

# NEWS FROM MOUNT HOLLY'S SCHOOLS

To keep you informed of school consolidation and other developments in education, the Chit Chat is pleased to publish the full approved minutes of the meetings of the education agencies that serve the students and citizens of Mount Holly. These include the **Mount Holly Elementary School Board**, the **Black River High School Board, Union 39 Supervisory Union** (the union of Mount Holly, Ludlow, and Plymouth school districts to ensure that their students succeed at the Black River High School), and the **Two Rivers Supervisory Union** (the recent amalgamation of Union 39 and the supervisory union that serves Chester, Andover, Baltimore, and Cavendish).

## Recent and upcoming Regular Meetings:

Board	Meeting day, time	Meeting date	Agenda	Minutes
Mount Holly Elementary School	First Wed., 7p.m.	May 6	<b>See below</b>	Not approved*
		June 3		
Black River Middle & High School	First Wed., 7p.m.	August 5	Not approved*	
		June 3		
Union 39 Supervisory Union	First Wed., 7p.m.	May 20	<b>See below</b>	Not approved*
		August 5		
Two Rivers Supervisory Union Board	Third Thursday	April 2	<b>See below</b>	
		August 20		
Executive Committee	First Thurs., 6 p.m.	June 18		<b>See below</b>
		Not yet		
Innovations in Education	Second Tues., 4 p.m.	June 25	<b>See below</b>	
		August 11		

*Please note\* the processes for approving and posting of agendas and minutes on the TRSU website have been updated. They are expected to be available monthly. Scheduled meetings times and places are subject to change. Check the calendar listed on [www.trsu.org](http://www.trsu.org) for changes. For any questions or concerns please contact Debbie Carleton, Administrative Assistant to the Superintendent at [802-824-6421](tel:802-824-6421) or [debbie.carleton@trsu.org](mailto:debbie.carleton@trsu.org)*

## MOUNT HOLLY SCHOOL BOARD

Regular Meeting Wednesday, May 6, 2015  
Ludlow Elementary School, Stage  
7:00 p.m.

Following the Meeting of the Union 39 board the Mt. Holly board recessed to the Library to continue their meeting.

### VIII. CALL TO ORDER:

Mt. Holly Board: Hannah Anderson, Bob Herbst, Sebastian Frank, Dave Venter

Staff: Bruce Williams, Linda Waite, Craig Hutt Vater,

Mr. Venter called the meeting to order at 8:58 p.m.

### IX. APPROVAL OF AGENDA:

Mr. Herbst **moved** to approve the agenda. Mr. Frank seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

### X. MINUTES APPROVAL:

Mr. Frank **moved** to approve the minutes from the April 1, 2015 regular meeting. Mr. Herbst seconded. Mr. Hutt Vater noted a typographical error in the Wood Pellet paragraph "discussed" should be "discussion". The motion to approve the minutes as corrected carried unanimously.

### XI. OLD BUSINESS:

#### A. Wood Pellet Boiler Proposal

Mr. Venter reported on a recent conversation with Ms. Cohen regarding her feelings about the Wood Pellet option. There was discussion about the alternative to choosing the Wood Pellet option. The board noted that this option is diversifying their heating, as well as improving the school's carbon footprint, and enhancing the environmental curriculum. Ms. Waite noted that the company doesn't tell you what your usage is or the cost of the pellets, while there are other companies out there that do. They also noted that at the last meeting the board had discussed putting the wood pellet heating option out to bid, and seeking bids for a 5 year plan, rather than a 10 year plan. They noted that Mr. Adams strongly recommended not entering into a 10 year plan. They also discussed comparing the pricing to current fuel rates. The board would like to hear from other companies and then invite the Pellet Co representative back to hear how they compare to the new information. The board also noted their concern with the spam email that they have been receiving from the representative.

### XII. NEW BUSINESS:

#### A. F26-Restraints & Seclusion Policy

Ms. Waite explained that the state reporting form was used as a base and there have been revisions made at the last meeting, along with some small typographical corrections. The reporting form can be adjusted as necessary as it is not part of the policy. The policy itself requires board approval, but doesn't currently need any adjustments. It essentially states that the school district will follow rule 4500. Mr. Herbst **moved** to approve the policy. Ms. Alexander seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

#### B. Limited School Transfer

Mr. Hutt Vater noted that the Mt. Holly board is the most familiar with the transfer program as it very closely follows the RSSU agreement that the Mt. Holly school district is already involved in. One of the differences is that in the RSSU agreement, there is a 2 student differential. However in

this program, there is only a maximum of 6 students allowed out of one school, but doesn't limit the number of students who can come in. Mr. Hutt Vater noted that there are no students from Mt. Holly currently leaving the school, but a few coming in. The limit on those coming in is set by the principal based on classroom size. Ms. Waite noted that Mr. Williams had made mention at the LES meeting of a limit on incoming students as well. The board noted that the language in the agreement doesn't mention a limit on incoming students. Mr. Hutt Vater noted that the limit on the outgoing students is no more than 6 students. This agreement is very clear to state that no more than 6 students at any point in time, not just 6 students (which might be interpreted as 6 per year). There was discussion about the children of staff members (in schools that have the employee benefit) don't have to fall under this program, but this program allows both schools to reap some financial benefit.

Mr. Frank noted a few typographical errors that needed to be corrected—"applications provided by May15" (missing the space between May and 15); article 3, section G, "along withal questionnaires" should be "along with all questionnaires"; article 5, section B, "May15" should be "May 15" with a space. Mr. Hutt Vater noted that LES hasn't yet approved the agreement due to an issue with the LES principal not having received the agreement yet. Ms. Waite noted that for this year only the application dates would be changed once all of the schools have had the opportunity to vote on the agreement. Next year, the application deadline would be in April. Mr. Herbst **moved** to approve the TRSU Limited Elementary School Transfer Program, and thereby authorizing the chair to sign the agreement on the board's behalf. Mr. Frank seconded and the motion carried unanimously. Mr. Hutt Vater noted that families moving into Mt. Holly will have the ability to choose from 7 elementary schools to send their children to.

### **C. Principal's Report**

Graduation will be Thursday, 6/11 at 6:00 p.m. The end of school and volunteer appreciation picnic will be at 11 on the last day of school, 6/12. The talent show will be at 9am intermingled into the day. Field day will be on 6/10 in the afternoon. On June 5, there will be a Food, Family and Fun event. It will be part of the Farm to Food initiative—yoga, smoothies, planting, and many other family oriented activities will be happening. There will also be a playground update that many people will be working on. The school concert will be on May 26.

