

BROOKLINE SCHOOL BOARD

JULY 27, 2010

MEETING MINUTES

A regular meeting of the Brookline School Board was held on Tuesday, July 27, 2010 at 6:06 p.m. at the Captain Samuel Douglass Academy.

Chairman Dave Partridge presided:

Members of the Board Present: Beth Lukovits, Vice-Chair
Forrest Milkowski, Secretary (6:17 p.m.)
Wanda Meagher (6:12 p.m.)
Ernie Pistor

Members of the Board Absent:

Also in Attendance: Susan Hodgdon, Superintendent
Dr. Betsey Cox-Buteau, Associate Superintendent
Mark McLaughlin, Business Administrator
Jeanne Saunders, Director of Special Education
Liz Perry, Principal, Richard Maghakian Memorial School
Lorraine Wenger, Principal, Captain Samuel Douglass Academy
Kristina Henry, Assistant Principal/Special Education Coordinator, CSDA
Pat Lynch, Secretary, Brookline Finance Committee

Board Member Pistor was in attendance via telecommunication. He informed the board he was calling from Bratislava, the Capital of Slovakia. He stated his Wife was with him and hearing one side of the public meeting although she would be departing the room within moments. He assured the board he would most certainly be alone should the board have the need to go into non-public session.

Chairman Partridge noted all votes would be by voice vote.

AGENDA ADJUSTMENTS – None

PUBLIC INPUT – None

DISCUSSION WITH BROOKLINE FINANCE COMMITTEE

As all members of the Brookline Finance Committee were not able to be in attendance, the discussion was tabled.

ADMINISTRATIVE REPORTS

Business Administrator

Mr. McLaughlin informed the board, although the process of closing the books is still underway, projected is an unreserved fund balance between \$150,000 and \$200,000.

The auditors will be in during the second week of August, and filings with DRA and DOE, based on the auditor's results, will be completed at the end of August. Chairman Partridge commented the anticipated unreserved fund balance represents less than 2-3% of the overall budget allocation.

Principals

Principal Wenger informed the Board when the new RMMS Assistant Principal is present all administrators would work on updating the handbook. A meeting has been scheduled two weeks out. Ms. Lukovits questioned whether the formatting problem had been addressed. Assistant Principal Henry stated the document in being put in PDF form so that it may be

- 1 scanned. It was noted the document could be sent via AlertNow. Chairman Partridge commented the need is simply to
- 2 be able to read the document.

7/27/10

1 When asked about enrollment numbers, Principal Wenger stated an additional student registered earlier in the day
 2 adjusting up the 6th grade number by 1. Principal Perry noted an additional student registered the previous day for 2nd
 3 grade, however, she was unsure if that student had already been included in the total count, and will verify. Assuming the
 4 addition had not been included, enrollment numbers break down as follows:

5			
6	PK-3 (3-year-old):	8	<i>Typical: 8 Special Education: 0 (1 student will be evaluated in Sept.)</i>
7	PK-4 (4-year-old):	12	<i>Typical: 7 Special Education: 5</i>
8	Kindergarten:	70	
9	Readiness:	10	
10	1 st Grade:	100	
11	2 nd Grade:	100	
12	3 rd Grade:	89	
13	4 th Grade:	88	
14	5 th Grade:	77	
15	6 th Grade:	107	
16			

17 Ms. Lukovits touched on numbers for identified students in the Pre-K program - 5 in Pre-K 4 and 0 in Pre-K 3. Principal
 18 Perry noted she had spoken with Ms. Shaw about the number of identified students in the Pre-K program. Ms. Shaw had
 19 remarked, she expected the numbers would changed based on last year's experience for the Pre-K 3 class where the
 20 number of identified students enrolled by mid-year was 5.

21
 22 Ms. Lukovits remarked the breakeven point for the program is 4.5 identified students, which has already been achieved. It
 23 was noted a waiting list had to be established for some typical students in order to maintain placeholders for children who
 24 may be identified down the road or may age into the program.

25
 26 Principal Wenger stated SINI/DINI (School in Need of Improvement/District in Need of Improvement) work has been
 27 ongoing with teachers from both schools working with Karin Pillion during the summer. The revised plan will be sent to
 28 the State in October, and will be re-posted on the district web site.

29
 30 A LTA (life threatening allergy) parent night will be conducted on Wednesday, August 25, 2010 at 7:00 p.m. AlertNow will
 31 be utilized to provide notification.

