

**SANBORN REGIONAL SCHOOL BOARD
MEETING MINUTES**

October 3, 2018

To view the video of this meeting, please visit our website at www.sau17.net and click on School Board Videos under the School Board menu

A regular meeting of the Sanborn Regional School Board was held on Wednesday, October 3, 2018. The meeting was called to order at 6:02 p.m. by Sanborn Regional School Board Chairperson, Peter Broderick. The following were recorded as present:

SRSD SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS:

Peter Broderick
James Baker
Dr. Pamela Brown
Larry Heath
Taryn Lytle
Tammy Mahoney
Corey Masson (via remote connection- Washington, DC)

Adam O'Rourke -Student Council Representative

ADMINISTRATORS:

Thomas Ambrose, Superintendent
Michele Croteau, Business Administrator

1. **CALL TO ORDER** at 6:04 PM by Chair Broderick with the Pledge of Allegiance led by several members of the Bakie School's Student Council. Principal Christopher Snyder introduced the group, part of a 14 member Council who were officially sworn in recently and have come here tonight as one of their first duties.
2. **ACTION ON MINUTES** –Chair Broderick asked for a Motion to approve the **Public Minutes of 9-19-18. Motion made by Dr. Brown and seconded by Ms. Mahoney.** Ms. Mahoney commented that Mr. Masson's location, as a remote participant should be identified per RSA 91-A: 2, III. On page 2, item 3.4, amend to say "Some of the NESDEC options discussed tonight will require a 2/3 vote of the community".

Vote: All in Favor as amended.

3. COMMUNICATIONS

3.1 Manifests- Payroll Check Registers #7 in the amount of \$802,976.04 dated 10-3-18. Manifests Expenditures #6 in the amount of \$485,574.61 dated 9-28-18. Manifests were signed and approved by Board and Administration.

3.2 Resignations-None

3.3 Nominations-None

3.4 Superintendent's Report- Superintendent Ambrose reported the following:

Progress on the Superintendent's Safety Advisory Committee continues with regular meetings that include various First Responders from around the State. The first training for staff on the ALICE model took place, which is essentially a model that teaches staff how to respond to imminent threats by taking a more proactive stance in a situation. Now, we will run drills with staff and then run drills with students and finally will run drills with staff, students and First Responders from all the communities and with Rockingham County. Assistant Principal, Bob Dawson at the High School and Dr. Patricia Haynes at Memorial School deserve thanks for their hard work with this training. Also, thank you to the Newton Police Department for their assistance and to Sergeant DiFlumeri who did the presentation today for staff, and it was very well received, prepared and well executed. It went very, very well.

The October 1st enrollments for the district stayed the same as the 9-1 report for a total of 1,598 students. This number is down by 3 students from last year. To view the detail of the Enrollments, [please click here](#).

4.0 COMMITTEE REPORTS

4.1 Policy – Dr. Brown reported that the group met tonight and discussed several policies that they are going to table under 8.1 and 8.2 on the agenda. They were modified slightly, so they would like to clean them up before reviewing them at the next meeting. They did discover that they already have a concussion policy for head injuries which is Policy JLCJ, so they will post that to the manual. The next meeting will be on November 7th at 4:45 PM. Everyone is invited to attend.

4.2 EISA- Ms. Mahoney reported that the group met on 9/19. In attendance: Chair, Tammy Mahoney, Dr. Pam Brown, Larry Heath, Superintendent Ambrose, HS Assistant Principal Bob Dawson. Called to order by Mahoney at 5:00 pm. Meeting was held in the SAU conference room. Minutes of the 8/22/18 meeting were reviewed and approved.

SAT results from last spring were shared. Math scores declined to 30% proficient from 37% last year. The statewide proficiency average is 42%, down from 44% last year. Reading scores improved slightly, to 54% proficient from 52% last year. The statewide average this year is 67% proficient, which is 1 point higher than last year's 66% proficient.

Strategies that the high school is employing include: All 9, 10, and 11th graders will take the PSAT practice test in the fall; Khan Academy work for 40 minutes per week, with the curriculum dynamically adjusting based on the students' PSAT test results as they're imported into the system; Move When Ready math grouping in 9th grade, which allows students to move to the next math level whenever competencies are achieved and not according to the semester schedule.