Mr. Hutt Vater reported that SBAC testing was completed today. He noted that technology-wise, the testing went well. The testing itself was rigorous. The students were allowed many breaks. MAPS testing began today for the lower grades. The local assessments have aligned with the common core. Ms. Alexander questioned what the instructional approach will be when implementing curriculum based on the test results. Mr. Hutt Vater noted that Mt. Holly does this on an ongoing basis. Philosophically, Mt. Holly doesn't "teach to the test", however the staff does evaluate the results and determine where they need to better focus their curriculum. Ms. Waite noted that the SBAC test results will not be used this year to determine AYP. The staff and administration will need some time to review the results to analyze the data.

Mr. Hutt Vater noted his concern with the SBAC testing not leveling down quickly enough for some students who had difficulties with the test. The test is supposed to challenge up for students who are getting questions correct, and level down for students who are getting questions incorrect. Mr. Hutt Vater reported on some specific examples where the leveling down didn't happen. The administration will investigate and try to determine why this happened.

The board also discussed the Foundation Search tool and if it has been successful so far. There was discussion about the after school program and about the Title I and Title II grants. Mr. Venter questioned how successful the grant writer has been with receiving funds. Neither Ms. Waite nor Mr. Hutt Vater had a sense of her success rate. The board discussed the guarantee that comes with the Foundation Search tool. The board would like an update on the grant success through the Foundation Search tool at the next meeting.

Mr. Hutt Vater reported that the petition that received 1000 signatures to stop and continue researching the merger bill has caused the legislature to hold a press release. Opponents to the bill are looking for virtual and actual participation in the discussion. Mr. Hutt Vater noted that there are a lot of great points in the bill, but it would be better served by being voluntary and by showing the benefits of this type of change, using TRSU as a model. He noted that the legislature may not stop discussion, but Mr. Hutt Vater suggested letting them know that if they aren't going to stop, at least make the two changes suggested in Mr. Hutt Vater's letter. Mr. Venter noted that with or without H361, the Mt. Holly district will have a difficult budget next year.

Mr. Hutt Vater noted that Mr. William's recommendation was to continue with Café Services. He reported that there has been a significant amount of research recently into Mt. Holly doing their own local lunch program. He noted that currently, they budget \$2500 and there is a guarantee that the cost won't go over that. No such guarantee exists with doing a local program. He discussed the farm to school program, FRL rates, and participation levels. At this point, they don't have a picture on the all of the expenses related to the program. Mr. Hutt Vater noted that Café Services will likely be bringing a different person into Mt. Holly next year. He also reported on some hybrid options they have been discussing to begin a transition to a local service. The board discussed some of the equipment that they will need. They also discussed how the position of food service supervisor would be advertised. The board discussed some of the benefits of a local program versus the transported food, including variety and quality. Mr. Hutt Vater noted that the hybrid issue has not yet been broached with Café Services, so he is not sure about their feelings on this. Mr. Venter questioned the impact of federal requirements on a local program. Ms. Alexander noted that she hoped that the Farm to School program would help guide them on a local program. There was discussion about a cost/benefit analysis for a local program. Mr. Frank noted that he felt that the financial risk is worth making sure that the students have a nutritious meal with fresh fruits and vegetables. He also suggested having farmers be able to sell fresh food to students at the end of the day to bring home to their families. The board discussed the Hydroponic farmer near the school and having a hydroponic display in the cafeteria. Mr. Hutt Vater also reported on the Seeds to Supper initiative in the past that helped families create quick healthy meals. Mr. Hutt Vater will follow up on the options for the next meeting. Ms. Alexander noted her interest in serving on a food service committee.

### **D. Other Business**

Ms. Waite requested that Mr. Venter sign the code of ethics as he was not at the reorganizational meeting when the other board members signed it. Mr. Herbst noted that it was good to have the chairman back at the meeting.

Mr. Frank questioned the signing of the warrants and how the process was done prior to the inception of the TRSU. Mr. Venter noted that the same process has been followed for many years, just the SU location changed from 9 High St in Ludlow to Route 103 South in Ludlow. Mr. Frank noted his concern about the location of the warrants. Ms. Waite recounted her conversation with Mr. Adams and Ms. Hammond regarding the courier to Mt. Holly. The courier schedule doesn't work with the payroll dates. There was some discussion about possible options to make it work. Ms. Alexander could also help out if the warrants could be signed at the Mt. Holly School. Mr. Venter noted that there was quite a bit of benefit to board members who review and sign the warrants.

### **XIII. MEETING DATES & AGENDA ITEMS:**

The next regular meeting will be on Wednesday, June 3, 2015 at 7:00 p.m. at Mt. Holly Elementary School.

### **XIV. ADJOURNMENT:**

Mr. Herbst **moved** to adjourn the meeting at 10:12 p.m. Mr. Frank seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

Respectfully submitted, Amber Wilson, Board Recording Secretary

## Black River High School & Middle School AGENDA

Meeting of the Board of Directors

Location: MHS – Gymnasium Date: Wednesday, June 3, 2015 Time: 7:00 p.m.

### I. Meeting of Union 39

### VII. Meeting of Black River High and Middle Schools Board

### VIII. Call to Order

### IX. Approval of Agenda Action

### X. Approval of Minutes

a. Minutes of May 6, 2015-Regular Meeting Action

b. Minutes of May 20, 2015-Special Meeting Action

### XI. Old Business

a. Limited School Transfer

b. Finalize Proficiency Based Learning Plan

c. Athletic & Student Handbook Approval Plan

d. Dress Code

### XII. New Business

a. Nomination of Girls Varsity Soccer Position

b. Principal Report *Informational*

c. Public Comments

d. Other Business

### XIII. Meeting Dates & Agenda Items

a. Regular Meeting, July 1, 2015 – BRM&HS

### XIV. Executive Session-*Personnel & Secure the Building*

### XV. Adjournment Action

## UNION 39 SCHOOL BOARD

Special Meeting Wednesday, May 20, 2015

Black River High School, Library Learning Common, 7:00 p.m.

### I. CALL TO ORDER:

U39 Board: Randy Bixby, Bruce Schmidt, Linda Guerrero, Dan Buckley, Angi Benson-Ciufo, Sue Barton (arrived 7:48 p.m.)

Staff: Shannon Martin, Linda Waite, Karen Trimboli, Craig Hutt Vater, Pam O'Neil, Tom Ferenc, Michael Eppolito, Lauren Baker

Public: Lisa Schmidt (LES board)

Mr. Schmidt called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

### II. APPROVE AGENDA:

Ms. Benson-Ciufo **moved** to approve the agenda. Ms. Guerrero seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

### III. STAFFING UPDATE:

#### A. Resignation

Ms. Good's letter was included in the board packet. Ms. Martin read her letter aloud. She will not be returning to the school after her leave is done. The schools are looking for a replacement. Ms. Martin noted that Ms. Good also sent a letter to the students, and came to last night's concert. There was discussion about her not having been given a new contract since she hadn't yet returned to school, but the assumption was that she would have been given one. Ms. Benson-Ciufo **moved** to accept Ms. Good's letter of resignation with thanks for her service. Ms. Guerrero seconded. The board requested that the administration send her a letter thanking her for her time. The motion carried unanimously.

