

West Bath School Administrative Unit

Board of Directors Meeting Minutes

June 7, 2017 at 6:30 PM at the West Bath School

Members Present: Dennis Crews, Keith Hinds, Robert McDaniel, and Ashleigh Randall

Members Absent: Jordi St. John

Others Present: Patrick Bowdish, Aggie Demers, Camille Kauffunger and Emily Thompson

Call to Order:

The meeting was called to order at 6:30 PM by Keith Hinds.

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

Comments from the Chair:

Mr. Hinds said he would like to applaud and congratulate the students and staff for the phenomenal concert last week. He stated that loved having it on the basketball court. He thanked the superintendent and staff for coming up with a new plan when it was realized the grass was too soft and applauds everyone's efforts on making the quick change.

Approve/Amend Minutes of 5/3/17

Mr. McDaniel made a motion to accept the minutes of May 3rd as presented. Mr. Hinds seconded that motion. Vote (4-0).

Adjustments to Agenda:

Mr. Hinds said that he would like to remove item 9.2 from the published agenda.

Public Comments:

None

Committee Reports

1. Policy Committee –
 - a. Mr. McDaniel said that some things that are coming up later in the agenda, part of it is in response to MSMA's suggested policies. Some of the discussion will be the need or the lack of need to take a policy from two pages to ten pages. Mr. McDaniel said he felt the board's policies read well the way they are.
2. Technology Committee – No Report
3. Facilities Committee
 - a. Cleaning Company Transition
Mrs. Thompson said that in mid-May the school made a change from Benchmark cleaning to BSC Cleaning. The school could not be more pleased with the transition out by Benchmark and transition in by BSC. It was very smooth and Mrs. Thompson said she would like to thank both companies for their support.

Mrs. Thompson said that the school has a day porter who has quickly become part of the school, and is hard working and detail oriented and he's been a really nice fit. Currently the evening custodian is still being determined. That position has been harder to fill due to the early transition, and right now is being taken care of by a site manager so that they can learn the building and make sure that everything is taken care of. Mrs. Thompson said that soon the school will be transitioning to summer maintenance and the year will start with a new staffing plan.

Mr. McDaniel said that it sounded that starting the contract early worked out well for everyone.

Mrs. Thompson responded that from her perspective, it did. She said that it of course caused the need for adjustments at a time of year where there's not a lot of capacity to make changes. It will be helpful for the summer maintenance cycle because BSC will know the building, the rooms, the staff. She said that it will make that process much more smooth than the contract had began on July 1st and from that perspective it made sense.

4. Finance Committee

- a. Town Meeting Report – Mr. Hinds said that the town had a successful town meeting and the final budget was approved 29-4. He thanked the residents for their continued support. He reminded the board and the audience that the school still needs to have a budget passed at referendum, which is scheduled for Tuesday, June 13th. He stated that on the ballot will be the budget and request for permission to use any state funds if those come through. Mr. Hinds said that voting will take place at the West Bath Fire House from 8 AM – 8 PM. He asked Mrs. Thompson to please place a reminder in the newsletter.
- b. Payroll Warrants – Mr. Hinds said that payroll warrants were reviewed and signed on May 2nd, May 15th, May 30th.
- c. AP Warrants - Mr. Hinds said that AP Warrants were reviewed and signed on May 4th and May 19th by Mr. Crews, and May 5th and May 19th by Mr. Hinds.

Superintendent's Report

1. Financial Report

- a. School Department Budget – Mrs. Thompson said that with 8% of the year remaining, there was still 24.19% of the budget remaining. If the carryover that is allocated for the next fiscal year, an amount of \$282,214.95 is removed, there still is 16.3% of the budget remaining. With \$85,000 of reserve funds pulled out, there is 13.9% of the budget remaining. Mrs. Thompson said that she felt the budget was in a solid place with one month of the school year remaining and that she was feeling pleased with how the school department is both budgeting and monitoring spending.

