

**SANBORN REGIONAL SCHOOL BOARD  
MEETING MINUTES**

**September 19, 2018**

**To view the video of this meeting, please visit our website at [www.sau17.net](http://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, September 19, 2018. The meeting was called to order at 6:04 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)

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.

2. **ACTION ON MINUTES** –Chair Broderick asked for a Motion to approve the Public Minutes of 9-5-18. Motion made by Dr. Brown and seconded by Ms. Mahoney. Mr. Baker requested that his following comments be included:

The reason this study was done is important and has to do with a balancing act. We have a certain amount of resources; we have to allocate them the best possible ways we can. The School Board Association states: “the key role and responsibility of a school board is the development of a budget that serves the needs of the students while simultaneously respecting the ability of taxpayers to fund such a system.” This is about sustainability. We’ve had year after year of teachers budgets failing because the operating budgets were too high. Again, this is about balance. This NESDEC study has come up with 8 possible ways we can do this. As a community we have to take a serious look at these options and determine what we’re going to

take seriously. We cannot continually go to the taxpayers and ask them to pay a substantially higher cost per student than surrounding towns. If we look at our cost per student, compared to surrounding towns it ranges from 8.9% higher to 37.6% higher. At the same time we want to be able to give teachers raises. We have to be competitive. The balancing of all these areas is why we had to do this study and why we must give it serious consideration.

**Vote: All in Favor as amended.**

### 3. **COMMUNICATIONS**

3.1 Manifests- Payroll Check Registers #5 in the amount of \$895,617.14 dated 9-20- 18, #5A in the amount of \$2,457.73 dated 9-6-18. Manifests Expenditures #6 in the amount of \$802,574.61 dated 9-19-18. 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: The NESDEC options discussed tonight will require a 2/3 vote of the community, should they be adopted by the district. He has done extensive legal research on the Articles of Agreement between Kingston & Newton which (in part) state there will be an elementary school in both communities. However, because we are a school district comprised of two or more towns, the law states that it would be either a K-6 grade or a K-8 grade school in those communities. So, if we should choose in the future to adopt a model that would require reorganization of any of our elementary instruction, we would need to get a 2/3 vote to change the Articles of Agreement prior to adopting that model.

He appreciates those that have reached out to him with questions, to get the facts, as opposed to those that go on Facebook and talk about what they think the facts are. He encourages the public to continue to reach out to him and he will share what he can. He closed by thanking everyone for being here tonight.

### 4.0 **COMMITTEE REPORTS**

4.1 Policy – Dr. Brown reported that the group met tonight and will be discussing policies later tonight. The next meeting is October 3 at 4:45 PM.

4.2 EISA- No Report

- 4.3 Facilities- No Report
- 4.4 Finance- Mr. Baker reported that the group met on 9/12 with Tammy Mahoney, Taryn Lytle, and Michelle Croteau present. Attending by teleconference was Jim Baker. The Finance Committee reviewed the July 1- August 31<sup>st</sup> Budget reports. Over the 60 day period, the district spent \$4,361,721.00. That includes a debt service payment on the bond for the high school construction of \$1,022,193.00. The next highest costs were Salaries and Benefits including Health and Dental, and Information Technology services. We also reviewed budget adjustments to allocate money from expense areas with surpluses to accounts that need additional funding. The total of these adjustments were \$106,548.00. The highest adjustment was \$83,548 between special Ed funds. Special Ed funding is especially hard to predict because just one IEP or out of district placement can substantially alter costs. There was also an adjustment from information systems to books. These adjustments are not increases to the budget. They are reallocations reflecting changes of funding needed within existing accounts. We reviewed a letter from the school districts auditors notifying the district that the NH Dept. of Education has completed their Fiscal Year 2017 audit of the Districts Expenditures and Federal Awards. The DOE found no issues of concern. We also reviewed a list of obsolete shop equipment to be disposed of by auction through the State of NH Surplus Auction. The following items are examples: Wood Planer, Milling Machine, Metal Lathe, Arc Welder, etc. Lastly, we were notified the districts electricity broker has negotiated a discounted rate of 7.17 cents (\$0.0717) per kilowatt hour for 36 months starting Nov of 2019. The previous rate was 7.3 cents (\$0.073) a minute.
- 4.5 Public Relations-No Report
- 4.6 Personnel- Ms. Lytle reported that pursuant to the last board meeting, the Board Evaluation is ready to go and she will review it after the related policies are covered tonight. This was agreed by all.
- 4.7 SST-No Report
- 4.8 Seminary Discussion-No Report
- 4.9 Budget Committee-No Report

