

**BARRE UNIFIED UNION SCHOOL DISTRICT
SPECIAL BOARD MEETING**

Spaulding High School Library and Via Video Conference – Google Meet
August 7, 2024 - 6:00 p.m.

MINUTES

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:

Michael Boutin (BC) – Chair (attended online)
Giuliano Cecchinelli II (BC) - Vice Chair (Chaired the meeting)
Sonya Spaulding (BC)- Clerk
Nancy Leclerc (At-Large)
Emily Reynolds (BT)
Terry Reil (BT)
Garrett Grant (BC)
Alice Farrell (BT)
Catherine Whalen (BT)

BOARD MEMBERS ABSENT:

ADMINISTRATORS PRESENT:

JoAn Canning, Superintendent
Carol Marold, Director of Human Resources
Elizabeth Brown, Director of Early Education
Lisa Perreault, Business Manager
Melissa Greenwood, Asst. Principal BCEMS
Ted Mills, Asst. Principal BTMES

GUESTS PRESENT:

Adam Jacobs, AJ Jones, Allison Mills, Ben Matthews, Bern Rose, Brodey PriddyChris Moran, Christie Omodeo, Christine Parker, Colleen LeFebvre, Courtnie Lange, Danielle Owczarski, Darby Hiebert, David Delcore (Times Argus), Denise Lavallee, Deon Preston, Emily Thomas, Erika Dolan, Guy Isabelle, Jackie Wheeler, James Carpenter, Jasmine Jones, Jasmine Wible, Jennifer Bisson, Jeremy Scheid, Jessica Maurais, Joelen Mulvaney, Josh Howard, Katie Jarvis, Kirsten Evans, Kristina Safford, Laura Ortiz, Lindsey Wells, Mary Bowers, Megan Spaulding, Michaela Morris, Nora Duane, Paul Malone, Peter Anthony, Prudence Krasofski, Rachel Greenfield, Rachel Van Vliet, Roberta Melnick, Samantha Lawrence, Sarah Attig, Sarah Helman, Sarah Hill, Sean Toohey (Legal Counsel), Sharon Jacobs, Stacie Jacques, Stephanie Collins, Steven Thompson, Tamara Cooley, Tyler Graves, Tyler Watkins, Victoria Pompei, Wendy Sell

1. Call to Order

The Vice Chair, Mr. Cecchinelli, called the Wednesday, August 7, 2024, Special meeting to order at 6:01 p.m., which was held at the Spaulding High School Library and via video conference.

2. Pledge and Mindfulness Moment

The Board recited the Pledge of Allegiance. The Board held a Mindfulness Moment.

3. Additions and/or Deletions with Motion to Approve the Agenda

None

Motion by Mr. Reil, seconded by Mrs. Leclerc, to approve the agenda, motion passed unanimously.

Discussion: Clarification on the executive session, minutes not in packet or website. Ms. Canning shared this is a special meeting and minutes will be provided at the next regular board meeting. Ms. Canning explained the executive session as client attorney privilege. It's concerning Open Meeting Law and it allows the board to share information with their attorney in order to avoid any future liabilities. This evening, the training and the opportunity to interact with your attorney are recommended in this way. It is a board training. However, within the content of some issues that the board is dealing with, premature public knowledge would leave the board at a disadvantage. Mr. Toohey, the Board attorney, was invited to the table to explain. He shared that this is a challenge for him because he's here as your attorney, and by virtue of speaking to you in public, they're essentially waiving attorney-client privilege, which is part of the reason why under Open Meeting Law, there's a provision that allows a municipal board like this to go into executive session and speak to your attorney so that you preserve attorney-client privilege. Interactions with the Attorney General's office resulted in a request that he provide training to the board. His understanding of this training tonight is giving the Board advice. He and his firm do training for school boards all over the state and regularly do the training in executive sessions for boards. There are

different legal opinions and he's open to that, but his advice as a board tonight is to go into executive session to have this. He does not expect at the end of the training the board to come out and make some decisions. We are going to discuss open meeting law concepts generally in an effort to address the issues that were raised in complaints. He's not going to be talking about those specific complaints. Legal advice given on how to avoid future complaints was through training. He's not there to make a decision if the violations were legitimate or not, that's not the point of the training. The process Mrs. Leclerc outlined under the open meeting law about how to handle a complaint agrees, but that's not what he's doing tonight. It's attorney-client advice and falls outside the vast majority of the work the board does, which is done in public.

