

BARRE SUPERVISORY UNION  
REGULAR BOARD MEETING

**TRI-BOARD MEETING**

BARRE SUPERVISORY UNION BOARD  
BARRE CITY SCHOOL BOARD  
BARRE TOWN SCHOOL BOARD  
SPAULDING HIGH SCHOOL BOARD

To meet concurrently at  
Spaulding High School Library  
155 Ayers St., Barre, VT

October 12, 2017  
6:00 p.m.

**AGENDA**

- 1. Call to Order**
- 2. Additions or Deletions to the Agenda**
- 3. Public Comment**
- 4. Approval of Minutes**
- 5. New Business**
  - 5.1 Legislative Topics (2 hrs)
- 6. Old Business**
  - 6.1 Act 46 (15 min)
  - 6.2 Contract Ratifications
- 7. Other Business as Needed**
- 8. Reports to the Board**
- 9. Executive Session**
  - 9.1 Labor Relation Agreements (if necessary)
- 10. Adjournment**

**Reminders:**

Next Supervisory Union #61 Board Meeting:	October 19, 2017
Next Barre City School Board Meeting:	November 13, 2017
Next Spaulding High School Board Meeting:	November 2, 2017
Next Barre Town School Board Meeting:	November 1, 2017

## **BARRE SUPERVISORY UNION BOARD**

### **BOARD MEETING NORMS**

- **Keep meetings short and on time**
- **Honor the board's decisions**
- **Stick to the agenda**
- **Everyone gets a chance to talk before people take a second turn**
- **Keep remarks short and to the point**
- **Respect others and their ideas**

**DISCUSSION TOPICS FOR BARRE SUPERVISORY UNION**  
**TRI-BOARD LEGISLATIVE DISCUSSION**

<b><u>Topic</u></b>	<b><u>Question/Concern/Issue for Discussion</u></b>
Ed Funding	<p>What will be done to alleviate the \$45 million hole in the ed fund, besides just passing it off to local boards to address, who are dealing with depleted reserves, cuts in grant funding and projected increases in health insurance?</p> <p>How will future discussions regarding education spending take into account that we are all carrying the burden of high spending school districts, even though a supervisory union like ours continues to spend considerably less per pupil than the state average? How will you find a solution that does not penalize us for continuing to keep per pupil costs low?</p> <p>How do you justify that a district that spends \$12,000 per student is equitable to a district that spends \$17,000 per student? How will you address this in future discussions regarding school spending?</p> <p>What direction do you see our state going in terms of level funded education budgets? How do you see this realistically happening with fixed costs such as negotiated agreements and student needs?</p> <p>Please consider PER PUPIL SPENDING when making decisions regarding funding. For example, the FY17 cost containment directive with penalties, which was repealed but not before causing harm, caused BSU and member districts to use reserve funds, which in future years has caused increases to tax rates and per pupil spending. Please comment on the fairness that one district could spend \$17,000+ and those districts cutting budgets to keep expenses down (BSU \$12-\$13k), were also subject to penalty.</p> <p>Unfunded mandates make it difficult to develop budgets while also keeping the tax rate and per pupil spending low.. Recently the following have caused concern for us: 1) Teachers VSTRS Health Care Assessment, which increases each year, will result in an overall anticipated cost to BSU in FY19 of <b>\$175,420</b> 2) Wages/Salary/Benefits which increase at a rate disproportionate to inflation due to questionable public policy and a failure to address issues such as fact-finding standards 3) Act 166 Preschool Tuition Please comment on this.</p> <p>Flexible Pathways (Act 77) is a mandated requirement which requires flexible staffing, time management that goes beyond the school day, transportation costs and liabilities, and supervision/assessment/credit efficacy that requires dedicated staff. These pathways also require teachers to align individualized and unique work activities with Standards for another mandate (Proficiency Based Graduation Requirements resulting from the Education Quality Standards). The lack of funding support for these mandates puts pressure on an already overwhelmed budget.</p>