## 5.0 **STUDENT COUNCIL REPRESENTATIVE REPORT**

Mr. O'Rourke reported that the Student Council has been meeting regularly to discuss upcoming events; they have volunteers for *Reach the Beach* on 9/15, the theme days for Homecoming this week are *Career Day* on Monday, *Squad/Twin Day* on Tuesday, *Athletes vs. Mathletes* on Wednesday, *Class Themes* on Thursday and Friday is *Class Colors*. They are prepping for the Pep Rally with equipment managers, Ella Cotter and Sam Desrochers in assistance. Adam reported there has been great school spirit this week with many students dressing up and getting excited for the weekend events. On behalf of the Student Council, he extended an invitation to the School Board and the public to Homecoming on Saturday, 9/22 at 8AM beginning with the parade, followed by skits and dances.

## 6.0 **OLD BUSINESS**

- 6.1 **School Board Goals**-Superintendent Ambrose presented on School Board Goal Setting. To view the slides, [please click here](#).

Mr. Ambrose closed his presentation by saying that the 3 areas he would ask the Board to consider are Facilities, Instruction (specifically resources for those students with significant academic needs) and Policy Review.

Dr. Brown commented that she supports the list of goals presented, especially when it comes to measuring outcomes and planning for interventions. These coincide with the next step for Excellence in Student Achievement (EISA) committee goals; imbedding specific academic outcome trends in the 5-year plan and identifying outcome/improvement targets. They want to see where they are going and what kinds of targets they can meet with our resources and programs. For example, Professional Development is a work in progress, so we want to look at the arc and see what progress we can make over a 2-5 year plan. She also supports the goal of revising the Policy Manual, having received most of the New Hampshire School Board Association's recommendations and notes on our manual. This year, we should be able to complete the updates in one year, not two.

Mr. Baker expressed his 3 goals as follows:

1. Facilities -Evaluate and include the results of the NESDEC (National School Development Council) study in our budgeting and Facilities goals.

2. Instruction – Three part:

A). Set measures to evaluate where the District performance is with regard to meeting academic goals as per the new definition of Student Success.

B). At least 2 x a year, host an Administration report on the progress of achieving these measures.

C). Compare academic performance year to year and improve Sanborn's results in relation to State of NH reported averages. The goal is to continually evaluate success of the curriculum with regard to our students demonstrating mastery of academic content. A comparison against statewide performance will help us measure this.

3. Budget – To the extent possible, prepare the 2019-20 proposed Operating Budget with sufficient savings that when combined with the professional and staff support increases, the total proposed budget does not exceed a combined total cost increase of more than 0.5%. This current year, we've started to make good progress in this area. To reach the point of sustainable funding within the means of the communities ability to pay, we need to try very hard to continue trying to equalize our higher cost per student and tax rates with the lower costs of neighboring towns.

Mr. Heath commented that the Budget Committee will begin their deliberations on Thursday, October 11 at 7PM in the Library. He invited the public to join and looks forward to seeing everyone.

Mr. Masson questioned how many goals described tonight are aligned with Student Success as defined, adding that we do have to be fiduciary agents, but at the same time, how many of the goals described are focusing on student outcomes, or something that is measurable.

Chair Broderick responded that he assumes we will be looking in April or May at the outcomes of these goals, so we cannot look that far ahead yet to evaluate them as we are still in the process of digesting them.

Ms. Mahoney appreciates the Superintendent's report which is very detailed, and likes Mr. Baker's additions as well. Speaking for the EISA Committee, these will provide guidance for the work they want to do around the Strategic Plan and the process of measuring outcomes. She would support these goals.

Ms. Lytle asked for clarification if the Board is adopting goals tonight and assessing the success of them in April or May. If so, these need to be measurable because a new sitting Board in March will be starting the process

again. Ms. Lytle proposes picking 2 goals that can be achieved; a comprehensive policy review and a road map for best use of resources, to include facilities and allocation for intervention as these both influence student outcomes. These are realistic achievable goals.

Chair Broderick added that we have 200 policies to cover.