Mrs. Randall asked if Mrs. Thompson felt like it is a stretch to hit those numbers, or whether it was comfortable? Mrs. Thompson responded that right now it is feeling exactly right. She said that if one looks at the line by line items of the budget those lines are hitting zero because she does zero based budgeting and it is

expected. Mrs. Thompson said that she feels that this budget is exactly right at this time.

Mr. McDaniel said that he wished to point out that the town's Financial Advisory Committee made a strong case that if the school department gets state funds, there is a push that those go back to town's coffers to off-set citizen tax burdens. He said he wished to bring this up because the case was made strongly at town meeting.

b. MSBA Letter to School Boards

Mrs. Thompson said that she knew that the board members received the email directly from MSBA and asked the board to turn their attention to the final paragraph of the coversheet that states, "We are asking School Boards across the state to vote to support this letter at their next board meeting and share with it with their local legislators." She said that knowing that members had received it and reviewed it ahead of time, she was going to ask the chairman to comment on this.

Mr. Hinds asked the board if they wished to take any action based upon the recommendation from MSBA, whether they would like to endorse the letter, or whether the board wants to create its own letter of support and forward it on to the state representative and state senator?

Mr. McDaniel responded that he had read the letter and the letter made him uneasy. He said that the supplemental documentation stated that the typical superintendent in Maine makes twice the salary of the governor. He stated that one can argue that the governor may or may not be underpaid, and he wants to double the salary once he's out of office but that it made him uncomfortable. He said that he did not care what the percentage is, and that there are exceptions for remuneration of superintendents depending on the size of the school district, but that he was not prepared to vote in favor of the letter. Mrs. Randall said that West Bath was in a unique situation and what the board would be lending support to in this letter doesn't really apply.

Mr. Hinds said that he respected those view points and that his own frustration is the constant barrage of criticism that superintendents, teachers, support staff take in the political arena. Having the opportunity to stand up and defend the hard work they do is something that the board should seriously consider. He stated that the state mandated requirements of certifications for a superintendent are far superior to the requirements of a governor, and he believed that governor has already vetoed a pay raise on a couple of occasions because it is known that his salary is low. He said that he did not believe it is fair to compare a superintendent's salary to that of the governor.

Mr. Crews said that he heard the concerns as raised and sided with the salary itself isn't a good indicator of the work of the additions that a superintendent adds to the entire educational process. He stated that while West Bath's situation is unique, with one of the five combined positions statewide, he thought it goes

beyond self-interest goes towards the self-interest of educational system of the state. With those pieces, he said that he found himself supporting the letter because of statewide issues surrounding school administration and the cuts proposed by the governor. Funding levels need to be appropriate to the position, and the health of education statewide. In that case, he said he would lend his support to the letter for those reasons.

Mr. McDaniel said that the letter is aimed at administrative salaries. It is not about teaching. He said that if you look at neighboring districts' budgets, you see that they are reducing staff. No districts say that they are going to do something to reduce administration. He said that while he agrees that the state should support education more than they are doing, he did not have a disagreement with the basic premise and that no matter what the percentages are, one never really sees that schools are going to have fewer administrators in a school district that serves 12 schools. It's always fewer teachers, fewer special programs. He said that he supported more educational funding from the state, but the letter does not address that. It is addressing the wrong part of the beast.

Mrs. Randall said that she can defend the work that superintendents and teachers and educators do, maybe not in such a broad, political arena. She said that she knows the letter packs a punch, but that she is not a fan of it.

Mr. Crews said that all of the positions need to be filled at the appropriate staffing levels to do the job. If a district is talking about cutting a teacher and that leaves the students short, then the district is talking about the wrong solution for the problem. He said that what this letter is doing is objecting to removing all administration level funding from the state. That is what the proposal was, to remove administration funding from the state and leave it squarely on the communities with no assistance. He said that he does not think that is again an appropriate response to a problem. If administrative staffing is at the appropriate level for the job descriptions, it does not make sense to cut, and taking money away does not make sense either because it is at the appropriate level. If there are too many administrators so that inefficiencies are there, then absolutely, a district should match the level of work with the level of staffing. But that is not what this policy is about. This policy is about removing all of the administrative funding aide the state was providing.

