

**JOINT MEETING OF THE BROOKLINE SCHOOL BOARD
AND BROOKLINE FINANCE COMMITTEE
NOVEMBER 30, 2022
MEETING MINUTES**

A Joint Meeting of the Brookline School Board and Brookline Finance Committee was conducted on Wednesday, November 30, 2022 at 6:02 p.m. at the Captain Samuel Douglass Academy.

Kenneth Haag, School Board Chairman, presided:

Members of the School Board Present: Colleen Micavich, Secretary
Kelly Zakar

Members of the School Board Absent: Karen Jew, Vice Chairman
Alison Marsano

Members of the Finance Cmte. Present: Brian Rater, Chairman (arrived at 6:28 p.m.)
Tracy Perry, Secretary

Members of the Finance Cmte. Absent: Cindy LaCroix

Also in Attendance: Andrew Corey, Superintendent
Gina Bergskaug, Asst. Superintendent of Curriculum and Instruction
Donna Smith, Assistant Business Administrator
Daniel Molinari, Principal, Richard Maghakian Memorial School
Patricia Bouley, Principal, Captain Samuel Douglass Academy
James O’Shaughnessy, Esq.

AGENDA ADJUSTMENTS

Attorney O’Shaughnessy was in attendance to discuss the tax cap as part of the budget discussion. Superintendent Corey requested that discussion take place following the acceptance of meeting minutes.

There being no objection, the agenda was amended as requested.

CORRESPONDENCE / RESIGNATIONS / RETIREMENTS / NOMINATIONS

Superintendent Corey informed the Board the grant application to cover the cost of walkie talkies was not successful. The majority of the grants that were awarded were to provide additional security to entranceways; an item the district has already addressed.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Brookline School Board [November 2, 2022](#)

The following amendments were offered:

Page 1, Line 43; delete “The” at the end of the sentence.

Page 4, Line 46; correct the spelling of “is”
Page 5, Line 40; delete “that will go”
Page 8, Line 30; “\$60.950” should be “\$60,950”
Page 9, Line 1; insert “of” following “drivers”
Page 9, Line 41; replace “that” with “for” following “survey”
Page 11, Line 3; insert a period following “requirements”

MOTION BY MEMBER HAAG TO ACCEPT, AS AMENDED
MOTION SECONDED BY MEMBER MICAVICH
MOTION CARRIED
3-0-0

Brookline School Board – **Non-Public**. [November 2, 2022](#)

MOTION BY MEMBER HAAG TO ACCEPT, AS PRESENTED
MOTION SECONDED BY MEMBER MICAVICH
MOTION CARRIED
3-0-0

DISCUSSION

James O’Shaughnessy Esq. stated his understanding there are special warrant articles such as the teachers’ contract that call for appropriations. The concern is that the proposed operating budget and those articles will exceed the tax cap.

Typically the language in the tax cap warrant article states “the proposed budget” which typically excludes special warrant articles. It is his opinion that the proposed budget needs to come under the tax cap number, but the special warrant articles are not subject to the tax cap number.

Additionally, the language in RSA that governs the language in a warrant article for the tax cap is specific/very restricted. What you have to propose and what you are restricted to putting in that warrant article is just one budget. You cannot put multiple optional budgets. You have to put one proposed budget, one default budget on that warrant article. At the Deliberative Session, you present the budget and inform those in attendance that the proposed operating budget meets the tax cap; however, it is not sufficient to actually meet the needs of the district. You can specifically ask the voters to exercise their authority to override the tax cap. That is the appropriate process and why the Statute is designed the way it is, to give you that ability.

The vote to override the tax cap requires a simple majority to pass. The legislative body cannot change that rule. Whatever number the legislative body proposes is what is put on the ballot for March.

Member Zakar asked for clarification because the teacher contract is a separate warrant article, the district is approving an operating budget that does not contain that.

Attorney O’Shaughnessy stated it has to work that way. In the operating budget you build in the cost for the next year if there is no new contract (ongoing costs regardless of whether there is a new contract). What is in the new warrant article are the additional funds necessary to fund the new agreement in the first year. If a multi-year contract often there is an estimate of what the increases will be in years 2 and 3 over the prior year

(sanbornize provision). That is the notice provided the voters to adopt a multi-year contract and make it binding on the voters.