Dr. Brown commented that the policy review is doable, but measurable outcomes for Student Success will take 2 years.

Mr. Mahoney commented that we need a goal with instruction.

Mr. Baker commented that he would like to set the bar higher than two goals and if we come up short, we try to do better. We owe that to the community.

Ms. Lytle clarified that the NESDEC study we are reviewing tonight will involve a reallocation of resources that can directly benefit student success at our schools. Goals should be measurable and achievable and we cannot wait any longer to address them.

**Ms. Lytle made a Motion to adopt two goals:**

**1. Review NESDEC study information and come up with a recommendation for the best use of Sanborn Resources to support student success, seconded by Mr. Baker.**

**Vote: All in Favor**

**2. Comprehensive review and update of policies to meet the standards of New Hampshire Law, seconded by Dr. Brown.**

Dr. Brown supports the goal.

**Vote: All in Favor**

Superintendent Ambrose commented that he would like to set a goal around instruction that evaluates student data related to Student Success to get a baseline.

**Mr. Baker made a Motion to set measures to evaluate where the district performance is in regard to meeting academic goals, per the new definition of Student Success, seconded by Ms. Lytle.**

Dr. Brown asked to amend Motion as follows:

**Mr. Baker made a Motion to set measures to evaluate where the district performance is with regard to meeting academic goals, per the new definition of Student Success and to map outcome goals into program resource allocations, and to adjust program resource allocations based on the outcomes.**

Superintendent Ambrose summarized that there is a correlation between the definition of Student Success and where students are at, which tie into resources, which then tie into facilities and policy. It is all related.

**Vote: All in Favor with Amendment**

**Mr. Baker made a Motion: to the extent possible, prepare the 2019-20 Proposed Operating Budget with sufficient savings that when combined with the Professional and Support Staff increases, the total Proposed Budget does not exceed a combined total cost increase of 0.5%. Motion seconded by Dr. Brown.**

Mr. Baker added that this year, we have started to make good progress in this area and to meet sustainability within the means of the community's ability to pay, we have to continue to try and equalize these costs areas. We are paying substantially more per student, and higher tax rates than neighboring towns, so with efficiencies identified in the NESDEC study, and other areas, this is a goal we should be able to achieve.

Chair Broderick commented that he cannot support this 0.5% as the cost of living is a minimum of 2% and this goal is not realistic.

Ms. Lytle commented that as a School Board member and an educator, she cannot support any Board goal based on an arbitrary amount being allocated to the budget, when the budget should be set based on student academic needs. So, if the budget needs to go up based on allocating resources for student needs or down based on allocating resources for student needs, that is where the School Board's role comes in. She will not support this as a goal.

Mr. Masson agrees with Ms. Lytle and does not support this goal, saying this is a task of the organization and has to happen in order to succeed, in order to meet the mission and vision of the organization. Whether the budget goes up or down, we have fiduciary responsibility and the Superintendent has been highly responsible in his tasks and processes thus far, and we want to continue that

trend, so if there is an issue, it becomes an evaluation discussion. This is not a goal, but a realistic thing that will occur regardless and the voting body will take care of that.

Dr. Brown considers this a reasonable goal, based on the comparative cost-per-pupil, relative to other districts.

Ms. Mahoney believes it is good to articulate a goal for the community to understand that we are being as fiscally responsible as possible. It is a goal which is not set in stone, but something to work towards.

Mr. Baker commented that this is about balance, with many years of teacher contracts failing, we pay our teachers lower than surrounding districts, but our total operating costs are substantially higher, so we are looking at fairness here. We have to look at where the imbalances are. Two years ago, we passed a teacher's contract that increased the teacher salaries by 500K, which has been carried over for another 500K this year and then another 600K of increases was added in the second year. Due to finding savings in the Operating Budget, the total increase was on 6%, so when it went to the polls, it passed. The bottom line is the voters have to pass it, so to be responsible; we need to look at where we can save money.

**Vote: 3 in Favor, 4 opposed (Broderick, Lytle, Heath, and Masson)  
Motion does not carry.**

## 7.0 PUBLIC COMMENT

James McCarthy (Newton) –Coming from the manufacturing industry, he takes issue with the 1.5 year span for specific, relevant, measurable, time bound goals and finds that timeframe unacceptable. The 2 month plan is more acceptable but with holidays, it will be stretching it. Having the NESDEC plan and Capital Improvement plans, he asked where is the smart action on them and how are they progressing, as an agenda already set. He recommends looking at this before taking on more.