### IV. PROFICIENCY BASED GRADUATION REQUIREMENTS:

Ms. Waite reported that the 8 member team has been working since October on Proficiency Based Graduation Requirements and Proficiency Based Learning. The team introduced themselves and Ms. Waite noted that Mr. Waryzniak is also part of the team, but was unable to be here tonight. Ms. Trimboli explained why there is elementary school representation on a graduation requirement team, noting that the elementary education feeds into the secondary education so the preparation needs to start early. The team is attending a 2 day seminar each month and they are discussing what needs to be done and what has already been done. They are also discussing what PBGR's will mean to the students. The team gave a presentation regarding the PBGR's beginning with the team's mission statement: The Two Rivers Supervisory Union is committed to changing the culture of our schools to a proficiency based learning system that allows and encourages all students to be successful in our schools, higher education, careers, and citizenship. They also outlined the team's beliefs: With meaningful feedback all can achieve; All attempts in learning will be welcomed as opportunities for personal and academic growth; A respectful and encouraging learning environment will enhance student engagement; Professionals must collaborate to evaluate the impact of their practices and behavior on student learning; Effective professional development happens in collaboration with teachers and administrators.

Mr. Hutt Vater noted that current education systems can be described as a "mile wide and an inch deep" but the team is working on transitioning education to develop more detailed processes, including revisions, for a high quality outcome. The educators need to give more feedback-specific and detailed in order to improve outcomes. The presentation included a video about Austin's butterfly—that illustrates revision and specific feedback and the premise of continuing to revise until it is right. The presentation describes how to change a grading average to proficiency reporting with more specific feedback. The team described the difference between a formative assessment and a summative assessment being similar to the difference between a physical exam and an autopsy. The proficiency process allows the student to persevere and develop grit. They noted that many schools in Maine are already practicing proficiency based learning.

There was discussion about not necessarily everyone can be fully proficient. Ms. Waite noted that first they need to determine what proficiencies will be required and then move to PLP's to determine how those will work with each student. She also explained that there are 8 other teams in this area and two other areas in Vermont with approximately the same number of teams working on PBGR's. The grant that they have received to attend the conferences is giving them the opportunity and teachers and administrators to learn about this process. Ms. O'Neil reported on the VT schools who are currently using some form of proficiency based learning. She noted that the class of 2020, the current 7<sup>th</sup> graders, will be the first class to graduate with this change. She explained that there are 7 areas of education quality standards in which students will need to demonstrate proficiency: global citizenship, science, PE, math, health, performing arts and ELA. In addition there are certain content skills that students will need to demonstrate.

These transferable skills are clear, effective communication; self-direction; creative, practical problem solving; responsible, involved citizenship; and informed integrative thinking. Technology will also be woven into all the transferable skills.

The team noted that the overview requires graduation standards in which there is no one way to show proficiency—students show a body of evidence indicating proficiency; performance indicators that will describe what the student needs to know and show; and learning targets which are mini tasks showing specific skills. Mr. Eppolito described an example of a graduation requirement process from elementary through middle school through high school. Some of the work will be collaborative, while other work will be individual and each level would have to be met in order to build to the next. In the high school, the PLP will be able to elaborate how the student will get to the PBGR's. The team discussed how this plan gives the student much more flexibility to meet the requirements. Mr. Buckley noted that peer directed feedback will not only help the student receiving the feedback, but also the student giving the feedback. The board asked how the teachers will learn how to give this kind of specific feedback, and how they will teach the children to give this kind of specific feedback. Ms. Martin noted that the teachers need instruction, coaching and feedback themselves. They need talented teachers and intentional instruction. Ms. Schmidt also noted that the teachers also need to learn about child development in order to be successful.

Mr. Buckley questioned what happens with a special education student who can't meet a proficiency based requirement. Ms. Waite noted that special education by definition is specialized instruction to meet their potential with whatever necessary accommodations the student might need. Special education PLP's will differ from regular education PLP's and will be more applicable to their path. Mr. Eppolito described the ten principals that guide the proficiency based learning include assessments, evaluations, communication, student designed learning with multiple pathways, receiving feedback, and being allowed to retry. Ms. Waite described collaborative professional development having been building to this point. The long range plan is for the class of 2020 to graduate with PBGR's, and that means that the teachers and administration need to build a timeline. They have built a draft timeline and will have a more detailed version, but this will be a systemic change.

Ms. O'Neil noted that there has been work that has been doing which will impact the work they are going to do. She described Act 77 and the dual enrollment which will still be paid by the state. The flexible pathways includes dual enrollment and early college and other increased blended learning opportunities, such as career and tech ed as well as work based learning such as internships and work study. The PLP will provide information to students, teachers and parents to show strengths, challenges, interests and goals. The PLP will follow a team approach with a teacher-advisor, parents and the student. The document will be a growing document and will change as the student changes. There was discussion about the document allowing the flexibility for the student to demonstrate their proficiency. Mr. Eppolito described who is responsible for what parts of the plan. All of those involved will have to work together as a team, including the board and the parents. There was discussion about PLP's being updated at least annually per statute, but since the plan is for them to be tied to an advisory system, they can be updated as needed. The parents will need to meet with and have conversations with the administration and guidance regarding the PLP's.

Mr. Schmidt questioned how the SBAC falls into the PBGR's. Ms. Martin noted that the common core is still the basis for learning. She also noted that they will keep what's working and update the rest. She noted that the biggest challenge will be to effect change in the system and the teachers and how to provide the time and resources to make that change. She noted that there are 7 PD days, but only 5 usable ones (one is part of opening the school, the other is part of closing the school). She suggested that they need some time built into their day for this type of work. That same time can be used for student enrichment. Ms. Trimboli suggested enrichment similar to the alternative learning that is part of the ASP. The teachers could use Tuesday afternoons for the PBGR training. They wouldn't have early release on those days, because it is important for the students to continue to have benefit of the school day. They could use this time for enrichment based learning, student government, and mentoring, among other things. Grades 7-9 could work on Qwest type programs, while grades 10-12 could focus on their PLP's, shadowing, internships, etc. Ms. Waite noted that it is also important for students to learn what they don't like as well. This time will put the teachers to work on assessments and learning in order to meet state guidelines. They will also be working so there are no contract issues.

