

**HOLLIS SCHOOL BOARD
JANUARY 6, 2021
MEETING MINUTES**

A regular meeting of the Hollis School Board was conducted on Wednesday, January 6, 2021 at 6:00 p.m.

Robert Mann, Chairman, presided:

Members of the Board Present: Tammy Fareed, Vice Chairman
 Brooke Arthur, Secretary
 Amy Kellner
 Carryl Roy

Members of the Board Absent:

Also Participating: Gina Bergskaug, Assistant Superintendent of Curriculum and Instruction
 Drew Mason, District Moderator

Due to the COVID-19/Coronavirus crisis, and in accordance with Governor Sununu's [Emergency Order #12](#) pursuant to [Executive Order 2020-04](#), this Board is authorized to meet electronically.

As stated on the agenda, the meeting was aired live via Zoom. Telephone access was available for members of the public wishing to provide comment; 1-929-205-6099 US (Meeting ID: 915 5640 3009/Passcode 952854).

Each member of the Board was asked to state, for the record, where they were, why their attendance in person was not reasonably practical, who, if anyone, was with them, and whether or not they were able to hear the proceedings.

Vice Chairman Fareed

Stated she was participating electronically from home, attendance in person was not reasonably practical due to COVID-19, she was alone in the room she was in, and could hear the proceedings.

Member Kellner

Stated she was participating electronically from home, attendance in person was not reasonably practical due to COVID-19, she was alone in the room she was in, and could hear the proceedings.

Member Arthur

Stated she was participating electronically from home, attendance in person was not reasonably practical due to COVID-19, she was alone in the room she was in, and could hear the proceedings.

Chairman Mann

Stated he was participating electronically from home, attendance in person was not reasonably practical due to COVID-19, he was alone in the room he was in, and he could hear the proceedings.

Member Roy

Stated she was participating electronically from home, attendance in person was not reasonably practical due to COVID-19, she was alone in the room she was in, and could hear the proceedings.

It was acknowledged all members participating electronically could be heard. The Board was reminded all votes would be taken by Roll Call.

AGENDA ADJUSTMENTS

Vice Chairman Fareed questioned if individuals who are not registered voters in the Town of Hollis would be permitted to provide public comment. Chairman Mann responded that would not be permitted unless there exists a specific circumstance such as a subject-matter expert advising the Board. Vice Chairman Fareed requested individuals providing public comment clearly provided their name and address for the record.

Noted was that the period for public comment was inadvertently omitted from the agenda. The request was made to amend the agenda to add public comment following approval of meeting minutes.

A request was made that the agenda be adjusted to include deliberation on the acceptance and expenditure of the FY19 Public School Infrastructure/Facilities Grant.

Assistant Superintendent Bergskaug noted the agenda includes deliberation around changes to the Annual Meeting calendar; however, rather than approving a revised calendar, the request is for consideration of the alternative format for the Annual Meeting. Vice Chairman Fareed expressed a desire for the formality of addressing both for the sake of record keeping.

CORRESPONDENCE/RESIGNATIONS/NOMINATIONS - None

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Hollis School Board [December 2, 2020](#)

The following amendments were offered:

- Page 3, Line 30; insert “among” before “the first in the State”
- Page 5, Line 23; “district” should be plural

**MOTION BY MEMBER ARTHUR TO ACCEPT, AS AMENDED
MOTION SECONDED BY MEMBER FAREED**

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

Yea: Tammy Fareed, Brooke Arthur, Amy Kellner, Carryl Roy, Robert Mann

5

Nay:

0

MOTION CARRIED

PUBLIC INPUT

Drew Mason, District Moderator

Noted the passage of HB1129 last summer, which provides options for how to conduct annual meetings this year. The options are to conduct a traditional meeting or an alternate process. The alternate process involves a notice of the meeting, which is very lengthy, and must be mailed to every registered voter in Town (approx. 7,500). There is a virtual session followed by a period not to exceed 7 days where public input is accepted. There is a second virtual session during which the Governing Body and only the Governing Body can amend the Warrant Articles. There is time to prepare the Warrant and Ballot, which is followed by voting. Voting can be done in a variety of ways; drive-up, drive-thru, or in-person.

One of the key points is that the Governing Body determines whether and how public input is accepted at the meetings. The meeting is open to all members of the public. Public comment needs to be gathered, and the recommendation is that a summary of the input is made available to the voters in some form.

Mr. Mason stated his strong opinion the ballot should be an AccuVote ballot commenting on the time required for hand counting.

The Legislature is working on a Bill that was passed by the Senate earlier in the day and is due to be taken up by the House later this week. The indication is that the House will pass it, and the Governor will sign it. One of its provisions allows the governing body to postpone the meeting (unspecified).

The Board needs to consider whether to go for a traditional business session, this alternate form, or push the meeting date out to a time when there could be an in-person meeting or an outdoor meeting. That third choice would provide the authority for expenditures in line with last year's budget.

Chairman Mann questioned how the COOP School District will proceed and was informed the discussion will occur at their meeting later in the evening. Mr. Mason remarked his sense is that both the COOP School District and the Town are leaning toward the alternate process.

Asked if the cost of running the meeting would differ based on the option chosen, Mr. Mason responded the cost of preparing and sending the mailing to 7,500 voters will be an expense. Running a Zoom session that could be large, would require, in addition to a Moderator, a host and likely another observer or two to watch for raised hands, etc. The Hollis School District can likely accomplish that on a Saturday or an evening. His recommendation to the Selectmen is to hold a traditional election.

Understanding Mr. Mason may not be available to participate in the entirety of the meeting, the Board was permitted to raise questions on this matter at this time.

Vice Chairman Fareed noted the document titled "2021 Annual Meeting Dates and Deadlines – Draft – Alternative Meeting Method (HB 1129)" provided with the agenda. She questioned, if postponing, there would remain the same number of days and weeks that were noted on that document.

Mr. Mason stated that to be the case. There is still the need to work the schedule around the public hearing on the money articles. The Board is not tied to getting this completed by March 9th, which is the traditional election day. Vice Chairman Fareed added there is no requirement to have it completed by the end of the fiscal year (June 30th).

