

**SPECIAL HOLLIS BROOKLINE COOPERATIVE SCHOOL BOARD  
JANUARY 6, 2021  
MEETING MINUTES**

A special meeting of the Hollis Brookline Cooperative School Board was conducted on Wednesday, January 6, 2021 at 7:01 p.m.

Holly Deurloo Babcock, Chairman, presided:

Members of the Board Present:      Tom Solon, Vice Chairman  
Elizabeth Brown  
Cindy VanCoughnett  
Krista Whalen  
Beth Janine Williams

Members of the Board Absent:      Kate Stoll, Secretary

Also in Attendance:                  Bob Thompson, Assistant Superintendent of Student Services  
Drew Mason, District Moderator  
James O'Shaughnessy, Esq., Drummond Woodsum

---

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

As stated on the agenda, the meeting was aired via Zoom. Telephone access was available for members of the public wishing to provide comment; 1-929-205-6099 US (New York) (Meeting ID: 949 3687 3717 / Passcode 408411).

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

**Vice Chairman Solon**

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

**Member Brown**

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

**Member VanCoughnett**

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

### **Member Whalen**

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

### **Member Williams**

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

### **Chairman Deurloo Babcock**

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

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

### **APPOINTMENT OF PROCESS OBSERVER**

Chairman Deurloo Babcock appointed Member VanCoughnett as Process Observer.

### **AGENDA ADJUSTMENTS** - None

### **ANNUAL MEETING DISCUSSION**

Drew Mason, District Moderator, stated there are two options for the business session of the Annual Meeting; conduct the business session as is normally done or an alternate process approved through HB1129. The process used last summer was relative to a different bill, which has expired. The Legislature is working on a Bill that was passed by the Senate earlier in the day and is due to be taken up by the House later this week. The indication is that the House will pass it, and the Governor will sign it. One of its provisions allows the governing body to postpone the business session to one or more dates later in 2021 (unspecified). A third choice would be to push the meeting date out to a time when there could be an in-person meeting (or outdoor). That third choice would provide the authority for expenditures in line with last year's budget.

Public notification would have to be provided. There would be a first virtual session hosted by the governing body. The Board could choose whether and how to permit public input. There is then a period, not to exceed 7 days, for public comment to be provided. He recommended comment received be put in writing and made available to voters.

At the second virtual session the governing body would again have the authority to determine whether public input would be permitted. This is public input not registered voter input as the Legislature recognizes that in a Zoom meeting it is virtually impossible to hold a large meeting and restrict it to registered voters. At that meeting, the governing body, and only the governing body, may amend the warrant articles.

There is then a period of unspecified length for preparing the final warrant and ballot. That is followed by a voting session.

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

He believes the drive-up voting session requirement can be satisfied by a normal election, e.g., you drive up, park, go through the Supervisors of the Checklist, obtain a ballot, fill it out, put it in the machine, and drive away. He is not of the belief the law requires a drive-thru option.

Mr. Mason stated he would be speaking with the Select Board on Monday and will recommend that the Town election, which covers the COOP election, be a normal election on March 9th.

Chairman Deurloo Babcock commented at the last meeting, one of the ideas was to conduct a typical election for officials and all the ballot voting (warrants for both districts and the Town) all on the same day. She questioned if that was still the recommendation or if he was recommending having a local election on the 9<sup>th</sup> as is typical and then have a district meeting vote on a different day. Mr. Mason stated his recommendation to be the latter.

Chairman Deurloo Babcock questioned if the district were to go with this option, would the desire be for the votes of the Town of Hollis, Town of Brookline, Hollis School District, and COOP School District be on the same day. Mr. Mason stated he was looking to legal counsel for advice; if the voting session for the annual meeting/business session happens on the same day, is it correct that for the COOP School District ballot, Hollis voters can conduct the voting in Hollis and Brookline voters in Brookline. However, if Hollis and Brookline are voting on different days, we still need to have the COOP vote on a single day, and in that case would the Brookline voters vote in Hollis or in Brookline.

His recommendation was to conduct the election on the 9<sup>th</sup> and only the election on the 9<sup>th</sup>. In terms of the voting day for the business sessions, do them all on the same day because it requires almost the same amount of effort whether we have 1, 2, or 3 districts voting at the same time. If we have separate days, it is three times the effort.