Mr. Reil recommended moving this item to the front of the agenda since Mr. Toohey is present. Mr. Cecchinelli agreed that they usually try to do that with any guest.

The previous motion was amended to move item 6 to the beginning of the agenda. Motion passed unanimously.

4. Public Comments for Items Not on the Agenda

4.1 Public Comment

- Ms. Mulvanhey spoke about Project 2025.
- Mr. Malone commented about underfunding and money going to private schools. Private schools, daycares, institutions, and other programs are where students are sent to deal with social-emotional issues. He doesn't know how to get them out.
- Ms. Owczarski spoke of an assertion at a previous meeting about rejecting grant funding derived from tax revenues. Mr. Cecchinelli reminded her that budget discussion is on the agenda. She agreed to speak then.
- Ms. Van Vliet is grateful for alternative/therapeutic schools that can meet the needs of our students when we can't. Internal programs like SEA and Cares are helping. IEP teams make placements through the IEP process through Special Education.

4.2 Student Voice

None

5. Consent Agenda

5.1 Warrant Approval: July 25, 2024, August 1, 2024

5.2 New Hires: J. Merritt, K. Brons (Teachers); J. Bisson, Melody Frank, Jesse Schattin (Admin)

Mr. Boutin made a motion to approve the consent agenda, Seconded by Mrs. Spaulding

Discussion: Mr. Reil questioned why Melody Frank and Jesse Schattin were back in the packet. Ms. Canning understood that those two contracts were not signed with the board's understanding, and we are trying to correct that. Mr. Reil confirmed after digging out minutes and videos that they were actually included, so they were approved and can be dropped off.

Mr. Reil amended the motion to remove Melody Frank and Jesse Schattin from the list, and Mr. Boutin withdrew his initial motion.

Mr. Reil made a motion to approve the consent agenda removing Melody Frank and Jesse Schattin from the list, seconded by Mrs. Farrell, motion passed unanimously.

6. Executive Session

6.1 Opening Meeting Law 1 VSA 313 (a)(1)(F)

On a motion by Mr. Grant, seconded by Mrs. Spaulding, the Board unanimously agreed to find that premature general public knowledge of the items proposed for discussion would clearly place the Barre Unified Union School District at a substantial disadvantage should the discussion be public. Motion passed unanimously.

On a motion by Mrs. Spaulding, seconded by Mr. Grant, the Board unanimously voted to enter into Executive Session, with Ms. Canning and legal counsel in attendance at 6:21 p.m. under the provisions of 1 VSA 313 (a)(1)(F) to discuss the items proposed for discussion.

The Board exited the Executive Session at 8:02 p.m.

7. Current Business

7.1 FY25 Budget Discussion

Ms. Owczarski - A suggestion made to reject grant funding from tax revenues is a misuse of the school board's focus which shouldn't be a platform to protest tax-funded education grants. School Board's responsibility to seek and accept all legitimate funding opportunities, tax-funded education grants have already been approved and it's not within the board's purview to retroactively question their allocation during budget discussions. If board members oppose tax-funded grants, their engagement should be during the allocation process, not when discussing the budget. Board Goal - ensure an informed community free from political agendas is

working towards the long-term benefits of a well-funded school system. Need alternative solutions to ensure affordability without compromising the school budget. This isn't about reducing the budget to the detriment of our educational standards but about structuring funding mechanisms so that everyone can contribute according to their means.

Ms. Canning shared that September 17th will need to be the re-vote date because both the city clerks and Barre Auditorium are not available on the dates the board asked her to research. The board will be meeting on August 14th, a special meeting on August 21st, and a meeting on August 28th, so in the event the board needs three more sessions to discuss the budget, we have the opportunity to do so and warn the budget for a vote on September 17th.

From the last meeting, there seem to be two schools of thought

1. Present the same budget back to the voters.
2. Continue with the reductions to a 6.5% increase to the current year over the last year.

Reviewing the three previous votes, it seems the board got a little bit closer but there was still a decision not to accept the school board's recommendation.

Ms. Canning does not expect a vote tonight, only a discussion, questions, and requests for further information should you need it. What would those reductions need to be going into a fourth vote? She'll be looking at coordinating positions across the district and reducing repetition in some roles and responsibilities across buildings.

