

**SANBORN REGIONAL SCHOOL BOARD
MEETING MINUTES
June 5, 2019**

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, June 5, 2019. The meeting was called to order at 6:01 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
Electra Alessio
James Baker
Larry Heath
Jamie Fitzpatrick
Tammy Mahoney

Adam O'Rourke -Student Council Representative
Erin Gillespie –Student Council Representative for the 2019-20 school year.

ADMINISTRATORS:

Thomas Ambrose, Superintendent
Michele Croteau, Business Administrator (Excused)
Matthew Angell, SAU Office Manager

1. **CALL TO ORDER** at 6:02 PM by Chair Broderick with the Pledge of Allegiance led by High School Student Council students who will lead their respective classes in the 2019-20 school year.
2. **ACTION ON MINUTES-** Review of Public Minutes of [5/15/19](#). **Chair Broderick asked for a Motion to approve the Public Minutes of 5-15-19. Motion made by Dr. Brown and seconded by Mr. Baker.** Mr. Baker noted on page 5, that the first paragraph repeats. Dr. Brown noted previously that on page 11, "people" should instead be "NESDEC" to read..."and when NESDEC came to see us, they were amazed that we had so many buildings for the population."

Vote: All in Favor with amendments.

3. COMMUNICATIONS

3.1 Distribution of Manifest Documents-Payroll Check Register # 23A in the amount of \$383.69, dated 5-16-19 and Payroll Check Register #24 in the amount of \$801,788.38, dated 5-30-19. Manifest Check Register #27 in the amount of \$1,081,541.83, dated 5-31-19. Signatures by board members received.

3.2 Nominations- Mr. Ambrose reviewed the following nominations:

Bakie School: Kristin Tooker, Speech Pathology

Memorial School: Angelica Gardella, School Counselor

High School: Brendan Goudreau, Math Interventionist,

Abigail Presby, (English Teacher), Stephanie Westergren, Physical Science

Chair Broderick asked for a Motion to approve the nominations. The Motion was moved by Ms. Alessio and seconded by Mr. Heath. No discussion

Vote: All in Favor

3.3 Resignations- Superintendent Ambrose announced the following resignation with regret:

Bakie School: Alexsia Karamourtopoulos, Grade 1 Teacher

Adam Mullen, Grade 3 Teacher

Memorial School: Jodi Tamayoshi, Library Media Specialist

Middle School: Cristina Coffill, Spanish Teacher

Chair Broderick asked for a Motion to accept the resignation with regret, moved by Ms. Alessio and seconded by Ms. Mahoney. No discussion.

Vote: All in favor.

3.4 Superintendent's Report- Mr. Ambrose gave an update as follows:

◆ YMCA- I scheduled a meeting with the YMCA and want to report to the board and the public that the YMCA, should the board choose to reorganize the elementary schools, will be offering a kindergarten- sixth grade program at each school in the morning and afternoons, so that parents can pick up and drop off their children at their neighborhood location.

◆ Student Council- I met with the Student Council today and had a wonderful meeting. I asked them about vaping and what's going on in our schools. They gave me significant feedback that I'll be bringing from a school administration next week, to discuss in preparation for next year. I thought their feedback was actionable, reasonable and fair. I also had a good conversation with the Student Council about the potential reorganization of the district. Probably the most interesting part of this process has been meeting with middle school students and high school students and answering their questions. It was a very productive conversation.

4. COMMITTEE REPORTS

- 4.1 Policy- Policy met on May 29 and discussed 20 revisions to policies governing students in Section "J." Board members Heath, Broderick and Brown were in attendance as well as Asst. Principal Dawson, and Superintendent Ambrose. The committee reviewed and agreed to forward 17 of the 'J' changes to the Board for discussion and approval at the June 12th meeting. Three changes were tabled for further review. Revised policy EC was reviewed again, and also forwarded to the Board for next week's meeting. Today, June 5th, Policy met again - and reviewed 5 new "J" policies and a 6th J policy which has been recommended for repeal by the NHSBA and administration. These additional 6 changes will be forwarded to the full board this week for discussion and possible approval at our June 12th meeting. Our next Policy meeting date is to be announced.
- 4.2 EISA-The Excellence in Student Achievement met on May 15th. Dr. Haynes reported that the recent visit from the NH Department of Education's Commissioner, Frank Edelblut was productive. She also reported on the Portrait of a Graduate development work which is underway. The goal is to define the desired characteristics and qualities of a Sanborn graduate, which will help to inform the process of strategic planning. Meetings will be held with various stakeholders to develop a list of characteristics. These include students, business owners, parents, board members. Dr. Haynes has met with elementary student council members and elementary teachers. Mr. Stack has met with high school Student Council members. Mr. Ambrose will meet with a parent group. A focus group will be convened in July to distill all the lists to one single list of characteristics. Committee and members of the public who are present participated in this exercise. The final list of six characteristics was Self-direction, Critical Thinking, Emotional Intelligence, Metacognition, or ability to learn, Technological Competence and Collaboration. Others which were suggested included, Literacy and Numeracy or Content Mastery, Civic Literacy and Communication. It was noted that skills are evolving and that automation is changing the jobs and skills that will be needed in the future. Shaker Regional School District Results were briefly discussed as Mr. Ambrose was presenting that at the next board meeting. Of note is their superior student performance with a similar demographic to Sanborn and a much higher number of Free

and Reduced Lunch recipients. They have a large number of intervention professionals, which contrasts with Sanborn's very low number. Dr. Haynes stressed that our teachers are doing a great job but are stretched too thin and that they will benefit from added intervention resources. Top achievers should also benefit from those. Ms. Collyer from Newton commented on the importance of enrichment for top achievers and Dr. Brown of Newton commented on the importance of mastery in the Profile of a Graduate. Our next meeting is next Wednesday, June 12, at 4:45.

- 4.3 Facilities- Mr. Baker reported that Facilities met tonight and he will report on that at the next board meeting. The next Facilities meeting will be announced.
- 4.4 Finance- Mr. Baker reported that the Finance Committee will meet on June 12th at 3:45.
- 4.5 Public Relations-No report.
- 4.6 Personnel- Meeting – Dr. Brown reported that the next meeting is on 7/26 at 5 PM.
- 4.7 SST- No report.
- 4.8 Seminary –No report.
- 4.9 Budget- No report.
- 5.0 Wellness-No report.

5. **STUDENT COUNCIL REPRESENTATIVE REPORT**

Mr. O'Rourke introduced Erin Gillespie who will be replacing him at the board table in the next school year. Erin is an upcoming senior and has been on Student Council for the past three years. She is excited to get to work. Mr. O'Rourke gave updates on those students elected as the next Student Council Presidents for each grade will be. The seniors had an awesome cruise on Boston Harbor last Friday and are getting ready for graduation. On behalf of the class of 2019, he thanked the board and Mr. Ambrose for everything they have done. He will be attending Wentworth Institute in the fall.

