

# MINUTES



**Addison Central School District  
ACSD Board  
Board Meeting  
Monday, January 6, 2025, 6:30 pm - 8:30 pm  
Middlebury Union High School Library 73 Charles Ave, Middlebury**

## *ACSD District Vision and Mission*

### **OUR VISION**

*Our vision is for all ACSD students to reach their full learning potential, have a sense of belonging in our schools, and enrich our community and the communities where they live in the future.*

### **OUR MISSION**

*Our mission is to provide high-quality, equitable, and varied learning environments that inspire a passion for learning and growth among our students.*

## **In-Person Attendance**

Brian Bauer; Courtney Krahn; Ellen Whelan-Wuest; Ellie Romp; James Malcolm; Jamie McCallum; Joanna Doria; Laura Harthan; Mary Heather Noble; Matthew Corrente; Navah Glikman; Steve Orzech; Suzanne Buck; Tricia Allen; Wendy Baker

## **Remote Attendance**

Jason Chance

## **Not In Attendance**

Barbara Wilson

### A. Call to Order Upon Reaching A Quorum

Suzanne Buck

Meeting called to order at 6:31 p.m.

#### 1. Introductions - Board Members, Administrators, and Staff

5 min

Additional ACSD administrators present: Bruce Macintire, Director of Facilities; Emily Blistein, Director of Communications & Engagement; Caitlin Steele, MUHS Principal; Michaela Wisell, MUMS Principal; Jen Kravitz, Mary Hogan School Principal; Lashawn Sells, Shoreham Elementary School Principal; Nadya Bech-Conger, Cornwall School Principal; Jenny Urban, Bridport Central School Principal; Bjarki Sears, Salisbury Community School Principal and Acting Principal of Ripton Elementary School

#### 2. Motion to Adopt Agenda

Motion to adopt agenda.

Move: Jamie McCallum Second: Ellen Whelan-Wuest Status: Passed

### B. First Public Comment Period

Suzanne Buck 10 min

Public comments are encouraged and welcome at each regular board meeting during the period designated for public comment. Comments are limited to three minutes per person. Citizens will

be called to make their statement by the board chair. Public comments regarding personnel, students or legal matters will not be heard by the Board.

Sarah Ingersoll of Middlebury is an educator at Mary Hogan School. She very quickly read Dr. Baker's email regarding the FY26 budget impacts and wanted to provide her perspective. She has not had time to compile data but wanted to provide anecdotal information in support of keeping some of the support positions that are proposed to be cut from Mary Hogan School. They are at a time when students and teachers are finally feeling settled after the significant COVID disruption. She finds the proposed budget to be very unsettling and disruptive. There is still a lot of academic and social/emotional learning recovery to be made. She worries the cuts will cause significant negative impacts, particularly to staff morale. The changes may be well-conceived on paper, but negative for students and teachers in practice.

Ed Wheeler of East Middlebury made a comment concerning gender dysphoria and shared information he had read in an article from the UK Guardian newspaper. The UK has banned puberty blocking medications for children under 18. It was challenged in court and the highest court upheld the decision. He thinks the school district should consider this information in how it addresses transgender children.

Mario Capparuccini, Hospitalist at Porter Hospital made a comment regarding serious medical complications that can result from the use of puberty blockers, including risks to bone development. He believes this is a significant concern for adolescents who are given puberty blockers, and expressed concern for the health of the individuals. He thinks this is a liability to school districts that promote treatment of gender dysphoria with medications.

Xanthe Kilzer, resident of Ripton and employee at Mary Hogan provided a follow up comment to reinforce the email she already sent to Board members. She is concerned about the reduction in behavioral consultants proposed in the FY26 budget. They provide a vital service to meet the needs of both students and teachers in classrooms disrupted by students who may have developmental disabilities, trauma-related behavioral issues or lagging skills in behavioral self-regulation. She highlighted the concern as an equity issue -- each time a disregulated child disrupts a classroom, it has an impact on the broader learning environment. The Behavioral consultant positions are vital to help address the issue to improve learning access for all kids. She asked the Board to consider the school as a whole when it considers the proposed budget. When behavioral consultants support one student, they support all students.

