

**SANBORN REGIONAL SCHOOL BOARD
MEETING MINUTES**

February 21, 2018

A regular meeting of the Sanborn Regional School Board was held on Wednesday, February 21, 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, Chair
Dr. Pamela Brown, Vice Chair
James Baker
Taryn Lytle
Tammy Mahoney
Lauren Lanseigne -Student Council Representative

Absent: Larry Heath
Corey Masson
Thomas Ambrose, Superintendent

ADMINISTRATORS: Michele Croteau, Business Administrator

1. **CALL TO ORDER** at 6:02 PM by Chair Broderick with the Pledge of Allegiance.

2. **ACTION ON MINUTES** –Chair Broderick asked for a Motion to approve the Public Minutes of 2-8-18. Motion made by Mr. Baker and seconded by Ms. Lytle. No discussion. **Vote: All in Favor**

3. **COMMUNICATIONS**
 - 3.1 **Manifests**- Payroll Check Register #17 in the amount of \$789,131.28 dated 2-22-18. Manifests Expenditures #20 in the amount of \$548,579.77 dated 2/21/18. Both Manifests were signed /approved by Board and Administration.

 - 3.2 **Student Council Representative’s Report**- Ms. Lanseigne reported that they are in the mist of the annual Winter Carnival and that it has been going very well. Currently, the rankings are junior, senior, sophomore, then freshman, but she is hoping the freshmen have a chance to pull ahead, when the seniors have a chance as well. It is very close. The National Honor Society has been hosting a

very successful book drive. They have boxes upon boxes of books to be donated to new homes.

- 3.3 New Hampshire Excellence in Education- Mr. Stack shared that that the High School had some pretty exciting news earlier this week in that the school is a candidate for the *Excellence in Education* award. This award is given annually to one New Hampshire elementary, middle and high school that exemplify the five *School Excellence Competencies of Curriculum and Instruction: Community and Culture, Vision, Informed and Empowered*. He stressed that it is a big deal and that they had won once before as a high school in 1998, adding that it is a very exhaustive process when the site team comes in, they literally comb through the whole school that day and are graded against a five part rubric. There will be a lot of people involved in the site visit and they're trying to get as many different parts of the community pulled together. It is a very quick turnaround; he was notified yesterday that they're coming two weeks after vacation.

Chair Broderick commented that as one who went through it, they will be in practically every classroom talking to teachers and students. They will also be talking to lunch workers, administrators, custodians and just about everyone. He added that we were lucky enough to win it back in 1998, but exhaustive is a good word to use for the process.

Mr. Baker asked what the qualification is to be nominated. Mr. Stack responded that the school self nominates, so the school chose as a staff this year to put themselves in the running for it. What they do is invite schools (he has no idea how many are in the running) in for an initial presentation in front of the selection committee. From that, they decide if they're going to come out and name you as a candidate and schedule a site visit. He believes the middle school was a candidate four or five years ago. They received a site visit, but i don't believe they were selected that year.

Ms. Lytle asked if the school receives a written report after they do a site visit, whether or not they win. Mr. Stack does not know and will check. Ms. Lytle added if there is a written report, she would love to see it come to the school board and be public. Mr. Stack commented that even if there is not a written report, he hopes to obtain feedback from the committee which he will share one way or another.

Dr. Brown commented that she read through the application, the Power Point and the rubric for deciding a winner and has a few concerns that are not the school's issue; it's just with the entire award itself. She noticed that they're encouraging the school to fall behind into old habits of looking at inputs instead of out-puts. They're looking at things like climate, culture, instructional practices and data gathering rather than actual outcomes and assessment

trends. She is also concerned because 12 of 14 SAU outcomes have declined since the Pace project was started for many reasons, not simply that Professional Development is being developed for the teachers and they're not up to speed on Pace yet. We should be really concerned about our outcomes. It looks like the past winners had pretty high assessment outcomes, some of them had twice the success rates we have in Math and English in Eleventh grade and she is a little concerned about the time allocated to applying for awards as it could be as extensive as Grant writing. It is quite a major task and she would like to know how much time we're spending on this; how many administrators are involved, whether the time should be used for our students rather than awards. The eleventh grade Math tests scores' proficiency rate is 37% and she will bet that's not on anyone's resume. She is very concerned that we should be focusing on the students rather than applying for awards. Finally, simmering in the background, looking forward as a board, we have a continuing dialogue about what matters in our schools. Is it programs for programs sake or is it performance, actual outcomes. We seem to be moving toward a no grades, no grades, curriculum, no fixed seat time and no letter grades based on high stakes testing which is allegedly bad, but we need to have a discussion about the data we're getting and whether the new program is really serving our students, since it is described as more rigorous and that should be coming out in those capstone grades, such is the eleventh grade. Moving forward, she would like a follow up report on some of those questions.