AP scores were also shared. Of a total 106 exams, the pass rate was 28%, with an average score of 2.12; this compares to 69% statewide pass rate. The program is undergoing some analysis, particularly in comparison with the dual-enrollment program which has expanded substantially in comparison. In the interim, some strategies for improving the scores would be an increased rate of trial tests (3-4), without the possibility of reassessment; more controls on the enrollment criteria (i.e. prerequisites); a more generous timeframe for moving to another class should the level of rigor prove overly challenging. Meeting was adjourned by Mahoney at 5:45. The next meeting will be held October 10 at 4:30 PM.

Ms. Lytle asked for clarification on the AP practice tests.

Dr. Brown commented that she serves on the committee, and was pretty concerned to see the math scores decline to 30% from 37%. It's possible that other metrics that will now track, such as the armed forces qualifying test. Those types of other assessments are on the rise. To balance out the drop in the SATs, a student selects what scores they'd like to focus on, but she is concerned because with a 30% math proficiency rate, we have 65% of our students saying they plan to attend either a two year college or a four year university and this gap is very worrisome to her. We've been working on PACE for almost ten years, and we're now using spiraled math instruction. She would like us to really assess whether these programs are effective in serving our students, saying we have had quite a trial run on these new models, and she is really concerned about these scores.

Mr. Masson asked for clarification that it has been 10 years that we have been using PACE. Ms. Lytle added that she thought it was 3 years that we have been doing assessments. Mr. Ambrose commented that he would like Mr. Turmelle to address this at a future meeting in order to clarify.

4.3 Facilities- The Facilities Committee met this afternoon. The members present were Dr. Brown and myself. Mr. Masson was absent. Also present were Tom Ambrose, Steve Riley, Michele Crotueau and Annie Collyer. Ms. Crotueau reported that the Facilities Revolving Fund balance is \$238,715.89. This fund is supported by money collected from renting the district's facilities to outside groups. Part of the fees charged include recovery for wear and tear of the facilities and the equipment used. In turn, money from this fund can be used to maintain and update the facilities and equipment.

Ms. Crotueau reported on the status of our electrical rates. The current company has raised the rates. Our energy broker is negotiating with them over the increase. Our current electrical contract expires in November of 2019. A new contract has been entered with a new provider at a good savings starting then.

Steve Riley reported on the status of the demolition of the white wood building at the Seminary campus. The hazardous waste removal has been completed. We are awaiting final paperwork by the company certifying the removal. The permits for the building demolition are in process and will be ready for the start of that phase on Monday when the demolition company is hoping to start.

We've also started to review the existing Capital Improvements plan passed when Dr. Blake was here. The plan called for \$9.5 million in spending over the next 5 years. \$3.5 million of that was for repairs and updates to the Middle School most of it to be done this coming year. The plan was approved without any stipulation as to how it would be funded. Steve Riley has been asked to create a listing of the most urgent repairs needed District wide plus a list of important repairs along with estimates for their costs. We discussed and approved the need to repair the roof of maintenance garage at the Memorial/Middle School campus. The roof is leaking, the schools store supplies there and maintenance equipment is stored there. The original estimate in the Capital Improvement Plan was \$48,000. Steve has gotten recent estimates for \$7000 for a complete roof including ice and water shield and new dip edging. Earlier this year the Swasey gym roof was replaced at the cost of \$250,000. That was a \$108,000 savings over the original CIP estimate. The next step with facilities is continued review including the NESDEC study to come up with a workable and fundable plan.

4.4 Finance-No report since last meeting.

4.5 Public Relations- Ms. Lytle reported that the School Board community evaluation form is on the agenda tonight and will be discussed then. Mr. Ambrose added that he is planning to reach out to the realtors in the area, as recommended by the

Administrative team and they are putting together a pamphlet about the District that he will bring to the PR committee for review. Once that is finalized, he will schedule a breakfast for the realtors. Ms. Lytle said that posters are up at the schools identifying the School Board members by picture and town as well as the way to reach them. The next Public Relations will be held on 10/24 at 5:30 PM.

