



SCHOOL COMMITTEE

BUSINESS MEETING OPEN SESSION MINUTES

June 6, 2023

Meeting:	School Committee
Date:	June 6, 2023
Location:	MERMHS Library
Attendees:	Pamela Beaudoin, Superintendent Avi Urbas, Director of Finance Theresa Whitman, Chairperson John Binieris Jake Foster Kate Koch-Sundquist Anna Lin Mitchell Chris Reed Erica Spencer
Absent:	
Guests:	
Recorded by:	Maria Schmidt
Link to Reports and Presentations	https://www.mersd.org/domain/785

A. Retiree Reception 4:45 -5:45 pm

The following staff members were honored for their service to MERSD:

Susan Bell

Laurie Colpoys

Nancy Filias

Adrienne MacNeill

Erin Newman

Margaret (Deb) Nolan

B. Call to Order of Business Meeting Open Session– Ms. Whitman called the School Committee Business meeting to order at 6:05 pm.

[Type here]

- 1) **Public Comment** – Ms. Whitman accepted public comment in two stages for the evening. Invited to speak first were all those with non-budget issues. Ms. Whitman requested that speakers adhere to the two-minute time limit.

Donna Furse, 8 Blossom Lane, Manchester: Ms. Furse expressed her support for School Committee member Anna Lin Mitchell as the next School Committee chairperson. Ms. Furse spoke of Ms. Mitchell's financial background and stated the importance of this understanding as the School Committee works to address the district's budget crisis.

Caroline Weld, 15 School Street, Manchester: Ms. Weld stated that considerations of reorganization within the School Committee should be limited to its members. However, Ms. Weld also said that she believes consistency and experience are important as the School Committee embarks on a challenging year.

Lindsay Banks, 40 Forest Street, Manchester: Ms. Banks asked that, when considering the criteria for the new School Committee Chair, the School Committee consider the importance of having a chair that can reach across the aisle and bring people together. She also asked who would go to bat in a meaningful way for the schools.

Karen Bennett, 28 Lincoln Street, Manchester: Ms. Bennett also voiced support for Ms. Mitchell to chair the School Committee for the next year, citing her experience as a CFO. In addition, Ms. Bennett stated that she has heard that the school district hired a public relations company and asked for confirmation and the cost to the district. Superintendent Beaudoin confirmed that the district contracted with John Guilfoil Public Relations in November to provide crisis notification for the whole district. The contract is for \$15K per year.

- 2) **Chairman's Report** – Ms. Whitman stated that since the last meeting she has been busy responding to emails from constituents. Following the last meeting, Ms. Whitman was part of a student Q&A session at the high school. Students are struggling to understand the current budget situation and how it impacts them. Ms. Whitman has also taken input from present and past stakeholders. Although current members of the SC have not previously experienced anything like this budget crisis, previous members have been in similar situations. Ms. Whitman, along with many SC members, also attended the high school graduation and the district retiree reception. Ms. Whitman stated that she has been contemplating her role as chair of the School Committee for the past year. She recalled a session with district coach Michael Eatman where he had staff members record a personal mantra on a popsicle stick. For Ms. Whitman, her goal was "serve with integrity." As Ms. Whitman reflected on her service as the chair, she said there has been a learning curve and many times when she wished she had said or done something differently. However, she was able to come back to that mantra as a guide and has given her best to serve with integrity. Ms. Whitman also said that she has observed a pattern to the chaotic process of the budget. All players start with good intentions, but as crunch time looms emotions run high. However, at the end the partners are striving to do the right thing. In the last week, Ms. Whitman witnessed a shift in understanding and willingness to look at other

viewpoints and communicate effectively. Ms. Whitman credited both communities with integrity. She stated that the district is facing a fundamental misalignment in what the communities value in education and the ability of the two communities to fund the school district budget. Currently, this is hitting Essex, but in the past Manchester has been in a similar position. All stakeholders have a responsibility to tax payers and need to solve the bigger problem. Ms. Whitman stated that she believes there is a way forward, and it will require the SC to elevate how they approach the issue. She stated it is time for the SC to take what they have learned and refine the process. She stated that the SC will not allow the district to be destroyed and said that the key is for the SC to engage as a body, not individuals. A splintered approach does not allow all members to understand all components. Ms. Whitman stated that promoting stability allows the School Committee to entertain creativity. She advocated for a path of stability and consistency and emphasized the importance of the board acting together as a whole. Regardless of her role on the committee going forward, Ms. Whitman committed herself to serving the SC with integrity.

Ms. Whitman passed the gavel to Superintendent Beaudoin for consideration of the annual School Committee reorganization. The superintendent stated that this is an opportunity to discuss who will be the chair of the committee. The superintendent's role in the process is to take nominations.

Ms. Spencer moved to table the discussion for the summer session in order to focus on the other very important issues on the agenda. She said it was a disservice not to prioritize the budget discussion. There was no second to the motion.

Ms. Koch-Sundquist agreed with the need to postpone much of the reorganization with the exception of the chair position. She stated that the School Committee requires stability and to know who the point person will be as they consider the current budget process.

Mr. Foster moved to reorganize the agenda to move the reorganization of the School Committee to after consideration of the district budget. Ms. Spencer seconded the motion.

Discussion: Ms. Koch-Sundquist expressed concern that members would be very tired. Ms. Spencer said that is her point and that she believes the SC owes it to the public to talk about the budget before the leadership question and before the members are tired. Ms. Whitman agreed but advocated for starting the discussion and moving forward with the leadership. Mr. Foster said that the budget should take priority. Ms. Koch-Sundquist said that it is difficult to have the budget discussion without knowing who will fill the leadership role. Ms. Spencer said she received dozens of calls regarding the SC leadership and felt it was distracting.

The motion passed four votes to three. Ms. Whitman will remain in the role of chair through the budget discussion.

3) **Student Report** – Diego Sanson: Mr. Sanson spoke to the current climate in the school. He stated that it has been very tense over the last month and a distraction to learning. It is difficult to focus on class when worrying about the budget situation, because he cares a lot about the outcome. Mr. Sanson reminded the SC that, although on the outside the school seems to represent two different towns, in-school they are one thing, together. Unfortunately, he is seeing the outside influences dividing this group of one. Mr. Sanson said this is the first time he has seen this in three years, and he sees hostility. Mr. Sanson stated that regardless of the leadership of the SC going forward, the decisions made now will not be the solution for the larger problem. He stressed the need for a long-term solution. Mr. Sanson also said that he has witnessed patterns in the SC where things start out great but end up contentious by year's end.