- Substitute budgets are looked at again, and continuing to make the recommendation that it can be reduced slightly
- Take an additional \$6000 in supplies
- SHS General Education Student Tuition reduced by \$20,000
- Four to Five positions have not been able to hire for.
 - Vacant Math Coordinator for 1 year only. This position does not directly work with kids
 - Student changes in Special Education and plans to reduce staff there
 - Bus Monitors for preschoolers, paid via transportation contract. Looking at roles of current PreK staff to fill this.
- Co-Curricular
 - BTMES—Vote #3: It was increased by \$45,000 based on actuals. I reviewed why that line was over budget again and realized some advisors and coaches had coded it incorrectly, reducing that by \$25,000.
- Travel and Conference
 - During the 2nd vote, we looked at these lines as they wouldn't impact students and zeroed out all of them for a total of \$62,100. That's not reality, as we need to reimburse for mileage, so we reduced it by \$50,000 instead. This left us with \$12,100 to distribute throughout the budget.

To date, in votes 2 and 3, reductions of \$1,194,088 have been made. Should the board accept the administration's recommendation, it would be an additional \$624,107. Ms. Canning feels any further reductions will have a significant impact on our students. Next, cuts extracurriculars at middle schools. Staff recommended providing support to students as well as helping the administration with legal investigations.

Discussion opened up to the board.

- Statewide, about a 14% tax increase, 1.36 tax rate increase for Barre City, and a 3.49% tax rate increase for Barre Town, so both are well below any 14% increase. General Fund Expense variance increased by 7.95, but education spending increased 3.73%. Education spending is your expenses, less your revenues. Education spending is what you pay tax on. Asking voters to approve 41,125,402 represents a 3.73 increase from last year, still well below any 14%. The tax rate last year based on education spending and equalized pupil and long-term weighted average daily membership got us to a rate last year of 1.64, and this year's tax rate is 1.22. The only increase we are seeing is based solely 100% on the CLA. We have basically adjusted our budget to account for the increase based on the CLA.
- Concerns about cutting Math Coordinator positions as well as assigning PreK staff to transportation will impact students - Ms. Canning shared it's not uncommon for the Curriculum Director to play the role of Coordinator. She feels comfortable for this year, testing this out and having her play the role of Math Coordinator. It's a good year's solution, as positions like that will be hard to fill this time of year. It will still be a bus monitor but it will be current staff riding the buses. We can provide the level of support without having a separate monitor that we're paying for. Concern about putting another burden on the PreK staff who canceled a lot last year due to staffing issues. Ms. Canning will research further for the next meeting.
- Voters have said three times very clearly no, we want lower. Which Ms. Canning delivered, but is it enough? We typically have \$700,000 of tax stabilization. In this budget, we've got almost 1.4 million. Buys down the tax rate, but if we don't have duplicate funds next year that is money that's going to be made up by the taxpayers. Barre City's grand list took a big hit and had a lot of reductions because of flooding, and it just happened again, and indications are there's going to be another large impact on Barre City's grand list. If the grand list or the tax space shrinks that means there are fewer people paying taxes. Those folks still paying are going to pay more. Barre City reappraisal is scheduled for the 26th but don't know the impact of that's going to be. Barre Town doesn't have reappraisal, but CLA has been dropping, so we know a dropping CLA pushes tax rates up for ed funding. Student enrollment is decreasing; it's a trend across the state and the whole country. At what point do

we leverage those decreases to reduce expenses as well? With Act 127, no doubt the Vermont Legislature is going to tackle education funding and waiting again in this next session. We have no idea where that's going to land, and that has a direct impact on tax rates, expenses, and ed funding. There's a whole bunch of variables we can't ignore. These are things we have to be aware of.

