

2 BROOKLINE SCHOOL BOARD

3  
4 JUNE 22, 2010

5  
6 MEETING MINUTES

7  
8 A regular meeting of the Brookline School Board was held on Tuesday, June 22, 2010 at 6:06 p.m. at the Captain Samuel  
9 Douglass Academy.

10  
11 Chairman Dave Partridge presided:

12  
13 Members of the Board Present: Beth Lukovits, Vice-Chair  
14 Forrest Milkowski, Secretary  
15 Wanda Meagher

16  
17 Members of the Board Absent: Ernie Pistor

18  
19 Also in Attendance: Susan Hodgdon, SAU41 Superintendent  
20 Mark McLaughlin, Business Administrator  
21 Jeanne Saunders, Director of Special Education  
22 Liz Perry, Interim Principal, Richard Maghakian Memorial School  
23 Lorraine Wenger, Principal, Captain Samuel Douglass Academy  
24 James Doig, Assistant Principal/Special Education Coordinator, RMMS  
25 Kristina Henry, Assistant Principal/Special Education Coordinator, CSDA  
26  
27  
28

29 AGENDA ADJUSTMENTS

30  
31 Chairman Partridge suggested moving the discussion on RMMS staffing to the front of the agenda given the public  
32 attendance on the issue.

33  
34 RMMS Staffing for 2010-2011

35  
36 Chairman Partridge informed the public the last meeting resulted in a number of staffing possibilities being discussed. He  
37 noted the district does not have the funding for an additional teacher. Student/teacher ratio is larger than desired in the 1<sup>st</sup>  
38 and 2<sup>nd</sup> grade. Several potential ideas arose including the possibilities of merging Readiness students into the 1<sup>st</sup> grade,  
39 going to 3 Kindergarten classes instead of 4 and doing some shuffling to have an additional teacher in 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> grade,  
40 and a larger Kindergarten class size.

41  
42 As it is not in the board's purview to decide what scenario makes the most educational sense, the administration was  
43 asked to make a determination (taking into account the needs of the students) and return to the board with a  
44 recommendation.

45  
46 Superintendent Hodgdon informed the board she and Principal Desrochers have continued to track enrollment numbers  
47 as well as student needs. In Principal Desrochers' report to the Superintendent (dated June 17<sup>th</sup>) she stated enrollment  
48 numbers to be: PreK - 20, Kindergarten - 65, Readiness - 10 enrolled, Grade 1 - 101, Grade 2 - 100, and Grade 3 - 89.  
49

50  
51 As to the number of sections: Pre-K - 1 teacher/2 sections (3 and 4 yr. olds), Kindergarten - 2 teachers/4 sections (class  
52 size 16, 16, 16, and 17), Readiness - 1 teacher/1 section (class size 10), Grade 1 - 5 teachers/5 sections (class size 20,  
53 20, 20, 20, and 21), Grade 2 - 4 teachers/4 sections (class size 25, 25, 25, and 25), and Grade 3 - 4 teachers/4 sections  
54 (class size 22, 22, 22, and 23).

55  
56 In her discussions with the principals, who held discussions with staff regarding the needs of the students, the primary  
57 question asked was what is most fair and equitable for all students at RMMS. She has passed on to the board Chair the  
58 administration's recommendation that, with solid support in place, the 10 readiness students could be absorbed into the  
59 1<sup>st</sup> grade and the readiness teaching position could be moved to the 2<sup>nd</sup> grade to alleviate 4 sections of 25 students. She  
60 has discussed the recommendation with the incoming Principal, and, given the inability to fund an additional teaching  
position, she concurred with the recommendation of the administration.

1 Chairman Partridge noted class size for a combined Readiness/1<sup>st</sup> Grade would be 22 compared to the current 1<sup>st</sup> grade  
2 class size of 20. Ms. Meagher questioned if the recommendation was to place all enrolled readiness students into one 1<sup>st</sup>  
3 grade class or to spread them across all classes. Superintendent Hodgdon did not yet have a recommendation for how  
4 that would work, as she desired the opportunity to discuss the issue with incoming Principal Perry who has quite a bit of  
5 experience in early elementary education.

6  
7 When asked if the administration's recommendation would remain the same if additional funding were identified,  
8 Superintendent Hodgdon stated that was not an option that was provided/considered. Ms. Lukovits stated the readiness  
9 program has been discussed, it is a program the board believes in and has sold to parents who have expectations, and  
10 the recommendation is now to place those students into a 1<sup>st</sup> grade class that already has 100 students. She commented  
11 she was still debating whether or not funds would be available, and if, at minimum, funding could be identified for a part-  
12 time kindergarten teacher. She noted surplus funding identified within the special education budget.

13  
14 Superintendent Hodgdon responded the recommendation provided was what was requested of her, however, she  
15 anticipated, with further discussion; the board may come up with an alternative proposal. When asked what the  
16 recommendation of the administration would be if additional funding were identified, Superintendent Hodgdon stated she  
17 would support an additional teaching position for the 2<sup>nd</sup> grade.

18  
19 Chairman Partridge stated the amount needed for an additional teaching position to be \$71,000. The funding for the  
20 proposal that was brought up at the last meeting whereby a part-time kindergarten teacher would move into a full-time  
21 teacher would mean the addition of half a teacher at a cost in the range of \$20,000 $\pm$ . He asked whether the  
22 administration looked at the affect on Kindergarten if it were to go up to 3 classes. Superintendent Hodgdon stated the  
23 issue was discussed with staff, needs of students reviewed, and a recommendation forwarded to her. She considered all  
24 information provided in arriving at her recommendation. She added incoming Principal Perry and she have yet to have  
25 the opportunity to discuss it.

26  
27 Mr. Milkowski questioned whether placement of readiness students into 1<sup>st</sup> grade classes would change the experience.  
28 He questioned how and if the students would be divided into the 1<sup>st</sup> grade classes, what the environment would be, and  
29 whether there would be a loss in quality of education. He remarked by doing this the board would meet the objectives of  
30 the voters at the district meeting in that they did not want an additional teaching position.

31  
32 Incoming Principal Perry informed the board it would be a high priority for her to look at children's plans and understand  
33 how to best meet their needs to ensure proper supports are in place. She noted a lot could be said for having a good mix  
34 of children in a classroom. There are many developmental issues in early childhood and you can't really know what the  
35 summer will do and how the children will present in September. She added she would be reluctant to advocate for 10  
36 readiness students to be placed together in one 1<sup>st</sup> grade class as opposed to with 10 of their peers as she is not quite  
37 sure how parents might respond to a class that looks like that. She stated she felt they were all age appropriate for 1<sup>st</sup>  
38 grade, but developmentally they are at very different places.

39  
40 Mr. Milkowski noted similar work is done in other grades already in the sense of special education, IEPs, and how  
41 children, as they move through the system, have tailored individual learning programs. He questioned if it is believed that  
42 could occur in a readiness/1<sup>st</sup> grade class. Incoming Principal Perry stated she has yet to meet the entire staff, but would  
43 say RMMS is well resourced in terms of reading and math specialists as well as a good number of special educators. She  
44 is confident, with those supports in place, an early intervention focus could be in place and the best experience could be  
45 provided based on the needs of the students.