Andrea Way, Middlebury resident and teacher at Bridport spoke out to express concern about the proposed staffing cuts in the FY26 budget. Equity does not mean that everyone should get the same thing. 15 students in one classroom is not the same as 15 students in another. The board should consider students who are on 504 plans, ESTs or IEPs. Teachers in small rural schools have several students with plans in their classrooms, making it especially challenging to deliver the curriculum. She believes that access to services will be reduced with the proposed budget. She asked the Board to please see schools as individual as our students.

C. Recommendation to Approve Minutes of 12/16/2024 Suzanne Buck 5 min

Motion to approve the minutes of December 16, 2024.

Move: Jamie McCallum Second: Laura Harthan Status: Passed

D. Approve ACSD Bills James Malcolm 5 min

James Malcolm reported the ACSD bills that have been recently read by Jason Chance and himself:

General Fund: \$1,520,241.86 (Note: roughly \$165K of this is for student transportation; and about

\$186K of this is for teacher retirement)

Payroll: \$740, 502.17

Payroll: \$258,610.78

All questions about the bills were sufficiently answered.

Motion to approve payment of ACSD bills as presented.

Move: James Malcolm Second: Ellie Romp Status: Passed

E. Report of Student Representatives

Navah Glikman 5 min  
Sophia Lawton

Navah Glikman reported that MUHS students are back from break and getting back into a rhythm. The semester will be ending soon, so many students will be adjusting to new schedules as their semester classes are ending.

Steve Orzech asked how MUHS students have liked the new schedule structure at MUHS. Navah reported that many have welcomed the changes and flexibility, especially upperclassman. Some have complained about having clubs and activities in the early morning, but overall the reception has been positive.

F. Report of Superintendent

Wendy Baker 45 min

1. Action: Personnel Appointments and Resignations

- a. Accept resignation of Cathy Farman, ACP Middle School Principal, 1.0 FTE, Effective 6/30/2025

Wendy Baker presented one personnel action for board approval, and explained that the resignation of Cathy Farman from the ACP Principal position will be effective in June 2025. Cathy was aware that her position was sunseting due to the end of the consortium between ACSD and other Addison County school districts and chose to submit a resignation. Note: The ACP was developed as a partnership to provide specialized instructional opportunities for high-need special education students, but since the other districts have discontinued their involvement, ACSD has been left alone with the expenses. The FY26 budget restructures how those services will be provided to our highest need students.

Note: Laura Harthan abstained from voting.

Motion to accept the resignation of Cathy Farman as the ACP Middle School Principal, 1.0 FTE, effective June 30, 2025.

Move: Jamie McCallum Second: Tricia Allen Status: Passed

2. Budget Presentation #5 - Draft Budget FY26

Wendy Baker provided introduction to the final FY26 budget presentation. Slides can be found

at: <https://resources.finalsite.net/images/v1736190375/acsdvtorg/khm1opjwezarkae79hze/Jan6ACSDBudgetPresentation.pdf>

She grounded the proposed budget in the following context: Equitable distribution of resources across the District; Staying within a feasibility target of no more than 2% increase in education spending (and within the state's spending threshold); and Budgeting in service to the Board's Strategic Plan goals. The District's administrators prepared by taking training in equity-based financial management, aiming for a zero-based budget strategy (e.g.,

removing all the furniture and putting back only what is needed), and reorganizing the budget into 7 expense-type funding blocks to provide more transparency with how the District's money is being spent. Highlights:

Attention to Data & Policy:

- Uniform implementation of D^ Class size policy and comparable staff-to-student ratios (Policy D4) to support more equitable resource allocation (Policy C29)
- Alignment with statewide focus on affordability
- Resource allocation grounded in state and local student performance data

Staff & Community Feedback:

- Staff input in Spring 2024
- Community conversations and input survey in Fall 2024
- Staff Q&A and additional community Q&A sessions in January 2025

How the Strategic Plan shows up in the proposed FY26 budget (these targets informed the investments):

**BELONGING**

- New Director of Equity, Inclusion & Restorative Practice (split from Nicole Carter's position) will bring practice to inclusion work and coordinate with Director of Teaching & Learning to embed this work into the curriculum
- Student Response Coordinators (modeled after Mike Dudek's work at Mary Hogan School) will be placed at all 3 Middlebury Schools to lead prevention and response efforts for identity-based harm, and will provide support & leadership for rural elementary schools
- Create and maintain student conduct databases for consistent response across the District