- 6. **1st PUBLIC COMMENT**- Chair Broderick prefaced by asking for a Motion to increase the comments time to 40 minutes (from 20 with 3 minutes each) due to the topic of district reorganization.. Motion moved by Mr. Baker and seconded by Ms. Mahoney. Ms. Alessio commented that this request does not need a Motion.

Cheryl Gannon (Kingston)-Appreciated all the hard work the Administration put into the May 15th public forum, answering the questions that were submitted by the voters and taking questions that night as well. Some people new to the district might not appreciate the history of our district budgets. In about the last 10 years, our budget has passed twice, once when it was \$66K over the Default and once when it was the same as the Default. It was defeated 6 times. There were times that it was less than the default, that is when it passed. We also did not pass teacher contracts for three years. This is not a very good track record of supporting the proposed projects. It's kind of confounding as to why the budget keeps going up. Despite enrollment dropping, there are a lot of things that we have to pay for now that we have not paid for 10-20 years ago. One that was mentioned tonight, the drug and alcohol counselor. That is a problem in our community; we must fund that. Technology has become the center of what we do in teaching. It's not just the hardware, the software, replacements, maintenance, staff on the Help Desk. All of these things, despite our enrollment still need to be paid for. The fact that our teachers haven't had a contract is very disheartening. And it means that we have to hire new people and train them, which impacts the consistency and continuity of instruction. The reorganization that's being proposed is a very difficult change to look at. We don't like to think is it money or is going to be instruction. We need to face the reality that this district has an abysmal history of passing budgets. So we need to consider that and what we're going to do to be able to support what the district needs, and also to support the community, which we know is an aging community. I hope that we can all come together and come to a compromise and work together as a community as we face this very, very difficult decision.

Patrick Kelly (Newton)-I understand that so long as the \$1.4 million is allocated through intervention, this probably could be the best solution for our students. But as a community, I'm just a little bit worried about the process and I have come to that conclusion after talking with parents and getting feedback. As I have tried to get informed, they say they already know what they're going to do. The school board's already made up their mind and they asked me, why do I even bother? It is comments like these that we need to caution the process a little bit. And I just wanted to say my piece.

Melissa Hilfer (Kingston)-I'm voicing my concerns regarding the multitude of changes that will take place. I think a lot of people have expressed a passion for intervention, I can see why that is a very attractive option. Many children utilize the services and could be better served by more people able to provide them. But my concern is, were we to implement this intervention strategy on top of the shifts in location, paraprofessionals, teachers, intervention specialist, busing, all of these different pieces that are kind of in flux, because of the changes. How are we going to pull the data from these changes to see if the interventions are truly working in the way that we intended them to do? It's just a concern, because you may have a student that would have flourished, remaining at Bakie, let's say, or remaining at Memorial, that being pushed into a different school, they can't access the intervention in a way that they might have otherwise, and a place that was familiar to them? How are we going to know and be able to relay to the people that yes, this intervention was valuable, successful because we have the data to say so when there may be some kids who can't even make the most of it, because they're still dealing with the transition itself and the anxiety that may have brought on board. It is just something that I'm concerned about as a parent, as an educator. I have a background in education myself. Certain

populations struggle with even the simplest of transitions that other people don't even make note of. Moving a school is a large transition for many kids. And I just think that that's something that is would be difficult to justify when we can't show the data.

Michael Gannon (Kingston) – I have some good news. I want to pass along that has to do with the Middle School. Several weeks ago, when we had a meeting over at the auditorium, I spoke about athletics, and the sixth grade possibly not being involved in it. Over the past week, I was delighted to be part of a middle school track team that won the Tri-State County championship. The girls won the championship for the 4th year in a row and the boys won for the 3rd year in a row. Tuesday was the State Track Meet with 69 schools represented. Sanborn place 4 kids in first place and other students who did extremely well also. The first place winners all started out on a team as 6th graders. My fear is that we are going to shortchange ourselves and the student athletes with the move to the high school.

Corey Masson (Newton)-I have been immersed in municipal government for the last 20 years. During the day, my governance coaches and I work with a school district that has more students and buildings than this entire state. If we were observing, auditing and advising community members, staff, Superintendent and the school board during this process of redistricting and if we looked at the current stage, which we were here in Sanborn today, I'd be asking and many of my board members observing this would say to slow the process down. There far too many risks. What are some of the risks and evidence that this community staff and district are not ready for the decision that redistricting, regardless of what it may be? First, would be culture and public relations. What are the measures we are taking to ensure success? Here's a quote from April 3 2018 presentation. "I want to remind everyone that this plan is an overarching outline of what this would look like. These are estimates and should the board choose to make a move to have the middle school students attend the high school facility, there is further work to be done". He then goes on to say that he will be dedicated to and collaborative with staff. Where is Fremont in this? You are putting the Fremont culture at risk. Regarding financials and unencumbered funds and money left over to the community. These funds total 3.4 Million Dollars. Where is the plan? Regarding facilities, where is the redistricting committee that includes the staff?

Ashley Page-(Kingston) - I am here today as a voice for teachers and community members, which was this plan. I'm a teacher and Bakie parent. Looking over the Minutes of the last two years, my head is spinning as to how we got here. Let's take a moment to reflect on past meetings through the lens of student achievement and what we decided to do to put the performance back. At the start of the 2017-18 school year, professional development was the charge to help close the gap. During the November 15th meeting, there was extensive discussion of professional development. The Minutes read in previous budgets the professional development line has been slashed in order to preserve student programming. In order to improve student learning and outcomes, we can no longer ignore the need for ongoing teacher training. A proposal for \$75,000 was added to the budget for PD and members of this board tried to cut that number down. In the summer of 2018, we developed a relationship with Columbia University to help our teachers recommit to the literacy workshop model. The workshop model can take years to perfect and it seems that we are in year one of the renewed focus on this

approach. In my professional opinion not enough time has been given to see how this initiative has or has not improved student achievement. At the January 11 2018 meeting, a Newton resident stressed professional development is a process that involves taking steps towards a high functioning, growing and improving School District. Many teachers are taking training and I've commented that they need time to incorporate their training so this doesn't happen overnight. Furthermore, Dr. Brown mentioned professional development is a work in progress. We want to look at the art and see what progress we can make over a two to five year plan. I completely agree. The takeaways from these meetings are one; it seems there has been a charge to increase professional development to help our students into it will take time, maybe even years to see that how to the increase PD affects student achievement. Looking back again, the board ask Mr. Ambrose what solutions possibly implement in finance and logistics for unlimited and a hypothetical list that cost upwards of \$1 million. Not once was intervention mentioned as a solution to the performance gap. As the concerns over the reconfiguration of the elementary schools grew, I cannot help but notice the intervention argument ramp up. I agree a tiered intervention model is best practice. I agree that short term intervention prior to referral process is extremely important. If intervention had a reputation the way it has been used people to vote for this plan has severely devalued it. At times, it is even called early intervention, which is something entirely different than the academic intervention students over the age of 3 needs. Stating there's a \$1.5 million need for intervention and that this plan is the only way to fix it is not fair. I want to be clear I'm not against our resources for children. However, I'm against it being used as propaganda or an ultimatum. Mr. Broderick in response to public pushback, said, "but I'll tell you, if we don't put a good amount of financial resources into intervention, I'm going to be one very upset guy". Mr. Ambrose even said that one of the options is to do nothing and fund the intervention for 1.5 million. Where was all this fighting years ago to fund student needs. Mr. Ambrose said at the August 15, 2018, board meeting, this process will do one of two things, bring the communities together, or it will divide us. The attitude in which we approach this process will define which one of these two things will happen. My question to the board, when you look back at this process, can you honestly say you did everything in your power to bring our communities together for the greater good of our students. I am begging you to dig deeper into current practices, what the teachers need, and variables that have been overlooked before you make this decision.