	<p>While these programs are extremely valuable, a funding pool for schools who are implementing with fidelity would give incentive and ability to meet these mandates as they are intended. Otherwise it feels we are being asked to do more with less. Please comment on this.</p>
<p>Act 85</p>	<p>Act 85 established the Vermont Education Health Benefits Commission to determine whether and how to establish a single statewide health benefit for all teachers, administrators, and other employees of supervisory unions and school districts. This committee is charged with providing a recommendation to the legislature on this issue by November 15, 2017. We believe a single statewide benefit has many advantages and few disadvantages, particularly given the challenges seen in current negotiations and disparities in settlements across districts. We disagree with the rhetoric that this is an affront on collective bargaining, and believe that rhetoric is simply a cover for continuing to allow the union to leverage settlements in a fashion that is detrimental to addressing the education funding issues we face. Please comment on your position on this statement and on a single statewide health benefit for all teachers, administrators, and other employees of supervisory unions and school districts.</p> <p>Additionally, what are your thoughts on state-wide teacher and educational support staff contracts?</p>
<p>Act 166</p>	<p>Act 166 implementation continues to be a struggle. Immediate issues include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The inability of two separate state agencies to jointly oversee implementation in a successful and productive manner.</li> <li>● The power of the advocacy movement for the private sector of PreK and the success that movement has had in drowning the perspective of the public education community when we have attempted to raise legitimate concerns and comply with standing statute and regulations..</li> <li>● The inequity for families of children with disabilities. These families must send their children to a program where they can access special education, while families of children without disabilities have many more options.</li> <li>● The lack of standard templates; lack of refined processes [such as: (1) revocation of qualification status when a private center fails to meet the statutory requirements; and (2) monitoring of private centers for meeting educational quality standards; lack of advisees who work at ground level. This has not only resulted in confusion and frustration, but also in inequity in the delivery of high quality educational programming for our youngest students.</li> <li>● There is an immense administrative burden associated with tracking children and attendance, tracking agreements and documentation for PreK programs and tracking invoices and payments.</li> </ul>

	<p>How can (and will) you support those of us in public education in dealing with these issues?</p>
<p>Act 46</p>	<p>Continue the momentum for consolidation through Act 46, and also consider extending incentives. Barre would benefit greatly from this. Here are a few examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <b>One Board PreK-12</b>; this results in a decrease to 1) member transition/inexperience and stipends 2) Board meetings 3) duplication of information/packets/time devoted by Superintendent and administrative assistant.</li> <li>● <b>Efficiency in the Business Office</b>; for example, one single insurance bill required 4 checks, processed by 3 staff accountants, signed by 3 board members, and 2 treasurers. This is a single example of situations which happen frequently. In addition, sub-granting and assessments to and from BSU would be eliminated, and budgets would be much easier to follow and therefore transparent.</li> <li>● <b>State-wide Uniform Chart of Accounts</b>; we are facing a mandatory conversion to this state-wide system. New data information system migration timing would be perfect to move to one database (budget) as opposed to four. We would benefit from one audit as well.</li> </ul> <p>All of these would save money and provide efficiency eventually.</p> <p>We are still struggling with a “NO” faction in our community who believes the state either should not or will not actually force a merger. What can you do to help our community understand the inevitability, and benefits, of merging?</p> <p>Additionally, what are your thoughts on the one or more Act 46 lawsuits that have been filed or threatened?</p>
<p>Career Tech Ed</p>	<p>Have you participated in legislative committee discussions around the future of Career and Technical Education – perhaps how CTE fits into Personal Learning Plans (as early as 5<sup>th</sup> grade), Flexible Pathways, Work Based Learning, VT Graduation Proficiencies and assisting students to be both career and college ready?</p> <p>Do you see and want to share what you feel CTE Centers could do to better promote our program offerings and how our programs support all learners?</p> <p>Has there been discussion in committee on creating a focused team to look at remodeling VT’s education funding format?</p> <p>Would it be helpful for Technical Center Directors to meet with legislative committees to help clarify barriers, challenges and successes?</p> <p>Are there questions you or your colleagues have around career and technical education?</p>

<p>Input from VASBO</p>	<p>The Vermont Association of School Business Officials (VASBO) convenes the following committees which we believe could support the work of the legislature:</p> <p><b><u>Cost Containment Committee: White Paper-Due out December</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Review, evaluate and recommend meaningful strategies to share with Legislature. Draft a white paper to be shared with membership in December, with adoption in January. Participants, Peter Amons, Nathan Lavery, Lisa Perreault, Frank Ricker, Brenda Fleming</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Legislative Committee-Available to testify</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● An ad hoc committee to be available to provide insight and testimony as needed throughout the legislative session on school finance matters. Work with VSA, VSBA, AOE, etc., to coordinate legislative action and reports. Participants, Bob Fahey, Grant Geisler, Chris Sumner</li> </ul> <p>How can you help ensure the viewpoint of these educational experts is heard and IS taken seriously by the legislature?</p>
<p>Trauma</p>	<p>Schools are on the front line of the opioid epidemic, with students exposed to trauma arriving at our doors requiring substantial supports to access their education. Are there any discussions or plans to address the need for mental health services for a rising number of students in our schools? And, are there discussions to address the fact that the schools are covering the cost of the mental health services of these students?</p>
<p>RFP Bid Limit</p>	<p>Would you consider and support increasing the threshold for bid requirement of contractors from \$15,000 to a higher amount?</p>