4) **Consent Agenda** –

- Acceptance of Warrants: **AP #1065, 1066, and 1068**
- Minutes for approval: none

Mr. Foster moved to approve the Consent Agenda; Mr. Reed seconded the motion.

Mr. Urbas clarified that due to a financing software issue voucher 1064 had to be deleted and is now represented as voucher 1068 with no change to its contents.

The motion passed unanimously.

5) **Sub-Committee Reports**

- **Elementary Facilities/MSBC Sub-Committee** (Theresa Whitman) – No Report
- **Finance Sub-Committee** (Anna Lin Mitchell/Theresa Whitman) – No Report
- **Policy/Communication Sub-Committee** (Erica Spencer/Jake Foster) – No Report
- **Negotiation Team Sub-Committee** (Kate Koch-Sundquist/Chris Reed) –No Report

6) **Superintendent's Report** – Superintendent Beaudoin stated that the bulk of her work has been focused on the budget. However, she expressed gratitude for all those who worked to make the high school graduation a success. Superintendent Beaudoin also attended the high school Civics Fair and the Essex Elementary Talent Show. Both elementary schools will shortly celebrate their advancement ceremonies. Superintendent Beaudoin reflected that there remains a lot of fun, positive work going on.

7) **Continued Business** –

- **Municipal Special Counsel** – Mina S. Makarious, Anderson Kreiger LLP. Mr. Urbas introduced Mr. Makarious and his associate and explained that the

district engaged special counsel to advise on issues for field funding and to provide insight on the current operating budget crisis resulting from failure of the budget override to pass in the Town of Essex. There was the question of whether, given that the levy-limit portion of the budget passed, is it possible for the district to bring the total number down to meet this amount and not have to return the budget to town meeting for approval. In short, counsel said it is advisable for the district to proceed through town meetings in both communities.

- Reconsideration Budget Timeline and Requirements: Mr. Makarios stated that under statute Chapter 71, Section 16B, there is a process when one town in a two-member district does not vote to approve the operational budget. He stated that for two-member districts, all towns must vote. Allowing passage of a certain time period does not yield a vote by consent. Although there has been discussion that the Essex vote approved an amount within the levy limit, Mr. Makarios stated that this is an untested theory, and he believes it unlikely to be accepted by a court. The courts strive to preserve town input and are cautious about restricting that input. Regarding presenting a reduced budget, Mr. Makarios said that at issue is voters expectations in the original town elections. It is possible that Manchester voters would not have voted for any budget that included cuts. Similarly, Essex voters may have different feelings about a modified budget. Legally, Mr. Makarios believes it is safer to have a vote at two town special meetings.

Ms. Whitman asked for clarification about the passage of time. It is her understanding that the Town of Essex has a differing view and believes that if they take no action, a budget within the levy limit could be accepted. Mr. Makarios stated that, although previously the passage of time was allowed to stand in and provide acceptance for a partially approved budget, and that occurrence does provide an argument for the practice, the advice of counsel is that the practice does not represent the view of those hoping for a different budget outcome, either higher or lower.

- Turf Field Bonding: Mr. Makarios stated that the statute under Chapter 71 has different wording about authorization of a bond versus the authorization of the budget. The statute explicitly contemplates that a town can choose not to vote on a bonding issue, leaving it to pass that way.

Clarifying questions: Ms. Spencer asked what would occur in the event that the two towns did not both vote to support the budget at their town meetings. Mr. Makarios said that the district would have a joint meeting of both towns. This meeting would require fourteen days notice. The Select Boards would meet to approve a joint moderator to lead the budget approval at the joint meeting. In this case, the warrant language would be controlled by the School Committee, and the budget would be the only thing in front of that joint meeting. Mr. Makarios confirmed that it is a simple majority vote that would be conducted in-person, as

opposed to via ballot. Ms. Mitchell asked for clarification on the minimum number of days for the town meetings to be held. Mr. Makarious stated that, after the SC approved a budget, the SC will have seven days to submit it to the Select Board chairs, Finance Committee chairs, and treasurers in both towns. Each town then has 45 days to act on the revised budget. If either town rejects the budget, that is when a joint meeting is called, with at least 14 days of notice. If the district ends the fiscal year without an approved budget, the budget from the prior year will be used as a guide. The district is authorized to spend no less than 1/12 of the previous year's budget per month. DESE can approve a higher expenditure to cover certain expenses as required by the district, but they also have fiscal oversight of the district. Mr. Reed emphasized that the strategies for funding the school district budget are entirely up to each town and not up to the school district. In the event of approval at a super town meeting, each town would have to go through its own decision making process to determine how to fund a newly approved budget emerging from the combined town meeting. Mr. Reed asked if the budget could continue to be blocked. Mr. Makarious explained that he is the town counsel in Concord and Lexington. The short answer to Mr. Reed's inquiry is that there is a role for an override, but it differs based on the situation. The School Committee would be the entity putting forward what the question is on the warrant and does not have to make it contingent on an override. However, the interaction between Chapter 71, which governs the budgeting process, and Prop 2 ½ still exists. Prop 2 ½ ensures that towns have a ballot vote when taxation exceeds the levy limit. The budget would be set once it passes in the two-town meeting. Either member town might find it necessary to call an additional special town meeting if they decide to pursue an override versus trimming their town operational budget or using town reserves.

Mr. Urbas stated that the SC has asked for clarification about the process initiated on March 7, 2023 authorizing issuance for the turf field replacement. Within seven days of approval for bond issuance by the SC, notice was given to each town. It was understood that the towns have the option, but not the requirement, to approve bond issuance within 60 days. No action taken within that period would leave the SC approval in place. However, the regional agreement has language that states that it shall be district practice to get approval through an affirmative vote. Mr. Makarious replied that Chapter 71, section 16 enumerates the powers of the SC. Section 16 D and N contain provisions about how the regional district can incur debt: The first is that the SC can vote and, as long as neither town disapproves within 60 days, the debt issuance is approved. Section 16 N refers to a special election wherein debt issuance is approved via a majority vote in each town. The regional agreement of MERSD has language that states that it shall be the practice to seek an affirmative vote. It would be for a court to decide if the language in the regional agreement is binding. However, it is counsel's view that the language is not binding because the statute considers only two methods for debt approval. Approval at two town meetings is not one of them. There are also sections within the enumerated powers that refer to things that can be in the agreement, and this is not one of them. Therefore, it is neither detailed in the statute nor a method allowed by the statute.