Joanne Corriveau (Newton) - I truly get that we don't have any money and if this is the only decision that has to be made, then I will find a way to get my kids through this. I feel like it will be because of me and in spite of the rash decisions that has been made on the spot. I understand budgets. But what I do strongly disagree with is that the implementation of intervention is to save the day and save Sanborn. It is a tool. Look on Monster.com and most Interventionists don't need any more education than a regular classroom teacher and as our budget has said time and time again, if they do have more education than a regular classroom teacher, Sanborn can't afford that. I could apply for this job, but I do not want it. We are taking away teachers and adding an interventionist. It's a wash and I have to tell you, when you telling me that everything is going to be fine and all kids are going to survive, that is simply not true. I can tell you this, my daughter scored in the 95th percentile, both in math and reading. She's not going to need any of your intervention. But what she does need is what the teacher that promised her said that if she stopped crying and she got through school every day, that she would have lunch with her. That was

her special day. That was her classroom teacher. They said Oh, the teacher advised me .You know what? Talk to the doctor about her anxiety. They told me that structure is vital. Oh the structures are only in the classroom? I strongly disagree. After April vacation, when my daughter was clinging to my leg, afraid to go to school because a little girl was threatening to bite her in the classroom, pretending that she was a dog, you know what helped her? I walked her into class, her Secretary met her with a smile, and her Aide came over and gave her a hug. And that's what kept her in school. My kids are not going to need your interventionist.

Christine Cowden-Kingston)-I feel that we were sold something very different. When article eight was discussed prior to passing, I thought by voting to pass it I was doing what was in the best interest of our children's future. I regret my naiveté in trusting those that kind of broke it down for the public. And I severely regret voting for it. It is unfortunate that the passing of that article essentially and literally took the vote away from the community and put it in the hands of the school board. I wish by poring through all the Minutes in the last two years of the board meetings, my faith had been renewed in the process. But honestly, my research brought to light discrepancies after discrepancies. In the past, putting everything to a public vote, getting pushed aside completely now. And we're rushing towards this decision. And it's not our decision. And I just don't understand why everything previously went to vote and now all of a sudden, it's not. I clearly identified a progression of a clear agenda before adoption three as the only option. At some point all research stopped. If it didn't afford that option, number three. Intervention became a playing chip for a pawn. And it's being used now as leverage to pass this and do it quickly. I think that all of this contributes to the community feeling that the train has left the station. It also kind of diminishes my belief in the process. I don't think that we need to be moving so quickly. I ask that we please slow this down and think about the children and how this affects them. I know that there's a bottom line and that money comes into effect. And taxes are very touchy, I completely understand that. But I think somewhere along the way, we forgot that these children are going to be uprooted and moved around. Some of the kids are going to have to go to third grade in one school and fourth grade in another school. It just seems like we need to stop and slow down and think a little bit more. And I just can't stress enough how I feel like article eight really kind of put us on this path. And that maybe had we understood it a little more, this wouldn't have happened. And you guys even said yourself that you didn't think it was going to pass. Why, what was wrong with it, it's basically because we were giving up a vote.

Erin LaVallee (Kingston) - I guess I just kind of wanted to touch upon the emotions of things and how I can't believe that I'm here. And I mean that in the sense that I feel like I just took my baby home from the hospital. And now he comes downstairs every morning, and he's just slowly slipping by and growing so fast. And I just feel like this whole thing, just pushed the fast forward button again. All we really want as parents and especially as parents of the young is to just keep them close. And when we feel them slipping away, it tears at your heart. So, if there's any way that we could just think about this a little bit more, have some more parent involvement before we make this decision, it would really make people feel better. I think people would feel more comfortable about it if it is the direction it has to go. But right now, it just doesn't feel right. And I think I'm speaking for a lot of parents. It just feels like we weren't involved.

Karen Campbell (Newton)-I implore the board to really pause on making this decision. When I look at these options, what I don't see here is the high school. To me that poses the greatest need. So, when Fremont leaves, what going to happen? The school board right now has this tremendous opportunity to create a great vision, a great business plan for the town. Let's come up with the right plan for the town for the future, for the high school. Let's pull in other high schools, let's price adjust comparatively to Pinkerton. We can offer a smaller campus; there are so many options that we can offer with the high school that would appeal to lower taxes for the Newton-Kingston Taxpayer's Association, while at the same time improving student goals and the students would not necessarily have to be redistricted. You really have this opportunity move forward before solidifying the high school. I think this puts the town and the students in great jeopardy. It's a path that it cuts off other options. We're moving towards the path for the middle school here that takes that away. And then, what's the future? The future I see is just the declining enrollments. Let's come up with a good plan. You have the ability; you can lower the taxes and increase the high school into a magnet school. Pinkerton really is falling from grace; it is growing too big too fast. Let's find a way to make our high school comparatively priced. You could increase the value of your homes. Everybody could come to the table and really feel really good about it. So, that is my plea to you, to please just pause, figure out the vision for the high school that will help find a solution there that can help everybody.

7. **NEW BUSINESS**

- 7.1 Auditor's Report-Representatives from Vachon, Cluekay & Company reported on their review of the District's financials. Overall, there were no significant findings. Recommendations were made to streamline the Grant process by coming up with a better tracking and reconciliation system. Also, they suggested identifying items done once a year and tracking them progressively. (E.g. fixed assets) This would reduce the time and effort that would go into preparing the information at the end of the year.

Mr. Fitzpatrick asked why they don't do an assessment on internal controls.

Mr. Angell from the SAU Business Office responded that the auditors do look at internal controls when they analyze financial statements but is not a test of just internal controls. To do that would double the audit fee from \$15K to \$30K. However, if they did see a red flag, they would do an additional review.

- 7.2 Certificate of Vote for Student Assistance Counselor- Superintendent Ambrose informed the group that the Student Assistance Counselor's contract (in Guidance Department) is up for renewal. This position is split 50/50 between Sanborn and the NH Department of Health & Human Services and needs Board approval for the 2019-20 school year. It has been a very effective position in the district.

Superintendent Ambrose asked for a Motion to approve the Student Assistance Counselor Contract, moved by Mr. Heath and seconded by Ms. Mahoney.