The board questioned what other schools are doing with the PBGR's. Ms. Martin noted that without the extra time, she will still be able to meet the statute deadline, but it won't be as meaningful as if it would if given the planning time that the team is suggesting. The team noted that it is a long process and they need the elementary schools to support the systemic change. This is a 5-6 year plan that will be happening. In the winter time, the afternoons will still be a ski day for those schools will ski days. There was discussion about appealing to Okemo to have all TRSU schools have the same ski day for this purpose. There was discussion about having the para-educators running the enrichment programs. Ms. Trimboli indicated that some of the para-educators will still be needed to provide services to the students they 1:1 with; others will still be needed for special education programming; and others will need to help with this systemic change. The team is looking into enrichment options that won't cost the districts extra money. Ms. Martin noted that there are many resources available to the schools that they don't currently take advantage of because of the reduction in instructional time to the students involved as well as to those left in the classroom. This option allows students to take advantage of these additional resources.

The board discussed the need for the administration to hold the teachers accountable for using the time for this purpose. Ms. Martin noted that the teachers have become more engaged and are seeing the value in this process. The other schools have a ski day currently, so they have already built in PD time for the teachers. The teachers need to be able to work together. They also need to plan for student enrichment in order to keep the students engaged in learning activities. The board questioned what will happen if they endorse it, but the other boards don't. Ms. Martin noted that they could still use the ski day time for some of this work. Ms. Martin noted that the high school has an imminent timeline and must give the board a document before the 2016-2017 school year that the board needs to approve. Mr. Schmidt questioned how the school was going to be able to make up the 60-ish hours of classroom time that the students would be missing without impacting their education. Ms. Martin noted that they need to look at what quality education looks like and how education is delivered. This enrichment will help give students a level of engagement in their learning—they won't have to choose between their education and the resources and alternative instruction that interest them.

The board discussed changes to the number of credits to graduate and what the flexible pathways would impact. Ms. Martin noted that there needed to be rigor in the PLP's. They wouldn't look the same for each student but they would help push each student to meet his/her potential. The advisor will help the student stretch to meet that potential. Ms. O'Neil noted that this would be helpful to engage students who are typically difficult to engage which will help reduce the dropout rate. For students who need more of a challenge, they wouldn't just show proficiency, but the PLP's will help them demonstrate proficiency with distinction, with a portfolio or project. Ms. Martin noted that they don't have all the answers yet, but the PBGR team wants to know if the board supports the time needed for the planning. Mr. Schmidt suggested that the topic be placed on the June agenda and the board can think of questions about the planning time and student time and forward them to him so he can get them to the team for answers to be given at the next meeting.

Mr. Schmidt also noted that the school needs to teach basic life skills such as how to balance a check book, how to buy a car or real estate, responsible credit card use, and how to interview. This planning time could also be used for GLO, NHS, and student council meetings. Ms. Martin noted that the 8 person team can't think of all the questions, so they welcome the board's questions and ideas. It was also noted that the Tuesday

afternoon programming needs organization to make the program rigorous. The board also noted that it was too bad that the other boards haven't been given this same presentation yet so decisions could be made with all the boards on the same page.

**V. MEETING DATES & AGENDA ITEMS:**

The next regular meeting will be on Wednesday, June 3, 2015 at 7:00 p.m. at Mt. Holly Elementary School.

**VI. ADJOURNMENT:**

Ms. Guerrero **moved** to adjourn the meeting at 9:05 p.m. Ms. Barton seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

Respectfully submitted, Amber Wilson, Board Recording Secretary

**TWO RIVERS SUPERVISORY UNION BOARD**

THURSDAY, APRIL 2, 2015 6:30 P.M. CTES-Multipurpose Room

**I. CALL TO ORDER** A. ROLL CALL: Board: Wayne Wheelock, Julie Dupont, Bob Herbst, Angi Benson-Ciufo, Linda Guerrero, Jake Arace, Joe Fromberger, Lisa Schmidt, Gene Bont, Doug McBride, Fred Marin, Donna Parker (arrived 7:00 p.m.) Staff: Bruce Williams, Lauren Baker, Linda Waite, George Thomson, Chris Adams, Shannon Martin, Venissa White, Tom Ferenc, Jeannie Phillips, Craig Hutt Vater, Colin McKaig, Mike Eppolito Other Board Members: Dan Buckley Public: Chuck Scranton, Shawn Cunningham, Cynthia Prairie Student Rep: Skylar White, Lexi White Mr. Herbst called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. As they had not yet reached quorum at this point, they began with the presentation portion of the agenda.

**II. PRESENTATIONS: A. Rowland Fellowship** Mr. Scranton introduced himself and described the Rowland Foundation's work to facilitate "bottom-up change" fueled by passionate teachers. He reported that there are currently 44 high school teachers that are Rowland Foundation fellows and the foundation has given \$3.5 million to VT high schools. He described some of the work done by Rowland fellows. He introduced Mr. McKaig and Ms. Phillips as the TRSU Rowland fellows. Mr. McKaig presented his information on the study of technology in the curriculum, particularly the use of cell phones to aid in education and the neuroscience behind what happens in the brain with technology. He described some of his work and his conferences. Ms. Phillips presented her information on increasing productivity and learning through purpose, passion and play. The work needs to be relevant to the student, interesting and fun so the student wants to explore. She described some of her course of study, along with the conferences she attended. She also reported on some of the ways she is bringing that work into the school through various groups and activities. Mr. Herbst thanked them on behalf of all the boards and noted that TRSU is fortunate to have a faculty that is so engaged. The audience gave them a round of applause.

**B. Best Practices** Mr. Williams reminded the board how the Best Practices initiative came to be and how the board members became acutely involved and knowledgeable about the best practices in their own school. The board members were asked to define the practices, explain how they came to be and describe what sustains them. Mr. Williams noted that the IIL committee meetings are some of the best attended meetings in the entire SU. Mr. Williams read aloud the TRSU vision statement draft that has been being developed. The committee members presented their information in a Prezi presentation. Some of the key best practices were collaboration with community, communication, developing relationships, middle school faculty teams, student accountability and responsibility, the after school program, mindfulness, applying knowledge, sustainable energy, staff resourcefulness, unified arts, enrichment programs outside regular school hours, personalize learning, block scheduling at the elementary level so that certain topics, like math, are taught to all students at the same time, creativity and rigor, teaching the whole child, grass roots professional development, student citizenship, student engagement, tolerance, student enrichment, and student pledges. Each committee member went into great detail regarding their topic and how it impacts the school. The board recessed at 8:20 p.m. The board returned from recess at 8:25 p.m.