32
 33 With regard to vacancies and new hires, Virginia Commisso will be joining the 2nd grade team as the 5th second grade
 34 teacher. Karen Kulick, Assistant Principal/Special Education Coordinator for RMMS, has begun her transition meetings,
 35 and will officially start on Monday.

36
 37 With regard to the .5 psychologist position, Superintendent Hodgdon noted she had received a resume for the position
 38 earlier in the day.

39
 40 With regard to the .5 COTA position, a candidate was interviewed earlier in the day, and a recommendation will be
 41 forthcoming.

42
 43 It was stated the Speech Para position would be posted at the conclusion of the meeting. Director Saunders noted one of
 44 the para-educators that were reduced might be able to be called back for that .5 position.

45
 46 The question arose as to the level of experience needed for the Speech Para position. Director Saunders noted a Speech
 47 Assistant and Speech Para position are pretty much the same and used interchangeably. A Speech Para position is a
 48 new category and certifiable under the Department of Education. Director Saunders stated she would have to look into
 49 the specific requirements of the new category, and noted certification is required by June or July of 2011. Previously,
 50 throughout the SAU, speech training has not been required unless the position was that of Speech Specialist or Speech
 51 Pathologist.

52
 53 When asked about class assignment letters, Principal Perry stated letters had gone out. With regard to the 2nd grade
 54 class for which a teacher had yet to be identified, she had personalized those letters and informed students/parents they
 55 would be hearing directly from the teacher once that position was filled. Those teacher letters have since gone out.

7/27/10

1 Ms. Lukovits questioned whether the filling of that position would be considered a RIF re-hire, and was informed it would.
2 She questioned if the district is hiring for a position known to be a part-time, one-year position how it would be considered
3 a RIF re-hire. In the past, the previous teaching position was a temporary job (on three separate occasions) and was not
4 a RIF as it was temporary in nature from the onset. She remarked it was not the individual she was questioning, but
5 rather why the position would be a RIF re-hire.

6
7 Ms. Pillion stated she brought the RIF Policy up to administration as it was brought up to her and she is not aware of
8 specific contract language. Associate Superintendent Cox-Buteau stated, "according to the contract she previously had,
9 which was a teaching contract, any category of that opening up in the next two years, allows her to be called back."

10
11 Chairman Partridge remarked future contracts should not read in such a fashion if the position the individual is being hired
12 for is known to be a one-year position. Mr. Pistor stated his agreement.

13
14 Superintendent Hodgdon pointed out if the district hires for temporary one-year positions in consecutive order essentially
15 the same kind of permanent position is being created.

16
17 • RMMS Health Services

18
19 Principal Perry informed the Board, as a follow-up to the last meeting, she met with the School Nurse, Denise Curtis, who
20 has provided the Board with an overview of daily office activity.

21
22 She informed the Board with the need to find additional preparation time for teachers this year as a result of the foreign
23 language shift at the upper elementary, she was able to call upon some of the specialists. Denise Curtis is also helping
24 out with the Health Wellness curriculum in grades 1 and 2 for the upcoming year (1st grade classes in first trimester and
25 2nd grade classes in second trimester). That will occur in the afternoon.

26
27 After meeting with her and going over her caseload and the nature of the involvement with some of the children, they both
28 agreed she would come to the Board and recommend a .5 para for the upcoming year to assist her during her classroom
29 and lunch times.

30
31 Ms. Meagher questioned whether the legality of that had been looked into, i.e., whether or not the requirement existed to
32 hire an LPN or RN. She also questioned whether a para could administer medication. Principal Perry responded a para
33 would be acceptable with the nurse remaining in the building. She added the nurse takes her lunch prior to that of other
34 staff, and typically if students require medication they come in during their lunch period. She added the office would be
35 structured in such a way that it would not be an issue. Chairman Partridge stressed the fact the Nurse would be available
36 and in the building. Principal Perry added Ms. Curtis did not believe it would be an issue.

37
38 Chairman Partridge noted with no health training required for that position, it would be a .5 recall of one of the paras.

39
40 Ms. Meagher recommended the Principal be cautious with the delegation of medication, as she is not aware of State
41 requirements. Principal Wenger added, as many schools do not have full-time nurses people within a school can be
42 designated to dispense medication. Superintendent Hodgdon added those individuals do have to have training. Ms.
43 Meagher suggested it would be wise for the training to take place.