No discussion

Vote: All in Favor

- 7.3 Climbing Wall at Bakie Elementary- Mr. Ambrose reported that the Facilities Committee needs to research the insurance for this grant funded project and will table it until next week's meeting.

8. **OLD BUSINESS** –

- 8.1 District Reorganization Options/Discussion and Decision.-Superintendent Ambrose prefaced by saying he has been in conversation with Fremont and met with their Board last week. Our district has lost 4000 students in the last 10 years. We were at 2000 students 10 years ago. We're at 1600 students now. And in the next 10 years, we are projected to be at 1200 students with Fremont. If Fremont pulls out, we will be below 1000 students district-wide. Our current seated in school, second through fifth graders are 360 students. In four years, they will be in high school, we will have 160 students in our high school in Fremont choose to go to another community. We are working hard, and we are working the best we can but you have to remember we can't just change the tuition. The tuition is done through a very complex legal document that would have to be ratified by at least a portion of the voters before we could change Fremont's tuition. So, I want you all to know that there isn't anything that's been said this evening that hasn't been thoroughly looked at, but some may not be publicly reported on because it's in progress. I appreciate your comments sincerely. Everyone has been incredibly civil, realistic and reasonable. And I couldn't be more grateful for that. Thank you.

Mr. Ambrose reviewed the options and costs. To view slides, [please click here](#).

Mr. Heath made a Motion to adopt the alternative reorganization option included in the slides presented by Mr. Ambrose this evening. This Motion is Option 4 and includes:

1. **Moving the SAU office**
2. **Moving 7th and 8th grades to the High School facility**
3. **Pre-K-3 to Bakie School, Grades 4-6 to Memorial School**

4. **Using the money saved to fund K-8 academic intervention with 11 paraprofessionals and 6 teachers**
5. **Returning the excess estimated amount of \$450,000 to the taxpayers.**

Motion seconded by Dr. Brown.

Chair Broderick asked for comments from the School Board.

Mr. Heath-we have four options on the table. Of the four options, we have one that we absolutely do nothing, other than put in intervention and then pay a small fortune to repair an old building. Two, we have another option that allows us to move 7th and 8th to the high school and have zero updates to the Middle School with K through 12 intervention of 1.4 million. This is a total cost coming up to \$650,000 with the savings being \$750,000. The tax increase in Newton we've already seen on the slide is \$171 for the first year and \$129 for Kingston. A third option which we've been talking about for a long time, is essentially to move 7th and 8th grade up to the high school, and then have zero maintenance for the middle school and we'll have intervention for K -12, the \$1.4 M. What's this gives us is effective use of teachers, reduce bus routes by two approximately, and savings as outlined by the superintendent in the list given over the last few months. This results in a zero tax increase for both towns. The fourth option, which is the one that I made the Motion for, is zero renovation for the middle school with K -8 intervention. This is a \$950,000 per year one/two after Capital costs. Savings from the reorganization is still \$1.4 million and total savings is \$450,000. This is the tax savings. And the reason I'm not saying what the superintendent said is that the tax, the teachers' contract is approved for the year 2019. When you approved it in March, this will be for this year. So this year will not go into effect until 2020, next year. So there's no reason to have it set there

because it's already in the budget. So, as far as I'm concerned, this is a win, win for both the students and the taxpayers. They both win, not just one or two. But all of this is the program that has changed a lot from when it first started. We started 18 months ago. Where are all these people that have questions now 18 months ago? It is time to make a decision; it's time to stop kicking the can down the street. Let's vote and get this over with, one way or the other.

Ms. Alessio- I have a few things to say. Let me begin by first thanking all the individuals who took the time to send letters. I tried to respond however, briefly and may have missed a few. I came late to the table. I came in here in November. This was already an ongoing discussion. When I first heard about the proposals in the elementary school, I knew the toughest part was going to be convincing the parents even though then, it was almost two years away, still 15 months away. If we agreed to do this now, we're still 15 months away. Participate in the discussion, online, offline and behind the scenes, we still need all of you parents, all of you to come forward to help. I'm going to assume this is in the past. And honestly, I've told a number of you. I did not know how this was going to go with support because I have not talked with every board member, I have talked to two who convinced me we need to go forward. And I do believe that and there are two reasons why; real huge reasons besides the land here

and parent anxiety. There isn't a board member here that doesn't understand what you parents are going to go through with young children. Absolutely. And a lot of people in the town who no longer have children in the school, say to me "I don't have a dog in that hunt", it makes sense. But you might want to consider the parent. I don't think you guys are going to change your mind. And I say that sincerely from the bottom of my heart. This was a huge change, absolutely, no question. No question about it. But we've got two problems. One of which is increasing taxes. This is not a Newton-Kingston Taxpayers Association issue. It is a community issue. The way we fund our schools is through the property tax. We do not have a broad base tax. Whatever those people in Concord are doing, they're not sending any money back here. In fact, if anything, they're diverting it elsewhere. And that's not going to change. I personally would rather have my money. Because I can I can vote whether the chief needs another fire truck or if the police department needs another officer or if the schools need a new building. I'm voting here in town and I prefer to spend my money here. No question about it. But we have last for more than 400 students in the last 10 years and the projection is still to go lower. We've got 1600 Kids 600 in the high school 400, which are from Fremont. That means we only have four hundred kids in the high school. I just think it's my responsibility as a sitting board member to watch out for our money. And well, I agree it sometimes seems like the intervention piece is the carrot. When you look at what we've done with that budget was right. Mrs. Gannon was right. I looked at the last 12 years of our budgets, two budgets passed. How are we going to implement an intervention program when we can't even pass a budget? And they don't lose, most of them, by a lot of votes. We lost by six votes this year. I can't ignore the money part of this. There's just no way we have. We haven't even looked at some of the class sizes in the high school, we have in the elementary, and they're pretty low. And they're below the standard that we have set as a board for this district. That's a good thing on one hand, as a parent, and the education of the kids. It's not such a good thing from the taxpayers' point of view. And I can't believe I'm the one talking on behalf of the taxpayers as I've always been considered a spender when it came to the schools and I still want to spend, but only I don't. But you have to have a fiduciary responsibility to the taxpayers to spend wisely. If we only passed two budgets in the last 12 years how we would implement anything else? We have an abysmal rate of passing teacher contracts. We lose so many good people; they call Bedford High School, Sanborn West because they have so many of our teachers. Why? It is because they're making \$ 7,000 to \$10,000 more a year. Our guys lost 3 years of pay increases and they'll never catch up. That's not a good thing for us. By losing our budgets, either through a default or whatever, we let our buildings go. For those of you that don't know me, I served on the board through the 80's and 90's. We had spent for five or six years in a row, we allocated over \$100,000 a year for six years, \$600,000 in 1980s dollars, to repair the exterior of the Sanborn seminary building. It is beautiful, but when was the last time many of you saw the inside? It is deplorable. It's a shame that we let that building go. But prior boards and superintendents, no one here, let it go because they lost their budgets. So what are they going to do? They're going to cut out maintenance. And we have traditionally done that in our history and not just the last 20 years, probably because that's the easiest place to let go. So now we have a mausoleum, a building, on the National Register, and it's laying fallow. To make matters worse, a few years ago, someone forgot to put heat (oil) in the tank in the building and the pipes froze. That created even more than that. The town the Kingston asked

