

**HOLLIS BROOKLINE COOPERATIVE SCHOOL BOARD
AUGUST 21, 2019
MEETING MINUTES**

A regular meeting of the Hollis Brookline Cooperative School Board was conducted on Wednesday, August 21, 2019 at 6:01 p.m. at the Hollis/Brookline Middle School Library.

Vice Chairman, Tom Solon, presided:

Members of the Board present: Beth Janine Williams, Secretary
Elizabeth Brown
Melanie Levesque
Cindy VanCoughnett
Krista Whalen

Members of the Board Absent: Holly Deurloo Babcock, Chairman

Also in Attendance: Andrew Corey, Superintendent
Gina Bergskaug, Assistant Superintendent
Bob Thompson, Assistant Superintendent of Student Services
Linda Sherwood, Assistant Business Administrator
Rick Barnes, Principal, Hollis Brookline High School
Tim Girzone, Principal, Hollis Brookline Middle School
Brian Bumpus, Athletic Coordinator
Mary Martin, Student Council Representative

APPOINTMENT OF PROCESS OBSERVER

Vice Chairman Solon appointed Melanie Levesque as Process Observer.

AGENDA ADJUSTMENTS - None

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Hollis Brookline Cooperative School Board July 17, 2019

The following amendments were offered:

- In each instance it appears; correct the title of Mr. Thompson from Director of Student Services to Assistant Superintendent of Student Services
- Page 4, Line 28; replace the comma with a period at the end of the sentence
- Page 5, Line 1; replace “regarding” with “regard”
- Page 8, line 44: replace “joiner” with “jointer”

**MOTION BY MEMBER VANCOUGHNETT TO ACCEPT, AS AMENDED
MOTION SECONDED BY MEMBER WHALEN
MOTION CARRIED
3-0-2**

Members Levesque and Whalen Abstained

NOMINATIONS/RESIGNATIONS/RETIREMENTS/CORRESPONDENCE

Superintendent Corey spoke of a communication from Kelly Seeley, Business Administrator. As we are entering into the FY21 budget process, she is looking for a representative from the COOP School Board to the

SAU Budget Sub-Committee. Vice Chairman Solon requested members interested in serving in that capacity contact the Chairman.

Superintendent Corey spoke of the search for an Assistant Principal at the Hollis Brookline Middle School (HBMS), which resulted in two candidates being forwarded on to the SAU. Yolanda Flamino has been selected for the position. She currently teaches Science at the Hollis Brookline High School (HBHS). Ms. Flamino is completing her educational Doctorate in Leadership and Learning at Rivier College (has already earned 52 hours towards that degree). She holds her Masters in Curriculum Instruction from Rivier University, has a Masters in Exercise and Sports Studies from Smith College, and her undergraduate bachelor's degree from Trinity College in Biochemistry with a minor in European Civilizations.

The SAU is working with Principal Barnes as this creates an opening. The actual start date is to be determined. Ms. Flamino will be placed on the salary scale at \$88,288 pro-rated based on the start date and the fact Administrative contracts start in July.

Superintendent Corey commented Ms. Flamino will help the District continue to push focus on science and technology, will do a wonderful job relating to the HBMS students, and with her working alongside Principal Girzone and Assistant Principal Campbell, there will be a very solid team for the HBMS for many years to come.

Asked if she would continue teaching chemistry until a chemistry teacher is found, Superintendent Corey remarked there were a few candidates who had applied for a position at the HBHS. Principal Barnes is working with Assistant Principal Zeller to determine the best way to fill the opening. It may be as short a period as a few days or as long as the first semester.

Superintendent Corey informed the Board Student Transportation of America (STA) completed the official purchase of Hollis Transportation on August 6th. STA has worked hard to adjust many of the stops on the routes, but many are similar to those of the past. Routes have been posted. Nineteen drivers returned from Hollis Transportation. Being a large company, they have located 3 drivers who will be assigned to the SAU to start the year. Those drivers have received regular training and meet all State requirements. There are two drivers in training who should be licensed by the end of September.

Superintendent Corey spoke of the wealth of advertising done by STA. STA has brought into the fleet ten (10) new buses ranging from 2016-2018. The buses have been equipped with the safety bars. Being installed at the bus barn is a septic system (for bathrooms) for the employees and a well is being drilled to provide for running water. New construction on the bathrooms and offices for the staff is beginning. Extensive work has been done in the parking area. They have updated the radios on the buses and added new video surveillance systems on some. They conduct monthly safety meetings, are bringing in drivers, where needed, to assist with athletic runs (cross-rostering), etc. They are offering a competitive wage, and start employees with paid training from the moment they walk on. At 5:00 p.m. on Monday evening, they will conduct their driver start-up meeting at the Lawrence Barn.

STA's Regional Manager is very responsive. They have addressed a number of historical bus stop issues. A future goal is to get the routes more digital based so they can be loaded into PowerSchool.

Superintendent Corey spoke of a communication from Barbara King. Now that the field is in progress, she has reached out to the Boosters. They are looking to conduct joint fundraisers to help increase the donations towards the field.