Mr. Makarios stated that the courts tend to read these laws fairly strictly. The use of the term “it is our practice” in the language of the regional agreement can be interpreted to mean that it is not binding and instead represents something that is aimed for but not required. Mr. Makarios stated that he is aware of the counter argument by Essex counsel. He said that bond counsel may have more insight into how this issue is likely to be received by the courts. It is not entirely implausible that a court would accept the argument from the Town of Essex. Ms. Mitchell asked how things would proceed with the counsels of both towns in disagreement. Mr. Makarios stated that there remains risk involved in proceeding with borrowing without an affirmative vote from Essex, whether from potential litigation or risk in the bond market. Ms. Koch-Sundquist asked if there is a time frame for when the affirmative Essex vote needs to be held. Mr. Makarios replied that the standard in the statute should apply, but he cannot discount the risk when issuing the bond. Superintendent Beaudoin asked if there is an expiration on the Manchester vote from April approving the bond. Mr. Makarios stated that he does not believe there is. Although bond counsel may want to consider this in greater depth, Mr. Makarios’s experience is that there is not an expiration. However, the vote could be considered stale if enough time passes and the bond is no longer representative of what voters originally approved. Mr. Urbas stated that bonding for the two previous building projects were approved by the SC and the towns, and then they waited to borrow until the district had a better understanding of the numbers. The authorization stood for multiple years. Mr. Makarios said the reason to worry about staleness is about the perception of bond counsel if there are questions about a possible challenge. He acknowledged that projects take time, and it is not unusual for bond authorization to last multiple years. Ms. Spencer asked if there is potential that the bond issuer would look at this as a riskier proposition because of the internal disagreement and give a less favorable rate. Mr. Makarios differed his response because the question is outside his area of expertise. Ms. Spencer asked about the district’s position should Essex not want to fund the fields through debt. Mr. Makarios said it is acceptable to have more options in borrowing than are used in the end. If Essex decided to cash fund their portion rather than take on debt and did not pursue going to a town meeting, it would indicate that the district and Essex were reading the agreement in the same way. The district would have the authorization to borrow. What each town does to pay their portion of the expense is up to them, as the district is not taking the borrowing in the name of the towns. Ms. Mitchell inquired about the possibility of Manchester borrowing themselves since they are the only ones looking to finance. Superintendent Beaudoin clarified that the current approach resulted from a belief that the district and town partners had a common strategy that would preserve reserves to address the upcoming building project. However, that seems to have been a misunderstanding. Mr. Reed stated that the district always planned to use reserves to speed the turf field replacements. Borrowing would replenish the reserves. Mr. Urbas clarified that the goal of borrowing is not to replace reserves. The goal is to fund through the towns. Use of reserves is in place of acquiring a bridge bond note to provide 2-3 months of cash flow. Mr. Urbas spoke to Ms. Mitchell’s question about having the Town of

Manchester seek their own bonding. He stated that MERSD is the entity entering into agreement with the contractor, and MERSD would still need assurance that they have a commitment to the project from both communities. The district has accepted bids and entered into an agreement with a contractor. To switch funding to a municipality would undo all of that. The district has a \$1.2M project with \$800 approved by Manchester. The district does not currently have a commitment from Essex regarding the funding of their \$400K portion. Mr. Reed commented that he hasn't heard anything officially about how they are willing to fund it. Mr. Makarious stated that switching to Manchester as the borrower would require an additional town vote because what voters approved was MERSD borrowing. Superintendent Beaudoin reminded everyone that Highland Field is a district asset and Brook Street Field is split between the district and Manchester. Having MERSD as the bond holder allows it to be evenly divided using that formula.

- Annual Auditors' Report: Frank Serreti and Elizabeth Murphy of Powers & Sullivan, LLC, CPAs and Advisors: Mr. Urbas stated that all reports related to the annual audit of fiscal year 2022 are posted on the district's website.

Mr. Serreti stated that they audited the posted financial statements of the governmental activities, each major fund, and the aggregate remaining fund information of the Manchester Essex Regional School District (District) as of and for the year ended June 30, 2022, and the related notes to the financial statements, which collectively comprise the District's basic financial statements. They concluded that the financial statements present fairly, in all material respects, the respective financial position of the governmental activities, each major fund, and the aggregate remaining fund information of the District, as of June 30, 2022, and the respective changes in financial position for the year then ended. Powers & Sullivan conducted their audit in accordance with auditing standards generally accepted in the United States of America and the standards applicable to financial audits contained in *Government Auditing Standards*, issued by the Comptroller General of the United States. They are required to be independent of the District, and to meet other ethical responsibilities, in accordance with the relevant ethical requirements relating to the audit. Mr. Serreti stated that the audit evidence obtained was sufficient and appropriate to provide a basis for their audit opinions. Management (MERSD) is responsible for the preparation and fair presentation of the financial statements in accordance with accounting principles, and for the design, implementation, and maintenance of internal control relevant to the preparation and fair presentation of financial statements that are free from material misstatement, whether due to fraud or error. In preparing the financial statements, management is required to evaluate whether there are conditions or events, considered in the aggregate, that raise substantial doubt about the District's ability to continue for twelve months beyond the financial statement date, including any currently known information that may raise substantial doubt shortly thereafter. The basic financial statements comprise three components: 1) government-wide financial statements, 2) fund financial statements, and 3) notes to the financial statements. This approach focuses on both the District as a whole (government-wide) and the fund financial statements. The government-wide financial statements provide both long-term and short-term information about the District as a whole. The fund financial statements focus on the individual parts of the District's operations, reporting the District's operations in more detail than

the government-wide statements. Both presentations (government-wide and fund) allow the user to address relevant questions, broaden the basis of comparison and enhance the District's accountability. The government-wide financial statements are designed to provide readers with a broad overview of finances, in a manner similar to private-sector business. A fund is a grouping of related accounts that is used to maintain control over resources that have been segregated for specific activities or objectives. Fund accounting is used to ensure that Manchester Essex Regional School District 6 Management's Discussion and Analysis demonstrate compliance with finance-related legal requirements. All of the funds can be divided into two categories: governmental funds and fiduciary funds.