Mary Cyr (Kingston)-commented that in years past one objective was to become a top 10% school in the State which failed miserably. So, putting forth 3 goals tonight is fabulous. She looks forward to adding measurable outcomes to those and said to keep in mind it is a living, breathing document, so as needs and priorities change, those goals and objectives should be amended accordingly.



Gwendolyn McCarthy (Newton)-commented she still feels we are putting the cart before the horse. Why is it that every time a Board changes, you go back to recreating the wheel? She cited the 2016-2021 Strategic Plan, the 2017-2021 Capital Improvement Plan which has now been replaced by the NESDEC Plan. The reports from the State show statistics about cost-per pupil and tax rates that conflict with what we have been told by some members of the School Board.

**WORKSHOP DISCUSSION ON NESDEC OPTIONS**- Superintendent Ambrose prefaced the discussion by saying that our students are not performing where they should be, regardless of whether or not we consider State tests to be important or not. He wants every child that leaves the district to be able to read, write and do computation and have hope for a wonderful future. We have great teachers but we need intervention for children who may need help but not necessarily Special Education. So, we need intervention for kids before Special Education. In addition, as the leader, he needs to share the following:

**NESDEC Study Points to consider**

(\$6.3 Million)

1. The district needs funding for intervention for students (\$1.5 Million)
2. The district needs to establish emergency funds for immediate, unplanned needs (\$1 Million)
3. Money for professional development (\$300,000)
4. The district must consider the state of our facilities. The Capital Improvement Plan outlines **\$3.5 million dollars needed at the middle school** over four years. This does not include any other costs.

Superintendent Ambrose introduced Professor Todd DeMitchell from the University of New Hampshire, renowned for his 47 years of experience in education who will assist in facilitating the workshop. To see NESDEC Options, [please click here](#).

**Workshop Public Comments**

**On Option IIIB/ for grades 7-12 at High School (Closing Middle School)**

Cheryl Gannon (Kingston)-needs clarification on why NESDEC Study was conducted. Was it because the Capital Improvement Plan yielded enormous costs? (Answer- Superintendent Ambrose-The NESDEC study was done to look at future enrollment trends which have been on the decline and to see what resource allocations need to be made). Ms. Gannon sees no costs identified on NESDEC options. When will that happen? (Answer -Superintendent Ambrose has not analyzed all costs yet and will do that once options are narrowed down). When will it be ready to be presented to public?

Kelley Cullivan (Newton)-With Pre-K -6 at Memorial and Bakie, and with Memorial significantly smaller, how will we fit a whole other grade when it is already tight? Also, what is the plan for putting 7-12 in the high school building? (Answer- Superintendent Ambrose explained that no deep analysis has been done yet, but there is a 10% cushion on those class enrollments. For her question #2, He has been looking at maps. The one priority is that Middle School children have their own Middle School experience completely separate from the high school students).

Ken Weyler (Kingston)-Transportation on this option looks to be the shortest and he supports this for that reason but will be looking forward to hearing other efficiencies.

Gwendolyn McCarthy (Newton) - Questions how NESDEC pulled demographic data together as enrollments focus on 10 year projection and seems rather narrow. Also, perhaps we should start by asking the public whether they are opposed to any schools closing. We have no information yet and to present these and expect answers is difficult to answer.

Joanne Corriveau (Newton) -In her opinion, the options need more information and until she has that she cannot make any decisions. The study seems biased on the budget before the children's needs.

Natasha Little (Kingston) - These options are breaking up the kids into different schools and navigate the logistics of that if you are a parent of an elementary student would be very challenging.

Paul Strykowski (Newton)-Supports the school system and pays taxes despite his children not attending schools in the district. The transportation being short is good, giving the students a separate experience as the Superintendent mentioned is important and he has given his word on that. We need to look at the economics behind this, maximize the high school's capacity and there is no logical reason to keep the Middle School open as we are throwing money at an asset that will be underutilized.

Ken Elwell (Newton)-He is hearing the fear people have about their 7<sup>th</sup> & 8<sup>th</sup> graders coming to high school building and wants to remind them that this is not the Bronx, but a reputable high school. With the separation planned, there will be no trauma to them. What other schools have this set-up.