the district three years ago to purchasing or acquiring the property from the school district. We met for two and a half years, we came close, we came darn close and then we didn't have time to survey the land for the land swap. But I'm not even sure whether that would have passed in Kingston, quite honestly, because it would have been at least \$3.5 million dollars to clear that building of asbestos and who knows what else. That's without even taking off a piece of wood off from one of the window frames to see how rotted it was. As I said, I'm not even sure if Kingston would have taken the building even for zero or for a land swap. But now as we talked about moving into another building, where does that leave us? It scares me to death. Now we're going to have two buildings lying fallow. If we do nothing else after this meeting, we need to form a group, a task force, not a committee in conjunction with Facilities and get together some developers, some parents and some of the local real estate agents to actively solicit and elicit solutions to both the middle school and high school property.

We have to put on our big boy and girl boots and grow up and start dealing with the reality of our fiscal condition and it is in very bad shape. You would never get a mortgage with the kind of debt we have with our fallow properties. Mr. Masson is correct. Fremont does not have a seat at the table. They are renters but their input is important. We want to keep them happy and we've partnered with Fremont for over 40 years. Sometimes that partnership is like having a bad weekend with your husband or wife and you go away to Maine for kind of a cool off period. That's what happens between Sanborn and Fremont. It's not a bad thing. The nature of the town of Fremont with the Sanborn District is one. We really are an extended community. We don't want to screw our neighbors. I don't I don't think anyone on this board does. But our costs are high and part of their cost being high is the contract they have with us which pays for some of our capital costs. \$2500 a student. They don't have that at Pinkerton. They also have 3500 kids over there. So, we're hoping they stay with us. We did meet with them last week; it was a very productive discussion. Fremont raised some very good questions. The question for Fremont was if you move the seventh and eighth grade into the high school, does that mean that Fremont pays less cost per student? And what they were saying was, if we bring in 300 students from our middle school, there are 300 more students using our services that go into tuition. We said yes, if the Board goes forward and implements that change, it would have to be factored in. Now, in 6 years, the \$2500 piece of it goes away. But there may be other opportunities we can offer Fremont. And districts everywhere are always looking for other opportunities in other districts. The good news is people are coming to us. As bad as our math scores have been, and they've been deplorable, people still look to us because we have so many other assets available. And that's a credit to our administrative team into our teaching staff that they are really very, very good. And I know, all in all, we have a very, very good system. We're not the top in the state of New Hampshire; we're right in the middle. And I think we provide a very good comprehensive high school and elementary school education. And a lot of these kids are very successful when you come to graduation Friday; you're going to hear about some of the fantastic schools that these kids have gotten into. It is one of the better classes I have seen come out of Sanborn in a long

time. You should all be very proud. It is not a matter of going to UNH because it is the only one that will take them and I challenge anyone to say that to my face because that is not the case. We have very talented students. And you know, it's not just a credit to Sanborn and the staff and teachers, we have here. Because it is you parents who are behind your kids, there isn't anything we're going to do here that is going to make an improvement on your input with your children. I am going to support this and I am sorry if parents are going to be ticked off at me. I feel bad about it, I really do. But I do think it's in the best interest of the district. The intervention seems like it is a carrot, but we would never get it passed. If our kids can't calculate, it is not the way to go. They have to learn how to do fractions and multiplication. They can't just use cell phones. We can't communicate without spelling and we have to learn it in the elementary schools. The culture at Bakie and Memorial won't be lost. It may change a bit but you have dedicated staff with the youngsters; they're going to adapt better than the rest of us.

Mr. Fitzpatrick-Well, obviously I've given this subject a lot of thought. I've reached out to constituents, I've read and re-read all the different emails that came in and I tried to respond to all the ones that came in. I've gone back (I was not here on May 15th, I was out on vacation) and re-watched those videos, I've watched them a second time and come back to the presentation. I have looked at all the information, gone through all the Facebook pages to get a different feel for different comments that are being made. So, I understand the angst and the concern. I've gone to the frequently asked questions that Tom and the administration put out. I think that the information is good. I think it's been well put together. I do not believe that the current school organization is sustainable given what you see in NESDEC, or what you see in the planning, what you see in the aging of the population. I just don't see a way to go with the status quo, which was the option one, which was going to run intervention, and we're going to do investments in the middle school and we're going to have a teacher contract and it's already passed. The result of that will be, as was just stated, contracts will stop being passed and budgets will stop being passed. I do not believe it would be prudent use to invest the 1.6 million in the middle school, particularly when the high school is greatly underutilized and given the student enrollment projections at underutilization. So, I came to that conclusion that we needed support. Okay, we'll move in the seventh and eighth grade and that would make sense that would at least get us onto a path of a more sustainable situation. And then that proposal was enhanced with the proposal for the elementary school which seems from what I've been reading, and from listening to parents and reading the different letters and emails is a larger source of angst for a larger segment of the community. So, I spent a lot of time thinking that through and what does that mean, and what would happen with the reconfiguration. I see the savings that are identified, I see the intervention. We have heard much about what I think is also important; Centers of Excellence is the ability to have K-3 together, the ability of parents to have greater options in terms of, the concerns with bullying, or people not fitting in or what have you. If you have two

classes, and you don't really have a lot of options. If there are three or four classes available for that grade, you have more options for parents and different options. It gives people the same grade level, teaching levels, to be able to interact together to be able to try issues that are current to those particular grades and helps them to helps them to gel around the best teaching practices for that area. I know there's concern about having to move from third grade, fourth grade and having a move. So we can consider that a concern. And I understand the concern. It is also an opportunity, it's an opportunity for kids as they are getting to the third grade to look forward to change that, I'm going to be with the bigger kids now. I am moving into the next segment of my life. I am graduating! I'm now a graduate of grade three and moving into my school. So, I do think there are a lot of benefits here that we haven't really talked about, together as a group. I think the savings out there are also important, I do believe in intervention. I don't consider it to be propaganda. I think the intervention allows, if you look at things as a bell curve, intervention allows the teachers to take the biggest part of that bell curve and move it to the right and bring it to a higher level of performance. Intervention allows you to deal with details and allows you to go to the lower performing students and help them so they can get to the middle, so they can move into the bell curve to higher performing students and to be able to move them up further to be able to that they can to excel and exceed even further. I think intervention helps do that and I very much support intervention for that reason. I think it allows you to move the entire population, not just for who the interventionists are working with, but it allows the teachers to focus more on the majority of the students that are not requiring special assistance but can move faster and more forward as opposed to diverting teachers' attention. So I think that's about it. I've heard the arguments at 100%. Every penny of that savings should go to intervention. I got a number of emails on that and comments. I've gotten about the same number, if not more from people without kids in the school saying every penny of that should come back to the taxpayers, that it shouldn't be done for that, we're already paying for teachers, we're paying for an administration, they ought to be able to do that job, we shouldn't have to put more people in there to do it. I don't agree with that argument but I also am very concerned about tax burden. I do believe that they have a say and I do believe that we need them to have a say and we need them on board as a community. They fund the process, the majority of the funding comes from families, or households or properties or what have you without children, and you have to pull that in that cannot just be ignored. So I support greater intervention services and improved performance that I do believe will come from that. At the same time, I am sensitive to the heavy burden for taxpayers and we're going to need to find a proper balance. What that proper balance will be if it's exactly what's written on the board here on option four, I don't know what the profit margins would be. I want to take a look at what our actuals come out in, what the budget look likes, how do we develop that budget and where do we go from there. Ultimately, it has to be about the community and not just the students, the parents or the taxpayers. How do we thrive better as a community? The other thing that