Member Whalen questioned if able to postpone in the hope of conducting an in-person meeting, would it impact contracts that need to be signed by April 15<sup>th</sup>. Would the special order/legislation that is being considered permit the district to postpone that signing until the end of April?

James O'Shaughnessy, Esq., responded the Governor issued an order last year with respect to the non-renewal deadline for continuing contract teachers. To his knowledge none of those Executive Orders have expired because this is a continuation of an Emergency Order. He would have to review the orders, but 9 months ago when having this conversation, the issue still was you have statutory deadline to provide contracts and notice of non-renewal of teachers, the Governor issued an order, but the extent to which that is really something we can rely on is still a concern he has. He believes now that the Legislature is taking affirmative action to address some of these issues, he would be more reluctant to rely on the Governor's order for waiving a deadline that is set forth in a law.

He believes the Superintendent would be of the opinion, postponing it too long would create some real issues with staffing as it did last year. It will create a lot of stress and anxiety approaching the April 15<sup>th</sup> deadline.

Member Brown questioned if there is legislative movement to drop the Statute that would do what the Executive Order did last year with respect to those deadlines. Attorney O'Shaughnessy stated the current version of the 2021 Senate Bill 2 that is making its way through the Legislature does not go to that level of detail with respect to teachers and school districts. There are provisions for budgeting when you have not

adopted a budget and your fiscal or calendar year has expired. It could be something that they address after the fact. He is of the belief there is an urgency to this particular issue, and not so much an urgency with respect to the teachers.

Member Brown spoke of not being in favor of a one-day vote even if it is simpler. She would prefer to have COOP voting on a separate day. Asked for clarification, she stated her intend to be on a separate day from other districts.

Vice Chairman Solon questioned what, if anything, needed to be decided during this meeting. Chairman Deurloo Babcock noted she received a motion from Assistant Superintendent Bergskaug for Board consideration; "To elect to approve the alternative method for the annual meeting". She is of the belief the hope is that the Board would come up with an alternative method and approve it during this meeting.

Vice Chairman Solon questioned if approving a method would categorically dictate a timeline. Attorney O'Shaughnessy commented he helped draft the motion. It was not a motion the Board had to entertain during this meeting. There are some deadlines the Board needs to be aware of, however, there remains time to decide. The Public Hearing is scheduled. None of those obligations change. What does change is those two alternative meetings would have to be held and there would have to be notice prior to those meetings sent out to everyone in the community. He suggested it may be worth having a conversation and getting everything out on the table, but not deciding yet because we want to know what the Governor will do with this new bill and what the collective wisdom across the State is going to be.

If the Board decides to move forward with the alternative method and the 2021 Senate Bill 2 (SB2 refers to the bill number in the 2021 session - legislation to allow the postponement) is passed and signed by the Governor, the Board would be entitled to motion to change that vote, particularly if the circumstances change.

Vice Chairman Solon questioned what the deadline is for a decision around the method to be used, understanding there are requirements around notification dates, etc. Assistant Superintendent Thompson noted the public hearing date would be January 27<sup>th</sup> for both the traditional and alternative method. Attorney O'Shaughnessy addressed the information provided with the agenda around the 2021 Annual Meeting dates and deadlines for the Alternative Meeting Method (HB1129). Items in red were added and/or modified by him to make the required deadlines fit in with the alternative schedule. The Notice of Informational Session, Informational Session, and Virtual Annual Meeting dates cited are the three HB1129 alternative procedures. He changed the public hearing date to January 27<sup>th</sup> because he needed to fit in a public hearing, these other two dates, and the voting date within the months of February and March. The January 27<sup>th</sup> date is earlier than the district would normally conduct the public hearing because the Annual Meeting is proposed for February 23<sup>rd</sup> and March 1<sup>st</sup>. It must be those dates because you need to fit two in, and the public hearing cannot be greater than 25 days before the Annual Meeting.

In response to the question asked about a deadline for a decision regarding the method to be utilized, he stated the need for a decision to be reached a few weeks prior to the January 27<sup>th</sup> public hearing date.

Mr. Mason stated the schedule is predicated on trying to have the voting session on March 9<sup>th</sup>. The Board is under no obligation to do it then.