**III. APPROVAL OF AGENDA:** Ms. Guerrero moved to approve the agenda with the removal of the Finance Software discussion. Dr. Bont seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

**IV. REORGANIZATION: A. Election of Board Chair(s) and or Vice Chair** Mr. Herbst noted that some people have felt that the board should have one chair and leave the co-chair model. Ms. Benson-Ciufo moved to follow a chair/vice-chair model. Ms. Parker seconded. Mr. Herbst noted that having 2 people helped to share the workload and each knew the other would be able to run a meeting in their absence. Mr. Fromberger noted that he was a strong supporter of the co-chair model and felt it should continue until the group felt they were one unit. He felt now was that time. The motion to adopt the chair/vice-chair model carried unanimously. 1 Mr. Fromberger nominated Mr. Herbst as the Chair. There was discussion about nominating Ms. Mahusky and if that could be done when she was not present to accept the nomination. Ms. Parker nominated Ms. Mahusky. The board cast written votes and Mr. Herbst was elected with one vote in opposition. Mr. Fromberger nominated Ms. Benson-Ciufo as the Vice Chair. There were no other nominations and Ms. Benson-Ciufo was elected unanimously.

**B. Elect Clerk** Ms. Benson-Ciufo nominated Ms. Dupont as board clerk. There were no other nominations and Ms. Dupont was elected unanimously.

**C. Elect Treasurer** Ms. Dupont nominated Mr. Fromberger as the treasurer. There were no other nominations and Mr. Fromberger was elected unanimously.

**D. Meeting Date & Time** The board consensus was to set the regular meeting on the 1st Thursday of December, and the April meeting date to be determined at 6:30 p.m. with the executive committee meetings being held monthly on the 1st Thursday of the other months. The board discussed having the April meeting a week later so that the LES board would have time to reorganize before the TRSU meeting. Mr. Williams also noted that it is helpful that board members had let him know they wouldn't be able to attend tonight so they could determine if they would have a quorum.

**E. Newspaper for Legal Notices** Ms. Dupont moved to name the Vermont Journal as the newspaper of record with the Rutland Herald as a backup in the event of an emergency meeting. Ms. Guerrero seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

**F. Appointment of Attorney** Ms. Guerrero moved to not appoint an attorney at this time, but rather consult with one whose area of expertise matches the situation at hand should one become necessary. Dr. Bont seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

**G. Warrant Signer** Currently the warrant signers are Mr. Herbst and Ms. DesLauriers. Mr. Herbst suggested that they just have one warrant signer and a backup. Ms. Guerrero moved to appoint Mr. Herbst as the warrant signer and Ms. BensonCiufo as the backup. Ms. Schmidt seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

**H. Code of Conduct** All board members present signed the code of conduct.

**I. Committee Assignments** Mr. Herbst noted that the committee list was in the board packet for their review. He requested that board members make not of what committees they would like to be on and which ones they would like to be removed from and email him with that information. He also suggested that the committee list be emailed to the local board members so they could join a committee if they were interested.

**V. APPROVAL OF MINUTES:** A. Minutes of December 17, 2014 regular meeting Ms. Dupont noted that she had made corrections at the January meeting and the corrected minutes were approved then.

**VI. NEW BUSINESS:**

**A. Financials** Mr. Adams noted that all budgets have passed except LES whose annual meeting is this coming Monday. He noted that this year was a challenge with Act 153 and the special education expenses moving to the SU budget. He noted that the goal of a budget is to break even and at this time, the SU budget appears like it will break even. He reported that he has been delivering audits to the board. He also reported that the audits have all been successful with no findings of material weaknesses or significant deficiencies. He reminded the board about the importance of streamlining the contracts as much as possible to help the business office.

**B. Limited School Choice 2** Mr. Williams reported that the IIL committee has recommended to all the local boards to approve the limited school choice program from preK-8. The agreement is modeled after the RSSU agreement. He noted that the committee felt that the agreement is family friendly. He reminded board members that each board has the option to approve or disapprove the agreement. He indicated that as long as they have at least 3 of the 4 boards participating in the preK- 6 agreement, they will move forward with the approving schools. He also reported that currently the TRSU schools lose about \$60,000 in ADM due to the employee benefit of non-resident children of staff members being allowed to attend certain schools. This program would allow the TRSU schools to capture the ADM. The middle schools will be able to capture about \$45,000 worth of ADM with the 7/8 program if it is approved.

**C. Summer Meeting** The board discussed leaving it to the executive committee to plan the summer meeting. There was discussion about the board feeling weighted down by Vermont Education Finance. Mr. Williams noted that the board needs to begin to discuss what they can do to think outside the box so they can provide a quality education for a lower cost.

**D. Public Comments** None.

**E. Other Business** Mr. Herbst suggested that everyone contact their senators and request that they amend the bill that passed the house so that TRSU is not required to do another merger. The bill as it stands requires that districts of less than 1100 students merge by 2017. Many members of this board felt that they had already completed that step and therefore be exempt from this new law. They also suggested urging the senators to count preschool students toward the 1100.

**VII. MEETING DATES & AGENDA ITEMS:** A. Executive Committee, May 7, 2015, 6:30 p.m. at the Roost

**VIII. ADJOURNMENT:** Mr. Wheelock moved to adjourn at 8:50 p.m. Ms. Guerrero seconded and the motion carried unanimously. Respectfully submitted, Amber Wilson Board Recording Secretary

## **TWO RIVERS SUPERVISORY UNION EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**

**THURSDAY, JUNE 18, 2015 6:00 P.M. TRSU-The Roost, Conference Room**

**I. CALL TO ORDER**

A. ROLL CALL:

Executive Committee: Wayne Wheelock, Marilyn Mahusky, Angi Benson-Ciufo, Gene Bont, Alison DesLauriers, Julie Dupont, Joann Wilson

Staff: Bruce Williams, Linda Waite, Chris Adams

Public:

Ms. Benson-Ciufo called the meeting to order at 6:01 p.m.