Mr. McDaniel said that he suspected that what the governor wants is to put control over that aspect of funding into the local arena, so people who pay their local taxes have a say in the level of administration. The problem is that it seems that the state is not doing anything to supplement non-administrative requirements. It should be easy enough for the state to make these funds available but none can go into administration. That would seem to be a reasonable approach rather than cut. It allows for someone on your school board to make the cuts if you are not happy with the level of administration.

Mr. Crews asked the board to consider whether the local community isn't responsible for the school budget already? He said that administration of their school is part of their budget as it stands. This is just the state supplementing.

Mr. McDaniel responded that the school budget is paid for by the towns essentially. He said that right now communities are seeing that there is real pushback between some town budgets and school budgets. There is some conflict that needs to get resolved. The real problem is that it looks like districts are facing a significant reduction of state aid to education and if someone wanted to write a letter stressing that in different terms, he would support that. He said that he just does not happen to like this letter. Mrs. Randall said that she does not like the letter either.

Mrs. Thompson said that she feels that West Bath is in a unique position as one of the few districts that has a combined administration and one person doing the roles of several different administrators. She also said that as a minimum receiver, West Bath does not receive the funding for administration anyway. This letter is aimed towards those districts who have lost hundreds of thousands of dollars that they have used to fund other portions of education and now in order to make their budgets work need to make reductions to their programs in other areas but still meet state mandates. She said that she thought that everything that each board member was saying hits upon important points. But for her, what this letter is saying comes down to questioning what the West Bath SAU wants for education in the state of Maine. She said that she thinks that what West Bath has learned is that having local control and a local school board and local decision making even at this very small level of the West Bath SAU is important to this community. She said that if the board does decide to not support this letter, she would encourage members to think about what parts they do want to support or write a letter that supports West Bath's own philosophies of how education should be funded in Maine.

Mrs. Randall said that that was the part that she was stuck on. It is not that she disagrees with the subject matter, it's the way that it is put together that she disagrees with. And that signing off on it doesn't feel right. She said that if the board could draft something that spoke to them, and their experiences with local control, that would be more effective than a blanket statement that doesn't apply and doesn't speak to what the WBSAU could demonstrate.

Mr. Hinds said that he had not heard a motion one way or another. He stated that he was disappointed in that, disappointed that the governor wants to take away funding without removing mandates and burdening local taxpayers without reducing the workload the state mandates on administrators, and without streamlining the requirements of reporting, some of which is duplicated reporting.

2. District Updates –

- a. Celebration of Learning – Mrs. Thompson invited board members to attend the 7th annual Community Celebration of Learning on Wednesday, June 14th at 3 PM. She said that this event is the culmination of all of the students' work from this semester, and for the full year for the 5th grade students.
- b. 5th Grade Boat Launch – Mrs. Thompson invited board members to attend the 5th grade's launch of their skiffs following the Celebration of Learning at Sawyer Park in Brunswick.
- c. Volunteer Coffee & Crew – Once again, Mrs. Thompson invited board members to attend the Volunteer Coffee and Crew on Monday, June 19th. She said that

coffee will begin at 8:15, then the school will have a schoolwide crew meeting dedicated to volunteers beginning at 8:40 and that she hoped that all board members would attend.

Mr. Hinds asked if the shuttle will run to the boat launch. Mrs. Thompson responded that the shuttle will not run to the launch because there is plenty of parking at Sawyer Park. The shuttle will bring people back to their cars and then they are free to drive to the launch when they are ready to. It would begin at 4:30.