Chairman Deurloo Babcock remarked if not having voting day on March 9<sup>th</sup>, the schedule can be adjusted. She stated her belief the Board should decide by its next regularly scheduled meeting. The voters, Supervisors of the Checklists, etc. need to understand the process that will be used.

Member Williams stated agreement. She was not in favor of making a final decision at this time understanding there is time to see what the State does and to get the plan out for the community so that feedback can be obtained. She was in favor of a decision at the next meeting.

Chairman Deurloo Babcock questioned the will of the Board relative to the COOP meeting being on a separate day. Member VanCoughnett stated agreement commenting trying to do 3 or 4 voting sessions in one day will cause confusion, and the COOP typically garners the most interest. She would like the COOP to conduct its own meeting.

Member Whalen stated agreement with the comments made. She believes it difficult to have them all together as it becomes confusing.

Mr. Mason remarked it would be just like the local election; you walk up to the Supervisors of the Checklist, you get a stack of ballots and fill them out. He did not understand where there would be conflict.

Member VanCoughnett stated her belief the stack of ballots would be the conflict. If there are residents who are uninformed, they would not understand what was being voted on. If each district has its own presentation going into the vote it is a different attitude and one vote, and they know they are voting for the COOP. A bunch of ballots would not discern to them.

Vice Chairman Solon commented, as a Brookline voter who would have to vote for the Brookline School District items on election day, he believes the voting process is what is objectionable, but he does not know if it matters whether it is done in conjunction with other ballots or not. In terms of how it relates to the Brookline School ballot, there are those who understand it and those who have participated all along, which is the vast minority, and those who show up to vote. He does not know that having it on a different day than the other ballots will alleviate any of those problems. His potential objection to having it on the same day is the choice of the day. He is of the belief the concern with having it on the Tuesday and the ability to gain a necessary turnout on a weekday is something he heard voiced previously.

Chairman Deurloo Babcock stated concern with having everything on the 9<sup>th</sup>. She likes the idea of the local election being on the 9<sup>th</sup>. She is not as concerned with the COOP being separate from other districts. She imagines because the polls will be open for a long period of time that it will be easier on the volunteers that run the polls to be able to get through the ballots. If the virtual meetings are on separate days, voters looking to become educated on the information on the ballots will have it.

Member Williams agreed with the comments and was supportive of either option. Chairman Deurloo Babcock stated her biggest concern with this method is the lack of the public's ability to make amendments. She has been hopeful an in-person meeting would be able to be conducted.

Vice Chairman Solon requested clarification on what is being presented for legislation; just to move the voting date or the entire process to a later time. Attorney O'Shaughnessy responded the Bill he has seen allows the governing body to move both the election and the business session later in the year. Asked about the information sessions, he stated they are all related to the business session. If moving the business session/voting day by a month you can move the information session by a month.

Chairman Deurloo Babcock stated there to be 3 choices; try to conduct an in-person meeting, use the alternative method, or postpone the business session in the hope of it being able to be an in-person meeting. Mr. Mason

remarked given Attorney O' O'Shaughnessy's advice, he does not see any reason why the Board could not change its decision should circumstances change.

Vice Chairman Solon asked, assuming the Bill passes, is it correct to state should the Board postpone the Annual Meeting it potentially leaves open the option to have an in-person meeting later or an alternative method at a later date. Attorney O'Shaughnessy stated that to be correct. Should the Board not decide to pursue the alternative method by the middle of this month, it could still hold the alternative method form of meeting, it would just have to happen later. It can happen at any point in time really over the course of the spring, but you will not be able to do it March 9<sup>th</sup> and coordinate it with the other towns as there would not be sufficient time to fit all the other required meetings in.

Member Brown remarked the contract deadline is the middle of April. Attorney O'Shaughnessy responded there is no deadline to issue contracts, there is a deadline of April 15<sup>th</sup> to provide notice of your intent to non-renew a teacher. It is really the opposite of an issue of contracts. Typically, you issue contracts and the non-renewal notices at the same time, but the statutory deadline is for the notice of non-renewal. If you go past that deadline then you cannot non-renew.

Member Brown remarked it is a date, but not necessarily an important deadline that needs to drive this decision making. She is supportive of the flexibility of not deciding and hoping that in April or early May we could have a more traditional meeting.