- 3.4 Greenhouse Up-date- Ms. Croteau reported that one of the questions previously voiced was how the funds would be raised for the project. Having reached out to legal counsel, she reviewed the letter from attorney Diane Gorrow that talked about three different scenarios, saying that if the Board decides to go to the next step, then along with that we can talk about how to structure tracking of the funds and tracking of the construction itself. There are some options within this document which range from having an external group manage it completely to having a Trust Fund manage the funds, along with some other alternatives.

Mr. Stack commented on another question asked; whether or not there could be a second alternate location that could be looked at for the greenhouse. He informed the group that he did invite the vendor back who was working with them on the site work piece and did identify a second sight. The greenhouse company has approved that the site which would actually just be at the end of the classroom wing. There's a grass area that's close enough to the size that we would need without disrupting any of the walkways or anything that's there. So basically, it would be about the same cost because it would be much closer to the building, so you'd save a little bit because you wouldn't need that little walkway but you'd lose a little bit because there's a yard drain that would have to be capped off. It is probably about a wash cost-wise but it would eliminate the concern that folks may have had about using that site if there was

potential expansion use. From our purposes, using that site would be perfectly fine. It wasn't looked at originally because it's small (it's about the size that the greenhouse would be) but it would fit.

Chair Broderick commented that he read the three options but thinks this is something we would have to look at once we're further down the road with the greenhouse.

Mr. Stack agreed saying that the ball will be in the Board's court because they can't do anything else at this point until we know we have a commitment from the district, so that the fundraising can start.

Chair Broderick will meet with the Superintendent and Business Administrator to discuss what to put on the next agenda so we can bring it back for further discussion.

Mr. Baker commented that he had previously expressed that the Greenhouse Project be included in the NESDEC study. He asked for the status of the study. Ms. Croteau responded that we have a proposal that will be brought forth as part of the discussion. Mr. Baker also brought up the footprint of the high school and whether, as part of the NESDEC study, they could expand on the second floor, adding that what the study largely determines is where the greenhouse should go.

Chair Broderick agreed that if it is tied into the NESDEC and if we don't have that report we can't talk about the greenhouse specifically until it comes in.

Mr. Baker said that we could talk about it, but we just can't determine where the site should be. He added that he wants to be sure that the potential square footage of the second floor is included, even if it may not ever be necessary to do an addition. It is another option that we should know the numbers on.

Chair Broderick commented that the school was built for 1200 we've got 600 and he thinks an addition would be many, many, many years down the road, but worth discussing.

Dr. Brown commented that she looked back at our last discussion of this in January of 2017 and the estimated cost to complete was \$89,178. Now, 12 months later, it's up to over \$350,000. This explains why some of us reversed our votes, as I believe it was unanimous last year. Having to raise \$300,000 is going to be a big a project for people, so delaying any work on this until we get the NESDEC study seems sensible, in light of this revised estimate of cost which

kind of left my jaw on the table a bit. So that explains why some of the votes switched to pushing this through immediately.

Mr. Stack commented that his preference, that he wants to go on record as saying, would be that it be done right as this is a project that has a lot of potential to do a lot of good for the community in a lot of ways and it's being pitched in a way that is taking the right steps, doing it the right way and he supports where it is going. He wants to be clear about that.

Mr. Baker commented about the letter from the attorney, about the 3 different options for setting up the structure to handle the money. They didn't recommend the third option, but the first two seem very similar, except the first one would have more school board direct involvement. He is concerned that if you set up a trust, there's to be a lawyer running that trust or somebody's going to be running it. Would there be a cost involved?

Ms. Croteau responded, "No", that the key difference in those two options is that one is working with the existing trustee of trust funds which already holds funds so it just becomes another fund within that management process. The other might incur some costs because you would probably have to set up some organization to manage those funds because you wouldn't want the funds to track in somebody's personal account. You would have to have an organization establish that individual to manage to track those.