hasn't been talked about that I believe is beneficial is right now our communities don't really join together until the middle school. So, you get the sixth, seventh and eighth. This will have people in the community join together; play dates, interaction, going from Kindergarten all the way up to their high school. This is going to be important to build that community development plans that are out there and the opportunities are out there. Kingston's got a whole lot of real estate on 125. Newton does not have a whole lot of real estate on 125. Look at the options; you can see there's already some digression going on between rates for the same \$300,000 house. It's important to build a tighter community and interaction between students. I think that the this plan for the school will do that, so for those that are upset with that thought process or disagree with it, I completely understand that. I don't think the comments that people make or have been making are unreasonable. I completely understand their concerns. From my perspective, taking all into a balance, I will be in favor of it.

Mr. Baker-I also wanted to say that the information that has come from the public comment and the answering of the questionnaires, and the emails that I read that were forwarded to the board have given me a lot to think about. Some of the stuff I've been thinking about for years and some of it is new. I think this is very important subject. I ran for the school board on four goals; stop the runaway tax increases, decision making transparent, improved academics, and deal with neglected facilities. Five years ago, when I started regularly attending school board meetings, people that questioned our school rankings were told test scores don't matter; competency based education is the answer. The schools just need more money. Academics would improve as new programs are implemented, starting in kindergarten. We just have to wait until the kids in kindergarten will be in the 11th grade to see the improvement. Along the way, the measurable results remained below the state average and some were dropping. People who questioned the status quo continue to bring out information illustrating the academic test results were not improving while our cost per student was rising and enrollments were dropping. Also, our costs were still substantially higher than surrounding districts. This questioning was labeled divisive. Administration at the time said those questioning we're trying to ruin the schools. Now we have an administration that recognizes that significant academic improvements are needed. This administration has done its own cost comparisons, acknowledges that the cost per student is substantially higher than surrounding communities. The community also has an independent study on the dropping enrollments of our facilities use. This NESDEC report was presenting to the community in September of 2018. The public has had significant input since then, including questionnaires, and multiple public forums. So tonight, we're here to decide what to do. Some want to remain status quo with no intervention, some want to delay the implementation of any changes, some want to implement the intervention but not the savings. Some want all the savings to go to the taxpayers. Recently, the administration presented cost estimates of implementing the intervention, including facilities improvements, but not the savings as an additional

\$786 a year on property taxes on a \$300,000 house in Newton and an additional \$597 for comparable houses in Kingston. The historical reality, as people have noted, is voters do not support budget increases like that. On the other hand, if the savings are implemented, but the facilities and interventions are ignored, that would tax payers about as much, but none of these options is sustainable, long term. So, the board has to decide what the best is for students and the community. Administration has explained that substantial benefits for students multiple times. NESDEC studies show the issue with the facilities and declining enrollments. Administration has provided the cost of intervention plus maintaining facilities. Each option is very expensive, including doing nothing. Financial pressures are one of the greatest stressors on families. Based on the per-student costs and neighboring communities, our taxpayers have been overpaying for years. That cost combined with comparative under performance of our schools, the students, market values of our homes and our community put our community at a disadvantage. The superintendent has demonstrated to me that he is a man of his word. He stated that multiple academic and financial benefits can be derived from closing the middle school and consolidating the elementary schools. He and his team of administrators have addressed hundreds of questions regarding these options. Any of the proposed changes are still over a year away from implementation. Over 12 months to gather additional input from all the people who have concerns and finalize the details to resolve in a successful transition. I also believe the superintendent when he says he knows the interventions that are needed. These are not experimental. This will not be making kids into lab rats as some previous more experimental implementations have been described by students over the years. These interventions are tested. And we were told they've been implemented with excellent results. So, I support the administration's proposal. I also see my job here, however, as a watchdog. I trust but will also verify. I'm going to be watching the costs and monitoring the results. I'm sure many of you here tonight will be watching too. I am going to want to see regular presentations showing that the interventions are working and that costs are being managed. I also want to know what's being done to make improvements to anything that isn't working. And continued public comment will be a big help that nothing gets overlooked. We have 12 months to finalize the changes before any major implementation. We're also talking about a lot of money. I believe the costs also need to be phased in. In my opinion, the majority of costs should be incurred as savings are realized. Based on community feedback I've received, the implementation to be fair to taxpayers, at the minimum could be a zero increase budget. Even after slowing budget growth the past couple of years, our school district is spending 14% more per student than surrounding towns. So, all of these things considered. My vote is to support the alternative option. That plan will provide financial support for the greatly needed interventions, as well as provide well deserved financial relief to families and other taxpayers.

Ms. Mahoney- I want to thank those who reached out with their thoughts over the past several weeks. We've heard from people with a variety of opinions, from those who urge us to move forward with the process to those who urge us to delay. Some want us to reinvest any savings, while others want the savings to be returned as tax relief. The feedback has been pretty evenly divided between those in support and those who are not. I appreciate everyone's position and I understand that this is a significant and emotional decision. It's emotional for me as well. My children spent their elementary years at Bakie, almost a decade from start to finish. I volunteered in their classrooms and with the PTA, and I appreciated the dedication of the teachers and the sense of community that supported them throughout those years. I'm sure the experience is the same in the Memorial community. Those experiences make this sort of change very difficult to contemplate. But the bottom line is what's best for the education of the students. We have an unacceptable number of students not attaining grade level performance, especially in the earlier grades, and a lack of ability to progress in the outcomes for students overall. We have an identified need for increased intervention support to address this, which requires a significant investment of funds. We have a middle school that needs a hefty investment to maintain it, while we have declining enrollments resulting in excess capacity there, and in our other schools. We also have a community of taxpayers who feel overburdened, and are unlikely to respond positively to the magnitude of budget increase that would be required to maintain status quo with respect to our facilities, and to make the changes that address the educational needs we've identified. The proposal to consolidate the elementary grades into single schools and move grades 7 and 8 to the high school helps us meet those needs. It allows us to maximize the efficient use of our resources, while freeing up funding that will enable us to fund those educational needs without an additional burden on our taxpayers. And there are even more impactful educational benefits. It also enables us to provide more consistency in those elementary grades, by having all of our districts' students and their teachers grouped by grade in a single building. Developmentally, 4-8 year olds have different needs from 9 to 11 year olds, and each school will be able to tailor education delivery more closely to those developmental ages. Teachers at each grade level will also be able to work more collaboratively than they're able to when they're divided into separate buildings. We have an option to delay, for more time to study and discuss. To those advocating for that- we've heard you and we understand. This is a big decision and we all want to get it right. I hope everyone realizes the tremendous amount of thought, research, study, and deliberation that's gone into this process. For the past year, there have been many presentations for the board members and the public, to help cull out the factors that are critical for a decision like this. And the bottom line remains - how to best meet the educational needs of the students with the resources available to us, without creating an additional burden on our taxpayers.