46  
47 Ms. Meagher noted the readiness class size has doubled since the last meeting, and 10 students is a viable readiness  
48 class. She would not be in favor of combining readiness students with 1<sup>st</sup> grade students given the number of students  
49 now enrolled. As far as 2<sup>nd</sup> grade numbers, they are very close; 25 students in a classroom versus 22 is a difference but  
50 not a tremendous difference. She did not know the number of paras supporting the classrooms, but did know there are  
51 paras moving up with some of those students, which would mean there would be additional support in those classrooms.  
52 With the number of readiness students enrolled being 10, she would not recommend combining readiness and 1<sup>st</sup> grade.

53  
54 Superintendent Hodgdon stated both she and Principal Desrochers struggled with their recommendation because of the  
55 current number of students enrolled in readiness. They reviewed the needs of the 10 students to determine, if the  
56 alternative were necessary, could they, with support, succeed in a 1<sup>st</sup> grade classroom, and it appears with the supports in  
57 place and time to mature (which occurs over the course of the summer and more importantly over the course of the first  
58 few months of school), the recommendation would be the best possible equitable decision for all students. They felt

1 having 25 students per section in the 2<sup>nd</sup> grade was on the high side especially given the needs of that particular grade.  
2 She stated they were asked to provide a recommendation and have done that, but with reservations.

3  
4 Chairman Partridge noted there is no solution free of reservations. Ms. Lukovits remarked the superintendent has  
5 previously mentioned work done in 1<sup>st</sup> grade in that they are beginning to read, etc. That would be the group she would  
6 feel less comfortable with when considering combining grades. She suggested, in 2<sup>nd</sup> grade, where the numbers and  
7 needs are high, the addition of two full time para-educators (would have at least one certified teacher) would be a less  
8 costly solution.

9  
10 Superintendent Hodgdon stated one drawback to that would be that para-educators are hired for the position of para-  
11 educator and not teacher. She added the district is on a trajectory of trying to double and triple dose kids in K and 1<sup>st</sup>  
12 grade to get them to mastery so we don't have the issue of sending kids on to 2<sup>nd</sup> grade who have not achieved the level  
13 of learning to read that the district is seeking for all students. She was concerned with unintended consequences. Ms.  
14 Lukovits suggested the para-educators could be utilized to guide reading groups, etc.

15  
16 Chairman Partridge commented it might be less expensive to go back to the idea of 3 kindergarten classes and funding a  
17 full teaching position rather than two aid positions. Ms. Lukovits noted the kindergarten classrooms have a lot of support  
18 through paras and parents, and perhaps a shuffle could occur in another area. When asked if there have been class  
19 sizes as large as 22 in kindergarten, Ms. Meagher stated there have been.

20  
21 Ms. Barbara Bullard-Koonz, Kindergarten Teacher

22  
23 Noted there had never been more than 20 students in a class. In the ten years she has been in the district; at one point it  
24 was not to have more than 16 and then they went to 20. In the last couple of years they have been averaging 36-40  
25 children each. Ms. Meagher noted there were children added in the middle of the year that brought the class size over 20.

26  
27 Superintendent Hodgdon noted the district is approaching 2014 where all students will be required to meet standards.  
28 She added the ideal solution would be to add another staff member.

29  
30 Ms. Meagher stated the discussion was tabled two meetings ago, and should be brought back up. Mr. Milkowski  
31 commented the addition of a position was voted down at the annual meeting. Ms. Lukovits remarked it had been raised  
32 as a parent initiative, which was likely perceived differently than a board initiative. Chairman Partridge clarified what was  
33 voted down was an increase in the budget. Mr. Milkowski agreed, and suggested if funding could be identified within the  
34 existing budget the discussion could continue.

35  
36 Mr. Milkowski spoke to the expectation of returning unexpended appropriations to the general fund, and the need to be  
37 careful not to create the impression the budget is completed in such a way additional funds are available for use. Ms.  
38 Meagher noted the potential for use of surplus funding in the insurance line. The line was budgeted utilizing estimates.  
39 Actual costs were lower than estimates. Superintendent Hodgdon remarked she understood not only the expectation that  
40 unexpended appropriations be returned to the general fund, but also that the taxpayers/voters would not want the district  
41 to save money next year only to need added supports later on in the student's academic career, which would then take  
42 that money back. She believes any wise person would say catch students while they are young and make sure they are  
43 doing well as they leave RMMS and go on to CSDA.

44  
45 When asked where funding might be identified, Mr. McLaughlin stated a \$55,000± savings was achieved in the insurance  
46 line item due to the rate differential of the 17.6% estimated/budgeted increase and the 10.6% actual increase. The  
47 difference between the needed \$72,000 (teaching position inclusive of benefits, etc.) and the \$55,000 would have to be  
48 identified elsewhere within the existing budget. When the subject of the unreserved fund balance came up, Mr.  
49 McLaughlin remarked if a product were to be ordered today and not ship until August, the funding could be encumbered.  
50 However, if the cost is for labor that will be incurred, monies from this year could not be encumbered for future labor  
51 obligations.

52  
53 Director Saunders informed the board of a surplus in the special education budget due to an out-of-district student  
54 moving. She had proposed the addition of a full-time school psychologist position to address the large number of  
55 evaluations. She noted additional assistance is needed with Functional Behavior Assessments, consultations with teams,  
56 etc. Those services were contracted out this year. Hiring a psychologist would result in savings in the long run. She  
57 stated, if it would be in the best interest all students, she would reduce her request to that of a part-time position to be able  
58 to earmark some of the surplus funds to the additional teaching position.

1 Chairman Partridge noted a .5 position would be less than half the cost of a full time position as benefit costs would not be  
2 included. When asked for her opinion, Superintendent Hodgdon stated her belief combing these funds with the insurance  
3 surplus would be a viable solution. She noted she would not want to leave the special education budget without some  
4 level of contingency, as there is almost always needs that arise as the year progresses. She felt the proposal would be  
5 academically the best thing for students.

6  
7 Chairman Partridge questioned whether going from a full-time position to a part-time one would affect the ability to hire a  
8 qualified individual. Director Saunders stated she believed it would be challenging, but given the current economy,  
9 possible.

10  
11 PUBLIC COMMENT

12  
13 Ms. Cathy Ingram, 16 Glenn Drive, Milford, NH - stated she is a first grade teacher and has not been asked to provide  
14 input into the makeup of the classrooms. She has heard there were a lot of readiness refusals, which concerns her.  
15 Chairman Partridge informed her there were 6 refusals. Ms. Ingram felt that to be a considerable amount. She  
16 commented, in the first few weeks of school, the students go through a screening and testing and consultations with  
17 parents take place. Many times it is asked that students return to Readiness. If there were to be 4 students that fell into  
18 that category, the size of the readiness program would be 14, which is a high number.

19  
20 Kathleen LaPointe, 32 Parker Road - stated her concern with the social implications of placing readiness students in 1<sup>st</sup>  
21 grade classrooms; having them participate for a full year in 1<sup>st</sup> grade and then watch their peers move on to 2<sup>nd</sup> grade is  
22 much different than being in a readiness classroom. Chairman Partridge stated readiness students would not  
23 automatically be retained in 1<sup>st</sup> grade. As was done the last time such a program was implemented, a year-end  
24 assessment would be performed to determine whether individual students moved on to 2<sup>nd</sup> grade.

25  
26 Kristine Murray, 6 Colburn Road - spoke about her two children; one of which went through the readiness program. She  
27 commented had she put her child in a 1<sup>st</sup> grade class when he was in need of readiness, the conversations she had with  
28 him would have been very different. She noted parents are preparing their children to participate in a readiness class and  
29 the children would find it confusing to be told, in the eleventh hour, they will in fact be going into a 1<sup>st</sup> grade classroom.  
30 She added the school either believes in such a program or they do not. That decision should have been made a long time  
31 ago.