**II. APPROVAL OF AGENDA:**

Ms. DesLauriers **moved** to approve the agenda with the addition of a financial update. Ms. Wilson seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

**III. MINUTES:**

A. Minutes of May 7, 2015 special meeting.

Ms. DesLauriers **moved** to approve the minutes of the May 2, 2015 regular meeting. Ms. Wilson seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

**IV. OLD BUSINESS:**

A. Financial Software

Mr. Adams reported on a new consideration since the executive committee last met. He noted that there was a misunderstanding on his part. Since TRSU has only officially been in business for two years, the SU is not eligible for the lease interest rate that he had originally reported they would get. They would have had to be in business for at least three years and have three sets of audits. Mr. Adams noted that he is also requesting more spending. One of the best time savings will be the electronic time keeping. He reported that the salesman kept saying "we can do that" during the presentation, so he thought that the product was included in the quote. The new quote for the addition was originally \$16,000-\$17,000, but as a result of some negotiations, it is now \$10,413. The change in efficiency will allow them to cut down on some staff needed for payroll. The product is called Time Clock Plus. The system will allow the supervisor to sign off on a standard set of hours each week. The original quote was \$85,927 with a 3.07% interest rate. Ms. Dupont questioned if they could apply for the lease at the current rate and then re-finance next year when they have been in business for three years. The board discussed the increase in interest rates over time, the work required to refinance and whether it will be worth it at that time. There was discussion about being able to set up the payroll system for zero hours unless the employee enters otherwise. Mr. Adams noted that the setting up will likely be up to each individual boards. Ms. Wilson questioned if entries are done manually after the fact, to make sure that someone is monitoring the system to ensure that salary line items don't go over budget.

Ms. DesLauriers **moved** to purchase from Tyler Technologies the Infinite Visions software at a cost of \$96,340, taking a 5 year lease option through Municipal Leasing Consultants with an interest rate of 3.95%, intending at the conclusion of the lease to buy for \$1.00 the software that was leased, and authorizing the superintendent, Bruce Williams, to sign any legal agreements to execute this motion, while keeping the prepayment option of paying 102% of any balance that is prepaid. Mr. Wheelock seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

**V. NEW BUSINESS:**

**A. Superintendent's Report**

i. Fall Retreat Planning, Legislative Discussion

Mr. Williams noted that the idea came from multiple boards to begin some financial planning. He also reported that the DCLC group is also working on collaborative planning to assist the financial situation while still providing quality educational opportunities. He noted that Act 46 intervenes the thought process to restructure for efficiencies. He suggested that the boards and SU as a whole need to look at the intent and scope of the legislation to see what can be done. He also distributed a summary of the legislation. He suggested that the boards hold a significant discussion in August regarding the Act. He noted that three of the schools in the SU will likely lose the small schools grant. That is up for debate, but it is very likely. If the SU didn't follow Act 46, they will lose significant tax incentives. The pool in the Ed Fund will be shrinking to fund these incentives so the SU is effectively getting hit twice—they will be taxed based on a smaller pool. There are many advantages of forming a preK-12 district, but there are impacts that the constituents may have issues with. He reported on some of the advantages of a single district, such as 6 boards having voted on a limited school transfer program. The one board would be able to administer those transfers as they felt proper. He acknowledged the disadvantage of losing the local community feel of the individual schools. Mr. Williams noted that each school could have a governing council that could work with the board member representing that area, which would almost have the same effect of the school board currently. Mr. Williams also noted that with a unified tax rate, there will be the feeling of “winners and losers” with regard to the impact of the taxes the first year. This is somewhat offset by the tax incentives that the SU will receive.

There was discussion about the school choice towns. They cannot be represented in a preK-12 district. There would be a distinct advantage to give up school choice and join a district. They will be better off financially, but the students will lose school choice. Mr. Williams reported that the Plymouth board directed him to negotiate a joint contract with WCSU or TRSU that is best financially for them, but this change might interrupt that process. The board discussed the voting process to create a new district and what happens if the voters vote it down. They also discussed what can be done if one town votes it down. Mr. Williams noted that with enough students, the other schools could proceed, however there wouldn't be enough students without all of the towns. Mr. Williams also reported that Brad James advised him that the SU would still be eligible for the incentives even though they already received incentives 2 years ago for merging SU's. Ms. Mahusky questioned if they would be eligible for some waivers of some of the steps since they have already done some of them recently. Mr. Williams noted that they can abbreviate the process a bit.

Mr. Williams noted that there is an accelerated process and a process that is less so. The accelerated process gives the new district all of the incentives, but the one that is less so, gives them 4/5 of the incentives. Mr. Williams noted that Mr. Leopold will help with this process at no charge. He suggested August 4 for a meeting. He noted that the board members here need to discuss this situation with their constituent boards and take information about Act 46 to the retreat. Ms. DesLauriers noted that Mr. Williams' comments of “leaving money on the table” by not getting the incentives are not necessarily a great thing given the increase in that town's expenses as a result of the unified tax rate. Mr. Williams noted that Mr. Adams will do a financial comparison for the boards. There was discussion about how Mr. Adams would make this comparison. There was discussion about whether the work already done is enough to qualify for the incentives. Mr. Williams noted that it is not, and the SU would not be eligible for any of the incentives. If the goals of the law are achieved outside of the preferred model, they won't get the penalties, but they also won't be eligible for the incentives.

Mr. Adams gave a first blush analysis of the impact of this change, using FY16 ed spending. He explained the process of the calculations, using expected tax rates. The basic numbers indicate that Chester, Andover and Cavendish's expenses will go up, while Ludlow and Mt. Holly will go down. He also noted that the tax incentives are also impacted based on the average and the caps. There was discussion about the reduced rate that Baltimore receives from CAES. Mr. Williams suggested that this comparison doesn't show what would happen if the SU decided not to create the SD. Mr. Adams noted that the tax rate would be raised so much in some places that staff might have to be cut. Mr. Williams reported that he discussed a potential appeal with the state board regarding not consolidating elementary schools based on both building/physical plant size and on geography. He noted that many of the school buildings in the TRSU need much work. Ms. Mahusky noted that the TRSU is currently poised to start moving forward with creative and innovative changes, but will now have to put that on pause to complete these required analyses. There was discussion about the board representation in this new format.

#### **B. Staffing**

Ms. Waite reported that they are recommending a school wide SWP Math Teacher at .8 fte. This is filling a position vacated due to a retirement. She noted that the position in the past has vacillated between 1.0 and .8 fte. She reported that this position used to be in the local budget, but now that special education and related services have been brought into the SU last year. The recommendation is for Laurie Birmingham. Ms. Waite reported on her teaching experience, as well as her education history at Vermont Mathematics Institute. Ms. DesLauriers **moved** to hire Laurie Birmingham as the SWP Math Teacher at Chester Andover Elementary School as recommended. Ms. Mahusky seconded. The board discussed the hiring being based on the salary scale in the master agreement. The motion carried unanimously.

Ms. Waite reported that today she finished interviewing for the Title I Reading teacher. The new candidate will be filling the position Charlene Leonard retired from. She reported that the recommendation is to hire Kim Farrar, pending her release from her contract in Springfield. She currently has a verbal release from the superintendent. Ms. Waite reported on her teaching and education history. This position would be for a 1.0 fte position. There was discussion about these new hires coming in at a lower rate of pay than the people who have left the positions. Ms. DesLauriers **moved** to hire Kim Farrar as the Title I Reading Teacher at Chester Andover Elementary School as recommended. Ms. Mahusky seconded and the motion carried unanimously. Ms. Mahusky questioned if there was a concern for the candidate having moved around between jobs often. Ms. Waite reported that she was at most of these past positions for many years. The motion carried unanimously.