PUBLIC INPUT

Bruce McClure, 23 Hannah Drive, Hollis

Spoke of the information provided with the [agenda](#) titled “Coop Tech Ed Renovation”. He noted costs allocated to what was referred to as the \$98,000 plus \$5,000 donation, which was money raised by taxpayers through the passage of Article 13. That money was to be allocated to the Robotics team for equipment and space. Most of the equipment listed was not for Robotics, but rather new woodshop equipment. He spoke of the old equipment being sold off and the \$1,000+ cost for removal.

He questioned the costs associated with the Miter Saw believing it to be 3-5 times what the cost should be. He suggested the reference be corrected to identify the number of saws being purchased at the stated price.

He noted the stated cost for the laser engraver, \$25,845, and his disbelief a laser engraver could cost that amount. He suggested that could be a typo.

Mr. McClure reiterated the funding source for the equipment listed (appears to be for the woodshop) should be identified as the general fund. None of it is for Robotics, which is what the article was and what the taxpayers agreed to spend funds on. When the article was approved, the woodshop was intended to be closed. Although he is pleased that is not the case, the equipment should not come from the \$98K raised. He stated a desire for the Board to amend the spreadsheet, as suggested.

PRINCIPAL REPORTS/ATHLETIC REPORT

- Hollis Brookline High School Technology Proposal - Update

Brian Bumpus, Athletic Coordinator, informed the Board Becky Balfour will be recognized by the NHIAA for 25 years of coaching in the State.

Included with the agenda were 3 versions of a potential logo (each with a different outline color), which was put together with input from the field committee. The intent is to utilize the logo at the center of the new turf field as the focal point for the field. Mr. Bumpus stated his preference for the royal blue outline. The logo would be used for the field and future projects, e.g., re-doing logo on gym floor at HBHS, etc. Asked if it is permanent in the turf or requiring maintenance, he indicated it to be permanent.

Principal Girzone spoke of the items addressed in his report noting photos provided of some of the summer projects. In particular, rooms 107 and 103 have had renovations completed. The custodial and maintenance staff has worked diligently to ensure everything that was in the science classroom (107) has been retained and is now located in room 103. Plumbers were in this week addressing the final touches for connecting water to all of the sinks that were previously in room 107. The floors have been retiled and waxed. Walls have been painted.

The report noted new personnel to the District; grade 8 social studies teacher, Tyler Pare, Spanish teacher Mariela Carmelo, and grade 8 math teacher, Jake Richard.

ROCK curriculum work has been done on further developing the curriculum with a focus on self-management and self-awareness under the umbrella of Social Emotional Learning.

Enrollment numbers are down slightly compared to last year with the moving on of the prior 8th grade class. A fair number of transfer students have been enrolled including five 8th grade students and twelve 7th grade students.

Principal Barnes informed the Board current enrollment is around 870, which is slightly more than anticipated. There were about 30 transfers in, and not as many transfers out as typical.

The Instructional Practices Committee (IPC) has met on several occasions. Work includes updating board policies relating to alternative credits. As expected, once they got into the work around the formation of the committee and started getting into policy, they discovered it to be pretty complicated. The Board can anticipate receiving recommendations this year for amendments to that policy.

After the sub-committee convenes and reviews the data, it is expected the issue of the calculation of class rank (specifically for the top 10) will come before the Board (this year).

Also being looked at is the issue of weighting grades as outlined in the Program of Studies. The goal is for that to come before the Board at some point this year.

A sub-committee is being established to review assessing and grading at the high school (potentially 7-12).

The IPC Charter was included with the Board packet.

Vice Chairman Solon commented the sub-committees are not limited to membership of the IPC. Board members are invited to participate in one of more of the sub-committees.

Principal Barnes commented the IPC is serving as the steering committee to guide the work. The sub-committees will submit recommendations to the IPC, which will discuss and make a recommendation/presentation to the Board. There will be outreach to the community along the way.

Principal Barnes spoke of the Four-Year Technology Plan (Plan). A template was included with the agenda packet. It is believed the Plan can be completed over the course of four rather than five years. Engineering came out on the top of the list in Year 1. Those computers have been in there for nearly 10 years. He has been told they have exactly 1 year of useful life remaining. Computer Science needs new computers for collaboration (using desktops and need laptops). Science; specifically Physics, needs support in the form of laptops. Chromebooks won't suffice. Year 1 total cost is \$86,750.

Year 2 includes Social Studies, the remainder of the Science department, and World Language; all Chromebooks. Total cost is \$99,588.

Year 3 includes English (started with Chromebooks around 3 years ago for writing courses). Those Chromebooks need to be replaced (full department set). Also in English, with the journalism and yearbook courses, they cannot run off of Chromebooks. Would need standard Lenovo laptops to support that work. Math does not need as many computers (few carts), and the health program (1 cart).

Vice Chairman Solon commented on the number of computers proposed in year 3 for English (50) and Math (60). Principal Barnes stated the total to be 60 under Math (2 carts of 30 each). English would be 25 in each of the classes. Total cost for year 3 would be \$105,174.

Year 4 addresses the Counseling Department and a request for Chromebooks for outreach with students in small groups, e.g., career counseling, applications, etc. Music is exploring using songwriting and composing software (1 cart to share between Chorus and Band). Total for year 4 is \$14,306. Additional cost related to anticipated storage is \$40,000 (maximum, number) brings the total cost of the four-year proposal to \$345,818.