- Hoping as a board, we can all rally together behind a budget we can collectively support. Repeated failures of the budget are an effort to defund our students' education, misinformation, and lack of honesty, some say. These implications are irresponsible and unfair especially towards our students' education. All budget information has been available on the website and details have been shared over the past six months. It is perplexing that despite spending nearly \$69 million on education in 2023-2024, there are accusations of defunding and misinformation. Approaches to any budget involve reviewing prior year expenditures and adjusting any overages and underspending by reallocating and reducing spending. Need to look at: programs - compare outcomes with the results that we were expecting, comprehensive report of all capital expenditures including projects, large equipment purchases, tools and needs of the facilities, assessing the needs of our curricular curriculum program, projecting student enrollment, list of open and needed positions, spending around four million on transportation with no busing to our high school, there's a lot of vehicle usage in the warrants for getting students to and from school and SEA Program, a snapshot of those costs associated when we're paying parents, individual community members, and staff for student transportation, haven't seen any cuts from facilities. Bus riders - looking at line by line for fiscal year 2023, we paid \$281,000 for bus riders. For fiscal year 2024, we budgeted \$150,000, but as of today, we've spent \$267,000. Trying to rationalize how we underbudgeted, but we've spent almost \$300,000 on bus riders. Special Education program, making sure we're meeting all of the needs of the students. Reductions to look at \$15,000 for cell phone reimbursement and supporting information to justify the \$60,000 in custodial overtime. SRO at Spaulding High School - entertain supporting that, need conversations with the police departments, coordination, is it available? \$350,000 set aside for the Cares Program was mentioned to take a look at that as a possible reduction, but we need more information on that.
- We have looked at these numbers till we're almost blind to them, and we have a grasp of what they're talking about. When folks see General Fund Expenses they see a number, see a percentage, and then they see per pupil spending and education spending. This may be the root of a community engagement plan to explain why those numbers are different. When we talk about facility spending, staffing, and instruction, what has gone before and what is coming down the pike so if we're spending X amount of dollars on staffing, where's the report about staffing, where's the plan for staffing, where's the plan for facilities. We can look at that and say, if we have these folks doing this amount of work, we can anticipate that we will have some good outcomes. AOE did a staff-to-student ratio report in 2019; we are at 1 to 7. Seven students per teacher seem to be a little bit off, but that's what's out there. Those kinds of things, to bring that in and knit it into a community engagement plan as we approach this next budget vote so that the public has a really good idea of what it is they're voting on. They hear this amount of spending, that amount of spending, tax rate, CLA, and their heads spin. I think that has been a root cause of individuals not understanding and, therefore, not being supportive. If we can show that, here's a bucket, and into this bucket goes non-negotiables, the already existing contracts whether for staff, transportation, Xerox machines, etc. Those have to go in there. We can't cut them out. Here's what we need for instruction, here's what we need to have facilities: safe, clean, operable, warm, and the lights stay on. What is the co-curricular, the transportation? Look at those buckets and make it very simple for people to understand we would be making a tremendous amount of headway. Mrs. Farrell will gladly assist with any kind of documentation or written piece to share with the community because that's really important.
- We have to be brave enough to address the spending, and it's not something that's fun to do or we like to do but that's what I'm hearing from the voters. It's not so much the taxes, it's the spending and where the money is going and where it is exactly. A lot of the things I see are very vague. Substitutes - is that from all schools, or is that one school? How many positions is it? As an elected member that's in charge of oversight, it's difficult when we don't get specifics and then can't vote because we don't know what we're voting on. I don't think it's much different for members of the public when they are looking at things that are put out for public documents and see the same things. ESSER positions - put out in the public that they were temporary positions and were not going to be rolled into the general fund. It's not comfortable but it's got to be discussed. It's a huge portion. How can we get around it? How can we make it work? That's why we're here; we need to talk about it because pushing it away and trying to put through another budget is like doing the same thing over and over again, and expecting a different result has not been a good method.
- Concerns about conferences being reduced. Hate to see opportunities taken away from staff to improve their skills, refine their skills, and network with other professionals. Having some confidence that there will be sufficient opportunities, whether those are provided in services or such, to provide that. I understand the impact of not having those opportunities. A bit of perspective, when we look at these numbers line by line, just for the board, we cost \$353,000 in the proposed budget. There are just realities of how much things cost if 9 members cost \$353,000. Imagine what it costs to educate over 2,000 students and over 600 who require an IEP, just a piece of perspective offered as we continue this discussion.
- Reductions List offered: If we're going to budget effectively, we really need to see what is the plan for the next 12 months for Capital repairs, assets, and all those kinds of things. Reduce the tax stabilization from 1.4 million back down to 700,000. ESSER funded positions. Need to look at the 40 open positions and accommodate those positions into the open positions that we have to see if we can offset that ESSER funding. We're sitting on a lot of open positions that we could utilize to slide those into permanent roles that aren't going to increase expenses. Open positions don't provide services to anybody. It's been 3 to 4 years since we've carried double-digit open para positions. We need to reduce that number by half. It's not fair to continue to ask the community to fund positions that we're just not filling. We are pushing approximately a million-dollar