32  
33 Ms. Susan Conley - informed the board she has been a teacher for over 15 years and has worked with 4<sup>th</sup>, 5<sup>th</sup>, 6<sup>th</sup>, and 7<sup>th</sup>  
34 grade, and college students. Part of the reason she relocated to Brookline was because of the Readiness program. She  
35 works with children who have lost the readiness opportunity and has heard parents say had I known what I now know; I  
36 would have supported my child going to readiness. As a teacher for that long of a period, she is grateful for the board's  
37 consideration, as she has seen the impact readiness has on students.

38  
39 Ryan Kelley, 4 Captain Seaver Road - questioned the dollar amounts being discussed. Director Saunders stated if she  
40 went with a .5 psychologist position she could contribute an estimated \$40,000.

41  
42 Chairman Partridge remarked, adding that to the \$50,000 from the insurance line would make the addition of a position a  
43 viable alternative. He noted the need to support a certain contingency percentage within the special education budget.

44  
45 Ms. Mary Kay MacFarlane, 37 Milford Street - commented 3 sessions of kindergarten with 65 students creates class sizes  
46 that are too big. She noted her son was in this year's kindergarten class in a room of 20, which she would not have been  
47 comfortable with had she not know the specific teacher; a seasoned veteran professional. She commented readiness is a  
48 wonderful gift for those children who are not quite ready for 1<sup>st</sup> grade. It gets them into school full-time and provides the  
49 skills necessary to enter 1<sup>st</sup> grade with confidence.

50  
51 Combing those children into the current class brings the total to 108. That would surpass the incoming 6<sup>th</sup> grade as the  
52 largest class in the district (106). She expressed sympathy for the parents of 2<sup>nd</sup> grade students, but feels if the district  
53 cannot place another teacher in the largest class in the district she would be hard pressed to support putting another  
54 teacher in a grade where the class size would be 25. She spoke to the adjustment for children that go from a 2.5-hour  
55 program to a full day.

1 Mr. Jim Kely, 2 Mead Drive – stated his belief 5 teachers for the 2<sup>nd</sup> grade is just as important. He believes adding one  
2 teaching position would be equitable for everyone. He noted the difficulty in trying to make a decision at the last minute,  
3 and suggested the process be improved so that information could be provided to taxpayers 2-3 months sooner to allow  
4 them to make an informed decision. He felt it unfair to think taxpayers would not have approved it.  
5

6 Mr. Milkowski stated complete information was not available, however there was an indication there would be a need and  
7 a motion was made to address that need.  
8

9 Ms. Madge Smith, 77 Pepperell Road - was one of the parents involved in making that motion at the board meeting. She  
10 felt the town would have voted to support the recommended increase had it been presented as part of the school board  
11 budget. She felt it to be legitimate to hire a teacher. She remarked when the large 6<sup>th</sup> grade class went through 2<sup>nd</sup>, 3<sup>rd</sup>  
12 and 4<sup>th</sup> grades they did have 5 teachers.  
13

14 She questioned the state's recommended class size for 2<sup>nd</sup> grade. Ms. Lukovits stated it as 25. Chairman Partridge  
15 added the school board's recommended class size is 22-25.  
16

17 Ms. Jenny Dalo, Special Education Teacher, RMMS – stated special education is a large part of the issue. Larger class  
18 sizes will increase that budget. There will be additional testing and need. She felt special education staff couldn't be  
19 utilized effectively in a class of that size. She believes the budget would skyrocket if larger class sizes exist for the  
20 younger children.  
21

22 Mr. Harold McNabb, 39 South Main Street - felt increased class sizes would set a bad precedent. Increasing class size to  
23 25 would make larger class sizes more acceptable. He felt it to be a fairness issues to have relatively standard class  
24 sizes across the board.  
25

26 Mr. Tad Putney, 8 Milford Street - was concerned with whether adding a teacher in the 2<sup>nd</sup> grade was a one-year anomaly  
27 in terms of headcount. He believed it clear, based on the latest numbers, it would not be. Adding another 2<sup>nd</sup> grade  
28 teacher for the coming year would also address what is reasonable to expect to be the same problem next year.  
29

30 Chairman Partridge commented the board would have been pleased to add another teacher, but were facing a budget  
31 year with recent experience of a school budget being voted down. Ms. Meagher added the prior year's budget was  
32 reduced significantly more than the \$71,000 being discussed. Chairman Partridge stated the issue to be whether or not  
33 they can add a teaching position without increasing the current budget.  
34

35 Mr. Milkowski noted both Hollis and the COOP had proposed a budget with essentially 0% increase whereas Brookline  
36 brought in a budget with a 6% increase. As the only district proposing an increase, the intent was to keep the budget as  
37 tight as possible.  
38

39 Chris Pestana, 49 Rocky Pond Road - questioned whether it was believed if taxpayers understood the readiness program  
40 could be cut, the outcome would have been the same. He did not believe that would have been the case. He commented  
41 one of the biggest redeeming features of the town is the educational program. He did not believe educated voters would  
42 have let this scenario play out. Chairman Partridge stated the problem to be when the budget was put together the  
43 readiness numbers were not known. He added the numbers for Kindergarten were not known and the numbers for 1<sup>st</sup>  
44 grade students change every year. Normally between 5-20 1<sup>st</sup> grade students show up who were not in the kindergarten  
45 system.  
46

47 Mr. Pestana questioned whether it was possible to approach the town to revisit the budget. Chairman Partridge stated  
48 that process is very long and complicated and requires the ability to prove to the Department of Education that the district  
49 has unanticipated circumstance(s) that justify such a request.  
50

51 Principal Wenger commented in the prior budget season, a list of items to be cut was provided and the budget was cut  
52 even further. As a result teachers gave up raises to retain teaching personnel.  
53

54 Mr. Pestana commented the readiness program has been in New Hampshire forever. He does not believe anyone would  
55 advocate cutting that. Chairman Partridge stated, while the board was discussing merging readiness for one year, it was  
56 not discussing nor would it discuss the idea of actually dropping the readiness program. It was merged one year, as the  
57 readiness numbers were 3. When the option was raised this year, it was believed the number of readiness students was

5, which is small for a viable class. He reiterated the discussion was about merging the readiness program for one year not elimination of the program.

Shannon Sinclair, 1 Lancy Brook Road – questioned if eliminating readiness is still on the table, wouldn't that just increase the 1<sup>st</sup> grade stipends to exactly what we are trying to eliminate for the 2<sup>nd</sup> grade? Chairman Partridge responded if the board took that scenario, what we would end up with is a class size of 22 in 1<sup>st</sup> grade and 20 in 2<sup>nd</sup> grade compared to the current class sizes of 20 in 1<sup>st</sup> grade and 25 in 2<sup>nd</sup> grade. Different classes can better handle a larger class size than others, and 2<sup>nd</sup> grade is one where the school is not very comfortable with the larger class sizes.

Ms. Jen Dolloff, 17 Lorde Lane - was relieved to think the board had identified a remedy. She questioned class sizes beyond 2<sup>nd</sup> grade. Chairman Partridge stated class sizes to be approximately 22 in 4<sup>th</sup> grade, 20 in 5<sup>th</sup> grade, and 27 in 6<sup>th</sup> grade.