Highlights of the audit: In reflecting on the audit process, Mr. Serreti stated that they experienced no difficulties in dealing with management in the course of the audit. He noted an improvement in the level of readiness by the district and attributed this to additional staffing. Mr. Serreti stated that no audit adjustments were uncovered, and they experienced no disagreements with management. Mr. Serreti said that one of the most important areas for oversight is cash because it is susceptible to theft and is one of the most important aspects of the audit. It requires monthly reconciliation measures, and the district has done a great job of sustaining these measures. Mr. Serreti provided the following fund highlights:

- The General Fund Balance was \$2.8 M, in-line with the prior year
- \$134K restricted to debt service
- \$38K for capital stabilization
- \$321K for encumbrances
- \$520K of E&D voted to be used for the FY23 operating budget
- This yielded \$1.3M unassigned fund balance which is the starting point for E&D calculation. The final number came in at about \$1.2M, which is about \$441K under the required limit, over which the district would have to return monies.

Overall, results indicated that MERSD has a structurally sound budget that is well-planned and has good budgetary controls in place to ensure that spending is in-line with what has been appropriated. Mr. Serreti also reviewed fund totals and the School Choice fund, long-term debt, short-term debt, and other long-term liability (OPEB, etc.). Funding rose to 15.3% for long-term liability, and Mr. Serreti commented that MERSD has been more aggressively funding that liability than other districts and began to do so earlier. He credited the district with setting the path for others who are now seeking to do the same. In summary, Powers & Sullivan was able to issue an unmodified opinion on the financial statements, which is the best that can be conferred, meaning that financial statements are fairly stated in all material respects in accordance with financial principals. Financial performance indicates a sound budgetary process and controls. All materials received were accurate and no internal deficiencies were noted. All interactions were professional and courteous. Mr. Serreti also reported on the report on federal awards and audit of the child nutrition program and the special education cluster, as required for any entity that spends more than \$750K in federal funds in a given fiscal year. All findings were a clean report. Finally, Mr. Serreti reported on the management letter, which is designed to comment on weaknesses. The report included two recommendations for the district: 1) Reassess organizational structure/roles and responsibilities, and 2) Consider adopting formal financial

policies. Mr. Serreti believe that the District should assess the current roles and responsibilities in the business office and consider adding a payroll and purchasing clerk position to the organizational structure. The existing financial data analyst position would perform most accounting functions under the direction of the Director of Finance and Operations as well as oversee a payroll and purchasing clerk that would have primary responsibility for processing payroll. This organizational structure would bring the accounting staff in line with similar sized school Districts and would increase the controls over the District's accounting functions. The additional position would also give the finance department the ability to implement its formal monthly and year-end closing process more consistently, which would allow for a timelier closing process. This would also help to facilitate a timelier filing of year-end reports with the Department of Revenue for certification of excess and deficiency, submission of the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education's End-of-Year Financial Report and completion of the District's annual financial statement audit. In response, the district added a payroll and purchasing clerk position to the budget and continues to look for qualified candidates. The District has not adopted formal policies documenting the District's financial goals and objectives. For example, financial policies will establish benchmarks for excess and deficiency, fund balance levels, a long-term capital and debt plan, and other important financial indicators. Other policies that should be considered are purchase order requirements, and allowable use of District credit cards. These policies and procedures will provide a framework for management to utilize when making important financial decisions. The School Committee's policy subcommittee is currently working on drafting financial policies. The auditors continue to recommend that the district document and adopt financial policies. The SC recently updated its financial policies to align with the most recent guidance from the MA Association of School Committees. Additionally, the SC policy subcommittee has begun working on drafting a financial reserves policy.

Questions: Ms. Whitman commented that the SC policy subcommittee has begun to work on policy related to use of OPEB funds.

Ms. Whitman reminded those present that all audit materials are available on the district website under "Finance and Operation."

- FY23 Budget – Spring Budget to Actuals & Final Budget Transfers – Vote to Approve. Ms. Whitman emphasized that the items covered in the present meeting before the budget vote are critical and intentional to inform the budget decision. Superintendent Beaudoin stated that the district is trying to put new processes in place, in line with the request by Ms. Mitchell for more frequent budget-to-actual reports.

Mr. Urbas stated that the current budget-to-actual is a forecast because the fiscal year has not yet closed. Staff is paid biweekly, and teachers receive five payments on the last day of school. This payment is a significant expense and is part of the current fiscal year. In addition, some purchase orders may still be open on June 30. Mr. Urbas stated that the district has changed procedures over time to build better forecasts. Not much has changed since the prior forecasts. Each year, there are patterns for anticipating expenses. In November, the number of FTE employees has

largely settled, and as the year proceeds there are fewer unknowns. Things can change between the Town Meeting in May and the conclusion of the summer months. By September/October of the school year, staffing and benefits are very established. Changes to operating expenses can come from utilities and SPED and SPED transportation costs, which are responsive to student needs. Mr. Urbas stated that currently the district looks to be ending the fiscal year with typical savings. While the winter estimate for savings was \$290K, the total savings is currently expected to be \$78K, down from an anticipated \$212K. Utilities costs were a significant component of the change. Previous savings expired, and utility costs have risen as a result of the war in Ukraine. Previously, \$188K was transferred into the budget to meet utility costs, and an additional \$20K will be needed. This is also the time for prepayment of SPED tuition costs. Mr. Urbas said that FY24 is looking to have some increases, and he recommended increasing OOD prepayments by \$134K to offset the one to two newly identified placements for next year.