Member Micavich asked for clarifying information on the override process, and was told unlike a Board meeting, the Deliberative Session is a meeting of the legislative body (voters). A motion would have to come from a member of the legislative body. The Board can structure the presentation however it wishes and is not prohibited from making it known the district is required by the tax cap to present a number but is aware the number is insufficient to meet the needs and the reasons why. The legislative body would listen and presumably someone would make a motion to increase the proposed operating budget. If that motion passes, that new amount becomes the proposed operating budget that is placed on the ballot.

Asked for clarification of the default budget, Attorney O'Shaughnessy explained the default budget is the amount of the same appropriations as contained in the operating budget authorized for the previous year, reduced and increased, as the case may be, by debt service, contracts, and other obligations previously incurred or mandated by law, and reduced by one-time expenditures contained in the operating budget.

Member Zakar commented it is conceivable that the default budget could be higher than the operating budget under the tax cap. Attorney O'Shaughnessy responded the statute actually says the Board is required to follow the formula regardless of whether it is greater than or less than the proposed budget.

Superintendent Corey commented on the need to understand that the amount just returned to the taxbase is used as an offset when calculating the percentage to that 8% for the budget. There is a high probability the budget will come in below the 8%, but there are always conversations around it, and he wished for the Board to understand it is about the budget itself.

Asked if a sanbornized contract would have more of a negative impact in terms of the tax cap, Attorney O'Shaughnessy stated whatever dollar amount is sanbornized for future years becomes part of the operating budget in those future years (builds in an increase over the prior year). He is uncertain if that is a positive or negative. It will increase the operating budget by that dollar amount.

Member Zakar commented the sanbornized years (2 and 3) would become part of the default budget. Attorney O'Shaughnessy stated the dollar amount would be part of both; the operating budget and the default budget as a contractual commitment.

PUBLIC INPUT

Chairman Haag opened the floor for public input at 6:17 p.m.

Tracy Perry, Secretary, Finance Committee

Stated appreciation for the information provided.

The public input period was declared closed at 6:18 p.m.

PRINCIPALS' REPORT

Daniel Molinari, Principal, Richard Maghakian Memorial School (RMMS) and Patricia Bouley, Principal, Captain Samuel Douglass Academy (CSDA) highlighted items from their report, which was included as part of the [agenda](#) packet.

DISCUSSION

There being no objection, the Board went out of the regular order of business.

- Renovations Update

Superintendent Corey stated the district is making tremendous progress. The elevator shaft is in (steel and concrete). The framing has been completed for the security office. The second floor (above the security office) will be addressed in the coming days. The library area has had all of its ductwork put in. Earlier today the millwork started. What used to be the large storage area is receiving the cabinetry for what will be a new faculty room and workspace. Beyond that will be three flexible spaces (200-300 sq. ft. depending on the room), which will be able to be used for special education services, reading services, etc. The I.T. office will also be moved to that floor.

It is hoped a tour (starting at RMMS) will be able to be conducted ahead of the December meeting. The project is currently on budget. The Administration is working with the architect on ADA compliance issues to be addressed, e.g., new sidewalk being wheelchair accessible, playground.

It is believed the project will be completed following the February break.

- Building Survey Discussion (<https://safesupportivelearning.ed.gov/edscls>)

Superintendent Corey noted the information provided by Member Micavich. There is a wealth of information available. Not knowing the direction the Board desired, he recommended forming a committee to ensure the survey that is presented is what is desired by the Board. Members Zakar and Micavich have both expressed an interest in serving in that capacity. With the Board's permission, he would work with Assistant Superintendent Bergskaug, Principals Molinari and Bouley and Board members Micavich and Zakar to complete this task. He noted Bob Thompson, former Assistant Superintendent, used a survey in Hampstead to gain data about what he was coming into. Superintendent Corey will look to get a copy of that. Mr. Thompson expressed he felt that worked well except for trying to take the complete sentence answers and put them together.

Asked if he used a specific tool, Superintendent Corey stated his belief it was a tool for which he received permission to adapt. He will verify that.

That committee would work as a subset of the Board, and the information gained would be brought back to the Board for discussion. If able to develop a tool that is appropriate it would be available for future use. Each board in the SAU could look at the tool and adjust it to their likes/needs.

Superintendent Corey stated the desire to have an update, if not a selection, to bring before the Board at its December meeting.

Asked if information could be gained from other Superintendents in the State to determine if anyone has experience using the EDSCLS survey, Superintendent Corey stated he could start with those districts in the southern tier (similar to SAU 41) to see if any have utilized that survey.