Liz Walker (Newton)-Supports 7<sup>th</sup> & 8<sup>th</sup> graders coming to high school but her concern is about Pre-Kindergarten at Bakie and bringing children back and forth from Newton to Kingston will be a lot to deal with. (She has 4 year-old daughter).

Heather Ingham (Newton) - If the Middle School closes, that will mean we have two buildings in our district that are not being used and she wants to bring that to people's attention.

Nicole Ash (Kingston)-Would support Option III F, as each age would have their needs attended to.

Dave Rosenberg (Kingston)-Costs to build separations at high school, what are they? What about air conditioning?

(Answer by Superintendent- We will build an entrance and two doors. We don't have specific costs yet as I haven't been tasked to do so by Board. We do not have A/C, except in the library)

Tammy Gluck (Newton)-Supports this proposal for the reasons that have been discussed tonight. If the Board decides to task the Administration with pursuing this option, she would like to hear about the plans to "mothball" the Middle School. As a previous speaker mentioned, we would have 2 buildings (Seminary Campus and Middle School) vacant and there are costs associated with closing any building. What are the potential options for using the Middle School? (e.g. moving SAU office there to accommodate additional students at high school) Also, other concerns to be addressed; Fremont has space issues at Ellis School and the Agreement with Sanborn is up in 6-7 years. These will need to be addressed as part of the process. Once we move forward, Ms. Gluck would like to hear from an educator about the impact of these moves on students, teachers and administration. They need to be spelled out for the public before any proposal comes forward.

Annie Collyer (Newton)-Supports Option III B as it doesn't need a Warrant Article and can simply be done. The assurance that there would be a Middle School experience for the kids is extremely important. There are also tremendous educational advantages which the Superintendent has referred to. (E.g. access to teaching facilities, teachers trained carefully to deal appropriately with each age group). Option III F is also appealing if it were to pass in a Warrant Article, but she would need more information such as the effect of having groups of children (Pre-K to 3) together as it relates to literacy and their receiving the foundation that they need. She has the same concerns for the 4-6 graders as it relates to math and would like to see these educational possibilities laid out. Fremont's future interest in the district is something to discuss so that they can prepare their students in the best possible way for career and college readiness.

Ian McGregor (Newton)-went to Triton where this option existed, the building configuration was separate, similar to what we are discussing here tonight, so he would support this option. With children at ages 9, 6 and 3, his family is quite vested in what is going to happen. Either option III B or III F would be OK. He thanked Mr. Ambrose for being upfront and honest, something he feels is missing or sugarcoated sometimes. The bus routes for small children are a concern, as well as transitioning children too many times. He would also be interested in a study or data related to any of these larger transitions.

Caitlyn Foucher (Newton)-She has a Kindergartener, so this will affect her child's whole career in the district. She is not comfortable with her being on the bus with 9-12 grades because children

develop differently and while she may be precocious intellectually, she is still a little kid that needs to be protected and not exposed to older kids. This is not about budget as much as it is about the children. What about class size with combining all these students, how many will get lost in the cracks? (Answer-Superintendent supports a later start time so that students are not riding with older children and would be happy to talk with her).

Kelley Cullivan (Newton) - By the time her children were in 5<sup>th</sup> grade, they were developmentally ready for 6<sup>th</sup> grade. Believes that option IIIF would be better served as a Pre-K to 4. (Answer - Superintendent Ambrose said that enrollments did not support this in NESDEC study).

Jon LeBlanc (Kingston)-Would like to know if Fremont was factored into the equation. (Answer - Superintendent Ambrose said he and Superintendent Hutton talk regularly about their students. There are 3 things that come up regularly; the Seminary Campus, the Middle School closing as a facility for students and Fremont. He has nothing to report at this time, but they are all being discussed). Mr. LeBlanc asked about the athletics piece and whether the 6 graders would still participate with 7<sup>th</sup> & 8<sup>th</sup> graders, and the same question pertains to Band participation. (Answer - Superintendent Ambrose asked if he would include that question in a survey that he will receive soon). Lastly, Mr. LeBlanc asked about the operating capacity changes that would result with separating 7 & 8<sup>th</sup> graders from others. (Answer- NESDEC did not take programming into account but felt comfortable with their analysis as it was exhaustive).