We have a proposal that our administration has confidence in. Response to Intervention (RTI) is an established, widely utilized program with research to support it. RTI programs generally use scientifically based instruction for all students, keep track of student progress using valid and reliable measures, use data to identify students who don't meet well-developed standards and benchmarks, and then provide those students with specially designed, evidence-based, and intensive intervention. So the question becomes - how much longer should we wait to put it in place? For the students who struggle, who lack the reading or math skills they need to grow and be successful. How much more time should we take, while they lose more and more ground? For the students who need a more rigorous pace, who become bored because their needs aren't being met due a lack of enrichment resources. And for the teachers, is it fair to leave them in limbo, waiting for a decision sometime down the road? I believe we've been provided with the information to make an informed decision, and it's not right to kick this can down the road any longer. I have faith in the superintendent and our administrators, and I support the plan they've presented to us. Should the board vote in favor of the proposal, keep in mind that it's just the beginning of the process. There will be time for careful consideration and opportunity for involvement, as the logistics are reviewed and plans are fine-tuned and finalized. Our administrators have already shown their willingness to work with the community to address the concerns that have been raised. I hope the community will come together for the sake of the students and the pursuit of the best outcomes for them.

Dr. Brown-I have heard a variety of opinions on these proposals, including those expressed, tonight. I'd like to start by giving a timeline which might be helpful to show this decision has been long and deliberative - not rushed or made in haste. First, let me mention that as a teacher, I have never considered the "building" or "classroom" in which I found myself especially important to me, or to my students. I've taught dual-enrollment courses to high school and community college students for years in many locations, 1) an old Quonset Hut during August (in 93-degree heat - no A/C), 2) modern university classrooms, 3) in older high school classrooms at night and 4) even in a rented Verizon Wireless corporate conference room in a commercial complex along the highway (when our district leased short-term space for instruction). I have learned that it is not the building or the classroom which is important for learning, it is the quality of the instructor. In 2015, I noticed a puzzle. Our towns had growing tax burdens but falling enrollments - yet the growth in spending per-pupil was not providing our children improving academic outcomes. This paradox was much discussed around town. In 2016, I joined the Board and asked the question: Our students are bright, cooperative, and motivated. Why wasn't Sanborn's academic data matching or exceeding that of top-performing districts? Particularly when our per-pupil annual costs exceeded those of higher performing districts? A new Superintendent, Mr. Ambrose was hired and we began exploring our "academic stagflation": rising prices, without increased results. Our first task: data gathering.

In December 2017, the Board approved \$30,000 for the New England School Development Council, NESDEC to conduct a study “looking at enrollments, cost per student, and future recommendations for facility use.” (Board Minutes, December 6, 2017, emphasis added) In spring 2018, NESDEC toured our facilities, asked questions and conferred with stakeholders. In late summer 2018, the district widely publicized our first Board meeting of fall would feature the presentation of the NESDEC findings. On August 15, 2018, John Kennedy and Karen LeDuc of NESDEC presented their 80-page report at a well-attended meeting. The audience listened, and asked questions. The Report was posted for the community, as were the Board’s minutes and video. On September 19, the Board held another large public meeting on the NESDEC findings. The workshop, entitled, “Community Discussion of NESDEC School Facilities Study Options” was heavily attended and led by moderator Todd DeMitchell. What did NESDEC find? Please recall that NESDEC was tasked with “looking at enrollments, cost per student, and future recommendations for facility use.” (emphasis added) The Report’s recommendations emphasized that our District was excessively wealthy in facilities (school buildings) but “poor” in support staff and educational programs. Rising costs and rising taxes would not be sustainable in light of declining enrollment – but adjustment of our “capital-labor” ratio could be done. NESDEC explained 9 possible configurations for facilities reorganization to correct the facilities/programs imbalance, liberate funds to improve learning, and accommodate long-term projected enrollment drops. I want to emphasize the following, and everyone should pay attention:

Of the 9 possible configurations, 6 of the 9, or 67% of the NESDEC options proposed “grade regrouping” - or the grouping (consolidation) of grade levels, across our Elementary schools. Actually, there were a total of 10 options if you include two more options on pages 57-58. So, 8 of 10 options encouraged we consolidate grade levels across school buildings.

I emphasize this, because some citizens have said this part of our process was “rushed” or “hidden.” The changes are in fact overdue. The NESDEC study has been publicly available since August, and the options discussed, and raised at board meetings, budget hearings and public forums. Board members have spent many hours at home studying them all carefully, asking “What configuration would give us the biggest bang for the educational buck?”

Second, please note the NESDEC Report also repeatedly emphasized that

“Grade span (re-)configuration affords facilitation of collaboration, coordination, and communication amongst grade level educators.”

The benefit to consolidation was also emphasized by NESDEC for the new Jr-Sr High complex (particularly for “math, sciences, etc.” pages 67 and 70).

While they acknowledged variables such as bussing would need reprogramming – and I personally remain acutely concerned about bus scheduling, as well as preserving 6th Grade athletics and monitoring student use of a shared High School library - Elementary Grade regrouping to benefit our students and staff performance dominates the NESDEC menu. In short, Elementary reorganization has been front-and-center since August of 2018. And, Warrant #8 was drafted and its passage urged to explicitly allow “flexibility” (you see that word used often), in reorganizing programs and facilities to advance student learning, while being fiscally manageable to citizens. New Hampshire’s Shaker School District won “School Board of the Year” in 2018 and enjoys double the assessment results we obtain - with buildings organized into slightly larger classes, coupled with vastly increased paraprofessional support and intervention services. This reorganization proposal - to me - is an emergency situation. We are in urgent need of facilities reorganization. And frankly our students’ progress demands it. I see enormous gains to grouping our Grades Pre-K to 3 at Bakie, and 4 to 6 at Memorial, and I am excited to vote in support the Alternate reorganization option.