Mr. Mason remarked, in terms of the dates relative to when the Board schedules the public hearing and when petition warrant articles are due is all relative to the first virtual meeting.

Vice Chairman Fareed asked for clarification, should the Board decide to conduct the March 9th virtual meeting, the calendar for all that needs to occur would begin in a few weeks, and was told that is correct.

PRINCIPALS' REPORT

Assistant Superintendent Bergskaug highlighted items from the report provided with the [agenda](#).

The skylights are currently being replaced at the Hollis Upper Elementary School (HUES). The lighting project is mostly complete at HUES and the Hollis Primary School (HPS).

Despite being fully remote at this time, the District is continuing, as best it can, with business as usual, e.g., math week, solving puzzles, dress up days, WING awards, holiday concert.

Enrollment numbers have been consistent over the past few months. Total enrollment is up by 3. Asked, she stated uncertainty with whether those additional students are new to the District. Vice Chairman Fareed noted the disparity between the NESDEC expected enrollment numbers and the actuals is reflected in several dozen families choosing to home-school because of COVID. Any home-school student can request a return into the buildings or remote with little notice.

She questioned if the student population is staying about as healthy as it was prior to the holidays. Assistant Superintendent Bergskaug stated the District has requested families continue to complete the Daily Symptom Monitoring report beginning this week as the final decision on the January 19th return to in-person school is based on the health and wellbeing of our staff and students. There are some positive cases and some students who are quarantined because of family members. Spikes can be seen in the State. There is time before the 19th, and the situation is being closely monitored.

Vice Chairman Fareed questioned if positive rates are being tracked in the Town as a whole, noting the context will matter with respect to the decision for how to conduct the Annual Meeting. Assistant Superintendent Bergskaug stated that is looked at. It is difficult to track as not all cases are reported in a timely fashion for a variety of reasons. It is looked at but more in the context of general trends. An uptick has been seen in the Hollis community.

Member Arthur spoke of the wait list for consideration of an enrollment status change and questioned if the criteria for getting off the wait list is that another family chooses to go remote or other scenarios. Assistant Superintendent Bergskaug stated an in-person student would either have to want to go remote, move out of the community or choose to home-school, and that would open up an in-person spot. Another option would be if the waitlist became so large that an entire section could be moved back to in-person. There are students on the wait list who have chosen not to return to in-person but remain on the wait list to make that decision at the next opportunity (January 29th). Information is included in every Friday newsletter.

Member Arthur questioned, if re-opening January 19th and there are two weeks before the January 29th date, if there are families that do not feel safe to return to school, what their option will be for those two weeks after being remote. Assistant Superintendent Bergskaug stated a lot depends on numbers and the availability of the remote teaching staff, and the reasons for not wanting to return. There is a limited number of spaces where those students can partake in Zoom of the remote classroom teacher but maintain their status with the in-person classroom teacher, but we certainly cannot guarantee that. What some families opted to do that last week of December was rather than risk possibly having to quarantine over the holidays, they chose to stay home and participate in Google classroom and forego the Zoom. We can work with families and do our best to accommodate requests.

DISCUSSION

- Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Committee Update

Assistant Superintendent Bergskaug stated the DEI Advisory Committee (Committee) has worked countless hours to get the draft document (included with the [agenda](#)) to this point. The Committee will meet again January 14th via Zoom to review feedback submitted during public input from December. Community input asked for a review of equity, the use of a visual diagram, how the document impacts students' rights to free speech and some other points around the wording. Overall, the public input session went well. Some community members and Committee member Warner are still opposed to the work. The Committee recommended sending the document to the Board for input. It is the Committee's goal to review the document again on January 14th and submit it to the Board for consideration at its February meeting. When the document comes back to the Board it will be accompanied by potential recommendations for next steps.

It has been difficult work that is not supported by all. Some of the discussions and comments during public input have been difficult. That is the nature of this important work. The document will be brought before the Brookline and COOP school boards during their meetings this month, and each board will ultimately decide how to proceed.

The draft document was made available for public viewing as part of the formal agenda packet.

Vice Chairman Fareed noted the language in the draft does not differ drastically from the version provided at the last meeting. It has been available for review for several weeks. Assistant Superintendent Bergskaug noted the [link](#) on the website to the agendas and minutes of the Committee meetings. A review of those documents provides details of the evolution of the work.

Chairman Mann opened the floor for input from the Board.

Vice Chairman Fareed noted, as in the national and local landscape, in the most ancient text that we have as a people, very often ideals have been stated and ratified by centuries and even millennia of agreement, and yet we have not perfected the practice. Very often we must restate what was said in older words at older times to refresh the commitment to what has been a fundamental goal, imperfectly achieved. She stated her support of a resolution from the Board that reaffirms the commitment to the most profound ethos that has ever been brought forward by humankind from so many different sources in history, and that is that we are all equal, and each of us deserves equal access to the same resources.

Member Arthur stated her full support of a resolution in the area of diversity, equity, and inclusion. It impacts all of us and is important to all our students. By focusing on this work all our students will be better community members as they embark on their journeys in a diverse world.

Member Roy spoke of being pleased with the content and the inclusion of the Senate Bill. She is uncertain many people know there is an additional legal driving force behind the initiative. She suggested work be done on the flow of the document and offered to assist with that. There is a disconnect between calling it an initiative and calling it a resolution. The lay person may not understand how that impacts and what the consequences are of calling it one or the other and voting something in. When presenting it, it is important to identify the document as draft. It was not clearly marked as a draft.

Member Kellner noted she did not have any specific comments on the document. She stated her support of and appreciation for the hard work of the Committee.

Chairman Mann commented what struck him first was that the document is referred to as an initiative and not a resolution. A resolution needs to be very specific and direct. He believes the way it is structured caught him by surprise, as it is not what he would expect a resolution to look like. He understands the work that went to getting the document to this point. However, most of the language he does not see as content that belongs in a resolution. He appreciates the fact that we are citing Senate Bill and effort to make definition but finds that as supporting collateral to what a resolution needs to be. He would like the Committee to consider that.