Old Business:

a. Siblings of Grandfathered School Choice Students

Mrs. Thompson said that last month she had updated the board on the status of the siblings of grandfathered school choice students. She said that they board would recall that last year, at the request of the Board chair, she had surveyed school choice families to find out how many had younger siblings who would potentially be looking at West Bath School in the future. The results of that survey are that there are 5 children - 2 next year, 2 the following year, and 1 two years after that. As was discussed in May, the RSU1 board has discussed the issue of siblings of grandfathered school choice students and decided to not as a board approve that they can attend WBS, which means that families who wished to need to apply for a superintendents' agreement, which allows them to attend.

Mrs. Thompson said that while she approved the two requests, the RSU1 Superintendent did not. Both families appealed the denial to the Commissioner of Education. In the recent past, the Commissioner's office has tended to side with families. However, Mrs. Thompson said that on Friday the families and the school were notified that one family's appeal was denied. Another has not heard back. There is one final possible step, which is to appeal to the State Board of Education. Mrs. Thompson said that she received an email from one of the parents that said, "I would also like to know if there's been any discussion from the West Bath School board about paying for siblings that got caught up in the withdrawal? Are there any options that West Bath has in their control as the other side of the withdrawal to take care of choice families who lost out in the process?" Mrs. Thompson said that she felt this was an interesting question. She said that the board has discussed that while West Bath has nothing financially to gain by having families here, it is the right thing to do for our community to welcome siblings to West Bath School. So said that she wished to pose the question to the board, are there any options that the board sees to support these families?

Mr. Hinds said that when this communication was shared with him he suggested that we reach out to the attorney to find out if these students would be able to come to West Bath as tuition students. He said that he was not sure if that could work due to the cost of the tuition, but that the attorney did say that tuition could be waived for these families, if the board chose. He asked the board to discuss the scenario.

Mr. McDaniel asked what costs might be involved? He said he knows what the costs of the school are, assuming that a section does not need to be added. Are

there any other financial obligations? Mr. Hinds said that every other provision in the tuition policy would be in place, so that if there were any additional costs to the district, the board could choose not to take the tuition student.

Mrs. Thompson said that she would go through the tuition policy procedures, which includes a screening that does not happen with a superintendents' agreement, but does happen with a tuition agreement, and there would have to be space. She stated that the board has had the conversation all along that as long as the student does not require additional expenses, then there is virtually no cost to having them attend, although there are costs for supplies and things along those lines. It is more thinking about a bus traveling down the hallway half full, adding another student to that bus makes things more efficient.

Mr. Hinds asked Mr. Crews if he wants to weigh in as he was involved in the withdrawal process. Mr. Crews stated that the withdrawal committee tried to take care of this issue in the process, but in the interest of getting the decision done, it had to put it to the side to deal with again when it arose. He said that he had hoped that these children would be handled with a superintendents' agreement initially. The committee was also not sure of how many children there would be, or what the parameters would be. He said that his personal feeling was that as long as there weren't any exceptional circumstances, the individual cost is almost negligible and he does not see why the board could not take them in. He said that he would want to be careful about what precedent that set.

Mr. McDaniel said that it sounded like it could be approached by amending policy JFAB to set limits to be sure that in the new section it applied only to siblings of students currently enrolled. Mr. Crews said that it should be for siblings of students who were enrolled at the time of withdrawal.

Mr. Hinds presented draft language from the attorney that could be used to amend the policy. He explained that that was why the policy was on the agenda for later in the evening. Mrs. Thompson commented that it is a separate agenda item, and it was not assumed that the board would rule one way or another, it just gives the board the option to make changes if the members decide to. Mr. McDaniel asked if it made sense to create these 5 exceptions under whatever language and just do that, or to ask that families go through the appeal process before we make exceptions.

Mrs. Thompson said that she looked at other policies for similar situations, although there's nothing around withdrawal agreements there are policies regarding having employees' children attend school if they live out of district. The wording in these policies is that families first attempt to get a superintendents' agreement. They do not talk about going through the appeal process but Mrs. Thompson said she felt that trying to get a superintendents' agreement first is the appropriate step.