Chair Broderick brought up his concern over losing control when private groups take over. How much does the school board want to oversee versus not because once we say a private group does it, we've kind of step back and say, it's all yours now.

4.0 **COMMITTEE REPORTS**

4.1 Policy – Dr. Brown reported that policy met on the 8th to discuss the items shown below under Old Business. The New Hampshire School Board Association's legal review of our policy manual is slowly trickling in and we hope to have more of it soon. They're working on it. Our next meeting is March 7th.

4.2 EISA- Dr. Brown reported that the next meeting is March 21st.

4.3 Public Relations- Ms. Lytle reported that the group met recently and there is an article they ran this week in the *Carriage Towne News* talking about the different roles of the school board, budget committee, SAU office and really trying to encourage the public to come to anything and everything.

4.4 Seminary Discussion-Dr. Brown reported that the group met on February 1st. They had just received the second appraisal and will discuss it further on March 28th.

5.0 **PUBLIC COMMENT**

Sandra Rogers-Osterloh (Kingston) –commented about the greenhouse. There's no doubt that we can benefit from having a greenhouse and adding to our science program and then incorporating other disciplines into that as well. But I am very concerned. A year ago, we sat here, and the price was 89K, just shy of 90K thousand, and now with the 60K given to the school district or this group for a potential greenhouse, we're looking at 423K with needing to raise 363K, roughly for this location. I agree that a greenhouse can benefit our district and our students educationally. I know that's not supposed to be coming from tax dollars and that the district will have to fund any issues that come up with the greenhouse after they put the greenhouse in. It is kind of like anything else that's great, but what does community involvement really mean? Does that mean we can have plants in there in the summer? Does that mean my neighbor can? Are we going to do background checks on people? They're coming in because they say, well, I can only come during the day, I work second shift and I want to have plants growing in there and I gave you \$20 when you were drumming up money. Also, what's going to happen in the summer? In the summer, it's a ghost town, the custodians and a couple of secretaries that's who's in the building. Who is going to take care of that and are those people going to be vetted? When we say, yes, raise all the money and then you tell all the people that give the money that they are going to have a vested interest in this structure, but then say, well, you can't come in, during school day, you can't come in because there's no one here on the weekend. There are a lot of things to think about and also it concerns me to have a structure that the school district and the taxpayers have no control over after the fact. Don't get me wrong. I think a greenhouse is a good idea, but how it's done and what is done and the size that it is. We understand the purpose, but what's going to happen after that if it's a community greenhouse because you can bet I am going to donate to that so that I can have rights to it because I can't seem to grow anything on the sandy soil, no matter how many loads Magnusson's brings me of topsoil. A couple of other things that concern me, I totally agree that this needs to be included in the NESDEC study. Is there going to be a rendering of what this will look like on the end of the math wing? And also, what about access from the science wing to the math wing. These things should be considered and another very important thing is we have declining enrollment. We want to spend a ton of

money on this, say that we're bringing in community money to pay for it, and then we'll have to tell the community they can't come in when they're going to be around kids. We need to make sure that they have had a background check. What's going to happen in that bigger picture with a structure that includes community involvement? Another thing that really concerns me, I am so glad that you folks are paying attention. We have a middle school that is aging and inadequate and this structure is already big enough to include a middle school. The number of students that we have i know there's been a little chatter about talking to Fremont about bringing those eighth graders in. I know it's just kind of out there, but this is the place for expanding this building and maybe we need to look at that declining enrollment and what would if we did do our addition here because i know there were pictures of it that I saw, of what it would look like for the future. That was one of the selling points what is the greenhouse going to look like with that? I just want you to think about it clearly, and I want you to look at the big picture.

Cheryl Gannon (Kingston) would like to echo the previous speakers. My question was is the public going to have an opportunity for input to learn about this (Greenhouse) project and to provide input other than just here at school board meetings. I think there were a lot of issues that the previous speaker raised that the public would be interested in commenting and learning more about, so I would hope that that would be an opportunity that would be considered. In regards to the Excellence in Education award, I was wondering who or what is the entity that gives that award? Also, in previous years, just before the vote, the school board has produced an informational newsletter called the *Essential News*. I was wondering if that was in the works or planning to be done this year. Finally, in regards to Excellence in Education, Math has been a concern for the high school and a new curriculum was put into place and I was wondering if there was going to be any kind of an update on how that's going?