The last section is very crisp and direct and references policies and procedures, which he appreciates. The roles of the School Board are planning, policy, and personnel. A resolution needs to influence policy. He is in favor of the idea of claiming or reaffirming some beliefs around DEI, but feels the document needs to be more direct; what are we resolving, what is the foundation that will be used.

Member Arthur commented what she took from the remarks is that the last piece of the document, which she sees as the resolution, is language the Chairman is supportive of. Chairman Mann responded roughly; once the final draft is provided, he will likely drill down deeper on the language and how it is structured. He is just looking at it from a high-level document and the state it is in today. Because the resolution will state the actions the Board resolves to take, he would like to see more around that language, e.g., how do we continue a conversation around these elements, make sure that as students walk through the doors of our school, they feel that no matter what background they came from, this is my school, my teachers, my community. He spoke of the format used in resolutions. Member Arthur noted pushback from the community on that type of format.

Asked to explain further, Member Arthur stated members of the public took issue with the language being used providing “Whereas” leading up to the resolution statement; that that is not the right way to write a resolution.

Chairman Mann reiterated he would like to see the definitive statements that place the resolution very squarely and clearly and ties to what we will do about it in the resolution section.

Vice Chairman Fareed noted hundreds of resolutions are issued by States. These are documents that can list a dozen “whereas” statements in order to capture the logical argument and critically informative information so as to build a structured basis for reaching the resolution, and then the “therefore” is a structure that is commonly used, and a couple of points of objectives and goals to be met that are articulated in an actionable fashion. She understands that members of the public may not have liked that format, but with all due respect to their views, the structure is that the “whereas” and “therefore” is a convention used for official statements from our governments across the country.

When there are changes to RSAs, that information is incorporated into policy. The Senate Bill cited is one of many the Board will address and build into policy, as required. That action occurs due to procedures already in place.

Vice Chairman Fareed stated concern there could come a point where we lose the essential nature because of certain structural debates. What we do not want is to start a new school year having not reached a reasonable document. This is not a policy that has legal implications, and it is not a procedure, which is an internally designed response to policy by the Administration, it is somewhere more general than that, and guides those things. The degree to which it must meet some specific architecture is less critical in her mind.

Member Arthur expressed the desire to understand if the will of the Board was to send the document back to the DEI Advisory Committee for revision or if the Board was ready to make its modifications to the document so that it could be approved. Vice Chairman Fareed questioned if the Committee viewed the document as their final product. Chairman Mann stated his impression there is additional work the Committee plans to do on the

document, and the intent to bring it back before the Board. The agenda does not include formal action on this item.

It was noted the Committee is not obligated to take any of the feedback provided and could leave the document as is. Vice Chairman Fareed added the Board is also not obligated to the document. It is a reference document from the Superintendent's resource, not the Board's. Chairman Mann agreed the Board could decide to use the document as reference and do a re-write, reject all of it, or adopt it in its entirety. The Committee that exists currently is one formed by the Superintendent. It was not chartered by the Board. At the end of the day, the resolution must be adopted by the Board as its own. He reiterated he believes a resolution does not do any harm to speak to our goals. As a resolution, there is no binding aspect to how the Board functions. That translates into the policies we write.

Member Arthur requested Board action on the resolution be included on the next agenda. Chairman Mann commented the only question he would have is regarding what assurances there are that the Board will have the final draft in time for the next agenda. If there is a final draft in time, he would have no objection to including it as a deliberative item. The Board will need the time to conduct its own detailed review. He recommended the Board utilize the practice used with policy review in that the document would go through several readings. By doing so, the Board and community will have ample time to discuss the document.

The question was asked who would do the revision work between readings noting the Policy Committee is comprised of the Assistant Superintendent, Board Member Kellner, and the two Principals. That structure allows the legal and expert input from those administrators to inform the RSAs that come down from the State, etc. This is a Resolution and does not belong to the Administration. Chairman Mann suggested there may be opportunities for the Board to conduct a workshop around the language. There may be opportunities for the Policy Committee to take this up.

Vice Chairman Fareed stated her appreciation for the work members of the community and the Superintendent have done in this regard. She respects the process and the input. On the other hand, over time she has seen boards of directors and executives become intertwined in ways that she has repeatedly found not to be ideal for maintaining a separation of powers. While she accepts the validity of the input the Committee gave to the Superintendent, she views it the same as input from any subject matter expert, legal counsel, etc. These are advisors to the Superintendent, the executive of our corporation. From her point of view, a resolution like this is coming from this Board, and she is not interested terribly in the DNA added to it by administrators from various buildings, etc. As one individual voice on the Board, she would have to be convinced that the input from members of the Policy Committee, separate from Board Member Kellner, would not be relevant to this kind of document.

- SAU Rent/Long Term Lease – SAU Bond for Renovations of 4 Lund Lane

Chairman Mann spoke of the recent Governing Board meeting during which discussion occurred around a lease agreement and a potential revenue model.

During discussions that occurred last year, the two big takeaways heard from the community around the bond initiative were related to the desire for a better understanding of the revenue model; how cost would be distributed equitably across the 3 districts and the desire for a lease agreement that would protect the investment over the period of the life of the bond.

Chairman Mann stated his impression, although not against the idea of moving forward, the Governing Board expressed an interest to learn more about the potential renovation/bond, but he does not believe they are as far along in the journey as this Board is. This Board has been looking at this issue, conducting studies, and having conversations with the various stakeholders for several years. What struck him during the meeting were the basic questions around the possibilities of relocation and other aspects that have been reviewed several times. It was clear to him that the other districts are not as far along in the process as this Board, and there is the need for much more conversation at that level.

Chairman Mann remarked he is not in support of moving the bond forward at this time. The bond is secondary to the work that needs to be done. As the Governing Board meets quarterly, with each agenda, there is a fair amount of work to be accomplished. To be able to dig into the deeper details around such an initiative at that level, we need almost a full year to bring that board along in this journey. Regardless of the bond issue, from a planning standpoint, some sort of lease agreement is needed. That conversation needs to continue with the Governing Board. The conversation of the needs of the Administrators needs to take place with the Governing Board and the Superintendent. This Board can bring forward an option for addressing the needs.