Jamie Fitzpatrick (Newton)-Thanked Board for commissioning report. This and everything, like the goals discussed earlier, are tied together. He would support option IIIB because it provides for savings with the closing of the Middle School and provide funds that could be used and tied directly into student achievement and student performance. It can also help to provide teacher compensation level similar to other districts, so we are not losing our best and brightest teachers to competing school districts. The single most important item in terms of improving student performance, in his opinion, is teacher excellence and education with the students. This is the main driver to help students perform. Most kids or adults will talk about the teacher that influenced them, not about the number of kids in their class. This is a good way to figure out how to reallocate resources, to give a better education with better results to the students of the community. Option IIIB also leaves the youngest amongst us alone and in the local community in which they live. Fewer transitions are best. He looks forward to the details.

#### **Comments on option for grades 6-12 at High School (Middle School closing).**

Kevin Holt (Kingston)-Having 6-12 at High School keeps athletics and Band participation together, and keeps the curriculum and socialization intact.

Matthew Liacos (Newton)-new resident with a 4 year old and 2 year old, so quite invested in the outcome. He is employed by Triton Regional High School (7-12 grades) and says it works well.

They have one physical building partitioned off for the 7<sup>th</sup> & 8<sup>th</sup> graders. There is a clear separation between the students and it is 2 separate schools. He believes that looking at 6 and 7<sup>th</sup> graders is like splitting hairs developmentally whereas shipping a child across town to another school is not an option for him.

Cheryl Gannon (Kingston)-What are the different models of educational instruction for grades 6-8 and 7-8? Would there be an impact? Regarding the potential SAU office move, we were lucky to find space here for them here a few years ago. When the High School was being built, we were in a recession. Did they factor in changes when they did these 10 year projections? Can we expand in this building and where would we put the Greenhouse?

(Answer -Superintendent Ambrose said that the Greenhouse is on pause for right now and yes, we can expand at High School.) Ms. Gannon asked if there would be structural changes to the elementary schools to include 6<sup>th</sup> graders there.

Karen Campbell (Newton) -Wants schools to stay the same and states emphatically to please keep them as they are. If the Middle School needs to close, then she would choose option III B or III F, but would need much more information.

Annie Collyer (Newton) - In listening to the concerns over children having to be transported out of their towns, perhaps NESDEC could look at an option III F A w/pre-K and K in the town of origin, grades 1-3 together or grades 1-4 together and then grades 5 - 6 together for educational advantages and keep kids from travelling too far on a bus.

Lisa O'Toole (Kingston) - Nobody likes change and although it is hard, it can be good. The impact of what this will do is being voiced as mentioned tonight with many factors to consider; facilities, locations, bus routes, athletics, fields, arts, staff adjustments, student transitions. What is the plan is for the two tasked options and the due diligence process that should follow? (Answer-Superintendent Ambrose answered that the process is as follows: receive NESDEC results or options, finding the themes that people have identified to explore, survey the public for feedback, and report back at the 1<sup>st</sup> or 2<sup>nd</sup> October Board meeting with a plan to move forward and obtain Board approval. This is the Board's and Community's decision. The change to be implemented would be the end of next year (2020), which is a preliminary date and subject to change.

Gwendolyn McCarthy (Newton)-Can live with some of these options, but her real fear is that the Board could implement an option that costs much more than the 3.5M need for the Middle School or that we run out of funding. We need a commitment that if an option goes forward, we can't be nickel and dimed for every little thing.

Joanne Corriveau (Newton)-Cited a school she worked at in MA that transitioned to grades 5-12 whereby a 5<sup>th</sup> grader got pregnant by a 12<sup>th</sup> grader. It was a small town like Newton, so it can happen anywhere.

8.0 **NEW BUSINESS**

- 8.1 Academic Calendar Adjustment- Superintendent Ambrose explained that we have a conflict in April with an Early Release date and need to move it from April 10<sup>th</sup> to April 3<sup>rd</sup> to accommodate an SAT.

**Chair Broderick asked for a Motion to approve the Academic Calendar as amended, moved by Ms. Mahoney and seconded by Mr. Heath.**

No discussion

**Vote: All in Favor**

- 8.2 Policies for Superintendent Evaluation-CBI, CBI-R, CBI-R-E and CBI-E 1-3

Dr. Brown explained the criteria for policy CBI and why the language is being revised and/or struck.