44
45 Network Administrator

46
47 *Updates on network, email system, content management*

- 48 • *Held 6-22-10 & 7-27-10*

49
50 Ms. Lukovits asked whether parents were being notified of the change in e-mail addresses (Google) for district personnel.
51 Principal Wenger noted the old and new e-mails addresses would overlap for a period of time (until beginning of
52 December), and will allow plenty of time for the public to be informed.

53
54 Mr. Pistor recommended the e-mail system be set up in such a way that mail sent to current addresses automatically
55 forward to new addresses thereby eliminating the need for staff to check two e-mail accounts. Ms. Meagher added the
56 system should also be set up to delete mail after forwarding to avoid the mailboxes reaching capacity.

7/27/10

Special Education

Director Saunders informed the Board she and the Special Education Coordinators met in June and began updating the Policy & Procedure manual from 2002. Mrs. Marcy Kelley joined the SAU 41 leadership team on Tuesday, July 6th as the Assistant Director of Special Education.

She has met with the SAU 41 Parent to Parent Group to plan for the upcoming 2010-2011 school year and for the expansion of the parent group into Brookline and the Coop. This group developed a year and a half ago in Hollis. A few Brookline parents have been invited to attend the planning sessions to assist with the expansion of the group. The first planning session took place on Monday, July 19th. She noted she would be continuing partnership meetings with school administration and parents during the school day as well as conducting 4-5 evening workshops (informational sessions) during the course of the year.

The New Hampshire Department of Education has awarded the Brookline School District two free two-hour training sessions on how to write measurable IEP goals and objectives. Director Saunders noted the request for technical assistant was put in and resulted in two free workshops in each and every district. Special education teachers, related service providers, and special education coordinators will be attending those training sessions during the 2010-2011 school year. She noted, this past year, the district received a citation and a few complaints, all of which dealt with measurable IEP goals and objectives. The hope is to tackle this issue in the upcoming year. Ms. Meagher questioned whether the training would be along the lines of train the trainer. Director Saunders responded the need exists to have a train the trainer model when it comes to something like this.

Ms. Lukovits questioned whether Foundations was being purchased or had already been purchased, and was informed they have yet to be purchased. They were included in the submission through the ARRA application grant while the Superintendent was on vacation. Once approved by the Superintendent, it will go forward to the DOE for approval. Once that occurs the district will need to sign the agreement with Wilson Language (by August 12th), and materials will be provided.

SuperintendentSTAFFING

Superintendent Hodgdon provided her recommendation of Virginia Comisso for the grade 2 teaching position at RMMS. She noted Ms. Comisso has been employed at RMMS in a variety of capacities in the past, is a resident of Brookline, received her Bachelors from the University of Massachusetts, and has ten (10) years' experience. Superintendent Hodgdon recommended Ms. Comisso be hired at Bachelors Step 11 at a salary of \$51,564.

MOTION BY MEMBER LUKOVITS TO ACCEPT THE SUPERINTENDENT'S NOMINATION OF VIRGINIA COMISSO FOR THE GRADE TWO TEACHING POSITION AT RMMS AT STEP 11 AND A SALARY OF FIFTY ONE THOUSAND FIVE HUNDRED SIXTY FOUR DOLLARS (\$51,564)

MOTION SECONDED BY MEMBER MEAGHER

MOTION CARRIED

5/0

CAFÉ SERVICES

Mr. McLaughlin provided the Board with copies of information provided by Café Services. One of the documents was a communication from the President of Café Services, which states a projected net subsidy for the 2010/2011 school year of \$22,453 (\$17,843 providing a 2.5-hour position at CSDA be eliminated). The second document was a breakdown of operating costs, which detailed a net loss of \$15,893 for the 2009/2010 school year. It was noted budgeted for the 2009/2010 school year was a loss of \$5,000. Mr. McLaughlin questioned the direction the Board wished to take.

Ms. Lukovits commented washable trays were purchased, which should have reduced the cost associated with paper products, although it was noted labor costs would be affected with the need to clean the trays. Ms. Meagher questioned if Café Services was suggesting the loss is due to wage increases and no increase in revenue. Mr. Milkowski noted the reduction in revenue listed (\$184,822 to \$178,822). Ms. Lukovits noted a higher percentage of lunches occur at CSDA

7/27/10

1 and the population at CSDA has reduced. When asked Mr. McLaughlin stated he has not received an answer with
2 regards to justification of projections.