Attorney O'Shaughnessy noted a legal requirement in the current version of the postponement law (the 2021 Senate Bill 2), is that you must hold a public hearing prior to electing to postpone the meeting to a later date. There is no common wisdom yet around if you postpone, can you postpone it again or change it. Those are things that have yet to be decided. The other thing to think about is the scheduled deadline for the traditional public hearing. Pretending we have not discussed the alternative method and are going to have a regular in-person meeting in March, the public hearing is currently scheduled for February 3<sup>rd</sup>, and you need to hold it within 25 days of your annual meeting so if you are getting close to February 3<sup>rd</sup>, you will have to hold that public hearing, and at some point before then, you are going to have to make a decision about what you are doing. You will be coming up against these deadlines.

Chairman Deurloo Babcock spoke of the need for a decision to be made at the Board's next meeting. She questioned what the other districts have discussed. Mr. Mason commented he spoke with the Town in December. Two of the Selectmen seemed interested in the alternative process and the other 3 did not provide any indication. His general feeling is that nobody wants to have an in-person meeting in March. He suspects the Town will want to get their business session done sooner than later.

Chairman Deurloo Babcock commented they would use the alternative method to do that. Mr. Mason agreed. He added that the Hollis School District was discussing the matter as part of their meeting, which was taking place at the same time. He is of the belief they will follow what the COOP does.

Member Brown remarked she does not believe the COOP has to follow the direction of the Town. For example, if we believe it to continue to be safe to send our children back to school following the social distancing guidelines, that we as a Board must still be committed to it being possible and safe to have ourselves in a building following those same guidelines.

Member Williams stated her preference for in-person if it can be done safely. Following social distancing requirements is part of that. March into April and May there will be more rollouts of vaccine, but the other big thing that changes is the ability for an outdoor meeting.

Mr. Mason responded he has a problem with this as it is one thing to be in a classroom with 20 students or at a Board meeting with 6 members and 2 members of the public who are all masked and socially distant, but a very different situation to have 600 people in a big gym for 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, hours where they are speaking and yelling, and all the good stuff that happens. He does not believe that to be safe.

Member Williams stated agreement and reiterated her hope a meeting could be conducted outdoors. At this point in time, she does not believe a meeting could be safely conducted indoors in March, April, or May.

Member VanCoughnett commented last year we did everything on target and then flipped a switch a couple of days before. She questioned if it is correct to believe that were we to do that again; run all our meetings as we would and then before the March meeting would we still have time to conduct two virtual sessions. Attorney O'Shaughnessy stated that to be correct. He added, if too much time has elapsed there may be the need to hold a supplemental Zoom public hearing. That is possible and the law already contemplates doing something like that. There are ways to do it all, it is just if you shift in one direction there is a bunch of other stuff that must follow. It can become difficult to coordinate all the components, but there is time to figure it out.

Member Whalen spoke of the need to send a notice to every voter, which is not a simple task. She questioned who is responsible for that mailing/notification. Attorney O'Shaughnessy stated the SAU does it on the Board's behalf, but it is the obligation of the Board. Asked about the cost, Mr. Mason stated there to be roughly 11,300 voters in the COOP. If costing \$0.50 each for a moderately thick document, the cost would be in the area of \$5,500. Member Brown remarked that is the cost of postage alone. There is also the cost of labor to put the mailings together. She spoke of how conservative the Board is about the budget, and her concern with the cost of what could be double that for a mailing.

Attorney O'Shaughnessy stated the mailing only has to be done for the drive-up version of the meeting. If simply postponing the meeting, a public hearing is required. With the postponement you are still conducting a traditional meeting it is just happening at a later date whereas the drive-up method is a completely new alternative way of holding a meeting and because of that you must provide this notice to voters. He understands the budget includes the costs associated with conducting a traditional indoor meeting; however, is uncertain what the variance would be.

Member Brown commented the cost is a factor; however, she has greater concern with the belief it may be more difficult for the COOP to accomplish the things it needs to in a drive-thru meeting than a traditional meeting, even if that has to occur outdoors.

Chairman Deurloo Babcock remarked it is clear the Board is not happy with the idea of not being able to conduct a traditional meeting. The item will be on the Board's agenda for it's January 20<sup>th</sup> meeting with the hope of reaching a decision at that time.