Principal Barnes noted the proposal is fluid relative to costs and population changes. He does not see the cost exceeding the anticipated \$345,818. In fact, he believes it would come in under that amount.

The proposed changes would bring the District up to date with its peers. Principal Barnes spoke of discussions with other schools, and the fact the high school is one of the few schools that is not a one-to-one. The Board has discussed the drawbacks of one-to-one, and he is pleased that is not the route the District took. However, students need access to considerable technology. If not being a one-to-one, there is the need to have computers on demand in every classroom.

Asked what the rollover period is, Principal Barnes stated his belief it would be every five years, and expending \$40,000 every year for upkeep.

Wanting to address questions raised previously, he noted the Learning Commons currently serves as the hub of a fair amount of the technology. There would be the need to keep a class set of Chromebooks in there updated for study halls and activities of that nature. The plan includes ordering of 25 of the high-end computers for Engineering for use with the CAD software. Currently the class size is 18-20. There would be extra computers that could be used if there was the need to have a check-out mechanism for students wishing to utilize the computers after school, etc.

Vice Chairman Solon questioned if the Board should expect to see the costs for year 1 included in the upcoming budget proposal along with associated software, maintenance, etc., and was informed that is the case.

Ms. Whalen reiterated a \$40,000 cost would be in each budget going forward. She questioned if cost savings would be associated with online textbooks. Principal Barnes commented it depends on who you go through. Right now ordering of books is done by department heads. Some are savvier than others at getting more out of the publishers. Currently, the textbook companies are charging about the same per book/download. Updates may be at a lesser cost depending on how the publishers structure their licenses.

Where there might be less is reliance on the workbooks. Those are pretty brutal on the budget. A lot of the workbooks are given out and not returned as they are written in (single use). If relying more on digital access there may be savings there.

DISCUSSION

- Facilities Committee Update – Field Update

The process began with the back-left corner where the contractor has recently piled the sifted loam. They will be working out and fanning out and creating the leveling for the field.

Today they were onsite to change the GPS system for the bulldozers as they move from one piece of equipment to the other. Tighe & Bond (bond counsel) has approved Phase I and Phase II materials. Any material for the site, from crushed stone to the concrete drainage structures, are all approved by bond counsel. Any billing that comes in goes to bond counsel to ensure the work has been completed. From there it is forwarded to the Business Administrator to authorize payment. The field is still on schedule for completion on November 15th.

Vice Chairman Solon commented there had been uncertainty expressed about what composition would be used for the fill, and questioned if that has been determined. Superintendent Corey stated they went back to bond counsel. There have been concerns raised, but there is nothing out there that identifies crumb rubber as any worse than the tires we have on our cars.

- Middle School Tech Education - Curriculum Outline (informational purposes), Facilities Update

The document provided with the agenda was intended for informational purposes. Assistant Superintendent Bergskaug commented on some of the anticipated projects, e.g., layered animal project, tic-tac-toe boards. She

noted Mike Scaramellino, Tech. Ed. Teacher has been in-house setting up the shop and spending time with Principal Girzone. He is excited to start the school year.

Superintendent Corey echoed the sentiments of Principal Girzone regarding the work done by the custodians. The science lab is ready, the teacher has been outstanding spending the past few days in-house.

Room 107 received the finish coat of paint earlier in the day. There is a sink still to be installed. This weekend the robotics group will begin moving in a number of their items currently in storage.

Multiple meetings have occurred with Robotics. He thanked Josh Roby and Ken St. Hilaire.

Asbestos was located in room 107, which was not anticipated. That will set back the installation of the roll-up door with guidelines that have to be followed when addressing the asbestos. It was encapsulated, and the room is usable by students.

Asked if there is an estimated cost of remediation, he indicated it would not be expensive because of the encapsulation (approx. 20 pieces of tile). Where the cost will come in is when cutting occurs for the opening between the two rooms. It will have to be encapsulated. That cannot be done with students in school. An x-ray may be required. Testing for air quality will have to occur.

What was brought to light is an issue the District will have to start to address. That is an area of the building where it was believed that had been removed during prior renovations. There is an ongoing asbestos plan that has been added to those areas and steps will be taken to remove that in the future.

With regard to the comments provided by Mr. McClure, Superintendent Corey indicated the spreadsheet does need to be updated. He discussed that with Messrs. Robey and St. Hilaire the prior day. The priority had been getting the rooms finished. He stated, for the record, neither he nor the Assistant Superintendent ever advocated for closing of the woodshop program. When reviewed, there was equipment identified as needing to be replaced due to safety concerns.

Replacement of those items was not budgeted. Some of the costs will move over in the spreadsheet. Every year the District encounters items that need to be replaced, and were not budgeted.

He stated his belief the end result will be a tremendous set-up. Mr. Scaramellino is open to working with Robotics and views it as a collaborative/shared space. Superintendent Corey spoke of the high level of communication that has occurred.

Vice Chairman Solon stated from his perspective, the Article was in part to pay for improvement of the space for use by the classroom to be shared. Part of that is to get equipment safe for all people in the space. It is not a situation where that space is now a robotics space and everything that is in it will be exclusively robotics or exclusively woodshop. It is a common ground.

Superintendent Corey remarked robotics looks at it as a space to come in and build what they need to build for their build season and then go back to Room 107. It is viewed the same way with woodshop; they will come in and do their cuts. The students will be putting together their projects.