3 Chairman Partridge questioned how lunch prices in Brookline compare to those in the other two districts. Mr. McLaughlin
4 stated his belief Hollis' prices are slightly higher (perhaps \$.25).

5
6 Mr. Milkowski asked about the process of collecting monies owed. Mr. McLaughlin remarked, as of the previous day,
7 Café Services had been successful in collecting approximately \$3,000 in past due monies. He was unsure of the amount
8 of uncollected funds remaining. He noted the \$3,000 would be deposited into the food account and go forward into next
9 year due to the timing of its receipt (after books closed).

10
11 Mr. Pistor questioned whether credit was being extended as a standard practice. It was noted the policy/procedure states
12 if an account is negative at a certain level, a sandwich is provided instead of a hot lunch, however, that is not being
13 enforced. Mr. Pistor noted his surprise. He remarked the district is required to offer free and reduced meals to families in
14 need but the concept of credit especially if allowed to go beyond \$5 or \$10 seems a good way to lose money. Ms.
15 Lukovits remarked she would not confuse families in need with families that receive assistance. She noted there was an
16 incident at a school in Manchester of refusing a child lunch, which was a humiliating and awful situation. She added,
17 refusing a child hot lunch is not something she would recommend.

18
19 It was suggested letters could be sent out indicating if overdue balances were not satisfied the child(ren) would not be
20 eligible for the lunch program in the upcoming year. The desire was expressed for the breakdown of operating costs to
21 include a bad debt cost item. Mr. McLaughlin noted the line item for student lunch listed at \$89,735 might have had the
22 uncollected debt subtracted out. Compared to 2010, it appears that line has dropped about \$12,000. Another number
23 that would offset that is the Federal and State reimbursements. This past year the district received \$31,700. As the rate
24 has gone up, projected for the coming year is \$39,700 or an approximate \$8,000 increase. The difference on projected
25 income between the 2009/2010 and the 2010/2011 school years is about \$4,000 to \$5,000.

26
27 When the \$750 identified as promotional items was questioned, it was believed to be associated with sampling that is
28 provided on a weekly basis.

29
30 Ms. Meagher questioned whether the \$3,000 administrative reimbursement provided by Café Services if they do not meet
31 a zero balance was listed in the contract as an annual reimbursement or simply applied to the first year of the contract. It
32 was believed to be for the first year only.

33
34 Chairman Partridge noted his surprise in receiving a proposal showing a net loss of \$22,453 without any
35 recommendations for achieving the goal for which the company was hired (breakeven).

36
37 Mr. McLaughlin was asked to ascertain whether the \$3,000 administrative reimbursement associated with an inability to
38 meet a zero balance was a contract item for the first year of the contract or for all years of the contract. He was also
39 asked to obtain from Café Services their recommendations for achieving a zero end balance, clarification on the reduction
40 in the school lunch line item, estimates reimbursements were based on, what the line item for promotions consists of, any
41 reduction in paper costs resulting from the purchase of trays, and where past due accounts are accounted for.

42
43 Lightec

44
45 Mr. McLaughlin informed the Board a meeting was conducted at Town Hall on July 19th to discuss progress to date. He
46 commented the district was moving at an increased pace in January and February in order to meet deadlines with regard
47 to Lightec being identified as the preferred vendor and grant submission with the intent of having the work done over the
48 summer months. Since that time, the Federal Government has put in place middle administration to oversee the project
49 (TRC - national engineering consulting and construction management firm, managing the project on behalf of the Office of
50 Energy Planning through the State of New Hampshire). The State has pulled all Smartstart funding from PSNH, which
51 were monies PSNH was using to offset and work with Lightec to fund the project to get it up and running. Future filings for
52 work completed during the course of the year would have been reimbursed as the filings were submitted. As the Energy
53 Efficiency and Conservation Block Grant (EECBG) funding is not available at this time and with TRC being assigned to
54 oversee Lightec, everything has come to a stall.

55

- 1 He noted, at this point, if Lightec could not walk into our buildings starting tomorrow, they would not be able to get the
- 2 project done even if all funds were available, materials purchased, etc. It is no longer believed the project could be
- 3 completed over the summer months.

7/27/10

1 At best, we are likely looking at pieces of the project being done during winter and spring vacations as well as the
2 Christmas and New Year holiday or simply waiting until next summer.

