting: six ayes; one abstention from Mr. Vanderhoof, motion carried.*
537

538 **XIII. COMMITTEE REPORTS**

539 **i. Facilities**

540 Ms. Cloutier-Cabral reported the committee met December 6 and discussed the CIP and worked on it. They are looking at the
541 warrant articles we discussed earlier; we are looking to provide the maintenance information on this living document, which is
542 starting to shape up. We discussed the warrant for the tennis courts, and for LCS roof and windows. Mr. Post added we
543 discussed the form (spreadsheets) and how to provide more information and clarification. Ms. Cloutier-Cabral voiced we are
544 working on detailing the spreadsheets so that people will have a history moving forward. A question was raised if the warrant
545 funding line on the CIP is that an equation. If you click on the cell, does it have the equation or just a number plugged in. Ms.
546 LaPlante responded the committee used 10% compounding interest as the basis to recommend future funding. A question was
547 raised how much of the total from FY 26-27 is funded in the \$190,000 you are going to ask for. Ms. LaPlante responded the
548 committee didn't do it that way, the essentially said add 10% to the following year. A question was raised if you make changes
549 how will make changes to the funding. This is not a savings account you are supposed to fund the projects on the page, how does
550 a simple 10% do that. It works but the goals is to have a working document that doesn't have to be broken down and rebuilt
551 every year. Ms. Cloutier-Cabral responded that is what we are trying to do and trying to find a formula to meet the needs. We
552 may have to adjust it next year. It was noted 20 years from now that doesn't work if you are just bumping it 10% every year.
553 Every year that 10% is more than the year before, it doesn't sound sustainable. Ms. Cloutier-Cabral responded we might have to
554 reduce it if we are seeing that. Mr. Vanderhoof gave an example of he believes it would work better. Ms. Cloutier-Cabral will
555 bring the information back and see if it makes sense to come up with a different formula or number.

556 **ii. Finance**

557 Chairman Kofalt reported the committee met and discussed a little bit about the PO process, the transition from blanket PO to
558 sparse use of blanket PO's. This is in large part why we have lower encumbrances than prior years. We talked a little bit about
559 the \$1 budgeted for SAU performance pay and there were mixed feelings whether it made sense to do any kind of performance
560 pay program. We all like the idea in theory in practice it has been used in a way that was problematic. We advised Ms. LaPlante
561 to go back and discuss this with the Superintendent to see if it is something, they want to pursue or not. We talked a little about
562 LCS roofing and siding repairs. There was a question of whether to put it in the budget; we talked about getting Budget
563 Committee input. That was one of the topics to discuss with with the Budget Committee. Ms. LaPlante noted it was not a large
564 topic, they did not provide feedback. Chairman Kofalt suggested we need to follow up on this. We talked about the treasurer and
565 is only available on limited hours and days and we need to establish a regular cadence for performing bank reconciliations. Ms.
566 LaPlante will follow up on this to keep it on track. We talked about reviewing some of the policies before they go to the Policy
567 Committee and talked about the final audit, which arrived from the CPA firm that afternoon. We did not get to look at that final
568 audit and typically, they have a list of findings and recommendations that call for Board action and is something we will want to
569 review going forward.

570 **iii. Budget Liaison**

571 Mr. Post reviewed since the last meeting the committee met 3 times, we met with staff here with Chairman Jones, Ms. Browne,
572 and himself. FRES staff was asked to attend but did not. There were some from WLC. Some concerns they had were about the
573 makerspace project had stalled, funding was sought out and proposal were made but no one seemed to know where that went or
574 what happened. There was concern about music and sports equipment and money to make repairs and why money was returned
575 to the taxpayers and not spent in the district. He thinks the staff appreciated talking to the Budget Committee and were forth
576 coming about that. He thinks that as a Board we have some questions and answers as to why some things are not being done.
577 There was a subsequent meeting last Thursday, which I was unable to attend, but I did review the minutes and they reviewed the
578 5% budget with the Superintendent and Ms. LaPlante. They talked about some issues tonight, fields, using a warrant article for
579 that and they had questions about the tennis courts. Tonight we reviewed the minutes from the last meeting reviewed some
580 concerns with spending. There was a question on the kitchen summary, which was hashed out as a group tonight. He confirmed
581 at the staff meeting there were 6 staff from WLC from the HS and Principal Edmunds was there. They had asked for
582 representation from all the schools but only WLC had representation.

583 **iv. Negotiations**

584 Mr. Post believes we have wrapped it up, The Superintendent confirmed the document was completed and given to Ms. Eshback
585 and she will bring that to the WLCSSA for consideration and the vote after the holiday. He sent the final draft to Mr. Post this
586 evening.