Ms. Pat Lynch, Pepperell Road - remarked last month the number identified for a readiness class was 5 out of the 9 offered. Now the number is 10 out of 16. She questioned where the students came from. She asked for clarification on which teaching position was being discussed. Chairman Partridge stated the proposal of merging would be to move the readiness students into the total 1<sup>st</sup> grade class. The total readiness/1<sup>st</sup> grade class altogether would be 111. The recommendation was to take the 111 students and divide them into 5 classes and then move one teacher from the 6 teachers that are currently doing readiness/1<sup>st</sup> grade to the 2<sup>nd</sup> grade so that 2<sup>nd</sup> grade would have a total of 5 teachers to address the needs of 100 students. Currently the 10 teachers are split 6/4 and the proposal would split them 5/5.

Ms. Lukovits stated the Readiness/1<sup>st</sup> grade population grew by 3 since last month. Superintendent Hodgdon stated as of May 7<sup>th</sup> there were 5 recommended for readiness but no commitment on the part of parents. As of May 24<sup>th</sup>, there were 9 recommended and 5 confirmed. As of June 4<sup>th</sup> and again on June 17<sup>th</sup> there were 10 definite readiness students.

Ms. Cindy Cadario, 4 Pepperell Road – has two boys at RMMS and 1 at CSDA and loves both schools. One of her sons participated in readiness. She felt there was no way, even for one year, the school should go without the readiness program. She questioned the number of paras utilized in the third grade, noting the students had moved on, and questioned whether 1-2 paras could be placed in each of the 2<sup>nd</sup> grade classes, and was informed paras move forward with the children. If the needs move from 3<sup>rd</sup> to 4<sup>th</sup> grade, paras will move with them as needed. The district is treated as a whole with regard to where the paras are located.

Ms. Brenna McIlwrath, 8 Nightingale Road – was concerned if a readiness teacher was pulled and put in 2<sup>nd</sup> grade the same issue would arise next year and either a teacher would have to be hired or there would be no readiness.

**MOTION BY MEMBER MEAGHER TO REVIEW THE BUDGET AND LOCATE ADDITIONAL FUNDING TO COVER THE COST OF THE ADDITION OF A FULL TIME SECOND GRADE TEACHING POSITION**  
**MOTION SECONDED BY MEMBER LUKOVITS**

ON THE QUESTION

Mr. Milkowski noted he did not support the elimination of the readiness program. He added the request made by the board to the administration was to come back with a plan, which they did, which involved bringing readiness and 1<sup>st</sup> grade together. In their opinion, that is a solution that can be implemented. Chairman Partridge added the board did not provide the administration the option of identifying funding for the addition of a position.

**MOTION CARRIED**  
**4/0**

ADMINISTRATIVE REPORTS

Business

*FY10 End of Year Report*

Mr. McLaughlin informed the board, although there are a number of transfers, which will occur at the end of the year, the estimate for unexpended fund balance as of 6-11 is approximately \$100,000. Ms. Meagher noted that to be 1% of the total budget.

1 *State Budget – Impact on FY11 Revenues*

2  
3 Mr. McLaughlin stated, “In light of the most recent House and Senate session as of June 11<sup>th</sup>, projections in State Aid and  
4 Catastrophic Aid are down from last year. I know based on the latest State Legislative Bulletin, the revenues as  
5 distributed through the State Aid will be decreased approximately \$8.7 million statewide on a base of about \$30-35 million  
6 and Catastrophic Aid will be reduced by more than \$8.8 million throughout the state for the full year, which is based on I  
7 believe about \$32 million. Since Friday, the Catastrophic Aid number changed from that original estimate, and there was  
8 an added cut of a million dollars that was put in there by the State.” He stated the percent decreases of aid calculated this  
9 year were 85% in FY10 and right now they are looking to lower that percentage of distribution down to 67%. That is a  
10 statewide number. Some communities will do better than others depending on their overall aid, demographics, and  
11 financial status. Stated was that there would be no increases in entitlement grants for next year under any conditions.

12  
13 After calling the DOE, he was advised, even with the above percentages being posted, they still won't have a final  
14 calculation until the last week of August/first part of September. They are sticking with the numbers they had of a  
15 statewide average of about 67% overall. When they go through and look at the numbers again, it will be calculated  
16 through a prorated formula bringing in all the other districts in the state. Based on the number of students, based on the  
17 costs, they have a formula by which they go through the distribution. Experience shows that because of the ever shifting  
18 special education population, even with a prorated bases, some communities will wear the reduction a little better than  
19 others, and again, depending on what the final outcome is when the State calculates their items.

20  
21 Chairman Partridge questioned and was told the amount of anticipated Catastrophic Aid is \$44,916. It is likely \$10,000 -  
22 \$12,000 of that could be lost. Mr. McLaughlin stated there is no available data on State Aid.

23  
24 *Facilities Maintenance Update – Summer Work*

25  
26 Mr. McLaughlin informed the board he has had discussions with principals and maintenance staff in both buildings  
27 regarding work that can and should be done during the summer months. Some basic summer maintenance would be  
28 striping floors, scrubbing walls, sinks, cleaning blinds, ceiling vents, interior walls, etc. He is awaiting estimates for  
29 maintenance items that need to be completed to keep the schools clean, with good curb appeal, etc. With regard to what  
30 needs to be done for maintenance going forward, he has been provided with a number of items; paving, painting of a few  
31 halls, ductwork, repairs to rotted and broken siding at RMMS, etc. He noted the need to update the alarm system in the  
32 building, as it is currently a patchwork of three different alarm systems. Ms. Lukovits requested assurance the bell system  
33 at RMMS could be tied into the alarm system. Mr. McLaughlin will ensure that is done.

34  
35 He noted an estimate received for exterior painting of RMMS approximately a year, which was \$18,000. Chairman  
36 Partridge endorsed the idea of painting RMMS. Mr. McLaughlin stated the window moldings and sills would be pulled out.  
37 He is currently acquiring estimates.

38  
39 Assistant Principal Doig informed the board the bell system was being addressed on July 2<sup>nd</sup>.

40  
41 Chris Adams, 10 Sargent Road

42  
43 Asked for an explanation of the formula used to determine the amount of state aid allocated to the district. Mr.  
44 McLaughlin responded the formula is a fairly complicated one, and he would report back to him via e-mail.

45  
46 Chairman Partridge requested Mr. McLaughlin present a prioritized plan to be used as prep work for next year's budget  
47 deliberations.

48  
49 Mr. McLaughlin requested the board's endorsement to move forward with a few items - repaving (approximately \$3,000),  
50 lunch room tables (\$1,000). With regard to the larger project, exterior painting (\$18,000) at RMMS, he was looking for the  
51 board's endorsement that would be a priority they would like to pursue over the summer. Ms. Meagher stated that item  
52 would be considered a regular maintenance item. Chairman Partridge suggested perhaps the entirety of the project is not  
53 done with one effort if funding could not be identified. He thoroughly endorsed the idea of painting as an alternative to  
54 having to fix rot. Ms. Meagher remarked the windows would likely fall under the maintenance expendable trust fund  
55 where it would be more of an unexpected expense.

6/22/10

1 Chairman Partridge questioned whether it would make more sense to paint the entirety of RMMS in one summer or if  
2 painting should be done on a rotating basis.

3  
4 Ms. Meagher noted expending funds from the expendable trust fund would require a special meeting, which would have to  
5 be noticed in advance. Chairman Partridge felt the expenditure/meeting could also include the roof repairs needed at  
6 CSDA. Mr. McLaughlin was instructed to report back to the board whether the expendable trust would have to be looked  
7 to for funding of various projects. Assistant Principal Doig suggested the board might also want to address water and  
8 drainage issues at RMMS.