- 2023 Annual Meeting Timeline for Review

Superintendent Corey noted the information provided with the agenda. The timeline includes all relevant dates associated with the budget process for the SAU 41 Governing Board and the three districts within SAU 41.

For Brookline, the Public Hearing will be conducted on January 11, 2023 with a snow date of January 12, 2023. The First/Deliberative Session is scheduled for February 8, 2023 with a snow date of February 10, 2023. The Second Session/Ballot Voting is scheduled for March 14, 2023.

The Board returned to the regular order of business.

- FY24 Budget Discussion

Superintendent Corey noted a handout provided the Board (copy attached), which depicts the budget drivers and associated dollar increase over the FY23 budget.

He noted it will once again be a difficult budget season. The first major budget driver is out-of-district placements for students requiring those services via their Individual Education Plans (IEPs). The costs identified were simply the dollar increase over this year's budget (new students moving in or students who now need an alternative setting for learning). Those costs are increasing by \$253,240. Out of district related services, e.g., physical therapy, occupational therapy, etc. are increasing by \$73,541, and out of district transportation is increasing by \$74,530.

With out of district placement means there were items in the previous budget that are not in the proposed budget. The Excel spreadsheet shows the actual increase in new special education costs to be \$299,640.

The Guaranteed Maximum Rate (GMR) of increase for health insurance is 4.1% resulting in an increase of \$80,282.

Utilities has a total anticipated increase of \$74,000. The increase in debt service (bond) is \$55,179.

Regular education transportation will see the normal adjustment via the contract (\$23,256). The cost of fuel will increase \$18,000. Regular education student transportation will see a total increase of \$41,256.

There is an increase in special education paraprofessional needs (2 paras) resulting in a cost increase of \$43,358.

The SAU assessment is expected to increase by \$38,983. Teacher retirements (contractual) is an increase of \$32,458. Computer replacement costs (teacher computers) increases by \$16,500. An increase in wages for personal care (student support) is \$10,500. Contracted services (special education) show an increase of \$9,400. The 12 major drivers identified result in an increase of \$803,227.

Member Zakar commented on districts seeing more and more students with behavioral and social emotional issues. Assuming some of these situations may be contributing to the increased out of district costs, she questioned, with the difficulties being experienced in terms of special education staffing, is the district able to

plan for either bringing students back in district or keeping students in district by offering our own programming.

Superintendent Corey responded the majority of this new cost is dedicated to specific needs of an individual(s) that is believed to be served best out of district. The district is developing programming and is looking at starting in the 3 or 4-year-old program. We presently have a student(s) who tuitions from Brookline to Hollis. We are designing programs that service student needs and not trying to duplicate services between the two districts. The desire is to find placements that will help the individual(s) develop a skillset that can return to the district whether it is K-6 or 7-12. He stated his belief the total out of district placements across the SAU is around a dozen.

Finance Committee Member Perry stated building that capacity in the district is something she wholeheartedly supports. With positions remaining unfilled, she questioned if they continue to be built into the budget and how they are handled.

Superintendent Corey responded in the current (FY23) budget, those positions are all encumbered as the district continues to interview and look to fill them. As we go month to month with the positions remaining unfilled, those encumbrances will be released. Just recently one of the custodian positions was able to be filled. The Board will discuss the two para positions later in the meeting. In terms of the present opening for the Administrator, the Director of Special Education would be speaking with an individual the following day. It may be that the district contracts with a retiree to serve us during the remainder of this school year.

At the conclusion of Round 3 of the budget review process, the operating budget represents an increase of \$809,963.01 or 7.7%. If adding to that the proposed allocations to the Maintenance Trust (\$155,000), Special Education Trust (\$25,000) and Brookline's portion of the SAU budget (\$446,191.00), the total is an increase of \$928,946.01 or 8.4%. Once information is known regarding the teachers' contract that would become a separate warrant article. Capital repairs and bonds will be discussed.

Building Aid was applied for with the State. Four projects were submitted (2 for the COOP and 1 for each of the buildings in Brookline). There were 17 applicants. Our priorities were ranked 14, 15, 16, and 17.

Work continues with the Facilities Director and contractors to identify priorities and timelines for district infrastructure.

Between \$400,000 and \$500,000 was returned to the tax base and used to offset what had to be raised through taxation to support this year's budget. There is a part of the formula for the tax cap whereby the offset will reduce the percentage. The Business Administrator will calculate that further along in the budget process.