Ms. Williams remarked the equipment relates to the curriculum, which looks great. She struggles to understand the issue of some of the equipment. The space will be shared with the high school robotics and the middle school students. She stated the equipment to be confusing to her commenting perhaps the high school robotics team won't always be in the middle school. She is struggling where the line would be drawn in regard to shared equipment.

Superintendent Corey stated the focus, up to this point, was to ensure the facility would be open for the Tech Ed. component; that equipment was safe, etc. What the SAU prioritized was much of the equipment moving forward. Being presented to the Board tonight is the first significant piece of robotics equipment that will be in that shared space. There will be other items coming forward in the near future.

Ms. Williams questioned what equipment is specific to Robotics or Tech. Ed. curriculum. All of that equipment is being grouped together from the same funding source.

The way she understood Article 13 funding was with a lot of the robotics in mind.

Superintendent Corey commented the spreadsheet was intended more for the Business Administrator to use in capturing costs. The priority at the SAU is preparation for the opening. To the point made by Mr. McClure, some of the expenses will be moved to the general fund. With the final accounting of the project, they will be able to identify what is specifically a woodshop item, what is a shared item, etc.

Vice Chairman Solon commented it is likely that everything that is seen on the spreadsheet at this time will be utilized at one point or another by both classroom students and robotics. The equipment that is in a room is accessible to the students, and if in the room it is accessible to robotics. His understanding, from a School Board point of view, and one of the ground rules, was if the room is being shared, for the most part, if there is value to have that equipment used by both parties it is to the benefit of all to have it available for use by all parties.

Mr. St. Hilaire stated agreement; if sharing the space we are sharing the tools; everybody can use everything. He believes what is concerning people is the selection of items to be purchased. The items on the list were primarily purchased to address issues of safety in the woodshop, and they are really replacing woodshop tools. It is not what the Robotics team would have identified as a list of things needed for robotics.

Mr. St. Hilaire stated Article 13 was not about Tech Ed. It has kind of morphed to that. For years we haven't had a robotics space at the HBHS. Voters chose to spend \$98,000 to improve the Robotics space at the HBMS. That money was Robotics. Yes they will share stuff with Tech Ed. They 100% support Tech Ed. But in the end, there are a bunch of tools that are used to make wood out of that they absolutely need in the woodshop to make a good Tech Ed. program, but there is another list of tools the Superintendent has (some approved at the last meeting and one before the Board tonight), which are needed on the robotics side.

Vice Chairman Solon remarked he does not disagree. The point he wanted to make was everything that is in the space is accessible by both groups.

Ms. Levesque asked if there is an itemized list of what the Robotics Team needs in the space, and was informed the SAU was provided a list. One large item appears later in the agenda, two items were approved previously, and the other component was ensuring discussions around the layout of the room take place given the size of some of the equipment.

Ms. Levesque questioned if Robotics would receive everything that is needed. Superintendent Corey stated his belief they would get the vast majority. At this time, he is uncertain what the total cost will be. There were pieces around the asbestos, door, etc., for which exact pricing is not yet known.

Ms. St. Hilaire remarked once the spreadsheet is worked out, they will look at the list and see where it comes out. If there are things in there they are not comfortable with, he will make that known.

Bruce McClure, 23 Hannah Drive, Hollis

Spoke of having visited another STEM center that had a very interesting safety protocol and system in place. Every machine was equipped with an RFID sensor, every student needed a plastic card that is carried, and the only way that machine would start is if they had been checked out on the machine and trained.

- Student Services Update

Assistant Superintendent Thompson informed the Board July 31st is the submission deadline for Special Education Aid (formerly called Catastrophic Aid). The District receives a reimbursement from the State for students in special education whose total program reaches a certain dollar amount. For FY19, the total revenue for the COOP School District was \$586,000. The submission has been made. He spoke of the many hours dedicated by individuals in the department to complete that submission. An indication of what the FY20 allotment is should be available in the next month or so. It is anticipated the revenue will be flat or slightly lower based on historical trends. The criteria for special education aid has increased, and it is a funding source that is shared amongst all of the SAUs in the State.

The search process for a new Assistant Director for Student Services has begun. Anne Elser, who is serving in the role, has moved over to the Hollis School District where she will serve as the Special Education Administrator.

DELIBERATIONS

- To see what action the Board will take regarding the Administration's proposal for the utilization of the Tech Ed space and accompanying equipment upgrades/replacement

Superintendent Corey stated the request, on behalf of Robotics, for the purchase of a Haas Minimill 2 at a cost of \$35,063. The funding source would be Article 13. The equipment would replace a similar piece of equipment that has reached the end of its useful life. The equipment provides far greater capabilities during build season for the Robotics program. The equipment also comes with enhanced safety features. The cost represents a significant discount from the \$40,790 actual price. The discount was negotiated by the sponsor, Don Tucker, of Tucker Engineering. Mr. Tucker will also donate approximately \$10,000 of tooling components for the mill. The tooling donation includes bits, cutters, tool holders, and other small parts that add capabilities to the mill.

Superintendent Corey thanked Mr. Tucker and Robotics for reaching out to Mr. Tucker, and doing all of the legwork to secure the donation for the Robotic Program and providing the equipment to the District.