**Dr. Brown asked for a Motion to approve Policy CBI as written for a 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> read, moved by Mr. Heath and seconded by Ms. Lytle.**

No discussion

**Vote: All in Favor**

Dr. Brown explained Policy CBI-R, the procedure for Superintendent Evaluation and why the timeline was adjusted, along with the other language changes.

**Dr. Brown asked for a Motion to approve Policy CBI-R as written for a 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> read, moved by Mr. Baker and seconded by Mr. Heath.**

No discussion

**Vote: All in Favor**

Dr. Brown would like to strike the obsolete evaluation forms of Policy CBI-R-E, CBI-R-E-1, CBI-R-E-2 and CBI-R-E-3

**Dr. Brown asked for a Motion to repeal Policy CBI-R-E and CBI-R-E-1, CBI-R-E-2 and CBI-R-E-3, moved by Ms. Mahoney and seconded by Mr. Baker.**

No discussion

**Vote: All in Favor**

8.3 Policy GCOC-Evaluation of School Administrative Personnel

Dr. Brown explained the title of Mr. Turmelle's position is Director of Academics, Professional Learning and Student Affairs and should be reflected. Also, K-8 should be struck.

**Dr. Brown asked for a Motion to adopt GCOC as written, moved by Ms. Mahoney and seconded by Mr. Baker.**

No discussion.

**Vote: All in Favor**

8.4 Superintendent Evaluation

Ms. Lytle explained the recent Superintendent Evaluation shared and tabled due to policy review.

**Ms. Lytle asked for a Motion to adopt the Superintendent Evaluation move forward with the evaluation process of our Superintendent, moved by Mr. Baker and second by Mr. Masson.**

Dr. Brown asked for clarity on the evaluation being referred to for which Ms. Lytle clarified. Dr. Brown thinks it looks great but would like to add under Topic 1, "Utilizes the Board's annual goals and long-term planning documents as the benchmark for conducting district business.

Superintendent Ambrose pointed out that he would have his own goals too.

Chair Broderick asked if it should be moved to next agenda to work on specifics.

Ms. Lytle commented that Dr. Brown can add her comments to the evaluation.

Mr. Baker said that there is no rush. Ms. Lytle thinks that we want to be expeditious and complete it as discussed in Personnel meeting.

**Vote: 5 in Favor 2 opposed (Dr. Brown, Ms. Mahoney)  
Motion Passes.**

Ms. Lytle asked that the evaluations be completed in the next 2 weeks and given to Chair Broderick.

8.5 Budget Timeline Approval

Ms. Croteau reviewed the budget timeline that has been reviewed and approved with Ms. Collyer.

**Chair Broderick asked for a Motion to approve the 2019-20 Budget Timeline, moved by Mr. Baker and seconded by Ms. Lytle.**

No discussion

**Vote: All in favor**

8.6 Second School Board Comment

Annie Collyer (Newton)-commented that the default action by the Chair is to table items. This is frustrating and inefficient.

Chair Broderick commented that if it is not on the agenda, we cannot discuss it.

Annie Collyer (Newton)-the goals and Superintendent Evaluation were both on the agenda.

Ian McGregor (Newton)-Projections for 10 years are not enough, the projections should be much longer, like 10-20 years.

Cheryl Gannon (Kingston)- Appreciates goals being addressed tonight but they are always late every year. Also, why is our cost-per-pupil higher than other districts? She appreciates not limiting the budget to a % tonight.

9.0 **OTHER BUSINESS**

9.1 Next Meeting Agenda

- ◆ Board Goals
- ◆ School Board Evaluation

9.2 Announcements

9.2.1 The next Sanborn Regional School Board meeting will be held on **Wednesday, October 3, 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. Mahoney.**

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

11. **ADJOURNMENT-** Meeting adjourned 9:35 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**

**September 19, 2018**

Sanborn Regional High School  
Kingston, NH

**9:54 PM**

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

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

**Motion made by Chair Broderick to seal negotiation Minutes until negotiation is complete, moved by Mr. Heath and seconded by Mr. Baker**

**Roll Call Vote: All in Favor**

Meeting adjourned at 9:55 PM

Recorder: Michele Croteau