Finance Committee Chair Rater commented in looking through the spreadsheet he saw a lot of flat numbers from one budget year to the next, which were very close to actuals from the past few years. This year we saw an 8% inflation rate. It seems the numbers are much closer to the numbers for the previous year than he would have expected.

Superintendent Corey stated the Administration looked to level fund as many lines as possible knowing what is occurring in areas such as special education. He spoke of the level of inflation providing the example of the cost of a case of paper nearly doubling. Items used in large quantities in the schools have experienced large costs increases, e.g., toilet paper, hand soap. Although conscious of that increase, there is also the need to balance the risk with the needs.

Finance Committee Chairman Rater spoke of Account #10.2400.899 - FY19 proposed budget changes and was told the lines represent new items.

Superintendent Corey noted changes in the proposed budget from Round 2.3 to Round 3.

The anticipated cost for math workbooks (year 1 of new cycle) increased from \$2,000 to \$5,850 in each of the schools. The district is in a math review stage where this and next year are being used to reflect on K-6 math but doing it from a K-12 vantagepoint. Recommendations will be brought forth in the spring.

The proposed classroom teacher for grade 6 identified a cost of \$72,500, which is zeroed out in Round 3. The position was added during COVID utilizing ESSER funds. The district maintains class size by eliminating that position. The elimination would be achieved through a retirement; would not be letting any staff member go.

The cost of the part time Speech Language Pathologist position at RMMS went from \$69,973 to \$49,986 of which \$15,000 is proposed to be funded by the Special Education Trust. In CSDA, the 2 paras will have \$15,000 of the salary funded through the Special Education Trust (for incoming students). There is concern over the ability to hire for these positions. It may be that a consulting service is required. Superintendent Corey noted there remain 2 unfunded MTSS paraprofessional positions. He is uncertain that adding 2 additional paraprofessionals will allow for funding of perhaps any of the four. Consideration is being given to the two positions that are funded within the budget, but not hired, moving over to address these needs when hired. Doing so would reduce the budget by the \$42,611.

Noted were the grant funding sources available for new computer equipment. The 10 staff laptops that had been requested were reduced to 5 in Round 2, and back to the request of 10 in Round 3. The result is an increase of \$4,750 in each of the schools.

The cost for interactive flat panels in each of the schools will be funded through the Rural Education Achievement Program (REAP) grant.

The cafeteria tables at RMMS were removed in Round 3 resulting in a savings of \$8,800. The \$5,000 (RMMS) considered for the Milford Street vestibule design was removed as was the \$5,000 playground design for CSDA.

Total (current) proposed operating budget is \$809,964 or a 7.7% increase. Adding to that the SAU assessment (\$407,208), Maintenance Trust (\$75,000) and Special Education Trust (\$25,000) results in a total of \$928,947 or an increase of 8.42%.

The two largest priorities, from a capital improvement standpoint, were identified as a boiler and the control system. A warrant article could be put forth for those critical items or the Board could look to spread that cost out over time (lease/bond). The anticipated cost of a \$1 million bond would result in a \$65,000 increase.

Appropriations to the Maintenance Expendable Trust are able to be carried from year to year. The opening balance is \$71,200. The Maintenance Trust requests have been reduced to \$155,000. Being recommended for RMMS are Phase 2 of cafeteria tables (\$8,800), burglar alarm upgrade (end of life) (\$15,000), update the phone system (\$23,000), and access points (end of life) replacement (\$7,250). At CSDA, the fire panel cost is \$100,000, exterior doors (3) Phase II (\$10,000) and exterior lighting (\$10,000). The estimated ending balance is \$52,150 after utilizing the maintenance trust, if the voters approve the \$155,000.

Noted was that the cost of Chromebooks @ RMMS (105 @ \$350) would be funded through e-Rate.

Superintendent Corey remarked the two areas where feedback is sought are the suggestion of moving the para positions out of the budget and funding the cost through the existing two positions that are open and the direction the Board would like to take regarding the Curriculum Administrator position (fully loaded \$110,000). Bob Ouellette, who retired from the high school, has returned to provide hours of his time, which has taken some of the pressure off of administrators. Just recently, the Special Education Administrator was lost to return to the classroom in another district. That position will be hired for, and a review conducted to see if it can be crafted slightly different to provide additional supports.