- 4.6. Personnel- Ms. Lytle reported that the next meeting on 10/24 is cancelled.
- 4.7. SST-Superintendent Ambrose did not attend but read the Minutes and SST is in a good situation with their budgeting because of some new teacher hires and enrollments. We're beginning the process of preparing the budget for next year.
- 4.8. Seminary Discussion-Dr. Brown reported that two meetings were held on 9-10 and 9-11 and the next meeting is October 9th.
- 4.9. Budget Committee-Mr. Heath reported that the Budget Committee will meet on Thursday, 10-11 at 7 PM in the library.

5.0 STUDENT COUNCIL REPRESENTATIVE REPORT

Mr. O'Rourke reported that Homecoming went really, really well. The senior class won for the 3rd year in a row. The Pep Rally was really fun, loud, spirited, and it ran really smoothly. Saturday was also really awesome. All the floats looked awesome. All the grades, the skits and dances were awesome for everybody. Vending went well outside the games and all the games were pulling huge crowds. So, that was really encouraging to see, it was a really great send-off for our senior class. The Student Council made thank you notes for everyone who helped out during Homecoming as did the class councils. We have still been meeting every A and D day during FLT. The freshman class now has their positions elected to Student Council and each Council is official. Our Camp Lincoln trip that we do annually is coming up next Tuesday. We did order shirts and hope they come in, but we have our student council shirts. The process of choosing our honorary members is also starting and each class Council is going to decide before the Waterville trip in November.

Motion made by Ms. Mahoney to move Public Comment ahead of Old Business, seconded by Mr. Masson.

Vote: All in Favor.

6.0 PUBLIC COMMENT

Annie Collyer (Newton) – I had some comments that I want to make. I've had the privilege of attending some of the subcommittee meetings; the EISA two weeks ago was really great to hear how the administration is working to address some of these scores, and I certainly hear Dr. Brown is concerned whether we are doing that and whether we're preparing our kids well enough, it seems that we're really doing some good things. I was very impressed with what Mr. Dawson had to say and grateful to the EISA for pushing to get that formed and for the active work that they are doing. I attended the facility's meeting today, and another thing that I wanted to compliment this current board on is the way that you are bringing in the administrative team to give you input. The past Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) seems to have been done without input from the administrators, and it was done by architects to bring things up to code as though they were being built today, and then adopted by a school board without anyone looking at the reality of funding 9.5 Million dollars in extra spending over five years. It was just absurd. I spoke at that point on the absurdity of it. And I am really glad that you are now looking very carefully with the input from Mr. Riley of what really needs to be done. How much will it really cost, instead of these very inflated estimates that were in the CIP? So I am very grateful to the Board for the way that you're operating and for Mr. Ambrose in the way that he's bringing in the Administrators.

Jamie Fitzpatrick (Newton) – I would like to return to the discussion I have had previously about the grading system, particularly with the math grades declining down to 30%. I will focus my comments now in the elementary school and over succeeding weeks; I'll start getting into some of the other areas. I think it starts in the elementary school; presently in the elementary school, the difference between the two top levels of proficiency, are the comparison of two sets of words ; analyze and synthesize, which is the top, versus apply and transfer which is the second level of efficiency, one step down. The methodology that we're using to determine the difference between these words is not clear. They seem very subjective to me. They're not intuitive as to what the meaning is. Math for example, math grading includes demonstrating creativity and collaboration as a measure of math proficiency. The words Creativity and collaboration; In my mind, math is not about collaborating and it's not about creativity, it's about understanding math and being able to demonstrate the understanding by solving math problems. The proper and correct means of assessing the ability to solve math problems is what percentage of a group of problems on a specific topic can be consistently solved correctly. That is measured by what percentage you can demonstrate that you can solve it, that you have mastered that concept. This is the basis of the A through F grading system. What percent level proficiency have you achieved? Pretty straightforward, it is pretty intuitive, and it works. In this system you're not trying to divine in an unexplained manor, the difference between subjective words like analyze and synthesize versus apply and transfer. I would suggest to the Board that it would be worth their while to investigate further the systems that we are using for grading throughout the district and give it a look to go back to a proven methodology that is

intuitive, that's understandable, and parents could stay better engaged and involved with their children's education.