Mrs. Randall said that this should be the last resort, not the first step. Mr. McDaniel stated that he wanted to encourage them to go through the appropriate process, because there probably is some benefit to the district in a superintendents' agreement. He said that he was in favor of finding a way to find a way for these particular students to attend school here.

Mr. Crews asked if the two students pushed class sizes over the recommend board policy rates for next year? Mrs. Thompson said they would not because of the size of the kindergarten and that there was a plan to have two kindergarten classes net year. Mr. Crews asked if the language has wording for a scenario of what to do if there are two students but one spot? Mrs. Thompson said it does not. Mr. Crews said that the biggest concern originally was that seeing the number of students from the RSU in our classes that we might get an influx of students in one grade and not be able to accommodate that without splitting classes which creates additional costs.

Mr. McDaniel said that that was covered in the regular board policy. Mr. Crews said that it is, except in this case the board is talking about a block of children and not individuals for a particular year group. If four students wanted to attend at a later date, they could say that the board has precedence for allowing students to attend.

Mr. Hinds said that scenario already exists because the board has allowed the siblings to attend. Mr. Crews said that they attend because of language in the withdrawal agreement, and what the board is currently discussing is an amendment to policy that is an exception to the original agreement. He said that he is not against it.

Mrs. Randall said that all other parts of the policy still existed. Mr. Crews said yes, and that the only hitch he sees is if there were enough children in block to cause a split, do you take a few and not all, because that is rough. Mrs. Randall said that she feels that falls under enrollment procedures. Mr. McDaniel said that if the last gasp was for two students that might be more difficult to accommodate, and we might have to go with lottery again, saying that we can accept one student and not both.

Mrs. Thompson said that when she goes back to thinking about when West Bath was in the RSU and discussing school choice there was a process for adding students until you ran out of room. There was not space for everyone, and it was not a lottery, it was more first come first serve. Mr. Crews commented that siblings had preference to that. Mr. Crews said that we know that it is not an issue for next year, but we do not know what it would look like for the following years. Mrs. Thompson responded that if she could base decisions on what pre-k numbers for next year look like, then there would be space. But that is a year away. Mr. McDaniel said that the board could use the language that this does not create a precedent for any future admissions.

Mr. Crews asked if there was any public input on the matter. Mr. Bowdish spoke from the audience that from his perspective, the sibling clause should not apply if the sibling is not attending West Bath at the time. Part of the rationale is to keep families together. If in 6 years a family has a child, the child would not be eligible to attend. There's no compelling reason for continuity. Mr. McDaniel said that that could be handled by putting "this is valid until", a term limit basically. Mrs. Thompson said, she wondered if the board chair would like to get a motion from the board about how the board feels about this agenda item, then if they are going to move forward language could be discussed in the policy section.

Mr. Hinds asked the board if they had any further discussion. Mrs. Randall made a motion to Do explore avenues to accommodate siblings of grandfathered students. Mr. McDaniel seconded that motion. Vote (4-0).

b. Review of Board Policies

1. JFAB – Admission of Non-Resident Private Tuition Students

Mr. Hinds said that had the board chosen to not explore this topic, this item would have been removed from the agenda. He said that language was received from the attorney to amend the tuition payment section after the first paragraph. He read the language, “Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions, WBSAU reserves the right to waive the tuition of any non-resident student with a sibling who attended the West Bath School, free of tuition, as of July 1, 2015. Mr. Hinds asked the board members if they had any thoughts on the language that was read.

Mr. Crews said that the language was a little more open ended than he originally had envisioned and as it is written would include any student who has ever been at West Bath School. He said that he envisioned the language would say something about having a student enrolled as of June 30th and that he was not opposed to it being open ended, but it should really just be for the students who were here at the time of withdrawal.