3
4 Mr. Milkowski questioned, with a large amount of funding available but not expendable, is the group looking for an
5 alternative, i.e., would PSNH consider a reduced rate over a period of time on a quid pro quo basis. Mr. McLaughlin was
6 not aware if they had reached that stage, and stated that was not brought up in any of the discussions.

7
8 Mr. Pistor questioned other funding sources PSNH might be looking at with the reallocation of Smartstart funds. Mr.
9 McLaughlin responded Mr. Venu is trying to ascertain that information and will notify the districts/towns if other options are
10 identified.

11 KINDERGARTEN PROGRAM

12
13
14 Chairman Partridge informed the Board requests had been received by administration with regard to moving children who
15 are age appropriate for kindergarten directly to readiness. The issue was discussed with Principal Perry and
16 Superintendent Hodgdon. The feeling was that would effectively make readiness the fast track kindergarten and would
17 take away from kids that need readiness for what readiness is for, and instead provide all day kindergarten. The
18 administration is not in favor of this and has informed the parents who requested the issue be considered this will not
19 occur.

20
21 Chairman Partridge noted the desire to discuss ways in which the kindergarten program could be strengthened
22 academically. He was unsure changes could be implemented for the coming year, but discussions would have to take
23 place in order to implement changes in the following year. Options to be looked at would be academically strengthening
24 the program, what it would take to go to an all-day kindergarten, which would increase space needs, etc. Ms. Lukovits felt
25 some changes could be implemented for the coming year. When questioned about the time in between the two
26 kindergarten sessions, Principal Perry explained twice a week morning and afternoon children are at special for a total of
27 sixty (60) minutes. The mid-day break is about forty-five (45) minutes long.

28
29 Superintendent Hodgdon stated her understanding of the question to be what programming adjustments might be made
30 to strengthen the overall program. Chairman Partridge remarked Ms. Lukovits was questioning whether there is anything
31 short-term that can be accomplished for the coming year. Ms. Meagher stated her belief the kindergarten day was
32 extended with the implementation of one-way busing. Ms. Lukovits responded no time was added. The day ends at
33 10:55 a.m.

34
35 Chairman Partridge questioned what resources are available from the administration, teachers, etc. to look at the current
36 program. He questioned whether such a review could/should be a joint project with Hollis. Perhaps a group could be
37 formed consisting of administration, board member(s), public, etc. He questioned whether the Board was in agreement
38 this should be pursued. The consensus of the board was to pursue improvement of the academic output of the
39 kindergarten program.

40
41 Mr. Milkowski felt it best to first have an identified baseline and then to set goals. Ms. Lukovits remarked when the
42 program first started it was a developmental program, which she believes the district has long since outgrown.
43 Superintendent Hodgdon suggested defining what the district would like to see from its kindergarten program, identifying
44 objectives to achieve and then performing an assessment of where the program currently stands. Ms. Lukovits stated the
45 need for all to have the firm belief the kindergarten program is insufficient. Superintendent Hodgdon proposed looking at
46 what is a rigorous kindergarten program, what are the elements of a rigorous program, and what are the elements that we
47 want in our kindergarten program.

48
49 Mr. Pistor noted kindergarten is a tough grade in that it is a grade where the children are far apart in terms of the
50 knowledge they come in with. He noted his daughter derived a useful experience from it, however, with regard to
51 curriculum, she came out knowing what she went in knowing as she was prepared for the program. He noted some
52 children attend pre-school and some do not. Some children do not have knowledge of letters, numbers, sounds, etc.
53 Children that began the program without certain knowledge gained incredibly. He suggested the district needs to identify
54 expectations of children entering as well as exiting the program. Ms. Lukovits remarked children come in as they come in
55 and you have to have an end goal that you get to regardless of where they start. That is the one class where you cannot
56 set the beginning point. Mr. Pistor commented, in that case, you have to assume the beginning point is the least common

7/27/10

1 denominator otherwise the children that are at that least common point will almost necessarily be left behind. Ms.
2 Meagher and Ms. Lukovits responded that is why there is differentiated instruction.
3 Chairman Partridge stated the questions to be; what do we want the program to look like, what do we want the program to
4 provide, how that is accomplished, and where the funding would come from. Ms. Lukovits noted math and language
5 materials were purchased a few years ago. The materials are in place. Ms. Meagher commented the math program was
6 implemented. Ms. Pillion remarked materials were ordered and used for about a year. Ms. Lukovits reiterated you have
7 to have teachers that believe the program needs improvement.