#### **C. PBGR (possible joint Elementary/High School Board Meeting)**

Mr. Williams reported on the PBGR requirement at the high school level. He noted that the high school boards have been presented with the information. He also reported that it is important for elementary schools to begin planning for their students' to transition into this requirement. He is suggesting having joint Elementary and High School meetings to discuss that transition. There was discussion about holding a joint meeting in August and whether it would be instead of, or in addition to, the regular meeting. There was discussion about preparation documentation for the meeting. The board discussed holding this meeting as a carousel meeting with the regular meeting being held afterward.

#### **D. Public Comments**

Mr. Wheelock noted his concern for people at meetings having, and being on, their phones during meetings. There was discussion about some people receiving the agenda on their phones, so they are necessary. Mr. Wheelock noted that when people are texting during meetings, they are not necessarily paying attention to the conversation. Mr. Williams suggested a possible compromise being giving the chair a head's up that they might need to receive or make a call or text. The board discussed being courteous to the other people at the meeting by silencing the phones.

#### **E. Financial Report**

Mr. Adams reminded the board members that the goal of a budget is to get to zero. He noted that as it stands right now, he anticipates a \$25,000-\$30,000 surplus on the budget that can be used next year. He explained the factors that are impacting the amount of surplus, such as revenues and re-allocation of special education services. There was brief discussion about the next budget and the special education expenses within that budget.

#### **VI. EXECUTIVE SESSION:**

Ms. Wilson **moved** to enter executive session at 7:27 p.m. to discuss negotiations and personnel inviting Mr. Williams and Ms. Waite. Ms. Dupont seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

The board returned from executive session at 7:40 p.m. Ms. DesLauriers **moved** to hire Mr. Adams as the Director of Finance for the 2015-2016 school year at a salary of \$89,500 for the year, Ms. Baker for the same year as the Director of Information Technology/Integration/Instruction at a salary of \$70,392, and Ms. Barton for the same year as the Director of Student Support Services at a salary of \$90,202. Ms. Mahusky seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

#### **VII. MEETING DATES & AGENDA ITEMS:**

A. Regular Meeting, TBD

#### **VIII. ADJOURNMENT:**

Ms. Mahusky **moved** to adjourn at 7:41 p.m. Ms. Dupont seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

Respectfully submitted, Amber Wilson, Board Recording Secretary

### **TWO RIVERS SUPERVISORY UNION INNOVATIONS IN LEARNING COMMITTEE**

THURSDAY, JUNE 25, 2015 9:00 A.M. TRSU-The Roost

**I. CALL TO ORDER:** Committee: Dave Venter, Gene Bont, Kelly Kehoe, Jake Arace, Lisa Schmidt Staff: Bruce Williams, Rebecca Caum Public: Mr. Arace called the meeting to order at 9:07 a.m.

**II. CONSENT AGENDA:** A. Approve Agenda Mr. Venter moved to approve the agenda. Ms. Schmidt seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

**III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES:** Ms. Schmidt noted that the May 12 meeting was not at the Roost. Mr. Venter moved to approve the minutes of April 14, 2015 and May 12, 2015. Ms. Kehoe seconded and the motion carried unanimously. Ms. Kehoe questioned if committees needed to approve the minutes like this. Mr. Williams noted that the minutes for committee meetings need to just be a brief summary of their work, however the minutes of this committee in particular are important to keep other board members are kept up to date with the business of this committee. He also reported that the minutes are posted on the website, including committee meeting minutes. There was discussion about reminding the board members to visit the website to view committee minutes to stay up to date on the business going on in committees. Mr. Williams also noted that there are many similarities in the interest of the boards, so it would be good for board members to read the minutes of the other boards' meetings. Mr. Venter also suggested that, for those board members that prefer a paper packet, a similar reminder is sent.

**IV. OLD BUSINESS: A. Best Practices Initiative/District Collaborative Leadership Cohort/Proficiency Based Graduation Requirements** Mr. Williams reported that Ms. Carleton is in the process of trying to schedule an elementary school board carousel meeting. He reminded the committee about the PBGR law at the high school level. In the past graduation requirements were based on "seat time", but will now be based on demonstrating a proficiency. It will be important for elementary schools to begin to prepare students for this change. He reported that the high school boards have had presentations regarding the changes in the requirements. He also reported on some of the work that has been done by the PBGR team. Mr. Williams noted that Dr. Bont gave good feedback regarding the boards not having been prepped for the presentation ahead of it. Mr. Williams reported on the work that has been done and that will be done by the DCLC team, particularly regarding alternatives to having to gradually cut programming to remain within the budget constraints. Some of these discussions were planned to be held at the retreat in September. Mr. Williams noted that the passage of Act 46 will be a lens through which the boards with the DCLC teams' help will have to look at the alternatives. **B.**

**Limited School Transfer Update.** Mr. Williams reported that all 6 boards approved the program. Mr. Williams reported that there were a fair number of students that applied. Virtually every application was approved. There was one exception where a principal felt that a particular class was at its limit. He reported that most of the students involved in this program were already in the schools that they will be attending under this program. However, now that there is a joint contract, the schools can share the ADM, instead of none of the schools benefitting from the ADM. There are 12-15 students who will be participating in the program. **C. Combined Extra Curricular Update** Mr. Williams reported that the two HS principals, the two AD's, Mr. Schmidt and himself met (Ms. DesLauriers has a last minute conflict). He reported that the AD's felt that at this time, there is no burning need to combine teams. They did develop a plan to anticipate future needs in advance of an issue if there is a lack of numbers for teams. They will meet 3 times per year and look ahead to see if there is a looming need to combine teams. They also briefly discussed other extra-curricular opportunities, such as drama, music and other activities. The feeling was that there 2 is enough participation to field the appropriate teams in the next year. Mr. Arace suggested that this group include the town rec directors, Matt McCarthy and Howie Paul because they have a better idea of what is coming up through the elementary level. Ms. Schmidt asked for clarification that there will be a good schedule and team for JV Soccer this year. Mr. Venter questioned if this conversation was a positive conversation regarding solutions or more about turf-protection. Mr. Williams noted that there was initially some hesitation about the change, but as the meeting went along, the reason for thinking about this topic proactively became apparent and the meeting turned to a positive proactive plan. There was discussion about other SU's combining their teams to form very successful teams. Mr. Venter questioned what the trigger mechanism would be to make the transition to the combined team and if all the prep work would be done before that to ensure an easy transition. Mr. Williams noted that currently there is no mechanism in place, but since that is a concern, they will make sure that the groundwork is done so that they can move quickly if needed. Ms. Kehoe noted that she would like to see that ground work completed so that if all of a sudden one fall they think there isn't a full team available, they can combine the team quickly. Mr. Williams reported that the AD's had all of their numbers and prospective teams planned for the next three years. He noted that the two HS principals are very supportive of such a plan if it becomes necessary. Ms. Schmidt noted her concern with students getting playing time. She indicated that if a student has spent a season sitting on the bench, they won't be ready to move up to the next team the next year. There was discussion about how to make this SU attractive to families and building good teams, or more importantly, not losing players to other SU's teams because there aren't enough players for a team. There was discussion about opportunities for BRHS students to play football at MRUHS.