Mr. McDaniel suggested it may help if the wording said “had a sibling who was enrolled at West Bath” not just attend. Mrs. Thompson said that just because she collected sample language in the event the board had this conversation did not mean that the board was bound to the language.

Mr. Crews said his concern is that it is binding the school board further in advance than what this board currently thinks. And even if the board says that you need to get a Superintendents’ Agreement first, if the policy says this there is zero incentive for the agreement to happen to accommodate the children. He said again that he was not against it.

Mr. Hinds commented that the RSU’s reaction should be considered. Mrs. Randall said that she liked replacing “who attended” with “was enrolled”. Mr. Hinds suggested the language be changed to “who was enrolled at the West Bath School free of tuition on July 1, 2015.” Mrs. Thompson said that it could be argued that the way that the tuition reimbursement works that the students are not really free of tuition. She also stated that she has a list of the students who were approved as grandfathered students. The list is referenced with the withdrawal agreement. The board also has a list of the 5 students who they are talking about in the agreement. Mr. Crews said that technically we are only approving the first two because the board does not know how class sizes would look next year. Mrs. Thompson said that that would be covered under the tuition policy. Mr. Crews said he liked the idea of referencing a list because it is clean cut and dry. Mrs. Randall asked if the “free of tuition” should be removed. Mr.

Crews said that with the list it would not matter. Mrs. Thompson said that the free of tuition piece should be struck because it is not accurate. Mr. McDaniel said that it is to the board's advantage to be very specific while still accommodating the people that are known to fall into it. Mr. Crews said that he was on board with using the grandfathered siblings list. Mr. McDaniel said that he felt that it was important to keep in the part to reserve the right to waive the tuition.

Mr. Hinds suggested the following language, "notwithstanding the foregoing provisions, WBSAU reserves the rate to waive the tuition of any non-resident with a sibling who attended the West Bath School during the withdrawal process." Mr. Crews asked that Superintendent review the language one more time with the attorney. Mr. McDaniel asked if the change could be approved subject with the approval of the attorney? He said that it is not critical that this happen now, as they are not starting school tomorrow. Mr. Hinds said that he agreed, but that there are parents who are trying to figure out where their children are going to school next year and if we ask them to wait until mid-July that may cause them to explore other options. Mr. Crews said that the board could approve the intent of the language, but get the final legal language to approve in July. Mrs. Thompson said that we do know that from the attorney that there's no legal reason that it can not happen. Mr. Hinds said that the better approach would be to table it for now. The public has the recorded the vote that shows what the intent of the board is, and hopefully that will work for families for now. Mr. Hinds said that he would prefer to not vote for a policy change without having the language in front of the board. Mr. Crews said that there's no reason for them to not go through the policy as if they are going to be tuition students now, as we would not be billing them right now. Their worst case scenario is that it falls through and that they are right back where they are now. Mr. Hinds said that while that is true, it would be a month later, when during this time, families could be establishing relationships with a new school.

Mr. Hinds said that he would like to make a motion to table policy JFAB and seek advice from the board's attorney about language that captures the board's consensus. Mr. Crews seconded the motion. Vote (4-0).

2. JLCD – Medication Policy

Mr. McDaniel stated that there are three policies. JLCD is the master. This has come about because the state has issued guidelines which basically is a permission to administer medication. Their policy is ten pages, but the policy committee does not see that it adds anything more to what the board's policy currently has. Once new policies are passed or approved, we would need to cross reference the new policies. We can't reference them because they are not approved policies. The real reason this is back again is that we reference the permission form for parents, but there is no documentation in our policies regarding what that form actually looks like. There's no need to change this policy, other than adding the cross reference. Mrs. Thompson asked if he

wanted to look at the information under II regarding field trip policies. Mr. McDaniel said that he reads the policy to say that one has to be in the district for the policy to apply. There is some debate regarding what that means. Mrs. Thompson said that the language “in the district” could be struck. She said that she reads it that anyone who works within the district needs to follow the policy, but that it did not seem like necessary language. Mr. Hinds suggested that the language be changed to “any district employee administering medication”.