Vice Chairman Fareed commented last year 4 Board members participated in a Budget Committee hearing and another a public forum around this project, with respect to the facility itself. At the public forum, a very thorough description of current conditions and the needs and plans for the facility were discussed. It was a very thorough presentation. A secondary presentation was provided on the competitive properties in the region and other financial aspects. Those presentations were put together for a second public forum; all of this in the context of the growing title wave of COVID. Her sense at the time, and her sense from the recent Governing Board meeting is that we are the only ones who digested the hundreds of hours of work on the part of architects, energy efficiency experts, Budget Committee, Board, and staff to produce what she felt was a very compelling description and argument supporting this project.

We were not able, mostly because of COVID to really push this out into our immediate community, and certainly what we saw at the Governing Board meeting was that it caught those folks unaware. They never really had a chance to look at it. We need to tell that story much more broadly and work with our partners to bring them into it before they can make an informed decision regarding the proposed project.

Chairman Mann spoke of the exhaustive work completed and the compelling reason for doing the work. The justification is there, it is just that we need the stakeholders to be as far along in the process as we are. It would be unfair to bring forward a bond article contingent on a lease agreement, bond rates, etc.

Member Roy stated the desire to make it clear that the building is an asset of the Hollis School District regardless of who occupies it. It just happens to be the SAU 41 Administrative staff. That is where it gets a little mucked up. We must be looking at this from two perspectives; it is our physical asset, and we need to care for it, and we are members of the SAU Governing Board and, therefore, need to be mindful of where our staff is housed. Keep in mind that were it any other tenant, the conversation would be solely around improving the

facility/asset. She agrees with the remarks of the Chairman. That said, there must be a point where we say we are done; either we are going to improve the building or not. If it does not work for the SAU staff to be there because of their size constraints, etc. then that is the bridge we will have to cross.

Chairman Mann commented the complexity around the conversations of the multiple districts and how to equitably split up the cost of improvements vanishes when you start to discuss the possibility of repurposing that space for education delivery in the district. He believes the revenue model of the direct charge to the districts works well and would be happy to share that with stakeholders as we move forward.

Vice Chairman Fareed remarked the rationale for bringing forward the project last year was that the size of our staff has increased due to requirements imposed upon it. There are 17 people in that building sharing 2 very antiquated bathrooms, public spaces there are miniscule, and the project remains well considered and much needed whether this is the right time or not. She agrees the question of asking the public to fund a bond that we do not have our other stakeholders engaged in is a major issue, but it is not because the need is not there.

Vice Chairman Fareed spoke of a point made by Member Arthur during the Governing Board, which touched on the history of the use of this building. Through the decades the Hollis School District has owned the building and it has housed the SAU41 Administration, we have charged the least amount of rent we could bring ourselves to charge. That has benefited the district as a rent paying entity, but also our stakeholders in the other districts as well. We do not need to make a profit, but we never really thought about the rent as a mechanism to address replacement costs. Rent was always enough to manage the building and keep it intact. We never charged market rates to establish a replacement cost fund. In hindsight, that was probably in error and is a good foundation for looking at what we do next.

- Data Presentation

Assistant Superintendent Bergskaug provided a presentation (copy included as part of agenda packet).

Last spring, the State of New Hampshire cancelled State testing due to the pandemic. Late in the summer, in the middle of re-opening plans, the district was made aware of the requirement to complete fall testing to replace the spring testing and told the data would be helpful to the district as we refine our curriculum and adjust instruction. The fall testing is what is called Interim testing. It was not the summative testing, which is what we typically do in the spring.

This interim testing also tested prior year skills; fourth grade students took an interim test to assess 3rd grade skills; but did so in October. We would have to look at what remote learning looked like and if that had an impact on student progress, and the summer slide. The basic results showed percentage of proficiency for grade 3 skills in English/Language Arts (ELA) (4th grade students) at 67.9%, grade 4 skills at 75.5%, and grade 5 skills at 79%. For math, the percentages were 58.5%, 66%, and 62%.

In the absence of State data, it is unclear how the district performed in comparison to other districts. Across the entire SAU, math seemed to be impacted more so in the time of remote learning than ELA.

Overall student scores for assessment range from 1-4. Proficient is determined by a score of 3 or above. Individual standards are evaluated on a performance distribution of 1-3; 1= below standard; 3 = achieved standard, 2 = met or nearly met standard. All the individual standards are evaluated. The 3s become proficient, the 1s not proficient, and the 2s are divided between 2s and 3s.

When looking at how our students performed on individual standards, what was helpful with the interim assessment as opposed to the summative is the ability to drill down question by question, student by student.

She can look at one student and their performance and see how they responded to every single question, if wanting to get them from the 2 to a 3. Also available is a look at trends across the grade level and the ability to identify how the class did overall; which of the questions did the class struggle with the most. That will be important especially as we look at math across the entire SAU; were these skills/specific questions addressed during remote learning, were they not addressed due to time constraints and being addressed this year.

The reading standards for informational text was a relative strength for students having a greater percentage across the board of 3s. Reading standards for literature for grade 4 skills (grade 5 students) was a weaker area for them, and one the grade level team will want to drill down into to see how to address the specific needs of our student population.

The final individual standard for ELA is that writing is assessed. It is all graded by a computer. They look at what the student entered. At times what is seen is that the computer scored writing prompts can produce results that cannot really be determined so the students are assigned a zero. Specifically, this happens when the student recycles the question, and that is what we have always trained our students to do; turn the question around and turn it into your response. The computer can be confused by this input and believe the student is copying. It does not know what to do with that information. It is difficult to place a lot of value on the results of the writing scores because of these known errors.

In general, our students have relative strength in conventions and organization, but could improve in the area of providing relevant evidence that flows smoothly.

Looking at math, reviewed is measurement, data & geometry, and number and operations and fractions. In number and operations and fractions, both grade 3 skills and grade 5 skills showed a relative weakness with higher percentages of our students earning a 1 in that category.