**V. NEW BUSINESS: A. Content of Board Agenda and Minutes** This was already discussed during the minutes approval discussion. **B. Café Services and Farm to School Resources** Mr. Arace reported that the Farm to School team has met and attended a conference at the Farm to School Institute. They have begun work on the Action Plan. They currently have 4 pages of goals and strategies. They are discussing grant writing and coordination of the program. The group is trying to get a committee together from each school (principal, teachers, parents, board members) to meet monthly to continue planning and check in with the initiative team quarterly. There is some grant money available to keep the coordination going. He reported on some of the work that has been done with the GMUHS food service director and the plan to work with Café Services. Mr. Williams reported that there has been progress made in each of the schools that have had participants at the Shelburne Farms initiative. Mr. Williams noted that the Farm to School name is not completely understood at the board or school level. He also reported that the strategic



planning for the initiative has been successful. Mr. Williams reported that Ms. Caum has been working with the Farm to School facilitator to help outline a grant application. He noted that the goal of the initiative was to improve the quality of food for the students, make it fresher and help educate students about nutrition. Recently the LES/BRHS boards spoke to Café Services regarding the quality and healthfulness of their foods. Mr. Arace also noted that TRSU has the only Superintendent who has put some time into the Farm to School initiative. Mr. Williams also noted that part of the priority regarding this initiative is nutritional education and developing resources for good local fresh food, and developing a local economy with the healthy foods. There was discussion about the GMUHS program with hydroponics. They also discussed the tech center nutrition and food programs. There was discussion about whether schools are offering “home-ec” programs any longer, and if the kids have the opportunity to develop locally grown meals. Mr. Arace noted that part of the grant was for food carts, mobile units that can be brought to each classroom to give students the opportunity to cook with local foods. There was discussion about using the cart for math (measurements), science (chemical reactions with ingredients), and social studies (cooking culturally different foods). There was discussion about the area’s food insecurity status and whether that will help the grant process. Mr. Arace noted that this discussion has just begun. **C. Grant Writing: Priorities, Parameters, and Deadlines** Mr. Williams noted that Ms. Caum will be working with Mr. Hutt Vater on access to the Foundation Search tool, but he has also spoken with her regarding using other resources besides the tool. Mr. Venter suggested that she attend as many IIL committee meetings as possible to help with the prioritization of grant seeking. **D. Act 46** Mr. Williams noted that the guidance from the legislature regarding Act 46 is becoming very clear. He reminded the committee that there are strong incentives that they will lose and strong disincentives that they will be penalized with if they don’t transition to the “preferred model” outlined in the legislation. He noted that he felt that there were many other things that the legislation could have done to help the cost drivers. Nevertheless the bill has passed and the 3 boards will need to discuss what they want to do with regard to the Act. He noted that the Act might make it easier to shift and share faculty between schools. He suggested that the IIL committee can help shepherd this process and help to outline the “pro’s” and “con’s” of a transition. Ms. Mahusky had noted that just as the TRSU was poised to do great initiative work, they now have to discuss governance again. There was discussion about the preliminary numbers using the current budgets as a foundation. Four schools will benefit financially immediately, while the other two will not benefit immediately. However the impact is only marginally negative. He reminded the committee that these numbers are based on budget neutrality. He also noted that if the boards (or new single board) could develop other mechanisms of sharing resources to cut down on expenses while not cutting programming, the negative impact could be mitigated. The board discussed the tax rates. They also discussed OMS and if it has any impact on this process. Mr. Williams asked this committee to help organize the effort of the study group. Mr. Venter noted his concern with supporting this process without a list of pro’s and con’s. Mr. Williams noted that the placement on the list will be up to the committee, but he will help give them food for thought. He also noted that his goal is for the IIL committee to do the work on the processes to make sure that the end result will be better than Mr. Adams’ initial numbers reflected. The committee also noted their concern with a lack of information, such as how the board would be comprised. Mr. Williams noted that there are many ways that the board could develop the governance, such as based on student population, or one person from each school with weighted votes. Mr. Williams noted that the study committee will need to look at the options and make recommendations. He also noted that the voters of all of the communities will need to vote positively to make the transition. Mr. Arace noted that the voters can vote it down, but the tax penalties will then be on their shoulders and as a direct result of their decision. Mr. Williams noted that the boards need to develop a plan that they can support if they are to be expected to encourage the voters’ support. He also noted that the deadline for this is June 30, 2016, which will require a March vote. Mr. Venter noted his concern with a quality study on the limited time and suggested outsourcing the study. Mr. Williams noted that because this group has done this type of work before, they are better equipped to complete this study than most other groups. Mr. Williams noted that much of the TRSU work is done together currently, the work of the study group will be on how the board members and the board itself will interact with the communities and the communities’ expectations of the board. There was discussion about finding a similar district that is successful and looking at their best practices. The committee discussed using the Tuck School at Dartmouth for some of this study work. Mr. Williams noted that Mr. Leopold will be working with the SU on the legal issues that they will have to work through with this process. There was discussion about hiring a VSBA consultant (or former consultant) for help with the study committee. Dr. Bont noted his concern with representing all of the schools when he is not as familiar with those schools. The committee discussed back planning the deadline for the work. Mr. Arace noted that the boards can’t be thinking about this transition simply from a financial standpoint. They also need to make the voters aware of any disadvantages from either decision. The committee discussed the students being the most important consideration in this entire process.

**VI. MEETING DATES & AGENDA ITEMS:** The next meeting will be on August 11, 2015 at 4:00 p.m. at the Superintendent’s office.

**VII. ADJOURNMENT:** Mr. Venter moved to adjourn at 10:47 a.m. Ms. Schmidt seconded and the motion carried unanimously. Respectfully submitted, Amber Wilson, Board Recording Secretary