Mr. Hinds made a motion to amend policy JLCD to change the language of II. to “any district employee administering medication” and to add cross reference JLCB-E and JLCB-F. This was seconded by Mr. McDaniel. Vote (4-0).

New Business:

a. Confirmation of Audit Services

Mrs. Thompson said that in the board packet was the confirmation of auditing services letter that confirms the scope of audit services for this fiscal year. She stated that the scope includes an audit of the financial statements of the governmental activities, the business-type activities, and each major fund including the related notes to the financial statements for the years ending June 30, 2017 and 2016. She said that if it was approved she would sign the confirmation on the board’s behalf.

Mr. Hinds made a motion to approve the confirmation of auditing services and authorize the superintendent to sign on the board’s behalf. This was seconded by Mr. Crews. Vote (4-0).

b. Request to provide authority to the Superintendent to Transfer 5% of Funds within the FY 2017 Budget – Action

Mrs. Thompson stated that it was recommended by the auditors that she request the authority to transfer funds from one cost center to another, if necessary. She stated that it currently did not appear to be necessary, but with two payrolls and 2 APs to go, it may be. She said that she would report out at the July meeting regarding any changes, if necessary.

Mr. McDaniel made a motion to provide the Superintendent with authority to transfer 5% of funds within then FY 2017 budget, if necessary. Mr. Hinds seconded that motion. Vote (4-0).

c. Personnel Item(s):

1. Nomination of Sara Helman, 50% Special Education Director

Mrs. Thompson stated that throughout the budget process it was determined that there is a need for this position K-12. The board approved the job description last month. The position, while 50%, is 50% of the school year. Mrs. Helman has eleven years of psychological and behavior consultant experience. This year she has been the assistant special education director for West Bath. Mrs. Thompson said that she has been an incredible support to her, West Bath’s teachers, students, and families, and that it has been wonderful to be able to say to our families as we transition the 5th graders out that you still have the support of our school personnel as you move

through your IEP process. Mrs. Thompson stated that she brings strong content knowledge and practices in positive behavior supports, executive functioning, social skills, mindfulness, and self-regulation, and response to intervention. References expressed that she is helpful and collaborative, offers workshops to support current needs, extremely knowledgeable, and always willing to work as part of a team to benefit students.

Mr. Crews made a motion to approve the nomination. Mr. McDaniel seconded that motion. Vote (4-0).

2. Resignation of Deborah Barnes, educational technician II and Resignation of Mary Wallace, 50% educational technician II/special education secretary

Mrs. Thompson said that Ms. Barnes has been working in the district off and on for 5 years, but if one looks at her record she's worked for many more years than that within the RSU over time. She plans to relocate to Mississippi and that Mrs. Wallace has an opportunity for a full time position with United Way.

Mr. McDaniel asked if there will be challenges to replace them? Mrs. Thompson replied that it is always a challenge to replace faculty who have been a part of our community and know the students and the school's practices, but both have opportunities that they are very excited about. She said that she has posted for one full time position, which gives her a chance to bring in the special education director and have her get a sense of things before determining if the 50% position needs to be filled. It also allows our kindergarten students to come in and for the team to establish what needs there might be.

Mr. Hinds said that the board accepts their resignations with regret, and thanked them both for the time and wished them well in their future endeavors.

3. Approve School Lunch Price Increase – Action

- a. Elementary School Lunch from \$2.55 to \$2.65

Mrs. Thompson stated that the board may recall from the food service review last year that schools are required to meet the current federal requirement for the cost of a school lunch. The current federal requirement is \$2.86. The reason that we need to meet this is to be sure that students who are paying full price for lunch are paying at least as much as the amount of subsidy that is being paid for lunch. It is an equity fairness issue. Schools use a price equity tool to determine what the increase needs to be each year. Mrs. Thompson said that last year the board raised rates from \$2.45 to \$2.55. Looking at the equity tool this year it shows that the district needs to raise rates to \$2.67. However, Maine rules also state that a district can not raise rates more than ten cents per year, so West Bath would need to raise the rate to \$2.65 to continue to work towards the federal requirement.