Ms. Mitchell asked for clarification about the tuition prepayment because they are for FY24. Mr. Urbas responded that the department of education has stipulations to allow prepayment of tuition fees in response to the highly changeable nature of tuitions. This helps to avoid surprises to tax payers. The district creates the purchase order now and creates purchase orders and attempts to cover tuition payments for no more than three months. Ms. Mitchell noted that bus transportation decreased to \$222K and asked about the reductions. Mr. Urbas stated that the district restructured bus service, reducing two buses. In addition, earlier in the year, the district was paying fuel charges to compensate for rising costs. Mr. Urbas asked to reevaluate those fuel surcharges, and the final numbers were lower. Ms. Mitchell asked if FY24 will be similar. Mr. Urbas said that the only change is to the number of buses running. The only changes would be if the district decided to increase the number of buses. He said the district tries not to restructure so that kids are on the bus for too long. Currently, it does not look like the number of buses will increase for next year. Mr. Reed commented that it takes his daughter thirty minutes to get home after school. Mr. Urbas said that there is not a lot of money to be made on bus fees. Families question the benefit of long bus rides and become less likely to sign up for optional bus passes. Ms. Mitchell asked if the FY24 budget is based on projections from January. Mr. Urbas replied in the negative, stating that the number one driver is staffing and what will happen to their salaries. Additional changes are made based on knowledge for next year. This is the same with health care costs. In general, the district's approach is more conservative. Ms. Mitchell remarked on possible savings from transportation costs that could be applied elsewhere. Mr. Urbas said that there is a question about how reimbursements will come in from the state for transportation. He said no savings have been budgeted in. Superintendent Beaudoin remarked that state reimbursement is based on ridership. Decreasing ridership as a result of restructuring will result in lower reimbursement. Mr. Urbas said that the district has begun to work with a broker on utilities procurement. Transportation costs for SPED can be difficult to predict. Although it is contractual, new students and changing student needs impact the budget yearly. Regarding facilities expenses, Mr. Urbas stated that the district strives for level funding, but the small cap needs are underfunded. Superintendent Beaudoin said that SPED needs change throughout the year. It is a data-driven team process to determine student progress, and it is mandated by law.

Motion by Ms. Koch-Sundquist for the School Committee to approve the transfer request, per the language provided by Mr. Urbas, to bring the budget in line with forecasted actual expenditures. Ms. Mitchell seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

Superintendent Beaudoin made a final statement about transportation, noting that as a regional district MERSD is required to provide K-12 transportation whereas single municipalities have the option to stop transportation at grade six.

- OPEB Trust Annual District Contribution – Vote to Approve. MA State Law requires school districts to fund lifetime retiree health care for any retiree that earns pension eligibility, with a minimum employer contribution rate of 50% of health insurance premiums, but many districts and municipalities have yet to face and pre-fund these large future liabilities. MERSD's OPEB trust contributions are invested with PRIT, the same fund that manages teacher and state employee pensions. Earnings on these investments help to reduce the amount that MERSD must contribute. The contribution for FY23 is \$578,666, based on the formula contained in the teachers' contract, whereby MERSD pledges savings from negotiated changes in active employee health insurance coverage. This negotiation was put into effect in FY16. Savings stem from introducing lower-cost deductible plans and from reducing employer contribution rates from 80% to 75% for legacy staff and from 75% to 70% for new hires. Earnings on these investments help to reduce the amount that MERSD must contribute. Contributions since inception now total \$3.97 million.

Mr. Urbas explained that OPEB funds can only be used for future and current health care costs. Mr. Urbas requested that the School Committee approve transfer of funds.

Ms. Whitman moved to approve transfer of \$578,666 for the annual OPEB contribution. Mr. Reed seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously. Ms. Spencer abstained from the vote because of a conflict of interest.

- FY24 Reconsideration Budget Adoption – Vote to Approve
 - Public Comment – Ms. Whitman urged attendees to adhere to the two-minute limit to allow all to speak and to facilitate the start of SC deliberations and subsequent vote. Ms. Whitman also asked town boards present to call their groups to order if needed. Ms. Pereen, Chair Essex Board of Selectmen, called the board to order at 8:25 pm

Miriam Bradford, 128 Old Essex Road, Manchester: Ms. Bradford urged the board to consider teachers and staff and to emphasize commitment to their longevity and place in the district, so that they understand how much they are valued.

Lindsay Banks, 40 Forest Street, Manchester and Betsy McKeen, 35 Lufkin Point Road, Essex: Ms. Banks and Ms. McKeen shared the results of a bi-town survey and letter of support from 591 respondents in the towns of Manchester and Essex. As of 6:00 pm, 600 respondents had signed their names to the letter supporting the original budget as an expression of their commitment to maintaining excellence in the school district. Over 85% of respondents supported the original budget. Ms. Banks emphasized the impact on the real people, staff members and students, impacted by the budget decision. The full letter and signatures was submitted to the School Committee and district administration.

Ava Rizzico, 119 Pleasant Street, Manchester: Ms. Rizzico said that she is concerned about the high schools plan to implement new classes instead of maintaining the current ones.

Nadia Wetzler, 10 Moses Hill Road, Manchester: Ms. Wetzler urged the SC to consider other funding sources. She said that if the SC was willing to increase the number of choice students, it would both bring in revenue and increase the number of students, justifying a larger range of courses.

Shelley Bradbury, 79 Eastern Avenue: Ms. Bradbury spoke to the SC to explain why she voted against the override in Essex. She stated that at the last public hearing, several calls were made for opposing views, but that the climate of the gathering made it impossible because of intimidation and pressure. She said there is a false narrative that those you voted against the override budget do not support education, and that is not true. She said the pressure was also the reason that people did not speak out at the town meeting. She said that those in opposition have real concerns and want to be heard. Ms. Bradbury said that at the ballot, voters did not have this pressure and were able to vote how they believed. Ms. Bradbury said that democracy does not require an explanation of a vote. Ms. Bradbury said that opposition to an override to finance the school budget stems from financial fear and opposition is not just from senior citizens. Ms. Bradbury said that she wonders how she will continue to live in Essex and whether she will be taxed out in a few years. Ms. Bradbury said that there is a lot of hostility currently and personal attacks. She said that the School Committee needs to consider the will of the voters, and that they need to be heard. Ms. Bradbury quoted Einstein, who said, “We cannot solve our problems with the same thinking we used when we created them,” and said that, if we are striving to make our graduates empathetic global citizen, it is important to take this opportunity to teach them in this moment how to come together and work together to find a solution. Ms. Bradbury stated that it is about what people can afford.

School Committee Discussion: Ms. Whitman stated that the SC has received 286 emails regarding the budget. From this, Ms. Whitman was able to sort them by town and support for a budget. Although many were received before the district had constructed the compromise budget, they represented mostly pleas for the original budget. From Essex, there were twelve hard no communications, ten of which were from residents without children in the school system. Ms. Whitman said that the job of the SC is to consider all feedback and give thought to the fundamental issue that the two towns have not passed the full amount.

Superintendent Beaudoin presented an abbreviated overview of the budget proposals for consideration.