Superintendent Ambrose informed the Board that he has invited Mr. Turmelle and Mr. Dawson to the 10/24 meeting and he has asked Mr. Turmelle to create a presentation about our grading system, how it works and what's going on with that to update the Board, so he will be here to do that then. He would like the public to know that if you have questions or concerns about our grading system, he would like you to be there. He stressed that Mr. Turmelle has worked really hard to explain some things. This is a very complex matter and there is some misinformation out there but there's also some real work to do if we just come together and choose to solve some problems. The presentation will inform every one of the history of how decisions were made with the grading system and what is going on with it.

Mr. Baker asked if there would be an explanation of why the Administration thinks this system is better than the traditional system. Mr. Ambrose said there would be a component of that.

7.0 OLD BUSINESS

7.1 Board Evaluations

Ms. Lytle gave an update on the history of how the Evaluation came about and what comments she has received on it from the Board since they have received it. Dr. Brown has a recommendation for a question on how long they have been following the Board, which Ms. Lytle received and started to address. Ms. Mahoney also voiced that she has comments but we should have a Motion to discuss. A discussion ensued on the process of how the Evaluation should be reviewed; publically to process all questions or should comments by Board be sent to the Chair prior to the meeting, so that they can be summarized and presented fully and publically noted.

Dr. Brown made a Motion to approve the document and then discuss amendments, seconded by Mr. Masson.

Mr. Baker thinks they should add Dr. Brown's question. Discussion continued on various questions and perspectives. Chair Broderick mentioned using the process of summarizing the questions so it is not the first time everyone is seeing them. Ms. Lytle posed to the group the process of emailing questions to her and she would summarize for the next meeting.

Dr. Brown withdrew her Motion to approve the document.

Motion made by Mr. Heath to approve the process of disseminating information to the Chair of a committee to be summarized and presented publically at a Board meeting, seconded by Mr. Broderick.

Chair Broderick summarized that information will go the Chair of a committee and then be disseminated to school board members so they have time to review prior to a meeting.

Ms. Mahoney commented that she wants to make sure we are not violating laws by sharing information. Discussion on the laws of communicating legally as board members ensued.

Vote: 6 in Favor, 1 opposed (Brown). Motion Passes.

Ms. Lytle hopes that feedback in the future can be prompt.

Mr. Masson asked for clarification on the new process.

Dr. Brown does not like Google Docs being used for comments and prefers a public session for processing information.

Mr. Ambrose agrees non-editable documents should be used with no back and forth without reading it publically.

Mr. Baker would like a more detailed agenda going forward to be more informed.

Mr. Masson asked that the Board commission a board management tool to assist with this process.

7.2 NESDEC Next Steps/Update on Survey

Superintendent Ambrose reported that the survey will be available to the public until October 12th so this would allow enough time to compile the information for 10/24 meeting. At this time, we do have 427 responses. He is looking for a clear picture from the entire community. I think one of the most important things for everyone in this process to remember is that we had a Capital Improvement Plan that called out for 9.5 million dollars in improvements and 3.5 million of which were at the Middle School and this was over a five year process. When I was hired, I asked the board to consider holding off on that so that we could take a look at it and figure out where we're at in terms of enrollments and what the picture is. Because we had nine new administrators on the team, I felt like we needed to really get a sense of what was going on. So, that combined with the Strategic Plan; the strategic plan did not necessarily align to what I considered to be best practice. So, I asked the board to hold off and develop a definition of student success that we could then base all of our future decisions on and revise that strategic plan based on an adopted, agreed upon definition of student success. The, Excellence in Student Achievement (EISA) committee worked very hard and came to a sincere consensus after months of consideration and input from all stakeholders, including meeting myself with small groups of teachers to talk about things we decided and agreed upon, through community input, the survey, and the definition of student success. I would say it was a really good process, and we are happy with that outcome because it recognizes kids that may not be going to a four year school and some of the incredible successes that we've had, while also taking a look at different areas in the district that we might want to improve. So, now where we're at is that we've got this definition of student success, and we're going to be looking at information and data as to where we stand with regard to that bar. It is important to recognize