The number and operations in base ten was an area of strength for our students. Operations and algebraic thinking was strong as well.

Another way to look at the information is to track performance over time. A chart was displayed looking at ELA. It is not an apples-to-apples comparison. In 2016, the district did a paper version of the Smarter Balanced test, in 2017 it was a computer/adaptive Smarter Balanced test; scoring mechanism completely different and the student experience with taking a computer adaptive test was new. In 2018, it was the computer/adaptive Statewide Assessment System, different test. Between 2018 and 2019 are the only two years where the same test was taken from year to year. In 2020, we are not taking a summative assessment, we are doing an interim assessment.

If you look at 2020 grade 5 skills (current grade 6 students), 79% are at or above proficiency, and in 2019 you look to the red bar (grade 4), the same students in the spring of 2019 were at 66% and the year prior to that 77%. A little bit of a dip, and those are areas where we look at the individual cohorts.

English/Language Arts is relatively stable over the past few years. Math also relatively stable, but slightly lower this year than in years past.

Cohorts are tracked over time although difficult as this year we only tested 4th, 5th, and 6th grade students because we tested them for 3rd grade skills, 4th grade skills, and 5th grade skills. The current 7th grade students are in the COOP and those students' scores are mixed with the students from Brookline. It is difficult to look at that individual cohort and measure it against their prior performance as Hollis students.

The class of 2027 are the current 6th graders and 2028 the current 5th graders. If you look at ELA, it is very stable. In math the 6th grade students were at 62% proficiency in 2020, 67% in 2019 and 82% in 2018. They

are looking for consistency and particular outliers in any given year. They also want to identify if there were any significant changes to enrollment in any particular year, and this year we want to reflect on possible gaps created in remote learning during the springtime.

This data provides one piece of the puzzle. Also utilized are the local assessments and the day-to-day assessments, conversations, and instructions we have with students. Back in 2018, the Hollis schools were identified as targeted schools and were to be evaluated in 2 years to ensure there was growth. Because in 2020 we did not have summative assessments to provide to demonstrate growth, all schools are required to go out another year to demonstrate that growth.

Vice Chairman Fareed questioned when the State results would be provided so that a sense can be gained of how the district performed relative to the rest of the State and country. Assistant Superintendent Bergskaug responded to her knowledge, that information is not coming out. What was stated is that this mandatory assessment was going to be used for our own internal purpose but would not be used as an evaluator system. At the same time, it would be helpful to know how other districts in the State are doing. We will have to collect that information informally. We will find out in the spring. Our students will be tested again this spring. The 4th graders who tested in October for 3rd grade skills will have a 4th grade summative test this spring (between March and June). We typically do 3rd grade in April and 4, 5th, and 6th in May. That will provide good information.

The PSAT 8/9 was done for grade 8 and PSAT grade 11 and SAT for the 12th graders as their spring assessment. We can gather both State and national data. Asked how the seniors did on their SAT compared to our typical track record, Assistant Superintendent Bergskaug responded we were within a few points of last year. Math was slightly down and ELA slightly up.

Chairman Mann commented when you were talking through the categories of 1, 2, and 3 and how 2 is split and combined, it makes it difficult for someone to identify if some students are not getting it, and that is hiding it or maybe the 2 category is not really showing the true performance of the students that are getting it.

Assistant Superintendent Bergskaug remarked if there is a particular standard, she can drill into it, look at the 12 questions the students were asked within that standard and then identify what types of questions they were asked and what types of questions they struggled with to try to identify if it was taught during remote learning, something we did not teach, something we taught but it was in September of last year (testing 13 months later), etc. Also how do we reinforce it now because that standard is not going away and the expectations of understanding it will just get more integral.

Chairman Mann questioned if test scores will express the challenges of COVID from a learning consumption standpoint. Assistant Superintendent Bergskaug spoke of the ability to conduct 6 weeks of a targeted intervention and do some quick prompts again with the testing. Some take 5 minutes some take 20 minutes. That allows for focus in very small areas to look at student progress over time. It will be important to look at individual student performance in October and again in May to see if that growth is seen (1 year or more than 1 year of growth). Although less than a school year, the skills are one grade level apart.

Asked if the data reveals any red flags, she stated one thing that is a challenge is the current 4th grade students who were tested in 3rd grade – it is a different school, and that team does not have access to that data. She is going to need to work through providing that data to the 3rd grade team to look at whether anything needs to be taught differently or when was that skill taught in terms of reflecting and refining on their work this year. She did notice that in general our 3rd grade skills were not really on par with where our 4th and 5th grade skills were measured. She wants to ensure that is looked at. These students have never tested in a State assessment. This is their first exposure to State assessment. It was in October whether taking it at home because of remote or in

the building having just returned to the building after how many months of being away, etc. There are so many factors to consider.

They will drill down and look at the content and curriculum to see how to address potential weak areas. They also want to then look at the May performance and see did it even out, did we feel more comfortable, did we address specific skill gaps that we thought we saw with the fall data, etc. Asked how the district compared with the Brookline district, she stated over the past couple of years Brookline has performed higher than Hollis, and this year that was not the case. Hollis students outperformed Brookline students.

Member Arthur questioned if there will be a means of analyzing the data to determine trends or gaps for students who participate in-person versus those who participate remotely.

Assistant Superintendent Bergskaug stated that to be very manual partially because we have students who have moved between in-person and remote, and our students are not rostered as different class sections, they are just rostered as a fourth grader, etc. She would have to take all the data, roster them and separate them that way. That is something she wants to look at. We had our spring, made changes over the summer, and put them in place for the fall to open remote; how do we know if they are effective or more effective, is what we are doing in remote more effective than what we are doing in the classroom, etc.

Member Arthur commented there are not many districts that are operating both ways. Assistant Superintendent Bergskaug stated all 6 had to offer remote, but we are one of the few that did offer fully in-person. We have many districts where when they were open, it was a hybrid model. Some had potentially 2 days in person and then 2 days of no instruction. She believes the SAU is in a good place if you compare our district to the State in terms of the instruction that our students are getting without even considering the fact that it is high quality instruction by incredible teachers with really great students.