#### 9 PUBLIC INPUT

10  
11  
12 Mr. Putney, 8 Milford Street - questioned why school board meetings are not televised. Stated the PreK-6 audience faces  
13 challenges attending meetings and is the population most interested in the decisions of the board. He touched on rumors  
14 that have circulated, and stated his belief the board would be best served if their meetings were televised. He researched  
15 16 school districts and found only 1 other school board that does not televise their meetings.

16  
17 Chairman Partridge stated the number one reason the meetings are not televised is due to the difficulties televising from  
18 the school. The reason other meetings are easily televised is because they are held in the Selectmen's meeting room.  
19 Although not impossible for the board to meet at that location, it poses some difficulties. He noted the board previously  
20 recorded their meetings to be played at a later date. They stopped doing that for a couple of weeks and did not receive a  
21 single phone call.

22  
23 Principal Wenger touched on the lack of volunteers and the amount of effort required for recording. Chairman Partridge  
24 added the current meeting location could be wired to allow for live broadcast, but funding and lack of storage space for the  
25 necessary equipment have prevented that. Another option would be to meet and televise the meetings from Town Hall.  
26 Mr. Milkowski questioned whether meetings had to be held on school property. It was mentioned the Hollis School Board  
27 meets at Town Hall to allow for their meetings to be televised.

28  
29 Mr. Putney noted there would likely be a conflict with the Conservation Commission, which meets in the Town Hall  
30 meeting room the 4<sup>th</sup> Tuesday of the month. He questioned whether the board would consider holding its meetings at  
31 Town Hall for a test period beginning in September for 6 months or so to see what level of audience is received.  
32 Superintendent Hodgdon was not sure what the board's bylaws say, but believed the board could consider moving its  
33 meeting date and location. Ms. Lukovits commented on the number of times the board fluctuates from its regular meeting  
34 schedule, i.e., February and April school vacation weeks, March town meeting, etc. Ms. Meagher stated she would have  
35 no objection to televising board meetings, but also commented on fluctuations in the meeting schedule. She felt it would  
36 be challenging to schedule meetings around the meeting room at Town Hall.

37  
38 Mr. Milkowski noted the COOP Budget Committee would begin broadcasting live in August. They have, however, moved  
39 their start time from 6:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m. to better accommodate the viewing audience.

40  
41 Chairman Partridge stated the board is willing to have their meetings televised live. He will research what would be  
42 needed to accomplish that, including the cost of wiring the library at CSDA.

43  
44 Ms. MacFarlane asked for the school board meeting minutes to be posted on the Brookline web site. She noted the  
45 minutes are available through the SAU web site, however, without a link on the Brookline school district web site, they are  
46 difficult to locate. Chairman Partridge noted the need for the Brookline site to include a link to the minutes, and will look  
47 into the issue.

#### 48 Principals

##### 49 *RMMS Early Admission to Kindergarten Request*

50  
51  
52  
53 The request would require a change to current policies. Having not had the opportunity to review policies, Superintendent  
54 Hodgdon proposed the board engage in that work over the summer. Chairman Partridge stated the board would first  
55 have to form the opinion there is a reason to change the policies. Ms. Lukovits asked if the recommendation was to table  
56 the question or that the answer to the question is no due to current policies. Superintendent Hodgdon responded, at this  
57 time, the answer is no as current policies do not permit that. However, if the board is interested in looking further into this  
58 matter that would require re-writing the policy and having discussions around that policy. Ms. Meagher stated the board



1 had intended to review the policy. She asked for clarification that is what the board was being asked to do over the  
2 summer months.

3  
4 Superintendent Hodgdon stated that would be the practical way of getting to an answer regarding the request as at  
5 present the policy says that cannot be done, therefore, the request cannot be granted. A sample policy could be provided  
6 over the summer months. Chairman Partridge was unsure how much time and effort should be put into this process and  
7 remarked once you start with exceptions you travel down a slippery slope. Ms. Meagher was in complete agreement.  
8 Superintendent Hodgdon touched on some mandatory policies the board has to work on - air quality, bullying, truancy,  
9 student safety and violence, etc. all of which are required by state law.

10  
11 Chairman Partridge stated his preference the superintendent not spend time on this particular policy. Members Lukovits,  
12 Meagher, and Milkowski were in agreement.

13  
14 Assistant Principal Doig commented his family lived in a district that had a policy option. Thinking back if they had not had  
15 the policy option they likely would not have pursued it.

16  
17 Network Administrator

18  
19 *Updates on network, email system, content management*

- 20 • **Held**

21  
22 *Inform data management and analytics software*

23  
24 Chairman Partridge informed the public the Inform software is a data analysis tool that is being adopted by Hollis.  
25 Superintendent Hodgdon stated the COOP has tabled the discussion until their July meeting, as they were interested in  
26 knowing more about the system and whether it was going to be supported by the other two districts. If supported by the  
27 other two districts, they would definitely want to take part in it. Chairman Partridge commented using the same tools  
28 across all districts is a good move.

29  
30 Ms. Meagher questioned the advantages that would be gained. Superintendent Hodgdon stated Inform provides a data  
31 management tool beyond Power School, which gives student information largely about demographics, discipline, etc. The  
32 advantage to looking at the Inform package was that both are Pearson products, and at the end of each day with  
33 PowerSchool in place, data information is updated in Inform automatically and saves some data entry.

34  
35 One of the districts Hollis spoke with was the Farmington School District in CT. They have been using the Inform product  
36 for 3 years. Hollis was at the stage of trying to make a decision between build or buy. Build was found to be  
37 extraordinarily expensive. Farmington had engaged in the same assessment. What they said was that teachers like and  
38 are using Inform, however, it is something that would require them to use it on a regular basis in order to stay current with  
39 the interface. Since then some of the interface has been made user-friendlier. The Leadership Team looked at the  
40 program to provide their analysis of it. They wanted to know if it would work for our needs not only across a grade level or  
41 within a school but also for PreK-12. The resounding answer from that session was yes.

42  
43 Farmington brings all data; report cards, assessments, etc., into PowerSchool and then moves it into Inform. Although  
44 some other districts simply bring the data into Inform, by bringing it through PowerSchool it is more accessible for them.  
45 They started using it when they were developing their RTI and academic intervention plans, and found it has fit their  
46 needs very well. They were using Excel spreadsheets, which they found to be difficult for all staff to have ready access to  
47 and even more difficult to do any kind of analytic work with. They felt the product was excellent, they reported the training  
48 was excellent, and said Pearson is a company that gets schools and did a good job.

49  
50 As a result of this work and other technical work that was done, Hollis had a data tool consultant look at the background  
51 behind the program and make a determination of whether it would be wise to stay with Performance Tracker, which is the  
52 system used by the DOE, or to load our data into something like Inform. The result of that research was that it would be  
53 better for us to have a product like Inform because of the ease of use with PowerSchool and because longitudinally we  
54 could carry that data over school districts.

55  
56 In terms of the cost, there is a \$33,588 total cost for the software for the SAU district as a whole. There is also an  
57 \$11,000 one year only training fee that would be split among the three districts. Looking at the enrollments, at the time  
58 this was first considered (mid year); Brookline had an enrollment of 665 students. The first year cost for the software was

1 \$8,158 with a training cost of \$2,672. Going forward from FY11 per student fee for support is \$1.75/student. Being  
2 proposed is the use of unexpended fund balance.