Superintendent Corey requested the Board approve the purchase and accept the donation.

**MOTION BY MEMBER LEVESQUE TO APPROVE THE PURCHASE OF A HAAS MINIMILL 2 AT A COST OF THIRTY-FIVE THOUSAND SIXTY-THREE DOLLARS (\$35,063.00). SOURCE OF FUNDING IS WARRANT ARTICLE 13 APPROVED AT THE ANNUAL MEETING
MOTION SECONDED BY MEMBER WHALEN**

ON THE QUESTION

The Board requested a member of the Robotics team participate in the discussion.

Vice Chairman Solon questioned if Tucker Engineering's support was contingent upon this specific piece of equipment being selected.

Ken St. Hilaire, 44 Hayden Road, Hollis

Stated Mr. Tucker had input into defining it. They went to him with a different model in mind, and he indicated, for the money and what was looking to be accomplished in an education setting, this is the direction that should be looked for a number of reasons, e.g., fully enclosed product, more automated, etc. In his professional experience and his involvement with the team and others, he pointed them in this direction. He is a significant purchaser of equipment from Haas, and through that they were able to get a pretty significant discount.

Vice Chairman Solon spoke of having familiarity with Haas equipment. They are outstanding production machines. In terms of milling, they don't like to sit. Maintenance support is costly. He noted the extended warranty included in the proposal.

Asked if the milling machine would be used on a daily basis, Mr. St. Hilaire stated the mill to be at the top of the list in terms of useful pieces of equipment. That and the CNC router would be the two primary machines used to fabricate parts. It would not be used every day because they are not producing things, but the Minimill is the bridge; is a step up from the Tormac and others that were looked at.

Vice Chairman Solon commented professional machinists shy away from stepdown machines, but their expectations are also higher.

Mr. St. Hilaire commented on being with the team for 10 years. Back in the day they didn't do any fabrication; they cut extruded pieces of metal, had the mill and would mill some holes. In 2015, they struck a relationship with a machine shop company in Amherst and what that did for them was shifted the way they did things to moving into more of a design and fabricate. That model changed the level at which they operate. Students now fully CAD the device/parts, etc. Where previously they had to farm everything out to be manufactured, they are now trying to bring that fabrication back inhouse.

The tool is beyond what the students have had access to, but similar to what he has seen in other CTE centers around the State. If spending sizable money, this is the place to do it. The cost includes shipping, installation, and set-up. Asked if it would fit through the current door, he stated it would.

Ms. Brown questioned the cost for maintenance/upkeep, who would be maintaining the equipment, whether the cost will be from the school budget or paid for by Robotics.

Vice Chairman Solon commented on the different categories of costs, e.g., consumables and repairs. There is a three-year warranty after which repairs/maintenance can be costly.

Superintendent Corey stated his view of anticipated maintenance costs to be a shared cost. If faced with a repair cost, the equipment would be fixed, and he would discuss it with the Robotics program, which has been self-funded for many years.

Ms. Brown stated she is struggling with all of the equipment purchases noting the language of the Article did not reference equipment. It stated the intent to raise the sum of \$98,311 for the purpose of funding a facility for the HBHS and HBMS Robotics Teams. Facility is a space not equipment. She stated concern with trying to determine the kind of equipment, whether it would be used for Tech Ed or Robotics, etc. The Warrant was specific to space. Reconfiguration clearly fits in with the intended use as does asbestos remediation. Equipment, however, is something she is struggling with as well as the ongoing liability and maintenance. She questioned if service personnel would have the background checks that the District needs for them to have to come into the building. There is a statutory obligation to ensure contractors meet certain requirements. Will there be the need to ensure the individual only comes in after hours?

Superintendent Corey noted many of the maintenance questions are dealt with every day regardless of the type of maintenance required. In terms of the equipment, whenever an upgrade is made there is always going to be the ongoing fee. This is about putting forth the quality programs the community expects. What the District is proposing, and has worked hard on, will do just that. He does not see it as additional responsibility. We've always had Robotics, they have always been using these type of tools, they do an outstanding job of training their students, have a safety committee, etc. He stated a comfort with what is proposed for purchase just as he is for the pieces for the Tech Ed component.

Mr. St. Hilaire spoke as the drafter of the Warrant language stating the intent to have been to have a facility with the proper equipment to do what the Robotics Team needs to do. It was a reaction to not being able to have the tech center at the HBHS, which would have also had equipment.

Ms. Brown remarked we could argue all day and night about what people thought the words on the page meant. She stated the words on the page say nothing at all about equipment. She does not believe the Board is required/directed by the voters to spend it on equipment. She is concerned with spending funding on equipment until an asbestos remediation cost is known, which has all been started by this project. That could be a large number.

Superintendent Corey noted the asbestos has been encapsulated, which makes the environment perfectly safe. The price of \$5,250 is for the opening. It is for a certified asbestos company to come in, encapsulate it, make the cuts, address the asbestos, install the door, ensure everything meets code, and conduct the air testing. That is a company that the District had recommended to it by the architect. The company has been onsite and viewed the area before it was encapsulated.