Vice Chairman Fareed spoke of summer programs for students needing unique interventions. She questioned if thought is being given to possibilities of an extended school year that is a larger operation in the event they can identify a significant percentage of students who could benefit from that. The district has a substantial amount of money intended to be returned to the tax base (because of absence of spending due to COVID). If it is the case that we need to address a shortfall in instruction, should we be thinking about the Unassigned Fund Balance in a different fashion. Assistant Superintendent Bergskaug responded they are absolutely thinking of that. One challenge is once you hit 4th grade, students do not want to come in the summer. Do we have more possibilities now where we have more experience with remote instruction - maybe it does not have to be an in-person situation?

Beginning this week or shortly thereafter, the HUES Homework Program will be staffed by the National Honor Society students. Students will be able to receive help from our high school students. There is the potential there is an opportunity within that if that program goes well. It will be supervised by staff.

- Fiscal Year 2022 Draft Budget for Review

Assistant Superintendent Bergskaug stated the budget spreadsheet provided in the packet is the same as that which was provided last month with the one exception of an increase of \$5,300.17. The district was informed that the salary listed for the School Resource Officer (SRO) was stated incorrectly and had to be increased by that amount. The Town was able to secure grant funding that would provide the school district an SRO (partial funding). The current SRO would direct 100% of their time to the COOP. The amount identified in the budget needed to be adjusted by \$5,300.17. Relief from guidance is being sought for that amount. If not granted, the funds will have to be found from within the budget.

Vice Chairman Fareed commented on the number of cost reductions and provided the example of Line Items 10.2225.738.01 & 02 “cameras-safety”. Although that was a one-time expense, there are a lot of other reduced expenses such as several lines for student services/special education. She asked for clarification. Assistant Superintendent Bergskaug stated there are not any grand shifts in staffing, but some of our students are aging up to the COOP. Increases can be seen in the COOP budget for the areas where decreases are seen in the Hollis budget. There are also students who have left the district. There was a retirement in that department, which will result in a decrease in the salary (typically budget for a Masters Step 5).

Noted was that the proposed FY22 budget represents a 1.93% increase over the FY21 approved budget. That includes the first year (interest only) SAU barn bond payment of \$38,400. If choosing not to move forward with the bond, that amount would be removed. The proposed operating budget is \$145,300 or 1.06% above last year’s approved budget.

Asked if the SRO position would be a continuing position that will be grant dependent and if the district’s share would increase if the grant funding does not continue, Assistant Superintendent Bergskaug stated her belief the grant is a multi-year grant. She was uncertain of how long the grant funding would remain in place.

A sample warrant was provided with the agenda. Noted was the potential for change in the areas that are highlighted, e.g., location, date. The thought was to hold the meeting in the high school gym to allow for more space, if able to conduct an in-person meeting. If going with the alternative meeting format, there would be no physical location; Zoom meeting with ballot vote.

Article 8 would allow the district to access unanticipated revenue. The district does expect to receive additional funding between January and June 30th for COVID related expenses. Member Arthur asked for an example of a “private source” that the Administration would be permitted to accept funds from should the article pass. Assistant Superintendent Bergskaug remarked if any donation were received, it would have to come before the Board for acceptance (if over \$5,000 per policy). She stated she would review the language to determine if it is specific to the RSA.

Should the decision be made to utilize the alternative format, the public hearing date would change from February 9th to January 28th.

Chairman Mann commented on article 9 being contingent should article 8 not pass. Normally if a contingent article were not necessary, it would be waived. He questioned if there is concern with the possibility that both are approved, and we create a problem by choosing one approach over another. Drew Mason, District Moderator, stated the article could be worded such that if article 8 fails, then article 9 pertains.

Member Roy noted Article 1 could be removed.

Assistant Superintendent Bergskaug stated should the decision be reached to move to the alternative meeting method, and have the public hearing on January 28th, we would present this warrant, provide notice to all voters of a new meeting format, would have an informational Zoom session (potentially February 23rd), and then would allow for input. The final warrant would be presented at a second virtual meeting on March 2nd. On March 3rd, the warrant would be officially posted for a vote on March 9th. There is ample time to make changes desired by the Board and based on public input.

Mr. Mason added that there is no requirement that voting occur on March 9th. It could be done later. Assistant Superintendent Bergskaug noted the public hearing is conducted by the Budget Committee, and they set the date.

Vice Chairman Fareed questioned if it is correct that the Board, even at the annual meeting, can cut, but cannot add articles, and was told that is correct. If choosing the alternate format, the Board can do anything that the Legislative Body could do at the second virtual meeting; can amend articles, remove them. Cannot delete petition articles and it is a bad idea to amend them unless you have overwhelming reason.

DELIBERATIONS

- To see what action the Board will take regarding the FY19 Public School Infrastructure/Facilities Grant

MOTION BY MEMBER FAREED TO APPROVE THE ACCEPTANCE AND EXPENDITURE OF THE FY19 PUBLIC SCHOOL INFRASTRUCTURE/FACILITIES GRANT IN THE AMOUNT OF ONE HUNDRED SEVENTY-THREE THOUSAND THREE HUNDRED SIXTY-ONE DOLLARS (\$173,361) (80% OF TOTAL UPPER LIMIT COST BASED ON ESTIMATE PROVIDED IN APPLICATION) FOR INTERIOR DOOR REPLACEMENTS AT THE HOLLIS PRIMARY SCHOOL AND IMPROVEMENTS TO SECURITY AT THE HOLLIS UPPER ELEMENTARY SCHOOL. THE DISTRICT PORTION OF FORTY-THREE THOUSAND THREE HUNDRED FORTY DOLLARS (\$43,340) WAS FUNDED THROUGH BUDGETED DISTRICT FUNDING
MOTION SECONDED BY MEMBER ARTHUR

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

Yea: Amy Kellner, Carryl Roy, Tammy Fareed, Robert Mann, Brooke Arthur

5

Nay:

0

MOTION CARRIED

- To see what action the Board will take regarding the proposed changes to the annual meeting calendar (virtual annual meeting)

MOTION BY MEMBER FAREED TO APPROVE THE CHANGES TO THE ANNUAL MEETING CALENDAR

MOTION SECONDED BY MEMBER ROY

ON THE QUESTION

Assistant Superintendent Bergskaug noted the recommendation from legal counsel is for a motion specifically stating the Board is electing to approve the alternative meeting format. We could approve this motion and then

move to the recommended motion regarding the alternative format.