Mr. Mason asked for clarification on comments made that the public hearing on the budget must be conducted 25 days or less before the annual meeting. He believes the RSA states 25 days or more (can be no sooner than 25 days before the meeting). Attorney O'Shaughnessy stated that to be correct; you must hold it at least 25 days before. You can hold a second meeting within the 25 days (supplemental public hearing). You generally do not want public hearings to be too far out.

Mr. Mason stated his impression there is no appetite from the Board to have a traditional meeting in March. Chairman Deurloo Babcock responded she believes that everyone on the Board is understanding that a

traditional meeting in March would be challenging, and not something the Board wishes to pursue. She gets the sense from some members that the in-person factor is important. It seems the consensus is an outdoor in-person meeting would be the preference. She asked any member of the Board who disagrees with that perception to make that known.

On behalf of the Board, she stated appreciation for the time and energy Mr. Mason and his staff put into this. It is understood it would be easier if an answer could be provided at this time, but these are big questions, and the ability for the voters to comment and amend is important to the Board.

## **PUBLIC INPUT**

Eric Pauer, 12 Westview Road, Brookline

Having reviewed the 2021 Annual Meeting Dates and Deadlines document, he believes it to be a good plan to follow the alternative method (HB1129). He has spoken with townspeople who have expressed a desire to do all voting and the election on one day. By doing that, they would only have to be out in a public setting on one occasion. He agrees with Mr. Mason that it is not incrementally much more difficult to do that. Voters would be provided with more ballots; in Brookline they would receive a Brookline School District Ballot, Town Ballot, and the COOP, and then there would be the elections for those three as well. You could have 6 ballots. People would rather be able to do that in a single visit to the polls. He believes Brookline residents would prefer to vote in Brookline. Last year there was drive-thru voting for the COOP and that hurt Brookline a little as voters had to drive over to Hollis. Having the ability to do it all at one time puts less wear and tear on the Supervisors of the Checklists and staff. There is a timeline that appears to be workable and follows the procedure approved by the Legislature. If doing it that way, the cost of the notice could be shared. He stated his support of HB1129 versus the 2021 Senate Bill 2 method.

## **DISCUSSION**

- The School Board will be provided an update on the tentative agreement with the Hollis Education Support Staff Association (HESSA).

Member Whalen provided a presentation (copy attached). The goals were identified as:

- Arrive at a contract that allows the District to hire qualified staff at competitive wages

We cannot run our schools without all the HESSA staff. One of the issues that has been faced is hiring of custodians. The District competes with local and surrounding districts that pay a great deal more for these positions.

- To keep insurance caps to allow for budgeting
- Discuss cost versus benefit for taxpayers

The responsibilities of the Custodian position have increased significantly in the last year. These new responsibilities are anticipated to continue. Being proposed is a change in position categories; Custodian would move from category 1 to category 2, Maintenance Worker and Grounds Maintenance Worker from category 2 to category 3 and Building Maintenance Shift Supervisor from category 3 to category 4. Building Maintenance Supervisor and Grounds Maintenance Supervisor positions remain in category 5.

Currently, Brookline pays \$14.99/hour for a starting custodian. The COOP pays \$11.86/hour and Hollis \$11.42/hour. The proposal would provide for an increase in the custodial category of 2% for those on step and 2.5% for those off-step. In year one, a starting custodian would earn \$13.23/hour. For the rest of the table, the proposal calls for a 2% increase for those on-step and a 2.5% increase for off-step in years 2 and 3.

The 2% increase in year one results in an average overall increase of 7% (or \$1.37/hour) (due to custodial category shifts). The on-step cost increase would be \$51,980 and off-step \$47,085 for a total increase in year one of \$99,065. In year 2, the increased cost for on-step is \$42,484 and off-step \$28,039 for a total year 2 increase of \$70,523. In year 3, increased cost for on-step is \$41,178, off step is \$27,549 for a total year 3 increase of \$68,727. The total average increase over the three years of the contract is 5.7%, and the total increased cost for on-step is \$135,642 and off-step \$102,673 for a total increase cost, over the three years, of \$238,315.