A request was made by a Board member to consider a School Resource Officer (SRO) position. Superintendent Corey has discussed this with Police Chief Quigley. Should the Board look to put that position in place, the cost (\$100,000) would be addressed through a separate warrant article (some potential for grant funding).

Superintendent Corey commented one of the areas where he looks to avoid decreases is staffing, which results in larger class sizes. The district has worked very hard on keeping class sizes down. Given what is known at this time, it is believed the district will be well staffed to meet the needs.

Finance Committee Chairman Rater spoke of being able to see a lot of challenges being addressed through the proposed budget. This was clearly a very difficult budget to prepare. He spoke of prior years' budgets commenting they have done more than this one in terms of addressing maintenance items, new programs, etc. This is a very minimal budget. The large drivers are clearly special education and the fire panel. Those items are both essential and unavoidable. Given the challenges faced with the ability to hire and retain staff in the current economy and those around inflation, he believes what has been proposed is the best we will be able to do. It is a significant increase (7.7% in the operating budget and 12% overall) before teacher contract. Just the out-of-state special education costs account for roughly 4% of the increase.

Finance Committee Member Perry stated agreement. She expressed her gratitude to the Administration for the work done acknowledging the tremendous amount required to get to this point. She spoke of the largest of the drivers of the increases, which are difficult to control, e.g., utilities, and commented on the items that appeared on the list at the start of the process and have since been cut from the proposed budget.

Finance Committee Chair Rater stated his understanding of the suggested changes to the para positions given difficulties faced in hiring. The Curriculum position is a definite need and should be in the budget.

Member Micavich spoke of her appreciation for the proposed budget and the amount of work put into it. The district has prioritized the needed items. She too is sad that we cannot accommodate some of the other requests but understands this is what budgeting is about.

She stated her full support for the Curriculum Administrator position. At this time, she does not support the position of SRO. When talking about a budget where items in the area of academics and building infrastructure, it is not the right time for a position that she does not believe would serve the purpose that appears to have driven the initial discussion. She is in support of the suggestion around the paraprofessional positions acknowledging the difficulties in hiring. The MTSS paraprofessionals, she does not believe are well defined. A special education para is needed per an IEP.

Member Zakar commented she does not fully understand the difference between the para and MTSS para positions. She sees the MTSS coordinator in the budget, which she believes to be part of the curriculum administrator position. She is of the opinion the district should look to fund the positions it is obligated to provide.

Superintendent Corey remarked the easiest way to understand the difference would be to say that MTSS is an intervention process of sorts where you hope to capture students, based on data, before they get to the point where they have the need for an IEP. From an educational point of view, he agrees with the comments made to identify the students who already have IEPs and ensure their needs are met. What the district would do, if the curriculum position remains in the budget, is use that administrator to start to spearhead these data discussions.

Member Zakar remarked the MTSS data gathering is seen in the budget for this current fiscal year. She asked if the district is currently collecting the data. Assistant Superintendent Bergskaug stated the district looks at several pieces of data and can identify a group that might need support in a particular area. That person, as something in addition to what they are already doing, takes a look at the data and helps the teachers sort of organize the information and determine what interventions would be best. The Curriculum Administrator is a position she views as the one who would take that to the next level and really say this here is what you are going to be using with them in WIN time, and then reconvening and reevaluating. Perhaps the following year the MTSS paras could be utilized to better support the implementation of that. It takes time. She believes there is the need for the administrator to be doing the directing of that work as a primary focus before being focused on individuals who can implement it.

Member Zakar restated we are collecting data, we do not have an MTSS curriculum administrator who is analyzing, on a comprehensive basis, that data, and identifying students who need that extra support. The first part would be to get someone in to do that analysis and sort of comprehensive distribution of need, and then the third step would be bringing in folks who can help implement it. Assistant Superintendent Bergskaug stated that to be correct.

Regarding the SRO position, she stated she brought the suggestion forward after members of the community reached out concerning it. She does not feel, as a Board, there has been the opportunity for meaningful conversation about that type of position versus a community resource officer or some other strategy that could be implemented. She is not in favor of a warrant article, at this time. She would like additional feedback from residents, perhaps conduct a study, and review evidence of the impact of having a SRO, particularly in a K-6 environment.

Assistant Superintendent Bergskaug suggested that might be a good topic for the June/July/August timeframe. Perhaps have a presentation from Chief Quigley, review data in support of each of the positions and consider the potential for grant opportunities.