- Original 3/21/23 budget: Created following the conclusion of META negotiations and final estimates for health care. It was premised on the elimination of reserve funds as a revenue source. Conservative revisions brought the budget down \$485 from its starting estimates, and the SC voted to approve it. The town of Manchester passed the budget without need for an override. The proposed budget override failed in Essex.
- Cuts 5/16/23 budget: Surgical reduction of the majority of course sections in the district with fewer than ten students. This was done in response to community concern about enrollment in courses. Although the district has been reducing staffing for several years in response to the decrease in the enrollment bubble, the cuts represented by this budget go beyond not replacing retiring staff. Going forward, the full cuts represented here will be necessary to address the budget deficit if a correction is not made. Superintendent Beaudoin emphasized that the district still wants to offer a broad course offering, and this budget does not represent what is best for students.
- Compromise 6/6/2023 Budget: Combines cuts and use of reserve funds to meet 50% of the deficit. This budget does not take out elective sections in the middle and high schools. This budget does not allow the district to create the position of Music Coordinator. This budget reinstates the district-wide, elementary reading specialist. Superintendent Beaudoin emphasized that this is not a budget without cuts. As has been done for the last few year, this budget includes staff positions that will not be filled. Since 2019, the district has lost 15.85 FTE positions and 5.8 FTE teaching assistants.

Ms. Whitman asked for feedback from town partners. Sarah Mellish, Finance Committee, Manchester, reiterated that the Fin Comm is in support of the compromise budget. Ms. Pereen spoke for both the Essex BOS and Fin Comm in support of the compromise budget. Ms. Pereen said that the use of reserves creates a lot of impetus for town partners to resolve the fundamental funding issues. She stated that the boards do not want to see additional use of reserve funds. Anne Harrison, Chair Manchester Select Board, stated that both the BOS and Fin Comm of Manchester hold the position that the override and hard cut budgets were not acceptable. Superintendent Beaudoin stated that reserve use provided some savings in unemployment costs.

School Committee Deliberation: Ms. Whitman clarified that budget approval works by motion.

Ms. Whitman moved to approve the compromise budget as presented. Ms. Koch-Sundquist seconded the motion.

Discussion: Ms. Whitman stated that the SC needed to consider if there are comfortable asking Essex for an override. Mr. Foster replied that they have not worked up numbers for that scenario. Ms. Spencer said that the original idea of a compromise included contingencies for the town of Essex to agree to field funding and to enter into arbitration/facilitation for discussions going forward. She stated that there was little reason to accept this course if it does not further the SC goal of resolving the funding issues going forward, and she is under the impression that Essex has since refused to agree with arbitration. Superintendent Beaudoin stated that at issue is the use of the term

arbitration. The superintendent had intended to introduce the process of “interspace” bargaining as had been done with teacher negotiations. A facilitator would be employed to work through the problem solving process. Ms. Whitman stated that she has seen a marked tone shift and understanding about the importance of committing to the turf field before the budget is settled. Is Whitman asked if there is support for moving forward in the Essex boards. Ms. Preen stated that is correct. Ms. Whitman said that changing the word from “mediating” to “facilitating” made a large difference in perception. Ms. Spencer asked if the SC wanted a commitment to facilitation as originally specified. Ms. Koch-Sundquist stated that a facilitated process does not guarantee a result or that the district will not find itself back in this exact place next year. She said that collaboration meeting with town partners have been small groups of people getting together without accountability. Ms. Koch-Sundquist stated that it is reasonable to push for a more open process where all boards or delegates meet in an open session. Ms. Koch-Sundquist also stated that training with IBB (Interested-Based Bargaining, used for META negotiations) can be time consuming. Superintendent Beaudoin replied that is can be good for putting the parties on the same footing. Although the district chose to forego that training this year, the superintendent thinks it may be worth it going forward. Mr. Urbas stated that he has participated in the IBB process, and that it requires every person to step into the other’s shoes and solve the problem as if it were their own. Superintendent Beaudoin stated that the district’s position is very difficult as the need to synthesize a budget from two different inputs. The path forward is not clear, and the district cannot solve it alone. The superintendent fears that the district will be put in the position of meeting with each town alone and then be pulled back and forth. The struggle does not allow the district to focus on its core mission. Ms. Mitchell stated that at minimum the partners should have a monthly meeting. Ms. Whitman stated that the SC has the ability to set the tone on this issue. Ms. Koch-Sundquist asked Ms. Whitman to clarify. Ms. Whitman said that the SC needs to stabilize the district by passing a FY24 budget. Beyond that the SC needs to come up with a process for solving alignment for level services with fiscal constraints. Mr. Reed emphasized that the SC cannot request an override from the towns. It is beyond the purview of the SC. The SC works with the towns to understand their needs. Mr. Reed stated that they did so and that from there it is out of the hands of the SC. Mr. Reed stated that the Essex BOS could have decided to restructure their town budget so that they did not require an override, but instead sought an override. Mr. Reed characterized the vote against the override as a vote against how the Essex BOS sought to resolve the need for a correction. Mr. Reed emphasized that the school district has four stakeholders – the students, the staff, and the residents of each town. He said that in training for the SC, the main stakeholder is the students and the School Committee should focus on which budget is best for them. Ms. Whitman stated that she agrees but that they need a budget that will pass. By approving the compromise budget, the district has some control of the process. Without it, passing the budget could extend into the summer months. Ms. Whitman stated that she does not believe Essex has the votes to pass an override. Ms. Spencer said that the longer the process goes on, the worse position the educators are put in. She emphasized the need to stabilize the situation for district staff. Ms. Whitman said that with the looming June 15 deadline for layoff notification, approving the compromise budget provides a level of certainty that impacted staff will be reinstated. Mr. Foster

reminded the SC that they have been told by Ben Buttrick that anything \$1 above the levy limit will trigger an override vote. Ms. Mitchell asked if those supporting the full budget might throw their support behind the compromise budget if they understand that it does not include layoffs. Superintendent Beaudoin implored the members to understand that the compromise budget does include cuts and drastically impacts the district's ability to offer the program. The district is stuck between meeting expectations outlined in the District Improvement Plan and meeting the bottom line. Ms. Whitman asked the SC to discuss their reservations about the compromise budget. Mr. Foster stated that for him this is not a process about a specific number but about strategy setting up for next year. He said the choice is either the SC uses reserves to prevent a prolonged town approval process or try to put forth a budget that will trigger an override. He said that the SC needs to compromise. Advocating for the original budget will only harden opposition, especially from those who voted no. Mr. Foster said he does not believe in the success of an override. Mr. Foster stated that he supports the compromise budget. The question remaining will be how to incentivize all town partners to collaborate. Mr. Foster stated that he can only say that the SC will change their process and be open. He does not believe contingencies can be placed on the decision.