Asked if there is a ballpark estimate around the cost to address the issue, Superintendent Corey stated the installation is likely in the area of \$3,000 - \$4,000. Ms. Seeley had a discussion the previous day regarding the x-ray. The contractor was able to view the asbestos before it was encapsulated, the material was tested (\$1,000 cost), and as a result, it is unlikely an x-ray will be needed. Should that be required the cost is estimated at \$1,000 - \$2,000.

Vice Chairman Solon spoke of the question Ms. Brown raised of utilizing funds approved through Article 13 for the purchase of equipment. He questioned if any member of the Board was categorically opposed to the consideration of purchasing equipment for the reasons expressed.

Ms. Levesque stated her opinion when the vote was taken to permit the Robotics team to have the STEM facility, it was a matter of what is needed to conduct robotics. If equipment is what they need and they are not exceeding the \$98,000 that was voted on, she sees no reason why it would not be supported.

Vice Chairman Solon stated a desire to understand if there is an obstacle that needs to be addressed before continuing with the topic at hand.

Ms. Whalen stated she respects Ms. Brown's perspective and can see where she is coming from. However, she did believe the approval to be for the entirety of the program, inclusive of equipment.

Ms. Williams commented Ms. Brown brought up excellent concerns. The problem is in how to resolve that. It is not just a matter of how the Board interpreted the language/intent, it is in the community's interpretation. She interpreted it as the space and what was needed, which could include equipment. She is uncertain how the concerns could be addressed.

Ms. Levesque questioned if there is existing equipment that performs the same function as the Minimill. Mr. St. Hilaire responded they have a tool that has reached the end of its useful life (purchased in 2003). Asked about the maintenance and associated cost, he indicated the maintenance is done in-house on that piece of equipment.

It is a different class of machine than what is being considered. He believes they would rely upon the sponsor to help out in regard to identifying recommended maintenance given the type of things being cut with it and the amount of expected use.

Ms. Levesque commented there is no understanding of what the maintenance cost might be. It was noted the extended warranty is two years. Vice Chairman Solon commented on the small cost of running the equipment. Most of the cost is associated with labor, which can be done by the team. When a larger cost comes into play is when something breaks on the machine and has to be repaired/replaced. There is a two-year extended warranty. Going forward, we will have to anticipate annual costs in the hundreds and perhaps in the low single digit thousands of dollars if having it maintained by the professionals.

Mr. St. Hilaire spoke of the Robotics team budget. Students raise funds (approx. \$1,000 - \$2,000 balance) for equipment maintenance. They don't typically wind up spending it, but it is in the budget the students put together and raise. Ms. Levesque questioned if the District could allocate funds towards unexpected costs. Superintendent Corey stated his belief regular maintenance will become part of the operating budget just as the new saws in the Tech Ed. room will. In regard to unexpected costs, the District has contingency funds as well as the operating budget. If something were to come up that was of a significant dollar amount, it would be brought back to the Board.

Vice Chairman Solon commented it is not unlike the tractor bought to maintain the fields. You know there will be maintenance, and you hope not to have too many unexpected things come up.

Ms. Whalen questioned if some sort of agreement needs to be established with Robotics in terms of funding for large unexpected maintenance expenses. Superintendent Corey noted Robotics is the District's program. They are probably the most self-funding program. What often happens with Robotics is, when there is a need, someone steps up to the plate. The Administration will likely look at a line item in the budget to allocate funds for unexpected expenses (not significant dollars).

MOTION CARRIED

5-1-0

Member Brown voted in opposition

MOTION BY MEMBER WHALEN TO ACCEPT, WITH GRATITUDE, THE DONATION OF TOOLING COMPONENTS FROM DON TUCKER, TUCKER ENGINEERING, INC.

APPROXIMATE VALUE IS TEN THOUSAND DOLLARS (\$10,000)

MOTION SECONDED BY MEMBER WILLIAMS

ON THE QUESTION

The District's appreciation was noted.

MOTION CARRIED

6-0-0

- To see what action the Board will take regarding Policy EHAB – Data Governance and Security
 - 1st Reading; June 19, 2019
 - 2nd Reading; July 17, 2019 (as amended)*Given its 3rd Reading;*

MOTION BY MEMBER WHALEN TO AMEND POLICY EHAB – DATA GOVERNANCE AND SECURITY ACCEPT THE THIRD READING, AND ADOPT, AS AMENDED

MOTION SECONDED BY MEMBER WILLIAMS

ON THE QUESTION

Assistant Superintendent Bergskaug noted feedback received from the last meeting resulted in changes in Sections B1 and B2 to make “ISO” plural and in the addition of “of Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment” following “Assistant Superintendent” in the second paragraph of Section C.

Ms. Williams questioned whether “ISO” should be plural in the second sentence in Section B1. Assistant Superintendent Bergskaug responded it could be either one, but not requiring both. It was suggested the language be changed from “the” to “an”.

Asked for clarification of the language in the second paragraph of Section C, Assistant Superintendent Bergskaug indicated any member of the full Technology Team can serve as the alternate ISO. The full team is being defined in the parenthesis.

Ms. Williams commented the way it read gave the impression that all three are the alternate. Assistant Superintendent Bergskaug stated her belief the intent was any member of the full technology team, any one member, is the District’s alternative. The full technology team is defined. The suggestion was made to change “are” to “is” following the listing of the full technology team.