surplus annually, and we need to take half of that. All of our buildings, except the SEA building, have one principal and two assistant principals. Our two elementary schools have 800 plus students in them and Spaulding, to my understanding, is around 400. Why do we have three principals there? Need to move to one principal and one assistant principal with half the students that are in the other buildings from an equity standpoint. What should be on our minds for the next budget is the SEA program. The Tech Center is going to leave eventually. Building designed to house 1200 students, we're in the 400 range. We need to move the SEA building into the Spaulding building and get rid of that property. It would save the district a tremendous amount of money. With the Tech Center leaving, we will have the space. When they leave, if we don't have a tenant or a use for it, we absorb that additional cost. Factors we need to talk about, not intended to be inflammatory but I would reduce the Director of Facilities position in the district. We have facility leads in each building with principals who know their buildings and handle the day-to-day operations and things that happen in their buildings. If choosing between positional cuts that affect students or positional cuts that don't. That's one we can do without or think outside of the box. Mr. Reil's opinion, when I perceive some of the directors that we have Facilities, IT, HR, I think of those as administrative support positions. I don't think of those as director-level positions. We either reduce the Director of Facilities position or reduce those three director positions to administrator positions aligned underneath the Business Manager. To me, these are support positions, not director-level positions. Adding SRO back in, travel/conference should only cut down to \$32,000, not \$12,000, course reimbursement reduces it to \$50,000, it's excessively overspent and needs to be managed better, bus riders keep flat at 150 though significantly overspent, supplies underspent about \$45,000, drop \$50,000 across the board, BC Mindfulness Coordinator not replaced, custodian/maintenance supplies underspent by \$80,000 reduce \$80,000, propane underspent \$30,000 split that and take some money there, wood chip underspent almost 50 again split it or 40, Board legal fees - no contracts to negotiate should be able to reduce \$15,000, and contracted services \$5000. There was a big bump in the central office in Tech for purchased security - budget for 20, which was underspent and asked for a \$50,000 increase. Unless that is something specific that can take a substantial reduction, budget narratives that we've had there are several vehicles, that need to be reduced. Assistant coaches have been in and out of the budget; need to look at that. Cares program new program, but that's a big ticket item. Increase for playground equipment for \$100,000, but we're doing all that work this year, not sure if that's redundant. There's a potential reduction of \$100,000. Big bump in custodians, but custodian positions weren't added. I think we're short a couple; there was a \$270,000 bump in all those lines combined. It's either adding positions we haven't discussed or something, 60,000 of it is the overtime increase which I don't think is justified. Would rather see us increase a staff member, which would reduce overtime.

- Ms. Canning shared that it really is her full intent to look at all staffing. We have many of the positions you were talking about already under contract, so I think the ideas you have are similar to a vision, but to get there would not be in time for September 17th. Mr. Reil feels that if positions are eliminated, then that negates the contract. Both agreed that now's not the time to figure that out.
- The SRO position at Spaulding was supported. The reason they removed in the first initial cutback in March was that the city is chronically understaffed for the police. It's a problem in the state of Vermont in general. Requested Ms. Canning provide a list of cuts next week that we will be able to systemically go through and make motions on to remove them or what have you. She will have a response to the board's feedback this evening. She can't predict what that's going to look like because she works with the administrative team and the directors to answer the questions. She doesn't expect they are going to take my suggestions line by line. What she will ask at some point in the next three meetings is that the board vote on a budget. It was pointed out, because we're talking about the cost of education, that the cost of education would be far easier to handle in our district if we actually merged the schools the way that they should be merged, which includes classroom sizes. All of that is something we really have to think about if we're actually concerned about the tax rate in our community. We need to really move forward on that.
- Hearing that this is around the time when we normally start doing the budget for next year. There's an article in the paper about rising health care costs again of 20 to 24%. Looking ahead to next year's budget and being cognizant of potential increases that are going to be coming right away. The tighter we can keep this one, the easier it's going to be to just go right into the next year's budget to plan. Revising our purchasing policies to consolidate those, there's big savings to be had in that. Looking at the budget, there are many redundant lines for each different school, with a coordinated effort that could save a lot.
- The \$63,000 for substitutes is that one school versus another school. Mrs. Canning responded that it is a combination of the Barre Town K-8 and High school. That detail is great because we ran into issues about the budget and the percentage that went to each school. Supplies questioned - that's Spaulding. General Ed Student Tuition is the High school. Four to Five positions are still being worked on. Transportation - PreK busing. In reviewing the warrants we are continuously seeing large purchases by facilities and projects. If we can really get that plan of expenses so we can see them so we're not blindsided by large ticket items that are coming across.
- Last legislative session, there was the Board of Cooperative Educational Services Bill passed and signed by the governor, which allows for schools to come together in regions and work together. As we look at our space which we will be reabsorbing from the Career Center, it's a good idea to look at the SEA building coming back into Spaulding High School so we have a program that is in gear with IDEA, rather than separate but equal. A truly integrated program. Use the SEA building to generate revenue. An ideal program would be to turn it into a preschool center and then we could share with surrounding districts to have a cooperative preschool. It's important that we serve all levels from PreK all the way through to graduating seniors. Course reimbursement - in favor of teachers constantly increasing their knowledge but staggered so that