3  
4 Ms. Meagher questioned the type of data that would be stored and how it would be analyzed. Superintendent Hodgdon  
5 responded there is a whole range of data that hasn't been broken down yet. Data files would have to be created in a  
6 similar fashion. One piece of data would be the NWEA testing. Ms. Meagher questioned who would make the decisions  
7 about the data to be stored and how we would be able to report from and utilize the information.

8  
9 Superintendent Hodgdon responded with the position of Associate Superintendent, they were looking for someone with  
10 coordination and oversight skills. If funded through Race to the Top those funds could be utilized as well. Ms. Meagher  
11 felt the board was moving ahead too quickly. Superintendent Hodgdon stated the reason for the interest in purchasing  
12 this ahead of having a fuller technology staffing plan is so that data can begin to be entered. Each year that we wait  
13 would create more data that would need to be entered into the system. What data would be stored was part of the review  
14 of the leadership team. Ms. Meagher remarked one could be data rich and information poor if planning is not done.

15  
16 Principal Wenger looking at data systems is an item on the five-year plan. This has been ongoing for a few years.  
17 She stated the desire to become unified and not have each school district utilizing a different system. Information to be  
18 stored would be NECAP and NWEA and at the lower grade the Dibbles as well as local assessments. One of the things  
19 being done is the creation of common math assessments. Ideally the district would work with Hollis in terms of items such  
20 as math coordination. She remarked as we move towards the standards and common core we don't know where that will  
21 lead for assessments, but the ability to have that whole picture in one file that could be accessed and reviewed would be  
22 ideal.

23  
24 Superintendent Hodgdon stated Hollis is looking at a whole range of data to provide a fuller picture; achievement  
25 frequency, word tests, spelling, observation survey in reading, NECAP, NWEA, reading recovery data, writing prompts,  
26 report card data, demographics, disciplinary, bus notes, etc. She noted, through Performance Tracker, we are largely  
27 relying on NWEA and NECAP data, but we know we need more measures than that to make good assessments of  
28 whether students are achieving standards or not.

29  
30 Mr. Milkowski questioned what was driving the purchase. Superintendent Hodgdon responded the school likely has 85-90  
31 data points on each and every student, and to manage that effectively a tool is needed that can show that data in a  
32 composite and then allow the data to be broken out. What is utilized now is tremendously time consuming.  
33 Administrators in particular need to be able to get at this data to make their decisions regarding budget, staffing, etc. At  
34 the SAU level they need to be able to look at school-to-school data in a unified fashion. They are not currently able to do  
35 that in a very succinct easy way. In terms of the impact on academic achievement of students, the more ability we have  
36 to look at broader data the more we can pinpoint the needs of students and groups of students.

37  
38 Ms. Meagher stated someone would be needed to retrieve the data and produce reports. Superintendent Hodgdon stated  
39 the product allows building administrators to get data out of the system and the Superintendent or the Associate  
40 Superintendent to look at curriculum data. Ms. Meagher questioned who would write the reports needed to get data  
41 across multiple tables. Superintendent Hodgdon clarified the system has sample reports that could be used to gain quite  
42 a bit of information. Mr. Milkowski commented long-term there needs to be a plan, short-term this is a good idea, but  
43 there is no plan to support the long-term deployment. He felt until someone is in charge of the program there will remain a  
44 hodgepodge of reports being done differently throughout the districts.

45  
46 Assistant Principal Doig stated he could not speak to the who, which is an important question, but from the teacher  
47 perspective, right now the trending and analysis this system would allow them to do would save a lot of the labor  
48 intensiveness that goes on behind the scenes. There is a regulation on the books now for special education that requires  
49 progress monitoring to be reported out every two weeks. It is very labor intensive for teachers to be putting 6-week plans  
50 together for RTI with the system they are being asked to operate under. This system would allow some expedience. Ms.  
51 Meagher asked if that is something already canned in the system. Superintendent Hodgdon responded if not canned, it is  
52 certainly something staff can design within the system without additional resources.

53  
54 Superintendent Hodgdon stated the Hollis School District reviewed the key data that is used all the time and needs to be  
55 at people's fingertips, then went to the next level of what is data needed on occasion, and then looked further out. They  
56 had about 10 data points that would be wanted, needed, and used all the time. That is how they envisioned creating the  
57 reports in the system; starting with that core/prioritized data that is used all the time and then the gradual building in of

1 other data points. She noted the possibility for grant writing. As we move beyond the first stage of data there are other  
2 means of capturing needed funds aside from the operating budget.

3  
4 Chairman Partridge questioned whether Hollis has funded a position for the production of reports. Superintendent  
5 Hodgdon stated they encumbered money last year to look further at data management software. They hadn't pinpointed  
6 Inform. They had monies set aside to cover the full cost of \$33,000. At the time, the consultant they were working with  
7 was going to come back and do some work part-time (has since gone on to the DOE).

8  
9 Chairman Partridge restated his question as who Hollis anticipated would write the reports and do the work.  
10 Superintendent Hodgdon responded they looked at a part-time position possibly being needed and set aside funding for  
11 that, but they also looked at the program being user friendly enough so that teachers and administrators could in fact  
12 create some of the reports.

13  
14 Ms. Dolloff remarked the program is not categorized as bells/whistle/frill. The State data management system is very  
15 cumbersome. This is for progress monitoring and to know where all students are so that you don't discover in 6<sup>th</sup> grade a  
16 child is reading well below efficiency. She stated most schools have this, and it would be unfortunate to have to play  
17 catch up a few years from now. She commented the system is user friendly and would be used on a day-to-day basis in  
18 the classrooms. Teachers would be able to sit down and discuss the data their students are coming up with and then  
19 change their instruction based on that. Ms. Meagher stated her concern setting up the fields, etc. requires a certain  
20 amount of expertise to be done correctly. Ms. Dolloff commented there are only a finite number of assessments that  
21 districts are using throughout the country. The system is set up with those capabilities already.

22  
23 Superintendent Hodgdon stated the Leadership Team has spoken about the need to be consistent, which is part of the  
24 attraction of doing this as three districts coming together to work on that. If something separate were created in Hollis,  
25 Brookline would have to live with whatever is created and mimic it to pool data when the students enter the middle school.  
26 The Leadership Team felt this to be a priority for the first year of the work plan.

27  
28 Chairman Partridge touched on the amount of work the Hollis School District has put into reviewing this program. He  
29 commented with Chairman Beauregard driving this, he is sure he has asked every question you could think of and then  
30 another 500 more you didn't think of. On an issue like this, which is Chairman Beauregard's expertise, he takes his  
31 opinion as a very solid recommendation. Superintendent Hodgdon stated Chairman Beauregard had asked the two  
32 national technicians, who work on and have revised the program over a number of years, questions they in turn had to  
33 research.

34  
35 Director Saunders commented the issue of data entry came up at the COOP Board meeting at which Mr. Raymond  
36 explained the NECAP and NWEA data can easily go into an Excel spreadsheet and be easily uploaded into the Inform  
37 software. He felt that piece was manageable in terms of uploading data.

38  
39 Superintendent Hodgdon informed the board of user groups they could attend to avoid creating the system from the  
40 ground up. When asked, Principal Wenger stated to have all of the information in one place and to have it consistent is  
41 critical.