Asked if the Board is being asked to approve specific dates, Assistant Superintendent Bergskaug noted the information included with the agenda packet.

Member Kellner stated her belief the calendar provided assumes the Board will elect to go with the alternative meeting method and was informed it does.

Asked for clarification of the communication from legal counsel, Assistant Superintendent Bergskaug stated the Administration requested legal counsel weigh in on what the options are. The response (included in agenda packet) provides dates that are required for actions to occur if going with the alternative meeting format. She had a conversation with legal counsel about switching over, and whether a formal motion would have to be made to adopt this format. He said it would be required. He provided the language that has been shared with the Board.

Asked if a favorable vote for the alternative format means the Board is in fact voting to not have a live meeting, but instead the alternative annual meeting format, Assistant Superintendent Bergskaug responded yes, without a vote for that, we are going to conduct an in-person annual meeting.

MOTION WITHDRAWN

**MOTION BY MEMBER FAREED TO ELECT TO APPROVE THE ALTERNATIVE ANNUAL MEETING FORMAT PURSUANT TO HB1129 CHAPTER LAW 8, SESSION YEAR 2020 FOR THE 2021 SCHOOL DISTRICT ANNUAL MEETING
MOTION SECONDED BY MEMBER KELLNER**

ON THE QUESTION

Member Arthur stated the weight of this decision requires more information and guidance.

Assistant Superintendent Bergskaug stated if going with an alternative meeting format, as Mr. Mason mentioned going with the AccuVote ballots on voting day, that sets the timeline such that the public hearing would have to be January 28th, proper notice must be provided, which means that there are only a few days remaining for the Board to vote on this. There is the need to either schedule a special meeting to vote on this or vote on it now. Clarification was requested on the statement that the meeting does not need to be conducted on March 9th, e.g., could the Board state the desire to utilize the alternative method but want to do it at the end of March?

Mr. Mason stated the timeline the attorney provided was predicated on voting on March 9th.

Vice Chairman Fareed questioned how the Board would feel about not using the alternative method and delaying the meeting with the hope the vaccination program would make late spring/early summer a more conducive time to safely hold an in-person meeting.

Mr. Mason spoke of discussion of the same possibility at the COOP School Board meeting. That board did not decide tonight but is leaning towards an in-person meeting later in the spring when we can do it outside. It is certainly an option that appears to be available, and available if the Bill in the Legislature passes. That is a reasonable choice, would eliminate the need for the virtual meetings, and the public hearing could be pushed back to a date that is more commensurate to when the Annual Meeting is held.

The Board could vote now to choose a method without choosing a specific date and could change its position later should circumstances change. Other than the time pressure relative to March 9th, there is time to consider options. He stated his belief the one date that some attention must be paid to is April 15th as the deadline for notice of non-renewal.

Member Arthur asked for additional information on budgetary impacts. Mr. Mason explained the draft language in the Bill states “The governing body in both calendar year and fiscal year towns or districts may make expenditures between January 1st and the date a budget is adopted, which are reasonable in light of prior year’s appropriations and expenditures for the same purpose during the same time. Budgets shall be adopted no later than September 1st.” Asked if that is specific to municipalities, he stated it is not, it says towns or school districts. Vice Chairman Fareed stated the same situation existed last year. In a regular year, if you do not get your funding decided by the voters by the end of the fiscal year you have zero dollars on July 1st. This tells us we have the same dollars we have been spending in the previous year until September 1st. Assistant Superintendent Bergskaug remarked last year that was the sticking point, that it had applied only to municipalities and not to school districts, which is why we had to do our voting in June.

The New Items spreadsheet does include some positions as well as a self-contained intensive preschool for which a position was already hired but is now being officially added to the budget. We technically would not be able to write a contract for that position. Also included on the New Items list are Chromebook purchases, computer purchases, etc. A lot of the work in the building that must take place in the summer when students are not present, would not be able to occur. There are some drawbacks to waiting. It put the COOP in a very difficult position to move forward by not having a budget until the end of June last year. We could not even post for available positions because of retirements that came forward.

Member Roy asked for clarification there would be the need to have the meeting completed by the 15th of April to not be subject to those impacts. Mr. Mason stated that date to be a deadline for contract non-renewal, which differs from contract renewal.

Assistant Superintendent Bergskaug stated April 15th to be the deadline for guaranteeing a contract. We would not be able to issue notices of employment for our support staff because the contract is on the warrant.

Vice Chairman Fareed stated the negative aspects of the alternative format is that the public cannot make amendments because we do not have voter checklist opportunities in a Zoom meeting. Mr. Mason noted amendments can only be made by the governing body although input can be received from the public.

Member Roy commented the saving grace is that we do not have anything controversial on the warrant this year.

Chairman Mann stated his preference for an in-person meeting, but would not want to prolong the meeting beyond the contractual deadlines, etc.

Asked, Mr. Mason stated the COOP School District has no interest in having a regular meeting in March. What they are trying to decide (next meeting) is whether they want to conduct a virtual meeting or an outdoor in-person meeting. There was a lot of sentiment for an in-person meeting.

A sense of the Board was requested regarding conducting a traditional meeting on March 9th.

Asked if there are additional drawbacks to the Zoom meeting that should be considered, Mr. Mason spoke of it being time consuming for the governing body as there is the need to conduct two Zoom meetings and to gather and make available all the public input. The logistics of a large Zoom meeting can be difficult. It is costly to send out notifications to all registered voters.