Member Micavich spoke of the desire for an even broader discussion. She questioned the most needed position; do teachers feel they would rather have a social worker, school psychologist? She would like to hear from staff and administrators in addition to residents.

Member Zakar reiterated the need for researched based decisions; not limiting ourselves to a police model. Assistant Superintendent Bergskaug stated this year to be the first that the COOP has had a social worker in the budget, funded, and filled. The Administration can look at how the position has been utilized and what the possibilities could be when looking at one of our elementary districts.

Chairman Haag commented on mention of a credit to the tax cap based on funds returned to the tax base and questioned if the \$400,000 returned would be a direct reduction to the proposed increase and was told the formula differs from that.

Chairman Haag spoke of this being the third continuous year of having significant special education increases and asked if regular education is being impacted due to budgetary limitations. Superintendent Corey responded there is impact. They try to minimize it. They focus in first and foremost on the classroom ratios by avoiding increasing class size, ensure supplies and needs for academic programming is in place.

In the other two districts the Finance/Budget Committees provide a guidance formula. The cost of special education is outside of guidance because it is a legally mandatory service. When they have discussions about the budget they do not necessarily talk about special education. They discuss it and work towards cost avoidance, but realize it is a cost. What the budget/finance committees do is provide the administration with a guidance number that they would like to be achieved. If it cannot be achieved, they may provide relief from guidance or may tell the Administration to find the money. Were the Board to decide the cost is too great to support the curriculum coordinator position that would be an impact.

Chairman Haag stated he is firmly in favor of the curriculum coordinator position and would prioritize that over the SRO. He very much feels like this is the year for that position.

Asked, Superintendent Corey stated the biggest hit is always facilities. CSDA is now 20± years old and items such as boilers are of concern. His recommendation would be to go through this budget season and then gear up a facilities committee to look at those needs. The next time the district goes for a bond there will be proof of concept in that RMMS will be done, and it will be a tangible example of the benefits.

Finance Committee Member Perry commented as the representative to the Energy Committee she can say upgrades were just done to Town Hall, which included a new boiler. Over time it will provide energy savings, etc. We cannot expect children to function at a high level in buildings that are not great learning places. We need to think about the facilities

Member Zakar questioned the last time Brookline had an energy audit. Superintendent Corey stated the Energy Committee, EEI and the architect went through the buildings and provided information for the bond for the RMMS project as well as a plan for what needs to be done long-term. Ms. Seeley provides that information to the Town as part of the CIP plan.

There are things that will need to be considered in the coming years. The standards on underground oil tanks are changing again. It may be that we decide to move from oil to propane. From a school district perspective, a number of our facilities are now propane, and we are able to use the purchasing power that comes with purchasing along with the Town of Hollis. The SAU is looking at propane at the middle school given the condition of their oil tanks.

There is the need for a master plan. In the new space at RMMS (bottom floor and the two 3rd grade classrooms) there is LED lighting, which is much better for learning and will pay energy dividends. Some of those pieces could start to be pulled out of the plan and addressed through warrants or the energy pieces could be lumped together.

In Hollis, they went with solar (on roofs). Over 80% of their electricity is generated through their solar panels. There is the need for the district to do those things. Superintendent Corey commented he would not want to lose sight of the progress made as a school system on behalf of the students.

Member Micavich stated the desire to have further discussion around energy efficiency opportunities. Superintendent Corey remarked the COOP and Hollis school districts have energy committees through the Town. The energy representative from the Hollis Energy Committee attended last month's COOP board meeting with a recommendation for what is needed and necessary actions moving forward to plan to bring those to fruition. He provided the example of discussion, 6-7 years ago, of the need for a new roof at the high school, which would have come at a cost in the area of \$2-2.5 million (at that time). The Business Administrator constructed an 8-phase plan, which kept the tax rate consistent by spending the same amount every year. The district is finishing phase 8 this spring. The result will be a new roof and one that will age in sections.

Ms. Seeley works very closely with the Town of Brookline. She will be asked to pull information together to be included on an agenda following this budget season (Finance Committee will be invited to join the discussion).

Chairman Haag stated his sense the district would not be pursuing a bond on the boiler, etc. It did not pass last year when bond rates were more favorable. Superintendent Corey stated the other concern to be if able to reach an agreement with the teachers, he would not want to pit the teachers contract against a bond. As much as he needs all of that infrastructure, the teachers are what makes the difference for the students.

Chairman Haag commented if it came to it, there are funds available that could be utilized.