that we are reviewing the Capital Improvement Plan to figure out what the actual cost would be for some of those items. So, we had a meeting today with Facilities Committee, we looked at five different areas, and Steve Riley, our Director of Facilities, is going out to get actual quotes for those five areas because he felt that the numbers were way off what they actually would be typically, they were too high. So, I think that it's important to note that the NESDEC study is just one little piece of this process, and it is a piece that's important in the sense that it gives us the enrollment projections, which is not a crystal ball, as NESDEC said themselves at the presentation. They cannot guarantee one hundred percent accuracy of the projections; they can only study our community, our real estate sales, our births, and our current enrollments and the enrollment trends. We knew that when we hired them. They thoroughly went through all of our buildings and assessed the longevity and effectiveness of the buildings. But they did not attach any dollar cost to anything that's, not their role. Their role is data and numbers. So, the next step in this process is that the Board will need to take a look at the survey information and consider that, which I have made it very clear even in the survey document that it's not a vote, it's input. This is not a ballot; a survey is not a ballot. It's just input and it's important input because usually if a survey has a really strong trend, then it helps us. If it doesn't, then that leaves us with more questions and potentially more processes. Right now, it is hard to tell and that's why I felt like we really needed to give it a full two weeks for people to fill it out because just this week it went up by hundreds, in the last few days. So, having said that, the process that we're looking at this point is as follows: the Board will need to receive the survey information and have it presented to them on the 24th and have a conversation about the options they would like the Administration to deeply explore. The Administration, then we will need to work for a number of months to come up with the answers to all of these really important questions that parents have asked, some of you are right in the room. You've asked really important questions. Will my children, if they're at the High School facility as Middle School students have a Middle School experience, where will their sports be, will they be bussing with older children? What access would they have to older children or transitions in the building to get to gym, lunch, Art, Music? How would all of that play out? I would run those scenarios as a day in the life of a seventh grader. I want to know what that view is. What would the day be like as a staff member in the in the Middle School? What would my day be like as a High School student? Because it will change the way things are done. I think that it's abundantly clear that everyone wants our Middle School students to have a Middle School experience. That's come through loud and clear. We want the kids. Do you have an opportunity to be on a small team of teachers who know them really well to guide them through those critical years of adolescence before they start to take more responsibility for their lives in 9th grade. I have an 8th grader and I have a 10 year- old. I would settle for nothing less. And I promise you, we have no intention or I have no intention of doing anything less for your children. We won't know the answers until the Board asks the administration to study a model. I asked our Business Administrator to run the numbers on the Middle School and it is \$535K to run annually and does not include the costs of upgrades needed. The formal numbers will be ready on 10/24.

Mr. Baker asked if the High School upgrades are a onetime cost (Answer- Yes) and over 10 years the Middle School at that 500K a year would cost 5 Million to run.

Dr. Brown thanked everyone for coming to the NESDEC discussion on Sept. 19. She said she found comments regarding possibly long commutes for Pre-K/Kindergarten children especially helpful. Brown responded to a comment made that evening that the Board is “reinventing the wheel” by conducting a NESDEC study when the Board already has “several plans” to implement. Brown explained that the Board is “well aware” of the plans including the 5 year Strategic Plan, the Capital Improvement Plan, the Professional Development 6 year plan, and the Technology 3-year plan. She said she and others were elected to improve them, and that’s what we’re doing. With falling enrollment, Brown said, “We’ve become facilities rich - and salaries poor”. Our relatively new HS has so much excess capacity; it is now occupied by half the student population for which it was designed. Millions in facilities spending were being ‘planned.’ Meanwhile, our teacher salaries are not commensurate with high performing districts.” Brown added she was disappointed to see Baker’s proposed goal of a .5% budget increase cap in 2020 received poorly and characterized as ‘unworkable’ at the last meeting when just last year the level budget the Board approved was viewed a reasonable decision. Brown noted Chairman Broderick’s comment that Baker’s goal failed to factor in inflation itself failed to factor in an estimated enrollment decline of 5% for 2020 (NESDEC). She said Baker’s Goal remained a good one and she will pursue it. Brown also responded to a public comment that our per-pupil-cost was not high compared to some NH districts. Brown said some districts do have much higher costs per pupil than ours – but they are districts such as Harrisville with a cost-per-pupil of \$27,360 because it serves only 51 students with seven Grade levels. Their enrollment situation is worse than ours Brown agreed, but that does not mean our district lacks rebalancing opportunities. Brown reaffirmed that the Board encourages public comments but noted, “you’re walking into the middle of a movie. We spend 10 to 30 hours per week on Board work, DOE research and meetings. Most of the issues raised are already on our radar.”