It allows

- ◆ Sharing of “best practices,” greater synergy and mentoring, among specialized educators of the same grade levels
- ◆ Support services can be delivered more efficiently by specialists and interventionists of specific grades and it economizes on specialists’ time
- ◆ Parents will have greater choice of a teacher at each grade that best fits their child’s temperament and personality and
- ◆ “K to 12 friendships” will develop among students, which should help reduce bullying

Most importantly, parents across our towns with children will form greater bonds. Newton and Kingston at times seem Balkanized; but we are not “two towns,” we are one District. The fear I’ve heard mentioned about losing an elementary school seems to ignore the huge benefits our students will realize, including the saved funds - which will be allocated to K-8 Early Literacy Intervention support. I say “will be” – because I consider my vote a “bargain” I am striking with our Superintendent and our community. The ‘Social Contract’ I am supporting is a reduction in unneeded facilities in exchange for greatly improved elementary grade literacy – which should lift all assessment results, K to 12. 90% of our 2019 High School grads are projected to satisfy the indicators for success as defined in the new “Framework for Career and College Readiness” (which include the Armed Services assessments, participation in internships, Early College (Dual Enrollment) courses, as well as the SATs). I would like resource re-allocation to focus on immediately improving Early Literacy for the next two to three years.

We are also reviewing the direction our Math Program will take – a subject with which many of our high school students still struggle - and this first needs greater discussion and a decision. “Early Intervention,” however, should be a successful supplement – not a substitute - for traditional classroom work. Jack Kozek and others have expressed concerns about this, and I can assure you - we will be watching the academic data carefully to ensure we create dividends from the program. We would also like to increase support for enrichment programs, SST participation and early-college opportunities as our students show interest – and, we’re exploring the possibility of offering an Associate’s Degree to our High School grads! Finally, I have reviewed data on several districts which have successfully migrated to a single, Jr. High/High School campus [see below] including Newmarket, Sunapee, and others. All have been successful in reorganization and their Math and English proficiency results remain strong with most seeing improvements in recent years. The argument for reorganization is one of “best practices” or - what has worked effectively at high-performing school districts: fewer buildings, modified class sizes, with more academic program investment. My goal is to deprive Shaker another “School Board of the Year” award – so we can claim it for ours. As Mr. Ambrose has said, “Staying the same is easier, but it means the same results.”

Peter Broderick- The information on the NESDEC options are a book of information, as is the reorganization information. This, along with hundreds and hundreds and hundreds of emails, thousands and thousands and thousands of hours of work. This has not really been a rush to judgment. Dr. Brown talks about back in 2016 when she and I joined the board at the same time. So my question is do we need intervention? Look at the study that we received a couple of weeks ago, you saw the 34 students coming out of the first grade were behind and that number changed within one or two all the way to the eighth grade. That conforms with all the studies nationally; you're behind in the first grade, you're behind in the eighth grade. That's what we're trying to eliminate. You say, slow down. I understand that. What I hear when you say slow down are those students who need this intervention not getting the intervention. Because there's no way that people are going to vote \$1.4 million for intervention unless we can show them some savings and No means no in this town and in this state. So, if they say no, then we couldn't do it if we wanted to. What do we say to those students are behind, sorry, kids, but just going to have to keep on going the way it was. I was one of those kids. My mother walked me to school when I was young and I finally figured out that if I didn't go, she was going to keep on walking me. I hated school. I was a terrible student. Thank God for the United States Army. So, I know what it's like to go to school every day cringing because I wasn't prepared and I was behind. It is awful. We cannot allow those children to keep doing that. So if you wait two years, the 34 that come in next year, the year after and the year after plus the ones that are already in the system, are suffering. And we can do it at no cost. Because the savings we have from the closing of the middle school is going to compensate that. Our budget is up high because we've got five buildings that we have to maintain. We’re putting money into facilities that we should be putting into education. Our job is to educate kids. That's what we'll be doing with this money. I've talked about this book to the people here, maybe some of you may have read it; it's called Who Moved My Cheese. If you haven't read it, please read it. It's

about change and the anxiety of change. And this is anxiety. But I have to tell you, this is an improvement. We're not changing anything. The children will be going into the Bakie school and the Memorial School, and the teacher will be meeting them at the door. And the parents will be meeting them at the door and they'll be getting help from those teachers in that classroom. But we're hopefully and I have to say hopefully because let's face it, folks, a lot of this is anxiety. Your crystal ball, my crystal ball, you know, we're doing the best we know now and if some of you are my students, how many times did you hear me say you make a decision you find out later on it was the wrong decision. But if you can look back and say, based on what I knew then, it was the best decision I could make. Things change but you can't say, "Oh boy, did I mess up". No, it was based on what you know at the time. We're going to be making a decision and nobody's got a crystal ball, but I am anxious on two levels; that it is really going to work and match up and what if it doesn't? All the studies say it does. I've actually gone to teachers that I know; former teachers whose school's did this and they said the test scores went up phenomenally. I can only tell you that you put us here. You know, the easiest decision I could ever make, I put 15 years on the board of selectmen but the easiest decision I could make would be Hey, let's put it on a warrant. Let the people decide and washing my hands like that guy did a couple thousand years ago. Let the people decide; that's not what you elected me for. Anybody can make easy decisions. This is a tough, tough, tough decision for all of us. There's a saying in politics; every decision you make you're going to tick off half the people. Eventually, you're going to tick up off half about the people here –us! But that's not what you elected me for. We have gone through this for months and months, decisions, discussion. And you've heard me say right in this room, everybody knows what to do with the bull except the guy who's got the bull by the horns and right now, we've got the bull by the horns and we have to make the decision. We didn't make this in a vacuum. Think about it this, a couple of years ago would you've been able to email the superintendent and have him answer that? He has answered thousands. We've done everything I can think of. This to me is an improvement for the students, helping those who need the most help. You know some kids you give them a flashlight and put them in a closet with a book, they're going to learn. But the kids who hate school, who don't have a good time in school. That's what this is for. We can no longer let them fall through the cracks and this intervention, I believe, like a facet on a diamond, it's a facet. If you keep putting good things on the diamond, it is going to be hopefully, more brilliant and be worth more money. That's what we are preparing our kids for, the future.

Chair Broderick asked to move the Motion on the District Reorganization.

Vote: All in Favor

9. **OTHER BUSINESS**

9.1 Next Meeting Agenda

- ◆ School Board/Subcommittee Dates and times
- ◆ Budget Calendar FY 2020-21
- ◆ PD Date Move
- ◆ Fund Balance
- ◆ Goal Setting
- ◆ Primex Insurance
- ◆ Authorization to Hire/Summer Calendar
- ◆ Internships
- ◆ Rocket launch video
- ◆ Climbing Wall at Bakie

9.2 Announcements

- 9.2.1 The next Sanborn Regional School Board meeting will be held on Wednesday, June 12th in the Sanborn Regional High School Library from 6-9 PM.

11 **NON-PUBLIC SESSION**- RSA 91-A: 3 II (c) (d)

Motion made by Mr. Heath to enter into Non-Public Session at 8:04 pm, seconded by Ms. Mahoney. A Roll Call vote was held of all members present.

Vote: All in Favor

12 **ADJOURNMENT**- Meeting adjourned 8:05 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.