Finance Committee Chair Rater declared the Finance Committee adjourned at 7:45 p.m.

DELIBERATIONS

- To see what action the Board will take regarding the SAU 41 Anti-Discrimination Plan

MOTION BY MEMBER HAAG TO APPROVE THE SAU 41 ANTI-DISCRIMINATION PLAN, AS PRESENTED
MOTION SECONDED BY MEMBER ZAKAR

ON THE QUESTION

Assistant Superintendent Bergskaug noted changes are reflected in the first sentence under the heading of Summary of Parent/Guardian Rights and a portion of the language under #1 being removed to make the plan current with existing law.

MOTION CARRIED
3-0-0

- To see what action the Board will take regarding policy AC – Non-Discrimination, Equal Opportunity Employment and District Anti-Discrimination Plan

MOTION BY MEMBER HAAG TO ACCEPT THE THIRD READING AND ADOPT POLICY AC – NON-DISCRIMINATION EQUAL OPPORTUNITY EMPLOYMENT AND DISTRICT ANTI-DISCRIMINATION PLAN
MOTION SECONDED BY MEMBER ZAKAR

ON THE QUESTION

No changes have been proposed since the time of the last reading.

MOTION CARRIED

5-0-0

- To see what action the Board will take regarding Policy **IHBAA** - Special Education: Determination of a Specific Learning Disability

Given its 1st reading;

MOTION BY MEMBER HAAG TO AMEND POLICY IHBAA - SPECIAL EDUCATION: DETERMINATION OF A SPECIFIC LEARNING DISABILITY, IN ITS ENTIRETY, BY REPLACING IT WITH THE COPY PROVIDED WITH THE AGENDA, AND ACCEPT THE FIRST READING, AS AMENDED

MOTION SECONDED BY MEMBER MICAVICH

ON THE QUESTION

Member Micavich questioned the areas that describe the process being looked at, the pattern of strengths and weaknesses or the response to intervention and questioned if the language is being changed because the law has changed and no longer allows a discrepancy formula. Assistant Superintendent Bergskaug stated it was to ensure the district is current with current law.

MOTION CARRIED

5-0-0

- To see what action the Board will take regarding Policy **IJOC** - Volunteers

Given its 1st reading;

MOTION BY MEMBER HAAG TO AMEND POLICY IJOC - VOLUNTEERS, IN ITS ENTIRETY, BY REPLACING IT WITH THE COPY PROVIDED WITH THE AGENDA, AND ACCEPT THE FIRST READING, AS AMENDED

AS PRESENTED

MOTION SECONDED BY MEMBER MICAVICH

ON THE QUESTION

Assistant Superintendent Bergskaug noted the policy was before the Policy Committee as a result of discussions at a prior Board meeting. In reviewing the existing policy, it was noted our position is not defined as clearly as defined both in the law and our other districts. An overhaul of the policy was done. The real discussion item was volunteer requirements in terms of the number of hours. A few different models are being considered. Legally we do not have to do the two-hour suicide prevention for volunteers, but feel it is beneficial. We also have the full version of all of the required training and the refresher. It is near impossible to track all of our volunteers. The thought was to do the complete version of all mandatory training and in even years do the refresher courses. Then the question was would the liability insurance carrier agree with that approach.

Member Micavich spoke of the language being more defined as to who needs to be with a teacher or staff member and who does not.

MOTION CARRIED

3-0-0

ADJOURNMENT

MOTION BY MEMBER HAAG TO ADJOURN

MOTION SECONDED BY MEMBER MICAVICH

MOTION CARRIED

3-0-0

The November 30, 2022 Joint meeting of the Brookline School Board and Brookline Finance Committee was adjourned at 7:52 p.m.

Date _____ Signed _____

Budget driver:**Dollar increase over 2023 budget**

Out of District Tuition	253,240	
Out of District related services	73,541	
Out of District Transportation	74,530	401,311
Health insurance (GMR 4.1%)	80,282	80,282
Utilities		
Electric	13,000	
Heating Fuel – oil	59,000	
Propane	2,000	74,000
Debt service		
Bond	55,179	55,179
Regular education transportation	23,256	
Transportation fuel	18,000	41,256
Increase in special education para needs	43,358	43,358
SAU assessment	38,983	38,983
Teacher retirement (contractual)	32,458	32,458
Computer Replacement (teacher)	16,500	16,500
Wages personal care (student support)	10,500	10,500
Contracted services (special education)	9,400	9,400