6.0 **OLD BUSINESS**

6.1 [Policy JLCE-Emergency Care and First Aid](#). Dr. Brown gave a 1st Read of this policy which is identical to another policy in our Manuel, EBBC, explaining that due to the continuing opioid crisis in our State, it sadly become necessary to consider revising the policy to include administration of Narcan or other opioid antagonists. This policy was revised for a 1st Read by our school nurse, Karen Scanlon and we had a student intern, Madeline Hadwen and who assisted with this research and preparation. Other school districts have such a policy; Nashua, Raymond, Worthington (MA) and others to allow school nurses to administer Narcan in the event of an emergency. This is our current policy on Emergency Care and First Aid and the only change that's been introduced and it is a significant change reads, *This authorization extends to administering epinephrine or an opioid antagonist without prior notification to parents/guardians*. Dr. Brown encourages the public and the Board members to review this policy adding that we do have information on the research behind our opioid crisis and the fact that it will not be something that is used without an emergency. Our

emergency personnel cannot be here in time to take care of an opioid addict's overdose. We have to have it on the premises and we already have many medications locked in facilities in the nurse's office so this is not something that is brand new to a nurse. She has many medications on file that have been secured, so she would appreciate the Board thinking about this policy and giving us feedback. She would like the community to contact us as well with their comments.

Mr. Baker asked if this change in the policy been reviewed by legal counsel, so we know that we have the authority to grant that? People may have religious convictions or different reasons for not taking their child to a doctor so we should check on what language other districts use.

Dr. Brown responded that she believes that the superintendent has reviewed it.

Discussion ensued on Narcan protocols with Chair Broderick asking EMT Sandra Rogers –Osterloh for detail and confirming that it is standard operating procedure.

Dr. Brown will investigate double check and bring back information.

6.2 [Policy FFA- Memorialization-1st Read](#) Dr. Brown reported that the Policy Subcommittee has been working on a new policy about memorials for several weeks and this policy establishes an understanding between the district and our communities regarding the use of physical memorials for events and gatherings to memorialize a student or anyone that's close to the district who has passed away or died from illness, car accident, suicide or other reasons. A draft was brought to us by Mr. Stack and was reviewed with the help of the High School Counseling Director, Heidi Leavitt, who was extremely helpful in explaining the reasons why we would draft that language as we've done. Dr. Brown is sure the community will have many questions about this document. We will post it on the website and make it available to the public so we can have their feedback from the community. After reading the policy, Dr. Brown suggested having Ms. Leavitt come in and be available for questions at an upcoming board meeting as she has been really been extremely helpful to explaining in detail why certain things should be avoided for the best interest of the students, and she generated a list here for us, a way to remember people.

Ms. Lytle commented that Ms. Leavitt was great at giving the subcommittee members the rationale for the policy along with the background regarding psychology and best practices. There was lively, rigorous discussion and it was very helpful.

6.3 [Policy IHCD-Advanced Coursework/Advanced Placement Courses](#), 2nd Read. This is an updated draft to include a statement of the standards that we use to make sure our dual enrollment courses are in compliance with community college accreditation standards and the curriculum and so forth. So, all we have done

is add in language that will allow people to understand that the dual enrollment courses comply with the standards and rigor of a college course. Dr. Brown added that she would like to thank Mr. Stack for drafting this policy.

Ms. Mahoney made a Motion to accept the 2nd Read of Policy IHCD. Motion seconded by Mr. Baker. Vote: All in Favor.

7.0 NEW BUSINESS

7.1 Primex Agreement- The Business Administrator, Michele Croteau reported on a letter from Primex (the New Hampshire Public Risk Management Exchange organization), our insurance carrier with whom we purchase Workers' Compensation among other coverages. This letter is specific to our Workers' Compensation coverage and given our past performance they are offering a commitment on their part that will benefit them with the stability of knowing that we are going to continue to work with them and benefit us with the stability of capping future premium increases for Workers' Comp at a maximum of 10%. So this is a three year cap running from 2020 to 2022. She would recommend that we enter into this agreement with them. There is a specific resolution which is on the last page that would need to be moved and seconded and approved by the full board for us to enter into that agreement with them.