Regarding insurance, caps remain in place. With the Guaranteed Maximum Rate (GMR) of increase increasing significantly (10.9%), it was felt an increase in the caps was needed. Proposed is an increase of \$50 to the cap for both single and 2-person plans and a \$25 increase for family plans. The total increased cost to the District over the 3 years of the contract would be \$54,000.

Vice Chairman Solon questioned, and was informed the \$50 increase is in the monthly cap. Slides were shown depicting the current and proposed insurance costs for the District and employees broken down by plan and year.

A Flexible Spending Account is proposed to be added. It is not a cost to the District.

Total Warrant amounts (wages and healthcare); year one \$117,065, year two \$88,523, and year three \$86,727 for a total contract cost of \$292,315.

- The School Board will be provided an update on the Articles of Agreement between the Districts of Hollis and Brookline.

Chairman Deurloo Babcock noted legal counsel has reviewed the minutes of prior annual meetings to ensure all voter approved amendments on the Articles of Agreement were reflected in the document provided to the Board.

Attorney O'Shaughnessy stated it to have been an interesting process. The Recording Secretary pulled up Town Reports from prior years for the Town of Hollis, which contain the record of prior COOP minutes. The real focus of that was there was an issue with respect to the adoption of the Budget Committee and Article 7 not being present in the Articles of Agreement. He read the approved Warrant Article from 2004 where the Budget Committee was adopted by the COOP voters and incorporated the language into Article 7 of the Articles of Agreement. That was straightforward. There is nothing really special in Article 7 because the ability to adopt a budget committee is a statutory right, and the duties and obligations of the committee are set forth in the Statute. All he did was make an internal reference to that statutory provision. It is not necessary because the budget committee does exist regardless of whether their presence is reflected in the Articles of Agreement, but he believed it important to be reflected in there.

The next change that was made, which is a larger change, was Article 15. Article 15 is language that speaks to the procedure for reducing the number of grades that are covered in the COOP school district. This language was passed at the 2004 Annual School District Meeting. It was certified by the State board in May of 2004. He reviewed both the minutes from that meeting extensively and read all the minutes and the four amendments to try to discern exactly what had happened. All he did was incorporate the language that was in the 2004 Warrant Article. There are two places where there were amendments made on the floor, which he also incorporated. One is in paragraph C.2.b. and speaks to capital projects after March 2004. The other substantive amendment was under E, which spoke to how the article itself could be amended. There is a provision that says the article can be amended by a simple majority except those provisions developed under section C.1.c., which is the finance plan, which would require a supermajority vote of 2/3 of those present and voting on such amendment. That amendment was made on the floor of the meeting and passed by a vote at the meeting as reflected in the minutes of the 2004 meeting.

The impetus for the change was just to ensure that the current Articles of Agreement reflect the change made last year to Article 5 with respect to the calculation of operating expenses and the additional \$1 that is assessed to Hollis prior to apportionment. However, in the process, it was discovered that two previous amendments had not been incorporated into the Articles of Agreement.

Attorney O'Shaughnessy stated he does not think of his process as being discretionary at all, it was just being very calculating and thorough and reviewing records and documents to ensure we were careful and got things corrected. He did clean up the formatting at the very bottom (organized by article rather than date). That was discretionary but not substantive.

Asked if any action by the Board was necessary, he stated it to be an interesting question commenting there are very few opportunities for school boards to vote on amended Articles of Agreement because they do not change that often. Once the voters vote and the State board certifies a modification it is part of the Articles of Agreement whether the Board votes on it or not, whether you type it into a document or not. He believes the task of the Board, if anything, is purely an administrative task of acknowledging that the Articles of Agreement were updated consistent with the prior votes of the Legislative Body. Vice Chairman Solon questioned if it is a necessary or permissible vote. Member Brown responded based on what legal counsel has stated, she does not see it as necessary.

Attorney O'Shaughnessy commented Article 15 was adopted in 2004 and has not been present in prior versions of the Articles of Agreement. He did not know anything about that. He went back and cleaned up the older version so that it accurately reflected all the changes he was aware of.

Member Williams expressed her gratitude for the updates incorporated. She finds it helpful to have the formatting identifying the dates when changes occurred. We want the newest version to be readily available for anybody to access, but she believes it important to be able to see the previous versions as well. There is not a lot of transparency if we cannot see an older version. She would like to have the versions posted with the most recent at the top. She would like to see that occur moving forward.