Vice Chairman Solon noted if a single ISO or ISO alternate can fulfill the function, then where it is written “the” it should state “an”.

The suggestion was made that the Board accept a third reading, and that members having recommended changes submit them to the Assistant Superintendent so that they can be incorporated prior to a fourth reading and adoption.

Vice Chairman Solon noted language in Section F relative to disclosure of information, and stated the opinion the District should have Non-Disclosure Agreements for something of this nature. Were someone to violate, there would be a record that they understood the responsibilities relative to confidential information.

Assistant Superintendent Bergskaug questioned if that would be part of the District Data Governance Plan that was approved in June. Before the Board as Policy EHAB is more of a summary of that 60-page document. She questioned if the Plan would be the more appropriate place for that level of detail. She was uncertain of the implications if the language were in the policy and not in the Plan itself.

**AMENDED MOTION BY MEMBER LEVESQUE TO ACCEPT THE THIRD READING OF POLICY
EHAB – DATA GOVERNANCE AND SECURITY
MOTION SECONDED BY MEMBER WILLIAMS
MOTION CARRIED
6-0-0**

Vote on the main motion

**MOTION CARRIED
6-0-0**

- To see what action the Board will take regarding the re-adoption of the Memorandum of Understanding between the Hollis Police Department and the Cooperative School District

**MOTION BY MEMBER VANCOUGHNETT TO ADOPT THE MEMORANDUM OF
UNDERSTANDING BETWEEN THE HOLLIS POLICE DEPARTMENT AND COOPERATIVE
SCHOOL DISTRICT, AS PRESENTED**

MOTION SECONDED BY MEMBER WILLIAMS

ON THE QUESTION

Superintendent Corey stated the District has had an ongoing Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the Hollis Police Department since the District has had a Security Resource Officer (SRO). Every year he meets with the Police Chief to review the MOU. Added to the MOU this year were sections 11.1 and 11.2 under the heading of Equipment. The added language is as follows:

“11.1 Per agreement of the Superintendent of Schools, the SRO is permitted to have a fan and a small refrigerator in his office located at the Hollis Brookline High School.

11.2 The Hollis Brookline Cooperative School District will authorize access of video surveillance systems inside the school district to the Hollis Police Department and the Hollis Communications Center. The scope of access will be limited to emergency situations and investigatory matters.

Software will be uploaded on only a limited number of terminals located within the Communications Center and the Police Department facility. A list of computers with permissions to the video surveillance system will be provided to SAU 41 on an annual basis.”

Superintendent Corey stated the language has been vetted by legal counsel. Should there be a situation such as an intruder in a building, the Police Department would have the ability, after speaking with either the Superintendent or Assistant Superintendent declaring the emergency, to see into the corridors to assist in resolving the situation. It is specifically for the absolute true emergency situation.

Ms. Williams questioned who would define an emergency and how it would be defined. Superintendent Corey stated when looking at this language he is thinking of an intruder in the building. It may be that this would assist in being able to instruct an entire wing of the building to exit having knowledge of the location of the intruder. From his standpoint, that is the only instance he could see this coming into play.

Noted was that the language does not call out who would identify an emergency and in fact does not indicate an emergency to be the only instance the software would be utilized; “The scope of access will be limited to emergency situations and investigatory matters.” It was suggested the language would extend to a situation where it is reported there is illegal activity occurring in the parking lot.

Asked if that would be in conflict with the desired authorization, Superintendent Corey responded it would. He stated he would take the concern back to legal counsel to address. Vice Chairman Solon and Ms. Brown commented they were not uncomfortable with the language proposed, but wished to make it understood it is not in line with the intended use identified. Superintendent Corey commented the language is broad; however, his explanation of the intent comes from his conversations with the Chief. He reiterated the language could be tightened up.

Ms. Brown questioned the length of time the District retains its recordings. Assistant Superintendent Thompson stated it varies by school and the DVR capability the school system has. Principal Barnes stated the current DVR is 6 days. The one they are upgrading to is more like 2 weeks. The HBMS capability is 2 weeks.

Vice Chairman Solon questioned if the software the Police Department is utilizing has recording capability. Assistant Superintendent Thompson indicated the HBMS system allows you to grant people read only access. The Principal could go back and review two weeks of video, but can set it up so that office personnel can view in real time but cannot go back and review recordings. Superintendent Corey stated the goal to be to move the HBHS to the software used at the HBMS. That is presently being looked at. Assistant Superintendent

Thompson noted approximately 2 years ago a policy was developed that states only the Superintendent or his designee who can review previously recorded video.

Ms. Brown spoke of the COPSync program piloted a few years ago, questioned if it continues to be utilized, and, if so, how this policy correlates. Superintendent Corey stated COPSync went away. The New Hampshire Chiefs of Police went in a different direction. The software is no longer on SAU computers. Ultimately, the company went bankrupt. A number of other types of software have been investigated. He spoke of being comfortable in the security protocols and incident response. Proposed is an additional layer to that.

Ms. Brown commented on the ability, through COPSync, of teachers in the building having access on their devices and computers to be able to alert without making the offender aware of the alert. Superintendent Corey spoke of new programs coming out. When the Chief becomes aware of one that meets the criteria he is looking for, it would be given serious consideration.