42  
43 Chairman Partridge and Ms. Lukovits stated their support of the purchase. Ms. Meagher stated she was not completely  
44 comfortable with it, but would support it.

45  
46 Mr. Milkowski questioned what would occur if the COOP district decided not to participate/contribute. Chairman Partridge  
47 remarked Hollis has the funding earmarked. He was willing to authorize the \$11,000, but would not support expending  
48 additional funds. Superintendent Hodgdon stated the COOP Board wanted to hear the results of the discussions of the  
49 other two boards. She will contact the Chairman and see if a special meeting of the COOP board could be called to  
50 resolve the issue prior to July. Mr. Milkowski stated his agreement with authorizing the \$11,000.

51  
52 **MOTION BY MEMBER MILKOWSKI TO ENCUMBER THE SUM OF ELEVEN THOUSAND DOLLARS (\$11,000) OF**  
53 **THE UNRESERVED FUND BALANCE FOR THE PURPOSE OF PAYING A PORTION OF THE COST OF THE**  
54 **INFORM DATA SYSTEM**  
55 **MOTION SECONDED BY MEMBER LUKOVITS**  
56 **MOTION CARRIED**

57 4/0

1 Special Education

2  
3 When asked for clarification on the kindergarten enrollment numbers, Director Saunders stated information as recent as  
4 last week indicates 18. There is 1 in the evaluation process, which could bump the number to 19. Chairman Partridge  
5 noted no identified 3 year olds.

6  
7 Director Saunders informed the board a recommendation for the position of Assistant Director of Special Education would  
8 be brought before the SAU board for consideration on Thursday evening.

9  
10 She noted her FY11 operating budget included two positions; .5 certified occupational therapy assistant (COTA) and a .5  
11 school nurse. Ms. Lukovits questioned why the nurse position was budgeted for within the special education budget. She  
12 noted the position should be shared and requested Director Saunders work with Mr. McLaughlin in removing that  
13 particular item from the special education budget.

14  
15 Director Saunders stated her recommendation to continue with the .5 COTA position, as she knows it to be necessary.  
16 What she would like to do with the .5 school nurse is to utilize one of the current para-educators as a para-educator or  
17 health aid. That person would cover a one-on-one PreK student in the afternoon. For a full day on Wednesdays and  
18 mornings on Monday, Tuesday, Thursday, and Friday, that person would assist the nurse at RMMS. She noted that  
19 would allow the nurse the opportunity to go into classrooms, provide training, assist with Pre-K, etc.

20  
21 Ms. Meagher questioned the legalities of utilizing a health aid as opposed to a nurse. The district's current nurse, Denis  
22 Curtis, stated she has been without coverage for the past few years. As a result, she never leaves the building and is  
23 constantly on call. She stated a concern if the nursing position were eliminated the town would not re-hire for the position  
24 in the future. Ms. Meagher questioned if her preference was for that of a part-time nurse. Ms. Curtis stated it was. Ms.  
25 Meagher clarified the intention was to increase the nurse's office by a half-time person. It came about because of the  
26 preschool adding additional needs to the school, but it wasn't the intent that the preschool have a half-time nurse. When  
27 asked, Director Saunders explained her intent was to save a position. She has two Pre-K students in the afternoon that  
28 require one-on-one and those are both 12-hour week positions. She was trying to keep a para-educator.

29  
30 Ms. Lukovits commented there are 100 more students at RMMS than CSDA and the caseload is challenging. Director  
31 Saunders agreed and stated she sees the need for additional support including that of a school psychologist position. Ms.  
32 Lukovits was not willing to do away with a nursing position until the incoming Principal has the opportunity to oversee the  
33 workload in her building.

34  
35 Chairman Partridge questioned whether a health aid/para-educator could provide the relief needed or if a half-time nurse  
36 is required. He felt if the alternative were less expensive and could save a job, there were pluses to consider. Ms. Curtis  
37 stated such an alternative would meet the current needs, however, there is no way of knowing when that would change.

38  
39 Ms. Meagher suggested additional information was needed with regard to the .5 nurse position; however, the issue of the  
40 .5 psychologist could be discussed. Director Saunders stated there would not be enough funding for both positions.

41  
42 Chairman Partridge remarked if a .5 nurse position were hired the existing para-educator would be missing half a job. Ms.  
43 Meagher noted that to be reduction in force. Letters of hire have not yet been sent out to para-educators. Ms. Curtis  
44 questioned unutilized prior year funding, and was informed unencumbered appropriations cannot be utilized to cover the  
45 cost of positions/labor.

46  
47 Director Saunders noted if the .5 nurse position and the .5 COTA position were kept, \$40,000 was put towards the  
48 teaching position, and \$40,000 toward a .5 school psychologist, the total would be \$112,500. Superintendent Hodgdon  
49 commented the entire \$40,000 would not be needed for the additional teaching position. Chairman Partridge noted it  
50 would likely be \$30,000.

51  
52 Chairman Partridge touched on the need to get contracts out. Ms. Lukovits stated para-educator contracts one-year  
53 contracts because the population and needs of the school change. She noted she is not a fan of letting a position go and  
54 appreciates the efforts to save one.

1 Ms. Murray stated her understanding Preschool has been the only group to hand select their para-educators in the  
2 classroom and asked if Ms. Curtis would be allowed to do the same to ensure the person working directly with her and in  
3 that capacity would be the right fit. Director Saunders stated she her desire to meet with the special education teachers  
4 and assign para-educators based on the needs of the students.

5  
6 Assistant Principal Doig remarked commented on the daily hours of para-educators. He has 1 individual who works 6  
7 hours and another who works 5.75 hours. Over time it has evolved into a gentleman's understanding of when paras start  
8 and end their day. He stated when he came in and saw things were written a certain way he had to inform case  
9 managers they had devised their scheduled in a way that was inconsistent with how the contracts were written. That  
10 caused them to reshuffle things at the beginning of the year. He suggested if that has not been looked at, the board might  
11 want to.

12  
13 Ms. Lukovits asked if that level of detail has to be in a contract. Principal Wenger stated their day does not match the  
14 student's. When asked for clarification, Director Saunders stated the contract identifies the number of hours per day, but  
15 does not state specific start and end times.

16  
17 When questioned about the needs identified in support of a school psychologist position, Director Saunders stated she  
18 believed circumstances would change in terms of adopting a formalized RTI model, purchasing Wilson Foundations  
19 (reading curriculum) for K-2, which will also help reading and early intervening services. She believes with those  
20 measures things would change. She stated this position would help offset and support the teachers with students with  
21 emotional/behavioral needs.

22  
23 **MOTION BY MEMBER LUKOVITS TO ACCEPT THE RECOMMENDATION OF THE DIRECTOR OF SPECIAL**  
24 **EDUCATION AND HIRE A PART-TIME SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGIST AND A PART TIME CERTIFIED OCCUPATIONAL**  
25 **THERAPY ASSISTANT**

26 **MOTION SECONDED BY MEMBER MILKOWSKI**

27 **MOTION CARRIED**

28 **4/0**

29  
30 *Peanut Policy*

31  
32 Chairman Partridge commented the nut safe policy was put into place a number of years ago when there was a particular  
33 need. He had questioned what the policy would be for the coming year and was informed the nurse is recommending the  
34 school continue to be nut-safe. He commented he is not medically qualified to say whether or not this is needed, but has  
35 a concern some have come to think of this as the state of affairs and easier to keep it that way. Student body has moved  
36 through RMMS without this and the policy does not exist at the middle school. He touched on the significant impact the  
37 policy has on other students, i.e., eliminates gaining protein from peanut butter, etc. He remarked, to him, going to a nut  
38 free school should be a pretty extreme option with extreme reasons for doing it. He stated his desire for sufficient thought  
39 to be put towards continuing the policy.