8
9 Ms. Pillion added when the kindergarten program came about she was on the committee and in charge of developing
10 curriculum. Her experience was in full-day kindergarten and the curriculum she designed was academically oriented and
11 presented to staff. The kindergarten and 1st grade teachers worked to develop what was workable with the timeframe
12 given. She is unsure how that has developed since. She noted she, Principal Perry and Betsy Black, reading
13 coordinator, have had conversations over the past few weeks.

14
15 Principal Perry noted the State of New Hampshire has adopted the core curriculum. It is anticipated, at an administrative
16 level, they will be taking a hard look at that this year. She will be having conversations with all teams of teachers in terms
17 of a baseline and how the standards are being approached. That is where the kindergarten conversation can begin along
18 with the fact that Ms. Pillion and Ms. Black have been very proactive over the summer. She remarked there are some
19 very willing people in the kindergarten program, and she anticipates working with them to develop a schedule to fit a co-
20 teaching model, be supportive, and move the program forward. However, the need exists to be mindful the program is
21 only 2 and ½ hours in length.

22
23 Chairman Partridge was enthused to hear the discussions are planned, but felt a stronger message could go forward with
24 the understanding it is the goal of the School Board/district to address the kindergarten curriculum as an educational
25 issue.

26
27 Superintendent Hodgdon noted there should be a schedule of program audits for all programs. She suggested along
28 with program auditing the district should look to what other districts are doing in terms of strengthening kindergarten
29 programs with current time and staff constraints. She added there might be some items that could be implemented or
30 strengthening of existing program components that could occur in the coming school year.

31
32 Ms. Lukovits noted some Massachusetts towns have a lottery based full-day program. Chairman Partridge suggested the
33 extended day program in Hollis, which is need based, might be a program the district should look at.

34
35 Superintendent Hodgdon suggested she work with the administration and return to the Board at their next regularly
36 scheduled meeting with a proposal for a group that could come together to work on the issue.

37 38 BENEFIT BUYOUTS

39
40 Chairman Partridge stated benefit buyout is something the other two districts currently do. With new teacher contract
41 negotiations starting this fall, he would like to look into it, as it appears to be a win/win for teachers and the district. Would
42 like to look at offering something this year under the existing contract, but it would have to be worded to apply only to
43 employees currently taking benefits. He commented a program for this year offered to individuals currently taking benefits
44 would be vastly different than a program aimed at the entire group. In the first instance it is a win/win situation whereas in
45 the second case you could have individuals accepting a buyout who do not currently take insurance benefits (each of
46 those would be a cost to the district that would have to be balanced).

47
48 Mr. McLaughlin noted open enrollment in the district has come and gone. The buyout in Hollis is \$1,500 and only applies
49 to teachers (19 individuals participating). At the COOP, the buyout is \$2,750 (30 teachers participating). The total payout
50 for Hollis is \$28,500 and for Brookline \$97,000.

51
52 Chairman Partridge questioned whether there is a rough estimate that this is a cost savings for the district, i.e., was there
53 a comparison done of the first year of the buyout with regard to the number of individuals who chose to take part in the
54 buyout who were taking insurance benefits in the first year. Ms. Lukovits noted that is addressed every year at the annual
55 meeting. Mr. Milkowski stated the COOP has been offering insurance buyout for a number of years. They started at the
56 \$1,500 figure. Chairman Partridge noted the one time you can identify how many individuals would have opted not to take
57 the coverage irregardless of a buyout option would be in the first year such a program was implemented.

1 Ms. Lukovits remarked if an insurance buyout were offered as a temporary measure and approved by the union it would
2 be a win/win situation, however, what would be done with regard to current contract negotiations is different. In the short
3 term, the option would only be offered to individuals currently enrolled in the insurance plan. Ms. Meagher was unclear if
4 such an offer could be made only to individuals currently enrolled in a plan. Ms. Pillion noted, in the past, many staff
5 members have commented to her the district pays 100% of coverage for single-person and if individuals choose to be
6 included on a spouse's plan they are currently not compensated for savings to the district. She felt the proposal of limiting
7 the buyout option to those currently enrolled would be upsetting to some staff members.

8
9 When asked what the percentage of staff taking insurance is, Ms. Lukovits commented it is above 90%. Mr. Milkowski
10 suggested discussing the issue at the August meeting when information could be provided on the number of individuals
11 enrolled for both single and family coverage to allow for discussion of a proposal that could cover all individuals whether
12 currently enrolled or not.