Vice Chairman Solon suggested Section 1.5 be amended by inserting an apostrophe in “SROs” and Section 1.6 by moving “in students” to appear after “attitude”.

He questioned the last sentence in Section 8.2 commenting it appears to be contrary to what we ask our SRO to do, e.g., be aware of what is occurring, etc. Section 8.2 reads “The SRO shall not become involved in administrative (school related) searches unless specifically requested by the school to provide security, protection, or for handling of contraband. These searches must be at the direction and control of the school official. At no time shall the SRO request that an administrative search be conducted for law enforcement purposes or have the administrator act as his or her agent.”

Assistant Superintendent Bergskaug stated the Administrator cannot serve as the agent of the Officer. Asked for the meaning of “administrative searches”, Superintendent Corey stated an example to be an administrator going to an individual locker searching for drugs. That is a school related search. The SAU owns the lockers and can search them. If something is found, there is the potential for the SRO to become involved. Vice Chairman Solon remarked in an instance where the SRO is made aware of a location where drugs are likely to be, the language would prohibit the SRO from approaching an Administrator with that information. Assistant Superintendent Bergskaug stated it would then be a police matter and is completely their responsibility to address.

Vice Chairman Solon noted Section 12.1 cites mutually agreed goals and objectives. He questioned the expectations of the amount of activity the SRO would have at any given location. Superintendent Corey stated it is about an 80/20 split with the COOP getting the 80% and the elementary schools receiving a DARE program and some other programming pieces. Asked about the sharing between the HBMS and HBHS, he indicated it to be as needed.

Vice Chairman Solon noted all the SRO has access to is a conference room in the HBMS and has an office at the HBHS. He questioned if that is indicative of where he spends his time. Superintendent Corey remarked the primary concern for incidents typically is the high school, which is why that is where the office is typically located. He and the Chief are discussing the potential for a second SRO. Nothing has been decided as of yet. They are covering four schools and things continue to evolve around safety and security. Asked, he stated Brookline does not have an SRO.

Vice Chairman Solon requested the language around use of surveillance clearly indicate the intended purpose.

Superintendent Corey noted the Chief has indicated a willingness to attend a meeting and answer any questions. Ms. Brown stated she would be pleased to have him at a Board meeting. He will be invited to attend an upcoming meeting.

Superintendent Corey will make the requested changes and bring the MOU back before the Board at its next meeting.

MOTION WITHDRAWN

- To see what action the Board will take regarding the Business Administrator's recommendation regarding the retained fund balance

Superintendent Corey noted the recommendation of the Business Administrator that the Retained Fund Balance be maintained at \$142,000. The communication provided with the agenda included rationale for the recommendation.

MOTION BY MEMBER WHALEN TO RETAIN UP TO THE SUM OF ONE HUNDRED FORTY-TWO THOUSAND DOLLARS (\$142,000) OF SCHOOL FUND BALANCE FROM THE FY19 SCHOOL YEAR AS THE END OF YEAR AVAILABLE FUNDS ALLOW MOTION SECONDED BY MEMBER LEVESQUE

ON THE QUESTION

Vice Chairman Solon questioned if there has been discussion in recent years to address this differently, and, if so, what plans have changed to support this.

Superintendent Corey stated the Board has not had a recent discussion of this, it has pretty much been in place since his time in the District.

Vice Chairman Solon questioned if there is consideration of taking any additional funding out for this budget cycle, Superintendent Corey stated there is not. The funds are within the budget as is the Contingency Fund, the Special Education Trust Fund and the Maintenance Trust Fund. The District has worked hard to build resources to allow for addressing unanticipated expenses. He provided the example of the asbestos; had it been a major cost, this fund, with the proper approvals of the Board, the Budget Committee, and the DOE in place, would be able to be looked to in that type of situation. Another example would be if the Contingency Fund had been utilized and the elevator stopped working. The elevator is needed to be ADA compliant. That is the type of emergency that would be addressed. Asked about the statutory limit on the percentage of the budget that can be retained, he stated his recollection it is 2.5%.

Superintendent Corey commented on some districts utilizing the fund as a means of planning for a significant expense. Although he is not suggesting that, it is a discussion that could take place.

Linda Sherwood, Assistant Business Administrator, noted the Auditors completed the audit the previous day. They have moved on to the field work. It is expected a number should be known within the next few weeks.

MOTION CARRIED

6-0-0

REPORT OUT BY PROCESS OBSERVER

Ms. Levesque remarked the meeting ran well with some discussions going over and others under the expected time.

NON-PUBLIC SESSION

**MOTION BY MEMBER WHALEN THAT THE BOARD, BY ROLL CALL, 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 WILLIAMS**

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

Yea: Melanie Levesque, Cindy VanCoughnett, Krista Whalen, Tom Solon, Beth Janine Williams,
Elizabeth Brown

6

Nay: 0

MOTION CARRIED

*The Board went into non-public session at 8:22 p.m.
The Board came out of non-public session at 8:59 p.m.*

ADJOURNMENT

**MOTION BY MEMBER VANCOUGHNETT TO ADJOURN
MOTION SECONDED BY MEMBER WHALEN
MOTION CARRIED
6-0-0**

The August 21, 2019 meeting of the Hollis Brookline Cooperative School Board adjourned at 8:59 p.m.

Date: _____

Signed: _____