Ms. Whitman moved to forego Robert's Rules of Order to facilitate discussion. Mr. Foster seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

Ms. Spencer stated that 90% of Manchester voted for the original budget and said that they should be heard, as well. However, Ms. Spencer conceded that the override for the original budget was unlikely to pass and would leave the district in a worse place next year. Ms. Koch-Sundquist questioned what would happen if the SC approves the compromised budget now, using \$287K of reserve funds, and in the fall Essex votes the fields down. It would trigger a greater draw down of the reserves. Mr. Urbas stated that the \$287K is a step down from previous reserve usage and a step in the right direction. However, the gap next year will be higher. Mr. Reed pointed out that the apportionment for Essex will increase again next year. Mr. Urbas stated that it is not his position to call the compromise budget bad, but the detriment is that next year the deficit grows and will require further cuts or more money to resolve. Ms. Whitman stated that getting to a two town meeting has a cost in school climate and the climate of both communities. Superintendent Beaudoin stated that the \$1.4M shortfall for next year equals another 16-17 FTE positions lost. Mr. Reed reminded the SC that this year was set up as an override year through collaboration meetings over the three preceding years. Last year, the BOS in Essex announced that an override was coming. This year, the META negotiated COLA increase below the inflation rate. The Operating Budget was presented at only 2.85% increase and included added savings from health care. Mr. Reed emphasized that after all this, Essex voters rejected the budget. Although most town spending has increased at over 4% annually, the Essex BOS has kept spending well below that. Mr. Binieris pointed out that over the last thirteen years, Manchester has approved an override when necessary to support the school budget. Mr. Reed said that the point is that the year was

marked by savings, and Essex failed to support the budget. He stated that the school district is not doing anything wrong. Ms. Koch-Sundquist said that the district needs to either decrease the program and find common ground between both towns facing the decreased program or the district needs to reconcile itself to the point that Essex will require an override. Ms. Spencer said that Essex would need an override again anyway. Mr. Urbas stated that Essex will still have apportionment challenges, but the gap would be small if an override was passed this year. The true challenge will be if the rate of increase is set at Essex rising no more than 3.5% versus growth for the district as a whole at 3.5%. Ms. Whitman questioned how things will look different next year. She stated that in November the SC will know if they have funding from Essex for the turf fields, and they will also know if EES has been picked up by the MSBA. Ms. Whitman stressed that the SC needed to get to an outcome about the present budget and said that she believes the compromise budget creates structured reduction of reserve use and provides time and bandwidth moving forward. Ms. Mitchell stated that it is important to manage the relationship with both towns. If Essex has an issue, so does the entire district. Mr. Binieris said that he supported the original budget, but he is not confident that it would pass. In the interest of time, he favored the compromise budget as it is likely to pass and in good faith with the voters. Mr. Foster agreed and said that the challenge is how to set up the SC for a productive approach for next year. Mr. Foster supported the compromise budget because the original budget was unlikely to garner the needed votes during the summer and the compromise budget does not impact students in the coming year. Ms. Whitman concurred, stating that the timing for a special election is 45 days and would take the vote into July. Since real estate bills are out July 1, and Essex taxes are going up, the vote would be even more challenging. Mr. Reed stated that he is completely against the compromise budget. He said it is bad for Essex taxpayers. In addition, reserve use has been occurring for the past three years while the SC worked towards a correction. He said the SC has compromised in favor of the towns again and again. Mr. Reed said the compromise budget does nothing for the students, and it gives the district less flexibility. Mr. Reed stated that the compromise budget will give the Essex tax payers a lower tax bill in the hopes that the SC will produce a solution in the approximately six months left to them before the budget process begins anew. Mr. Reed agreed with Mr. Foster that the SC should revisit the regional agreement. Mr. Reed also suggested that, now that the voters have better seen the district's efforts at fiscal responsibility and the bad path that the compromise budget puts the school district on, they be provided the opportunity to vote for the original budget again. Mr. Reed stated that he could only support the original budget or the full cut budget, which he said would also allow the district to move forward. Ms. Whitman stated that the SC needed to focus on stabilizing the budget for FY24. Mr. Reed asked if the full cuts budget was off the table and the SC members all affirmed that it was. Ms. Koch-Sundquist stated that the compromise budget is not really a give-and-take, but really a triage approach that solves no problem. She also cited the multi-year plan with town partners to solve the budget problem and its failure. Ms. Koch-Sundquist stated that it is time to decide if Essex can be a partner in this district. She said that she does not support the cuts or compromise budget because they do not support the students. Ms. Koch-Sundquist stated that the current path ends in correction to Essex or in Essex saying they cannot afford to provide the level of education desired by the

district. Ms. Spencer stated that the compromise budget only buys a short reprieve of six months before the SC needs to wrestle with the deeper issues. Ms. Mitchell supported the compromise budget because it buys another year to look at apportionment. Ms. Mitchell noted that the apportionment formula takes into account enrollment and home values and favors Essex. Superintendent Beaudoin conceded Mr. Reed's point about only having six months to work on a solution. The superintendent also acknowledged that the field funding and facilitation contingencies have dropped off the table and questioned the value of the compromise budget without those verbal guarantees. Mr. Foster called it a leap of faith and stressed the importance of changing the budget so that the current crisis does not happen again. Superintendent Beaudoin stated process that change is needed but said that the district lacks engagement from partners to work on the process. The superintendent reminded the SC that the auditors concluded that the district is stable and secure and fulfilling its financial responsibilities. Superintendent Beaudoin asked what the committee will do to ensure that the district secures a commitment to do things differently rather than ask the district to change. Ms. Whitman agreed that the SC has watched as the district is been grilled on every penny and said that it is time to shift things. Ms. Pereen spoke to the issues of the field replacements. Ms. Pereen stated that the BOS did not want to put the fields on the last ballot as that would have increased the ask by \$400K that they knew would not pass. They cannot entertain the expense until the fall because that is when Essex receives its certified free cash from variable income, like meals tax. "Mediation" was not accepted by the BOS because of the definition in which a mediator has the final decision. The BOS believes that the vote of the Town Meeting has to be preserved as the final decision to represent the constituents. Ms. Pereen also said that they want all collaboration meetings to be open and all together. Ms. Koch-Sundquist stated that the SC has had previous commitments of support. Mr. Sanson stated that if the budget approval had to go through a joint town meeting, students would arrive at the first day of school knowing that Manchester parents forced a budget on Essex.