40  
41 Principal Wenger stated the nurse has provided her recommendation for the school to remain nut safe for the 2010/2011  
42 school year for medical reasons of the student populations. She stated there are other students people are not aware of  
43 and whose parents are not going to identify. She remarked it certainly would make things easier not to be a nut safe  
44 school and to just go along with 504 plans, but the nurse has made that recommendation based on medical needs of  
45 students.

46  
47 Chairman Partridge commented most of the population moves up through RMMS prior to arriving at CSDA without the  
48 same restrictions in place. Mr. Milkowski asked if it was viewed as a stage the school will go through for one more year.  
49 Principal Wenger responded that is what the school nurse is hoping for. Ms. Meagher reminded the board the written  
50 policy states the policy is to be reviewed on a yearly basis.

51  
52 A member of the public commented her child is peanut/nut allergic and going into third grade. He cannot wait to get to  
53 CSDA because it is somewhere where he wouldn't have to sit alone.

54  
55 Superintendent Hodgdon will ensure the policy discussion is placed on the Board's June agenda moving forward.

Chairman Partridge noted the issue needed to be discussed, as there are a lot of people who had an implicit assumption this was going away next year, and it needed to be made clear that is not the case. Ms. Meagher suggested information be sent out. Principal Wenger stated AlertNow could be utilized as well as the handbook.

Mr. Kelley suggested if the board intended to conduct an annual review, that it be publicly known.

Superintendent

*Update from the Assistant Principal/Special Education Coordinator Search Panel*

Superintendent Hodgdon informed the board she has had a quick conversation with incoming Principal Perry regarding the Assistant Principal search. Incoming Principal Perry remarked she thoroughly enjoyed working with the committee. She commented they have had some good candidates, some they are clearly very enthusiastic about.

*Staffing*

Superintendent Hodgdon informed the board she was in receipt of a letter from Melissa Leafe informing her of the impending birth of her first child. Health permitting, she would like to work up until her due date (10-10-10) followed by maternity leave. She is requesting the standard six (6) weeks of paid leave plus an additional approximate four (4) weeks of unpaid time off. She would utilize her sick and personal time during that period. She anticipates commencing maternity leave on Tuesday, October 12<sup>th</sup> and returning Monday, January 3<sup>rd</sup>. Total number of days would be forty-nine (49) including scheduled teacher workshops and early release days.

**MOTION BY MEMBER LUKOVITS TO ACCEPT THE MATERNITY LEAVE AS OUTLINED IN THE LETTER RECEIVED FROM MELISSA LEAFE**

**MOTION SECONDED BY MEMBER MEAGHER**

**MOTION CARRIED**

**4/0**

APPROVAL OF SCHOOL BOARD MINUTES

Brookline School Board – Non-Public . . . . . March 1, 2010

Brookline School Board – Non-Public – 1<sup>st</sup> Session . . . . . April 13, 2010

Brookline School Board – Non-Public - 2<sup>nd</sup> Session . . . . . April 13, 2010

Brookline School Board . . . . . May 25, 2010

**MOTION BY MEMBER MILKOWSKI TO APPROVE AS WRITTEN**

**MOTION SECONDED BY MEMBER MEAGHER**

**MOTION CARRIED**

**4/0**

Brookline School Board – Non-Public. . . . . May 25, 2010

Ms. MacFarlane questioned the food service budget. Mr. McLaughlin stated that was discussed a few meetings ago, at which time the budget was within \$5,000 of projections.

1 NON-PUBLIC SESSION

2  
3 **MOTION BY MEMBER LUKOVITS THAT THE BOARD GO INTO NON-PUBLIC SESSION PURSUANT TO RSA 91-A:3**  
4 **II (c) TO DISCUSS A MATTER, WHICH IF DISCUSSED IN PUBLIC, WOULD LIKELY AFFECT ADVERSELY THE**  
5 **REPUTATION OF A PERSON, OTHER THAN A MEMBER OF THE BODY OR AGENCY ITSELF**

6  
7 **MOTION SECONDED BY MEMBER MEAGHER**

8  
9 *A Viva Voce Roll Call was conducted, which resulted as follows:*

10  
11 Yea: Dave Partridge, Beth Lukovits, Forrest Milkowski, Wanda Meagher

4

12  
13 Nay:

0

14 **MOTION CARRIED**

15  
16 *The Board went into non-public session at 9:07 p.m.*

17  
18 NON-PUBLIC SESSION

19  
20 Principal Wenger presented the board the performance review for Kristina Henry, Assistant Principal and Special  
21 Educational Coordinator for Captain Samuel Douglass Academy. The board discussed the review.

22  
23 The Superintendent presented Principal Wenger's performance review. The board discussed the review.

24  
25 The Superintendent reported the issues related to the grievance have been settled.

26  
27 **MOTION BY MEMBER MILKOWSKI THAT THE BOARD COME OUT OF NON-PUBLIC SESSION AND RETURN TO**  
28 **THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE BROOKLINE SCHOOL BOARD**

29  
30 **MOTION SECONDED BY MEMBER LUKOVITS**

31  
32 *A Viva Voce Roll Call was taken, which resulted as follows:*

33  
34 Yea: Dave Partridge, Beth Lukovits, Forrest Milkowski, Wanda Meagher

4

35  
36 Nay:

0

37 **MOTION CARRIED**

38  
39 *The Board came out of non-public session at 9:31 p.m.*

40  
41 ADMINISTRATOR AND NON-UNION CONTRACTS

42  
43 **MOTION BY MEMBER MEAGHER THAT THE BOARD EXTEND KRISTINA HENRY'S CONTRACT AS ASSISTANT**  
44 **PRINCIPAL AND SPECIAL EDUCATIONAL COORDINATOR FOR 3 MORE YEARS WITH A 2% INCREASE.**

45  
46 **MOTION SECONDED BY MEMBER LUKOVITS**

47  
48 *A Viva Voce Roll Call was taken, which resulted as follows:*

49  
50 Yea: Dave Partridge, Beth Lukovits, Forrest Milkowski, Wanda Meagher

4

51  
52 Nay:

0

53 **MOTION CARRIED**

54  
55 **MOTION BY MEMBER LUKOVITS THAT THE BOARD ACCEPT THE SUPERINTENDENT'S RECOMMENDATION OF**  
56 **A 2% MERIT INCREASE TO LAURIE WENGER'S SALARY AS PRINCIPAL OF CAPTAIN SAMUEL DOUGLASS**  
57 **ACADEMY**

1 **MOTION SECONDED BY MEMBER MEAGHER**

2  
3 *A Viva Voce Roll Call was taken, which resulted as follows:*

4  
5 Yea: Dave Partridge, Beth Lukovits, Forrest Milkowski, Wanda Meagher

6  
7 Nay: 4

8 **MOTION CARRIED**

9  
10 ADJOURNMENT

11  
12 **MOTION BY MEMBER LUKOVITS TO ADJOURN**

13 **MOTION SECONDED BY MEMBER MEAGHER**

14 **MOTION CARRIED**

15  
16 *The June 22, 2010 meeting of the Brookline School Board was adjourned at 9:37 p.m.*

17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25 Date \_\_\_\_\_ Signed \_\_\_\_\_