Mr. Baker asked if there were any other options proposed. Ms. Croteau said there were not; her experience is that when you go to a commercial carrier for school coverage, districts don't fare well as this is sort of a niche industry. She is certainly happy to do so if the board would like to see some other proposals but she would be surprised if you do as well as Primex. Discussion ensued on commercial options vs. Primex (who serve municipalities).

Mr. Baker commented that Workers' Comp was about \$85,500 so 10% percent, if it went to that would be \$8500.

Ms. Croteau said that is the cap, they are not quoting a premium right now but interested in limiting our risk. This is saying in exchange for a commitment that they would hold that 10% cap for a three year maximum increase based on a maximum from the current year. So it is a cap of no more than ten percent over the current year's premium. Discussion ensued on how the cap is reached.

Ms. Croteau added that we can choose to continue coverage with them without participating in this and they will re-rate us. We would have Workers' Comp from someplace so it's either Primex under this cap program, which is a 3 year commitment, or Primex outside of the cap program, which doesn't then set a ceiling on your premiums for Workers' Comp through either a commercial carrier or some alternate carrier.

Dr. Brown asked for clarification on page 2 of the agreement, where it says annual contribution will be based on your *exposure base*. Is that the staffing level? What does exposure base mean?

Ms. Croteau responded that relates to determining a Workers' Comp premium, the calculation that Primex would go through where they look at the type of positions, the number of staff, there are ratings in terms of exposure, the type of position, for instance, someone who is a driver might have a different risk exposure than someone who a classroom teacher.

Dr. Brown asked if the SREA (Teachers Union) leadership have seen this and would they be interested or does this pertain to them?

Ms. Croteau responded that it is a cost born by the district that we must provide workers Comp and not something that is negotiated out.

Mr. Baker asked whether in her experience with these programs, she would recommend this is a benefit for the district. Ms. Croteau responded that she would.

Ms. Croteau informed the group that to adopt this agreement, Primex requires the board to vote on this which is as follows:

*Resolved: to hereby accept the offer of the New Hampshire Public Risk Management Exchange (Primex) to enter into its **Workers' Compensation Contribution Assurance Program, (CAP)** as of the date of the adoption of this resolution, and to be contractually bound to all the terms and conditions of Primex risk management pool membership during the term of the **Workers' Compensation Contribution Assurance Program (CAP)**. The coverage provided by Primex in each year of membership shall be as then set forth in the Coverage Documents of Primex.*

A Motion was made to accept the Primex Agreement by Dr. Brown and seconded by Mr. Baker. Vote: All in Favor.

7.2 Yearbook Advertisement Chair Broderick reviewed the annual full page ad that congratulates the graduating seniors. The cost for the full page is \$350.00.

Motion to approve the full-page advertisement in the 2018 Sanborn Regional High School Yearbook made by Ms. Lytle and seconded by Ms. Mahoney.

Ms. Mahoney asked if this is a budgeted expense. Ms. Croteau responded that it falls under the School Board's expenditure line...not above and beyond that.

Ms. Lytle asked what the advertisement says. The School Board Secretary responded

That it says “Best of Luck, to the Class of ____ May your future be everything you’ve imagined it to be and more” from the Sanborn Regional School Board.

Vote: All in Favor

8.0 OTHER BUSINESS

- 8.1 Next Meeting Agenda
-Safety Committee/Update (tentative)
-Greenhouse (tentative)

Dr. Brown would like any/all related to Safety, Key Fobs, etc.
Ms .Lytle commented as a parent that she would like a brief assurance of what is in place now and have a longer detailed update later if necessary.

8.2 Announcements

- 8.2.1 The next Sanborn Regional School Board meeting will be held on **Wednesday, March 7, 2018 from 6:00 PM to 7 PM in the Library at Sanborn Regional High School.**
- 8.2.2 The **Second (Voting) Session of the Annual School District Meeting** will be held on **Tuesday, March 13, 2018** from 8:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. in the **Swasey Gymnasium** (Sanborn Seminary Campus) for Kingston voters and in the **Newton Town Hall** for Newton voters.

9.0 Adjournment: Meeting adjourned 7:08 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.