Superintendent Ambrose asked the Board for a straw vote to determine whether they approve of the direction he is taking with regard to the NESDEC options.

Dr. Brown asked how many options would have to be narrowed down.

Mr. Ambrose answered probably not more than two, given the work involved. Some options would require a change to the Articles of Agreement. The Trends he has been seeing and hearing involve what has been the general consensus; that with declining enrollments, the option of sending the 7th & 8th graders to the high school, being ensured of having a middle school experience is more acceptable than disrupting the pre-k to 6 elementary grades.

The Board gave Mr. Ambrose universal thumbs up to continue in the direction he reviewed.

7.3 Superintendent Evaluation

Chair Broderick asked that those who have not submitted evaluations to please send them to the Superintendent’s assistant.

8.0 **NEW BUSINESS**

8.1. Policy BDE-E- Board Commissions and Statements of Purpose-Tabled to 10/24

8.2 Policy DBJ-Line Item Transfer Authority-Tabled to 10-24

9.0 **2ND PUBLIC COMMENT**

Jamie Fitzpatrick (Newton)-Just a question that came up in the recent discussion about the NESDEC study in the survey portion. Is there any protocol built into the survey, in the system to ensure unique responses or is a single person capable of making multiple responses to the survey? So, for example, can one person make 10, 15, or 20 responses? Is there some type of protection built in? (Mr. Ambrose answered, "It is a public survey that if you had six different devices, you could go on all those devices and enter it in on the survey". However, he is Monitoring the responses In an excel spreadsheet to see if there's any clear trends of somebody putting in more answers with every single answer exactly the same. He hasn't seen anything yet.

Gwendolyn McCarthy (Newton)- I just wanted to say thank you again for inviting the public and for reassuring us and taking a close look at the previous plans and the NESDEC recommendations. I would urge you to look at the NESDEC recommendations with a critical eye I say that because just doing a very quick search on Facebook, I found some interesting information that, for instance, just in this year in Hopkinton, where NESDEC had gone in and done a study for them for the same reasons. In one year's time, NESDEC's projected enrollment was off by 190 students, and their projections did not see enrollment at that number until at least 2024. So, take a careful eye on what they do with the assumptions underlying their work. I brought up before that I think some of their assumptions about Millennials and projected enrollments are that isn't really verifiable, on real data points. I think it's based on some faulty assumptions, but as Superintendent Ambrose said, it is an estimate it is a projection. I just wouldn't like to see it weighted more heavily than that. I also wanted to say, I kind of wish you all knew me outside of this context here, because I think like my friends, my family would tell you, I am pretty quiet, just about new around people. I don't know, I try to be friendly to everybody. I hate public speaking, which is why I shake a little bit up here and you can hear it in my voice. I really don't like conflict. I've pushed myself to go out of character a bit because my family and I moved here a little over 2 years ago and I attended a board meeting early on. Lately, I have been attending the board meetings and posting on Facebook pages because I'm really riled up about a few things. I'm upset about them, and I hear other parents who are upset, too. I wish more of them came, I am glad they did two weeks ago. I think you know, all the work you did to invite the public worked, and I hope you'll do that again in the future for all the community members. I think the more people you hear from the better, but I have to say, I feel like not all of the school board members are taking their primary duty to ensure that the needs of our children are met and that they are thriving for the benefit of our communities. I can't necessarily say I blame you because, turnout out at these meetings of people with children in the schools, has been pretty low and that's shameful. If parents and other interested community members with vested interests aren't speaking up and asking for more, for better, then maybe get a pass for that because you're having people ask you to do more you get a pass for that up until now, because two weeks ago you had a lot of people come. You've had Superintendent Ambrose say a lot of people responded to the survey. I want to apologize for anything that I said that was inaccurate or offensive to anyone, and I specifically