Attorney O'Shaughnessy commented his sense is there is some discomfort. In a normal world he would offer to print out all the documents he reviewed as well as all the old versions and sit down with the School District Clerk to go through it all so that there could be a level of comfort with where we are at and be able to confirm independently that the changes are all reflected. He could write a letter that the Clerk could sign stating to the best of her knowledge she certifies this is a true and accurate copy of the most up-to-date version of the Articles of Agreement. The Board could receive that and simply direct the Superintendent to post this version and all prior versions on the SAU website. Any of those things are doable. He does think the voters need to have access to the most current version at some point.

Chairman Deurloo Babcock commented having his participation in the Zoom meeting and understanding the work he has done is enough for her. Her only concern is the belief the Board does not want to take a vote on this. She feels that would send a message that somehow the Board is voting on the Articles of Agreement.

Attorney O'Shaughnessy stated his opinion the Board should have a process for closure because to him just as the corporate lawyer, what is the status. He suggested the Clerk be asked to review and certify the Articles of Agreement so that they can be posted for the public. The Board would not be doing anything except for asking the Clerk to do the job of the Clerk. He is certain she would be happy to do that and he would be happy to assist.

Vice Chairman Solon commented it seems to be a duplication of work because it sounds like Attorney O'Shaughnessy has already done it. He questioned what prevents legal counsel from certifying the accuracy in the same way he would any other legal document that he is entrusted to create. Attorney O'Shaughnessy stated it does not differ that much except he does not have real authority to certify public documents/create public records that way, and it is really the role of the Clerk. He agrees it would be somewhat duplicative, but he would basically review it in a Zoom meeting that would not require too much time. Nothing prevents him from doing it except he is not the Clerk.

Member VanCoughnett remarked the legal advice provided is to ask the Clerk to certify it, and she believes that is how the Board should proceed.

Attorney O'Shaughnessy stated he would contact the Clerk and keep the Chairman apprised.

### **DELIBERATIONS**

- To see what action the Board will take regarding the tentative agreement reached with the Hollis Education Support Staff Association (HESSA)

**MOTION BY MEMBER WILLIAMS TO APPROVE THE TENTATIVE AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE HOLLIS BROOKLINE COOPERATIVE SCHOOL BOARD AND THE HOLLIS EDUCATION SUPPORT STAFF ASSOCIATION (HESSA)**

**MOTION SECONDED BY MEMBER WHALEN**

### **ON THE QUESTION**

Vice Chairman Solon commented, as in the past, it would have been preferable to see a copy of the final contract in its entirety with these changes so that they could be seen in context.

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

Yea: Beth Janine Williams, Krista Whalen, Cindy VanCoughnett, Elizabeth Brown, Tom Solon,  
Holly Deurloo Babcock

6

Nay:

0

**MOTION CARRIED**

### **REPORT OUT BY PROCESS OBSERVER**

Member VanCoughnett noted the meeting ran on time for all items.

**ADJOURNMENT**

**MOTION BY MEMBER WILLIAMS TO ADJOURN  
SECONDED BY MEMBER WHALEN**

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

Yea: Beth Janine Williams, Krista Whalen, Cindy VanCoughnett, Tom Solon, Elizabeth Brown,  
Holly Deurloo Babcock

6

Nay:

0

**MOTION CARRIED**

*The January 6, 2021 special meeting of the Hollis Brookline Cooperative School Board was adjourned at 8:31 p.m.*

Date \_\_\_\_\_ Signed \_\_\_\_\_

# HESSA CONTRACT HIGHLIGHTS

## 2021-2024

# HESSA AND BOARD TEAM

HESSA	COOP BOARD
Ann Robinson – Hessa President	Holly Babcock – Board Chair
Lisa Heney – Para Professional at HBHS	Kate Stoll – Board Member
Lorri Hayes – Uniserv Director NEA-NH	Krista Whalen – Board Member
	Kelly Seeley – SAU Business Director
	Bob Thompson – SAU Assistant Superintendent

# Board Goals

- Contract that allows district to hire qualified staff at competitive wages
- Keep insurance caps to allow budgeting
- Cost vs Benefit for Taxpayers