Mrs. Thompson said that she also would like the board to consider an alternative, which would be that the board raises \$702.30 to keep school lunch

rates at \$2.65 for another year. This is figured by looking at the number of full price sales in 2015-2016, which is 7,023 and taking 10% of that total. If the board is to do this, the motion needs to state that of the the \$35,000 raised at town meeting to contribute to food service, \$702.30 is designated to keeping the lunch prices at \$2.55 for another year.

Mr. McDaniel said that he would personally like to avoid raising food service rates. The board has had an ongoing conversation about providing meals at no charge to students. If this the board's long-term thought process, it would make some sense to assume additional expenses and not raise costs to the families.

Mr. McDaniel made a motion to keep the school lunch rate at \$2.55 and designate \$702.30 from the \$35,000 raised at town meeting for food service. Mrs. Randall seconded the motion. Vote (4-0).

4. First Reading of Board Policies – The board completed first readings of the policies listed below. Any discussed changes are noted.
 - a. JLCD-E – Medication Administration on School Field Trips
Add cross references JLCD-E and JLCD-F and the legal reference
 - b. JLCD-F – Authorization to Administer Medication
Add reference and documentation

Mr. Hinds stated that he wished to adjust the agenda and give the opportunity for public comment prior to entering into executive session. He asked if there were any members of the public who wished to speak.

Public Comment

Camille Kauffinger spoke as one of the two families is affected by the sibling grandfather issue. She said that she regretted not putting her hand up to try to speak during the board meeting. Most importantly she wished to thank the board for taking the time to discuss this issue. She said that to come here and hear that overall the board has care and concern for families that have siblings who weren't taking care of within the withdrawal process is helpful and that she does hear the board's overall support and desire to address that policy. She said that she did want to stress that it does feel very time sensitive for both of the families who have asked for agreements for this year. She has an appointment next week with Woolwich school to establish numbers for security that as an Arrowsic family without a school that her kids have the next best choice, so they can join the other Arrowsic children. This is a decision that needs to make quickly. She said that she does hear the board's overall support that the focus needs to be on figuring out the right language. Mr. Hinds thanked her and said that he appreciated the position that she was in as well.

Executive Session

Mr. Hinds made a motion at 7:58 to enter into an executive session pursuant to Title 1, Chapter 13, Section 405,6,D. of the M.R.S.A. for the purpose of discussing labor contracts between the WBSAU and the WBEA. This was seconded by Mr. Crews. Vote (4-0).

Return to General Session

Mr. McDaniel made a motion to return to general session at 8:11 PM. This was seconded by Mr. Crews. Vote (4-0).

Mr. Crews said that he thought that it might be a nice idea of Mrs. Thompson add an archive of the weekly newsletters to the school website so it can be referenced throughout the year. Mrs. Thompson said that she certainly could do that. While it is not currently in place, all of the items that are listed in the newsletter are listed on the website as well, and are on the website's calendar, and are often also posted on the school's Facebook page. She said she would be happy to also post links to the weekly newsletters as well. Mrs. Thompson said that she would would also recommend that if you are not getting your newsletter each week to contact the school so we can assist you with that.

Mr. McDaniel asked if anyone is watching the videos of the board meetings?

Next Meeting Dates and Locations

Mr. Hinds reminded the board that the next meeting is Wednesday, July 12th at 6:30 PM.

Adjourn

Mr. Crews made a motion to adjourn at 8:14. This was seconded by Mr. McDaniel. Vote (4-0).

Submitted by,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Emily Thompson', with a long horizontal line extending to the right.

Emily Thompson