Member Roy spoke of her experience with Zoom noting there are options of a Zoom meeting and Zoom Webinar. The Zoom Webinar would allow for as many restrictions as desired; participants queue up to speak, can only be unmuted by the host, etc. A lot of the tedious aspects that can be present with a large Zoom meeting can be avoided. She stated the desire to be assured that, if going with this method, that the virtual meetings could be conducted as Zoom Webinars. Mr. Mason stated the legislation does not speak specifically to Zoom, it says virtual or something similar. Asked if the district is a commercial user of Zoom (paying for the service) where it could choose the format, Assistant Superintendent Bergskaug noted the SAU has multiple accounts having different permissions. Asked if there would be an additional cost to conducting a Zoom webinar, Member Roy remarked it depends on the number of participants. Webinars usually permit up to 500 people.

Chairman Mann remarked on the one hand he looks at the warrant as being straightforward and on the other he is hearing of the requirement to send out a mailing to every registered voter and then conduct two virtual meetings. Were the direction an in-person meeting later in the year, it would be more in line with a traditional meeting.

Vice Chairman Fareed stated she has expressed the desire for a mailing to every voting household with informational material leading up to the Annual Meeting for years. She feels the Board's communications saturate the school community, but do not reach as well the non-school community. She sees there to be a benefit to a mailing. Member Roy commented Zoom meetings do not have to be tedious. She does not have a problem with mailings. There is a cost, but she does not believe it to be too great of a cost.

Chairman Mann reiterated that through the virtual meetings, there continues to be a mechanism for amendments to be offered and considered, e.g., community members can make a recommendation to be considered by the Board when deliberating on the content of the final warrant. He asked for confirmation his understanding is correct. Mr. Mason stated the explanation is correct.

Assistant Superintendent Bergskaug noted there is a cost to in-person meetings as well. Mr. Mason questioned the will of the Board regarding conducting a virtual session that culminates with voting on March 9th. Should that be the direction, the schedule is short. Chairman Mann responded there is not a lot in the warrant that causes him concern regarding a short timeline. Mr. Mason noted the public hearing would have to be conducted by the 3rd or 4th week in January. Noted was that the public hearing is currently anticipated for January 28th if March 9th voting is the target. If going with an in-person March meeting, the scheduled public hearing (prior to this discussion) was February 9th. The end goal could change resulting in all the dates changing.

Member Roy questioned the consequences associated with an in-person meeting being pushed out to the May timeframe.

Vice Chairman Fareed commented if deciding to delay the meeting, the Board has time to decide regarding venue, date, etc.

Asked how the Brookline School District will proceed, Assistant Superintendent Bergskaug noted they operate under SB2; however, there may be a possibility that they will be required to have an in-person meeting.

Member Arthur questioned what type of information would help inform the decision of the Board. Chairman Mann remarked, for him, a lot has to do with where the community is regarding the pandemic. He spoke of the segment of the population that may not be well versed on computers and comfortable with participating in a virtual meeting. There is also the concern for those who are at higher risk should an in-person meeting be the direction taken. He is hopeful that in the spring there is the opportunity to conduct an in-person vote while maintaining social distancing, etc. Member Arthur requested information be provided and shared with the community regarding the impact on the Administration should the meeting be pushed out past a certain date.

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

Yea: 0

Nay: Tammy Fareed, Brooke Arthur, Carryl Roy, Amy Kellner, Robert Mann

5

MOTION FAILED

Assistant Superintendent Bergskaug remarked with the failure of the motion, by default we go to the traditional annual meeting, however, the dates have not been determined. She recommended the conversation extend to the Budget Committee which typically sets the date of the Public Hearing. Once you set one of the dates the ball starts rolling and the rest of the dates are set.

- To see what action the Board will take regarding the policy memo submitted by the policy committee

Chairman Mann questioned the impact of tabling the item until the Board's next meeting. Member Kellner noted the first two policies that are up for a third reading and adoption are the very lengthy ones. There has not been much in the way of discussion around those policies, and she was uncertain if bringing them forward at this time would generate discussion.

Assistant Superintendent Bergskaug stated her belief there would not be any negative impact of tabling action on the policies. Member Kellner stated agreement.

MOTION BY MEMBER ROY TO TABLE THE POLICY MEMO UNTIL THE BOARD'S FEBRUARY MEETING MOTION SECONDED BY MEMBER KELLNER

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

Yea: Tammy Fareed, Amy Kellner, Brooke Arthur, Carryl Roy, Robert Mann

5

Nay: 0

MOTION CARRIED

NON-PUBLIC

MOTION BY MEMBER FAREED THAT THE BOARD GO INTO NON-PUBLIC SESSION PURSUANT TO RSA 91-A:3 II (a) THE DISMISSAL, PROMOTION OR COMPENSATION OF ANY PUBLIC EMPLOYEE AND (c) TO DISCUSS A MATTER, WHICH IF DISCUSSED IN PUBLIC, WOULD LIKELY AFFECT ADVERSELY THE REPUTATION OF A PERSON, OTHER THAN A MEMBER OF THE BODY OR AGENCY ITSELF
MOTION SECONDED BY MEMBER ROY

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

Yea: Amy Kellner, Amy Kellner, Brooke Arthur, Carryl Roy, Robert Mann
5
Nay: 0

MOTION CARRIED

*The Board went into non-public session at 9:16 p.m.
The Board came out of non-public session at 10:38 p.m.*

MOTION BY MEMBER FAREED TO ACCEPT THE SUPERINTENDENT EVALUATION, AS AMENDED
MOTION SECONDED BY MEMBER KELLNER

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

Yea: Brooke Arthur, Amy Kellner, Carryl Roy, Robert Mann, Tammy Fareed
5
Nay: 0

MOTION CARRIED

ADJOURNMENT

MOTION BY MEMBER ROY TO ADJOURN
MOTION SECONDED BY MEMBER KELLNER

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

Yea: Brooke Arthur, Amy Kellner, Carryl Roy, Robert Mann, Tammy Fareed
5
Nay: 0

MOTION CARRIED

The January 6, 2021 meeting of the Hollis School Board was adjourned at 10:39 p.m.

Date _____ Signed _____