apologize to the superintendent and members of the board that I believe have the wellbeing and the best interest of our kids at heart and our schools, our teachers, our communities in mind. But to know that our schools have needed maintenance simple things like roofs, doors, windows, and smaller things. I know those needs existed before this current Board or this Superintendent, but to know that those needs existed and that we need more staff to support our children's educational needs, and we need more supplies, basic supplies like books and look around at this high school. I know we're in the electronic age but where are all the books? To know all that and to then propose to the public in the last round that they support a unanimous agreement reached by the school board to propose to the public a budget for the year that was less than the Default Budget, less than what you knew you needed, our school's needed, given all the things that hadn't been addressed. I think that's shameful, never mind actually request a sufficient budget to accomplish the things that needed to be done for years, forgoing, requesting additional funds that are necessary for renovations year after year and then proposing or going to NESDEC and having them come up with proposals to shutter schools, reconfigure schools, move young kids to the high school it's not right, either.

Joanne Corriveau (Newton)- I have spent a lot of sleepless nights, and I've really done my homework about, and I wish that I could stand in front of you today and tell you that because as I voiced before, I'm not in favor of closing the Middle School. But I did a lot of research on the percentages and success rates and what I found is that it's very hard. You can't compare because there's no apples to apples, so to speak, because there's so many variations, whether it's that New Hampshire cannot be compared to Massachusetts success rates or failures because they have State funding that we don't necessarily have and Newton/ Kingston can't be compared to other school systems that have businesses that have taxes that come in. So, I understand all that, so what I found was basically, it was a roll of the dice. There was a 50% chance that they did well and 50% that they did not, so that is very alarming to me because I feel like I'm rolling the dice with my child. One of the things that I want addressed as it goes forward, is this consistency of 5-7 year basically working the bugs out where the success rates go down extremely. And we talked earlier in this meeting about the 30% test scores. I looked through all the papers, all of the things that I could get my hands on; the internet, the library; I talked to a superintendent of a school, a Child Psychologist. I did on my home. With test scores that low, we are marginal everywhere at best. Our teacher pay is a marginal, our Special Education department is marginal, and our test scores are way below what they should be. So, how can we take the risk of having that upheaval for 5-7 years? So, that's, my one question I would like addressed when we do find our findings. And my other thing is, I looked at the budget and one of the things that I really felt bad because I thought of that song "We didn't start the fire" But, you know, like, everybody's saying our budget does not have the wiggle room for some of the increases. How can other school systems that have the tax rates and the population that we have, support an elementary, a middle school and high school? So I would like that addressed in your findings.

Cheryl Gannon (Kingston)-Took the survey and found it hard to make decisions because there was not enough information with the choices presented. It did not say anything about why these options were being presented. I know, I attend the board meetings, I was here for the presentation by NESDEC, and I've read the report. It doesn't say anywhere on the survey what the costs and benefits would be to weigh whether or not either of these options that were being proposed would be significant, and costs for taxes. What is the benefit or deficits to the educational model of moving from a Middle School model to Junior High model? What is the

cost for doing things that we might need to do at the high school, if the Middle School were moved there? 3.5 Million Dollars. I believe that figure came from the Capital Improvement, which many times this Board has decried as being unreasonable, not realistic. And even tonight it was mentioned here, the Facilities Director has said that those costs are much higher than he thinks. By putting a figure out of 3.5 Million, I think its scaring people saying that if you keep the Middle School open, this is what it's going to cost. What would those renovations be? Is that upgrading to a better facility? Is it just bringing that facility up to code? What is that 3.5 Million, which I guess is not realistic or not an agreed upon amount of what it would cost, so I just find it hard. I don't see how I can weigh that cost benefit with such little information, so I really hope that more is going to be forthcoming, and I would really like to see the cost for leaving the Middle School, as is, in that facility.