13
14 Mr. McLaughlin remarked if something like this were to be put on the table, the assumption would be that it would
15 continue forward. Chairman Partridge commented he was unsure how easy it would be for individuals who currently
16 receive coverage to switch to a spouse's plan. Ms. Meagher remarked it could not be done until open enrollment. She
17 suggested such a plan would have to have an effective date 6 months out as open enrollment dates are spread out
18 throughout the year. Chairman Partridge was not sure what could be accomplished in the coming year, but added by the
19 time contract negotiations have completed it would effectively be 6 months out.

20
21 Mr. Milkowski suggested the option of pro-rating a buyout to accommodate different open enrollment periods. Chairman
22 Partridge stated a concern those individuals not already receiving coverage would opt in immediately, and the need exists
23 to understand the potential exposure.

24
25 Principal Wenger suggested a sliding scale could be used; individuals would get up to X based on the savings of the
26 district (to cover the cost of those opting out who had not taken the coverage previously). Chairman Partridge remarked it
27 could be offered as; the district will share the profits up to a maximum of X per employee for the year. Ms. Lukovits added
28 the funds could be disbursed at the end of the year once true savings are known. Ms. Milkowski suggested a requirement
29 be for the individual to be enrolled in another plan for the entire year in order to be eligible.

30
31 Superintendent Hodgdon reminded the Board a sidebar agreement with the association would have to be negotiated for
32 the remainder of the existing contract.

33
34 Mr. Pistor questioned whether the Evergreen Clause would come into play if a new contract were not reached by the end
35 of the year. Superintendent Hodgdon responded the Evergreen Clause applies only to salary.

36
37 Mr. McLaughlin stated he would gather information on number of individuals enrolled, etc. and will distribute to the Board
38 prior to their August meeting. Ms. Pillion was asked to poll staff members to determine interest.

39
40 CONTRACT NEGOTIATIONS

41
42 A brief discussion took place with regard to the makeup of the negotiation team. It was determined, as has been the case
43 in the past; the team would consist of two (2) School Board members and two to three (2-3) teachers.

44
45 APPROVAL OF SCHOOL BOARD MINUTES

46
47 Brookline School Board July 14, 2010

48
49 *The following amendment was offered:*

50
51 Member Milkowski's name misspelled.

52
53 **MOTION BY MEMBER MILKOWSKI TO APPROVE AS AMENDED**
54 **MOTION SECONDED BY MEMBER LUKOVITS**
55 **MOTION CARRIED**

56 **4/0**
57 ***Member Meagher Abstained***

1 Brookline School Board July 1, 2010

2
3 **MOTION BY MEMBER MEAGHER TO ACCEPT AS WRITTEN**
4 **MOTION SECONDED BY MEMBER MILKOWSKI**
5 **MOTION CARRIED**
6 **5/0**

7
8 Brookline School Board June 22, 2010

9
10 *The following amendments were offered:*

11 Ms. Cathy Ingram resides at 16 Glenn Drive in Milford, NH not Hollis as was listed.

12 Page 7 – it was Assistant Principal Doig who informed the board the bell system was being addressed on July 2nd.

13
14
15
16 **MOTION BY MEMBER LUKOVITS TO APPROVE AS AMENDED**
17 **MOTION SECONDED BY MEMBER MILKOWSKI**
18 **MOTION CARRIED**
19 **4/0**

20 *Member Pistor Abstained*

21
22
23 Brookline School Board – Non-Public. May 25, 2010

- 24 • ***Held until next regular meeting***

25
26 Brookline School Board – Non-Public – 1st Session April 13, 2010

- 27 • ***Held until next regular meeting***

28
29 Brookline School Board – Non-Public - 2nd Session April 13, 2010

- 30 • ***Held until next regular meeting***

31
32 Brookline School Board – Non-Public March 1, 2010

- 33 • ***Held until next regular meeting***

34
35
36 ***Chairman Partridge informed the Board and the general public, beginning with the August meeting, the Brookline***
37 ***School Board meetings would be conducted at the Town Meeting Hall and would be televised live.***

38
39 ADJOURNMENT

40
41 **MOTION BY MEMBER MILKOWSKI TO ADJOURN**
42 **MOTION SECONDED BY MEMBER MEAGHER**
43 **MOTION CARRIED**

44
45 *The July 27, 2010 meeting of the Brookline School Board was adjourned at 8:18 p.m.*

46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54 Date _____ Signed _____