587
588 **XIV. BOARD BUDGET DISCUSSION**

589 Mr. Golding spoke that he needs more information on the track; it seems to be a Band Aid fix. If we are going to do it lets not let
590 it become the next tennis court. He questioned how much of the \$136,000 we are supposed to use for learning loss, we have used
591 far. He asked this a few meetings ago. Ms. LaPlante doesn't have an answer because the FRES tutoring program didn't start, she
592 can program it in as being spent but it won't start until January. Mr. Golding expressed the need to focus the funds on learning
593 loss. We need to focus on students especially based on our scores. Ms. LaPlante will provide details at the next meeting as well
594 as what we are looking for in additional requests. Mr. Post spoke that much of the work on the tennis courts we addressed with
595 taking it down and using the material to regrade the road, taking down the brush. That work has not been addressed it has been
596 stalled. He thinks we should use the \$20,000 to do that work and he doesn't think it is appropriate to move forward spending
597 \$20,000 if the courts don't get used. If we do a full redo on the track, it's a bond issue and we have so many other problems to
598 address. We should have playable surfaces and thinks it is a maintenance issue. Before we move forward with quotes, we need
599 true costs. At any time, cost can go up or down. The 5% is a good but when we start floating up with other warrant articles, we
600 are just increasing cost and he doesn't know if it will be approved. Ms. Cloutier-Cabral spoke that the warrant article relating to
601 the tennis courts and maybe the track what we are doing is asking what the public wants. She agrees we agreed to \$20,000 and
602 should follow through but we had a lot of feedback that caused us to revisit it. She was on the fence about doing it but by putting
603 it out there for the community, it gives them the decision and if they choose not to move forward with the plan. Regarding the
604 budget, it is a lot of hard work, every year it is tough and this year is no exception. She thanked everyone for working hard on it.
605 Ms. Anzalone thinks if we do the tennis court warrant article, we should do the track too. It is a huge increase in transportation
606 and we have to cover that. Her concern is she doesn't want people to just start cutting things and not knowing what is critical to
607 kids. She thinks it the community who should decide what we spend on that stuff. Mr. Vanderhoof thinks the track should be in
608 the budget not a warrant article, it is weird but it is as if you are hiding the cost by putting it in the warrant. If you put it in the
609 warrant you are presenting a lower number, giving the appearance of a stagnant budget and you pass it, and the other warrant
610 articles and it didn't go up just 5% it went up much more. He doesn't think people understand that it is not an apples to apples
611 last year's budget because you already rolled those warrants into it. Ms. LaPlante spoke that she prides herself on transparency
612 and would be amiss if she didn't address her concerns to the Board. She is concerned at how this (track quote) came to the
613 budget. It didn't go through the Facilities Committee or the Athletic Director, no disrespect to Ms. Browne but it includes
614 building a parking lot with no pedestrian walkway and we know it is a slope with no guardrail. Her concern is that as presented if
615 we move forward with any aspect to this there are hidden cost in the next 5 years that we will see such as lights, guardrails, pitch

width, drainage; it is a hard thing for her to point out but would rather address it in a public meeting so it is out there. Chairman Kofalt noted we need to include this in the next discussion with the Budget Committee.

XV. SCHOOL BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS

Ms. Cloutier-Cabral commented there is a lot to be said about the WLCTA report. It was a lot of good news in there. We have a lot of priorities but we started on a positive note. The arts and crafts festival was great, didn't know we could fit so many people in the town hall. They did a wonderful job with that.

Ms. Anzalone appreciates the acknowledgement that our syllabus are not where they should be and looks forward to getting them and wants more detailed information sent home to parents.

Mr. Golding voiced he is still opposed to a warrant for the tennis courts because it was approved, we need to put the full amount in there and not use the \$20,000 for anything other than what it was approved for.

Mr. Post spoke about the last meeting during board comments and the lecture in board comments. It was open criticism of board members for a very challenging meeting and talking about protocol and other about recusing themselves. He was really disappointed in how it went. He thinks the issue is we started the year out with being collaborative and putting a good face forward and he doesn't think we are seeing that. We had the opportunity to make a couple minor adjustments to policies that didn't get done, it didn't get done tonight or last time and we ended up with a huge group here of angry parents. Parents have the right whether you are a board member or not to bring a complaint forward and you don't have to recuse yourself. There is no RSA; there is no policy or protocol. You have your free speech and the fact that this was brought by a board member and there are plenty of more protocol things that would be a good idea follow but are not followed. I just want people to think twice about lecturing other board members about what happened and their actions.

Chairman Kofalt voiced he thinks a lot of these discussions have been frustrating and clearly got on people's nerves and thinks that is true of all us probably. He thinks sometimes we allow our differences to eclipse our points of agreement and that is too bad because he thinks all of us would like to see improvements. All of us would like to see excellence in this school district and he is not sure how we get back to that tone and conversation but that is what he would like to see.

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

A MOTION was made by Mr. LoVerme and SECONDED by Ms. Lavallee to enter Non-Public Session to review the non-public minutes RSA 91-A: 3 II (A) (C) at 9:36pm.

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

RETURN TO PUBLIC SESSION

The Board entered public session at 9:47pm.

XVII. ADJOURNMENT

A MOTION was made by Mr. LoVerme and SECONDED by Mr. Golding to adjourn the Board meeting at 9:47pm.

Voting: all aye; motion carried.

Respectfully submitted,

Kristina Fowler