we have individuals who need licensing that they would get first dibs. individuals who may be pursuing a Master's program would be on the list, and anyone pursuing a second or third Master's or PhD program that maybe they could wait. Those kinds of degrees are specialty degrees, and even though they enhance what we have in our district it may not be the right time for us as a district to be providing financial support for that type. If they have a license and are doing a fine job it might be something for them to pursue on their own.

- Ms. Canning shared some of the items are Collective Bargaining agreement items, and course reimbursements would be one of them and that would not be something she could unilaterally make reductions in. Mrs. Farrell agreed but something to be looked at as far as this whole planning. If we're looking at a facilities plan, spending plan, and instructions plan, where does that fit into our needs to serve students?
- Concerns shared that we're at a point where we're not balancing the needs of the taxpayer with the needs of the students. We're just thinking about the needs of the taxpayers. We need to remember it's a balance. How do we make sure that we are serving our students in the best way possible and recognizing that sometimes that means we have to increase budgets. We have increased salaries, health care, and costs just like everyone else. We are being asked to absorb all of those so that we can appease taxpayers. I understand that's part of our job but we also have to remember part of our job is doing what's best for our students.
- Sometimes investing in the schools can provide a benefit to taxpayers. Providing students with meals actually saves costs for some families compared to the tax burden. We have buildings that are in really good shape The central office, which is a really old building from 1908. It's remarkable how well that has been maintained. Maintaining is cheaper than fixing big problems in the long run, and in the age of flooding, it's important for us to make our buildings more resilient. We may have a legal obligation to provide certain standards for our students. Some considerations to put out there as we continue the discussion.
- Lots of great points were made, and lots of great discussions. Agrees with educating our community, using plain language, really making sure people fully understand what we're talking about. It's a lot, and it's really hard to comprehend. Community engagement and education should definitely be part of our budget plan going forward. Talking about Act 127, the district tax rate. That tax discount will be available to us for the next five years. I think the first three years is 3 cents, and then it tapers off. That's designed to help us build tax capacity as we transition out of the discount. The CLA in Barre City is going to change in the next couple of years to be 100%. That will take a huge tax burden off of taxpayers. I would love to ask our Barre Town Selectboard to consider a reappraisal and say that would really reduce the burden of taxes going forward. Community engagement and community outreach is still very important.
- At the next meeting, Ms. Canning will bring back to the board some open house dates, ways to reach out to parents, and school events. We are going to Music in Currier Park in September, which would give us an opportunity to reach out to folks.

8. Old Business

None

9. Round Table

Mr. Reil: Thanks, everyone. It's been a great discussion tonight, and he looks forward to the next piece. Thank you.

Mrs. Farrell: What he said. We did good.

Mr. Boutin: Thank you to Giuliano for jumping in and being the chair tonight. I have COVID and was not allowed in the building or out in public, for that matter. I do want to say thank you. I'm very happy with the discussion tonight and learning about open meeting law

Mrs. Leclerc: Felt the Open Meeting Law training was very good for this board. Felt it was beneficial. We should initiate a regular discussion about Open Meeting Law compliance training for all of us. I think in January, it's going to be required that we retake it anyways. It's challenging to rely solely on the board chair to interpret all the rules, and I think if the board made a concerted effort to become more familiar with the statutes and Robert's Rules, it would significantly benefit our board's functioning and decision-making. I'm glad we did this tonight. Thank you.

10. Future Agenda Items

Budget

11. Next Meeting Date

August 14, 2024, Spaulding High School Library/via Google Meet

August 21, 2024, Spaulding High School Library/via Google Meet (Special Mtg.)

August 28, 2024, Spaulding High School Library/via Google Meet

12. Adjournment

On a motion by Mr. Grant, seconded by Ms. Reynolds, to adjourn at 10:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Tina Gilbert