Mr. Foster moved the question. Ms. Whitman seconded it. The motion passed unanimously.

The motion to accept the compromise budget passed 4-3, with Ms. Koch-Sundquist, Mr. Reed, and Ms. Spencer voting against.

Mr. Foster moved to reconvene at a later time to consider the reorganization of the School Committee. Ms. Spencer seconded the motion.

Discussion: Ms. Whitman stated the need to move forward with leadership. Ms. Whitman said she was concerned that if a later date was set there would be external posturing in the meantime. Mr. Foster noted that the SC was also supposed to do a evaluation and review of the superintendent's goals. The next meeting is scheduled for August 8, 2023.

The motion failed 3-4, with Ms. Spencer, Mr. Foster, and Ms. Mitchell voting for the motion. Mr. Reed, Mr. Binieris, Ms. Koch-Sundquist, and Ms. Whitman voted against the motion.

- 8) **Reorganization** – Superintendent Beaudoin stated that she would entertain a motion to nominate a member to the position of Chair. Ms. Spencer asked if there are bylaws or traditions around the position. The superintendent said that there are no bylaws, though the chair has traditionally moved between towns. Usually, the vice-chair is from the other town.

Ms. Koch-Sundquist nominated Ms. Whitman for the position of chair. Ms. Koch-Sundquist stated that the SC requires stability in its relationships and work with administration, staff, and students.

Ms. Mitchell nominated herself for the position of chair. Ms. Mitchell cited her budgetary experience. She stated that she wants to professionalize the budget process and management of the board. She said she could provide fresh perspective.

Superintendent Beaudoin asked if there was a second to the nomination of Ms. Whitman.

Mr. Reed seconded the motion.

Superintendent Beaudoin asked if there was a second to the nomination of Ms. Mitchell

Mr. Foster seconded the motion.

Ms. Whitman advocated for consistency and stability. She stated that it is time for the SC to work as a group, not only for the budget process. Ms. Whitman said that much of the procedure over the last year has been because it was a very new group. Ms. Whitman stated that she has worked to build relationships over the last year. Ms. Mitchell questioned how next year will be different without changing leadership. Ms. Whitman stated that the Essex BOS has also just re-elected Ms. Pereen as chair to support stability going into the next year, and she believes it is worth it. Mr. Foster stated his appreciation of Ms. Whitman's work, but stated his priority is about setting up the SC for a successful collaboration next year with the towns. Mr. Foster questioned how we can expect a different result with all the same people in the room. Ms. Whitman replied that the entire SC needs to present in that room and part of the process. Mr. Foster stated that there might be room to support that goal by having Ms. Mitchell as the vice-chair. Ms. Koch-Sundquist stated that she has learned more in the last four months on the SC than in the previous year and that there is a lot to be said for gaining experience through time and training. Ms. Koch-Sundquist said she would lean on Ms. Whitman's experience and hope that both will lean into their training. Ms. Koch-Sundquist asked if Ms. Mitchell has completed the School Committee training, which she answered in the negative. Ms. Mitchell asked if leadership should be shifted to Manchester. Speaking to the question of training, Ms. Spencer stated that only two trainings were offered and they were far away. She stated that there is a learning curve in how to work as a committee and with the town partners. Ms. Koch-Sundquist stated that Essex is very fragile and feels outnumbered. She stated that she did not think it would be perceived well if Manchester had the chair voice. Mr. Reed stated that he does not recommend shifting leadership back to Manchester at this time. Ms. Mitchell indicated that she did not want the chair position if she could be allowed to help with the budget process.

Ms. Koch-Sundquist nominated Ms. Whitman to chair the School Committee for one year. Ms. Spencer seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously, electing Ms. Whitman to the Chair of the School Committee.

Ms. Spencer nominated Ms. Mitchell to the vice-chair position. Mr. Foster seconded the motion.

Ms. Whitman nominated Mr. Reed to the vice-chair position. Ms. Koch-Sundquist seconded the motion.

Mr. Reed noted that he served on the negotiations subcommittee and was not highly involved in the budget process. Ms. Whitman noted that the vice-chair speaks at the Town Meeting for Manchester. Ms. Mitchell stated that a key piece going forward is the budget and that she believes working together will make that happen.

The vote for Ms. Mitchell: Mr. Foster, Ms. Spencer, Mr. Binieris, Ms. Mitchell.

The vote for Ms. Reed: Ms. Koch-Sundquist, Ms. Whitman, Mr. Reed.

Ms. Mitchell was elected to Vice-Chair of the School Committee.

Superintendent Beaudoin inquired about adding another SC business meeting before the August 8 meeting and stated that the SC should meet before the town meetings at the end of June. Mr. Urbas stated that it is up to the town Selector to decide when they will meet. Ms. Preen stated that the Essex BOS has set a date of June 26. Superintendent Beaudoin said that if the warrant is approved at that time, Town Meeting would be fourteen days out, approximately July 14. Superintendent Beaudoin stated that she will communicate now with DESE that the district will not have a budget approved until mid-July and that MERSD will have to move to a 1/12 budget. The superintendent said this path will make a difference in how the district manages personnel. Although they will have to distribute layoff documents, the district will be able to tell staff with confidence that the positions will be reinstated. However, they will have to wait until July 14 to rescind the layoffs.

- 9) School Committee Comment** – Mr. Sanson stated that he came to the meeting with an open mind and was back and forth many times during the course of the discussion. He stated that there is always going to be a problem with the budget and with Essex but he is optimistic that the compromise solution will be good for working with Essex. He reminded the SC that the work starts tomorrow. Mr. Sanson said he was happy to have Ms. Whitman remain in the chair and thought it was great to have Ms. Mitchell join her in a leadership role. He urged the SC not forget about the fundamental problem that still exists. Ms. Mitchell asked about next steps. Ms. Whitman stated that she will check with Ms. Preen and will communicate via email with the SC. Superintendent Beaudoin said that Manchester has scheduled their meeting already.

10) Adjourn

Ms. Koch-Sundquist moved to adjourn the School Committee business meeting; Mr. Foster seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Meeting Adjourned at 11:11 pm

School Committee Future Meetings

- Dates to be determined.