Heather Bell (Newton) - I have some questions I would love the board to address as they make further decisions. The first is I've heard some costs associated with upgrading the high school if the 7th and 8th grade students eventually would be transported and moved to this facility. However, I have heard different options of 6th grade being moved to Bakie or Memorial. Would there be any facility costs necessary at those two schools to retrofit additional students and the development of an educational leads for those 6th grade students? So there would be potentially 3 schools needing facility upgrades. The second point is, I think the middle School is in a position, built in 1975, where the lack of budget over the years, along with reduced enrollment, has created a situation where the school facilities have not been kept up over the years. Can there be any guarantee from the School Board that at Memorial, Bakie and here at the High School facilities will be kept updated, so we're not in the same position in future years? My last comment is, I think financials are driving this decision, but keep in mind the emotional and academic needs of those students, and what will their lives, the 6th, 7th and 8th graders be like going forward. I think many that will be addressed in this survey, but it should not simply a fiscal decision.

Kelley Cullivan (Newton)-We are getting estimates to fix the Middle School, but will the school be sitting empty? If not, if it is rented, won't we still need to do renovations? (Answer, Mr. Ambrose-Typically, when public organizations rent a building to someone, any renovations that would go on in that building would be at the cost of the tenant, however he cannot answer questions until directed by the Board to pursue and options or options.) She feels that the parents cannot make an educated decision because the renovations at the Middle School are so dire, and shame on the school district. With windows not replaced since 1977? It is disgusting and grotesque. However, with that being said, you can't expect parents and residents of Kingston and Newton to say, okay, fine let's send our 7th and 8th graders over to the High School, which I think a lot of people would probably be okay with if it's going to cost us tax wise, because renovations still need to be made over the Middle School. I think that's a really big reservation, that the Board isn't taking into consideration. A lot of people are hesitant number one, because we want our kids to have the Middle School experience, which, if we're assured that they will, I think they'll be fine. But secondly, we need to know if we're going to be hit with a 3.2 million dollars tax bill for renovations on a Middle School that our kids aren't even going to anymore.

Chair Broderick commented that she is absolutely correct in everything she has said. The Board hears what she is saying and it has weight. Until the Board decides which options to look at, they will not have answers. The NESDEC Study was the first step, the survey was the second and the

community will have a many opportunities to weigh in throughout the process. We understand your anxiety and will work through the options with you.

9.0 **OTHER BUSINESS**

9.1 Next Meeting Agenda

- ◆ Fremont Joint Board Meeting Discussion Points
 - NESDEC Study
 - Update on Memorandum of Understanding
 - Sharing of Goals
 - FY 19 and FY20 Goals

- ◆ Policies DBJ and BDE-E

9.2 Announcements

9.2.1 The next Sanborn Regional School Board meeting will be a Joint Board meeting held on **Wednesday, October 10, 2018** from 6-9 PM in the Library at Sanborn Regional High School.

10. **NON-PUBLIC SESSION** –RSA 91-A: 3 II (c) (d)

Chair Broderick asked for a **Motion to enter into a Non-Public Session per RSA 91-A: 3 II (c) (d) moved by Mr. Heath and seconded by Ms. Lytle.**

A Roll Call vote was held. Vote- All in Favor

11. **ADJOURNMENT-** Meeting adjourned 7:56 PM

Minutes Respectively Submitted by:

Phyllis Kennedy
School Board Secretary

Minutes of the School Board meetings are unofficial until approved at a subsequent meeting of the School Board.

(Continuing Public on Next Page)

**SANBORN REGIONAL SCHOOL BOARD
PUBLIC MEETING MINUTES- CONTINUED**

October 3, 2018

Sanborn Regional High School
Kingston, NH

8:29 PM

In attendance: Peter Broderick, James Baker, Pamela Brown, Larry Heath, Taryn Lytle, Tammy Mahoney, Corey Masson (via remote-Washington, DC).

Others in Attendance: Thomas J. Ambrose, Superintendent, Michele Croteau, BA

Motion to approve 3 Early Retirements by Ms. Lytle and seconded by Mr. Heath.

Vote: All in Favor

Motion made by Chair Broderick to seal Non-Public Minutes regarding negotiations until complete. Motion moved by Mr. Heath and seconded by Ms. Lytle.

Roll Call Vote: All in Favor

Motion to adjourn by Mr. Heath, seconded by Ms. Lytle.

Meeting adjourned at 8:30 PM

Recorder: Michele Croteau