# CHANGE TO APPENDIX A

- Category 1: Office/Clerical Assistant, Instructional Assistant, Library/Media Assistant, ~~Custodian~~, Food Service Worker
- Category 2: ~~Maintenance Worker~~, Cook, ~~Grounds Maintenance Worker~~, Receptionist , **Custodian**
- Category 3: Para-educator, Special Education Para-educator ,**Grounds Maintenance Worker**, ~~Building Maintenance Shift Supervisor~~, Head Cook, **Maintenance Worker**
- Category 4: Secretary, **Building Maintenance Shift Supervisor**
- Category 5: 504 Para-educator, Building Maintenance Supervisor, Audio Visual Technician, Senior Secretary, Grounds Maintenance Supervisor, Registrar

# Wages

YEAR 1:           Custodial Category Shift with  
                      On step – 2% wage increase  
                      Off step – 2.5% wage increase

YEAR 2:           On Step – 2% wage increase  
                      Off Step – 2.5% wage increase

YEAR 3:           On Step – 2% wage increase  
                      Off Step – 2.5% wage increase

(Custodial category shifts in Year 1 are maintained going forward )

# Wage Breakdown

	<b>Step</b>	<b>Overall</b>				
	<b>% Inc</b>	<b>% Inc</b>	<b>OnStep</b>	<b>% Inc</b>	<b>OffStep</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>Year 1:</b>	2.0%	7.0%	\$51,980	2.5%	\$47,085	<b>\$99,065</b>
<b>Year 2:</b>	2.0%	5.4%	\$42,484	2.5%	\$28,039	<b>\$70,523</b>
<b>Year 3:</b>	2.0%	4.9%	\$41,178	2.5%	\$27,549	<b>\$68,727</b>
	<b>AVG</b>	<b>5.7%</b>	<b>\$135,642</b>		<b>\$102,673</b>	<b>\$238,315</b>

The 7% increase in Year 1 due to Custodial category shifts

# Insurance Changes and Costs

	<b>Single</b>	<b>2-Person</b>	<b>Family</b>	<b>District Cost</b>	<b>GMR</b>	
<b>Year 1:</b>	\$50.00	\$50.00	\$25.00	\$18,000	10.90%	
<b>Year 2:</b>	\$50.00	\$50.00	\$25.00	\$18,000	8%	Estimated
<b>Year 3:</b>	\$50.00	\$50.00	\$25.00	\$18,000	8%	Estimated
				<b>\$54,000</b>		

# Current District and Employee Cost

CURRENT	PREMIUM/MO	DISTRICT COST/MO	EMPLOYEE COST/MO
Single (23)	\$753.79	\$753.79	\$0.00
2 – Person (7)	\$1,507.59	\$1,210.00	\$297.59
Family (0)	\$2,035.24	\$1,260.00	\$775.24

# Contract District Cost & Employee Cost

YEAR 1 - 10.9% GMR	PREMIUM / MO	DISTRICT COST/MO	EMPLOYEE COST/MO
Single (23)	\$836	\$810	\$26
2-Person (7)	\$1,672	\$1,260	\$412
Family (0)	\$2,257	\$1,285	\$972
YEAR 2- 8% increase estimated			
Single	\$903	\$860	\$43
2-Person	\$1,806	\$1,310	\$496
Family	\$2,458	\$1,310	\$1,128
YEAR 3 – 8% increase estimated			
Single	\$975	\$910	\$65
2-Person	\$1,950	\$1,360	\$590
Family	\$2,633	\$1,335	\$1,298

# FLEXIBLE SPENDING ACCOUNT

The District will create an IRS Section 125 Flexible Spending Account Plan (FSA). These funds may be used to offset medical, dental, childcare or expenses as allowed by law. Employees will be allowed to voluntarily contribute by payroll deduction to Section 125 plan up to the limit allowed.

# TOTAL WARRANT AMOUNTS

	<b>Wages</b>	<b>Health</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>Year 1:</b>	\$99,065	\$18,000	<b>\$117,065</b>
<b>Year 2:</b>	\$70,523	\$18,000	<b>\$88,523</b>
<b>Year 3:</b>	\$68,727	\$18,000	<b>\$86,727</b>
	<b>\$238,315</b>	<b>\$54,000</b>	<b>\$292,315</b>

Thank you

Questions?