**ACCESS**

- Equity supports related to student performance data (resources invested where need is demonstrated)
- New budget block to ensure equitable student opportunities across the district
- Increase Health FTE for MUMS and MUHS to enable implementation of new Wellness Policy

**SUCCESS**

- Investment in classrooms: embedded math & literacy instructional specialists in K-8
- Additional FTE to develop common local assessments & data systems (to enable closer tracking of student performance), at least a 3-year investment

New Investments: \$2.2M in 21.2 New and Reimagined FTE

Sunsetting Positions and Structures from Blocks 3 (General Ed) & 5 (Student Services): 30.6 FTE, but most repurposed for other investment, so net loss of 9.4 FTE. See Slides 10 & 11 for details on positions.

Takeaways:

1. Prioritizes student experience and success based on data (Principal budget requests reflect strategies designed to meet data-based student success needs)
2. Invests in a high-quality licensed educator workforce (Strategic reinvestment of some cost savings to support Strategic Plan implementation; prioritizing universal instruction over academic recovery)
3. Provides Financial Transparency and Sustainability (Creates the budget architecture to meet the Strategic Plan; Lowers taxes in every ACSD town; results in \$1500 below the state spending threshold; class size average is 15 students for K-5)

Matt Corrente then provided a detailed review of the budget specifics, including calculation of tax rates. Slides can be found at: <https://resources.finalsite.net/images/v1736189360/acsdvtorg/zqy5lscryaricuff5nz/FY26BudgetDraft10.pdf>. Highlights:

Total budget: \$51.6 Million divided into 7 blocks:

1. Board & Administration
2. Tuition for UPK and PAHCC
3. Federal, State & Policy-required personnel for enrollment-based general education
4. Supplies & Services
5. Student Services (intervention, support & special education)
6. Student Opportunity Funds
7. Equity Investments specifically made to meet Strategic Plan targets

More Details:

Block 3 Enrollment-based Direct instruction: \$7419/pupil + Professional Development & Curriculum \$436/pupil = \$7855/pupil total.

See Slide 7 for Small School summaries of staffing, enrollment and class sizes. See Slide 8 for Mary Hogan & comparison with rural schools. See Slide 9 for Positions reductions and creations in Block 3.

Block 5 Student Services and IDEA expenses: \$3949/pupil total.

See Slides 11 & 12 for summary of Block 5 expenses and positions.

Block 6 Student Opportunities -- included additional investment to balance student access (e.g., Keewaydin) across the District.

Supplemental music \$47/pupil; Athletics \$442/pupil; Co-Curriculars \$57/pupil; Athletic & Co-Curricular Travel \$52/pupil; Field Trips \$7/pupil; KEEC (5th grade) \$13/pupil; and IB fees \$24/pupil ---->> Total to \$643/pupil

Block 7 Equity Investments -- includes additional spending to advance toward Strategic Plan/Equity Goals.

Instructional specialists (mostly math) \$351/pupil; MUHS Flexible Pathways (to improve grad rates) \$72/pupil; Academic Interventionists \$256/pupil; Professional Development & Data Services \$37/pupil; Summer & After School Programming \$22/pupil -->> Total to \$737/pupil

SUMMARY (See Slide 20):

Block 1: \$10,410,785 or \$3804/pupil

Block 2: \$ 2,317,709 or \$ 847/pupil

Block 3: \$21,499,971 or \$7855/pupil

Block 4: \$ 1,413,857 or \$ 517/pupil

Block 5: \$10,808,849 or \$3949/pupil

Block 6: \$ 1,759,590 or \$ 644/pupil

Block 7: \$ 2,108,165 or \$ 770/pupil

Total: \$50,318,926 or \$18,385/LTWADM

See Slides 22-24 for Per Pupil Local Education Spending for comparison with State Spending Threshold. ACSD's per/pupil local education spending is \$14,370.08. The State

Spending Threshold is \$15,926.00 -->> ACSD meets the threshold by \$1500.00

See Slide 26 for Town Tax Rate Projections:

Bridport: \$1.03 (-51%)

Cornwall: \$1.91 (-10%)

Middlebury: \$1.57 (-19%)

Ripton: \$1.81 (-12%)

Salisbury: \$1.14 (-48%)

Shoreham: \$1.14 (-47%)

Weybridge: \$1.68 (-14%)

Board Questions/Observations:

Steve Orzech asked some clarifying questions about the net loss of positions and noted that he hopes this puts the concerns about IB expenses to rest. Dr. Baker indicated that Matt Corrente had been able to secure reduced per school IB fees due to the District's configuration. Dr. Baker hopes to take advantage of the student opportunities afforded by being part of the IB community.

Mary Heather Noble asked Dr. Baker to explain how the budget supports kids with high academic needs, particularly since community input prioritized academic support. Dr. Baker responded that the budget invests in strengthening classroom instruction with instructional specialists to place more emphasis on supported universal tier I instruction instead of so much on academic recovery. This will augment existing teacher work. The investment in assessment and data systems will also provide parents with more meaningful and frequent feedback on how their students are performing.

Ellen Whelan-Wuest noted the importance of the projected tax rate chart, especially as compared to that from the FY25 budget. This will be an important thing to emphasize in voter outreach. Dr. Baker reminded the Board that the figures are based on what is known to date, and that ACSD can only control its spending, and the tax rates are determined by other state-controlled factors.

Joanna Doria asked about Block 7, and how Title funding is spent -- how does this budget demonstrate that Title funds are being spent appropriately? Courtney Krahn responded that the Title grants are very closely regulated, and that grant reporting requires demonstration of compliance with spending restrictions. Dr. Baker and Courtney both noted the benefit of the budget's block structure so that you can see baseline enrollment-based spending that is supplemented by student support and Title grant spending.

Steve Orzech also noted that many of the sunseting positions are positions the District has not been able to fill -- in the past, most of this becomes surplus that gets transferred to the Capital Reserve Fund. The Board should be aware that this will result in less available money for facilities projects.

Ellie Romp asked Dr. Baker if there wasn't a state spending threshold or the 2% feasibility limitation, what would she like to have been able to add to the FY26 budget? Dr. Baker responded that she feels the Block 6 Student Opportunities spending feels light to her, and that there is more the District could be offering to its students.

James Malcolm offered compliments to Dr. Baker and the administrative team for their hard work on the budget and their thorough knowledge of all the details.

Jamie McCallum mentioned some of the comments he's been hearing in the community, particularly around cutting of positions. He noted that these are positions that do good work -- what are the challenges that will come up with those losses? Dr. Baker acknowledged some of the challenges, but also noted the effort to streamline some student services through investing in licensed & trained coordinator positions instead of unlicensed paraprofessionals. She also reminded the Board that 11.5 of those positions to be cut are currently vacant.

Ellen Whelan-Wuest observed that the proposed budget represents a focus on how the money will be spent, and suggested that if Student Performance is driving the shift, the Board should strongly consider creating a Committee on Academic Performance. She also asked ACSD Principals how the budget process felt to them. Several responded that they appreciated the focus on student performance data, as well as the transparency of the different blocks and where the funding comes from. It is helpful to have the Block 3 structure to compare resource distribution across the District. Others noted that the process fostered powerful conversations, but that it has also been difficult because any cuts can create uncertainty and put stress on educators.

## G. Report of the Vice Chair

Suzanne Buck 5 min

### 1. Superintendent Evaluation Timeline & Process Update

Suzanne Buck provided the Board with dates and details for completion of the Superintendent Evaluation for Dr. Baker in accordance with the Board-approved evaluation process:

Dr. Baker will provide her self-evaluation materials to the Board by January 27, 2025. The Executive Committee will share the evaluation survey tool for board member input -- input will be due by February 7, 2025 (no extensions).

The Executive Committee will compile board member input into a written report and will meet on February 17, 2025 to finalize the draft. The draft will be shared with Board members shortly thereafter for their review.

The February 24, 2025 regularly scheduled full board meeting will be dedicated to a conversation between Dr. Baker and board members about the evaluation, adjusting goals, and adjusting the evaluation process as needed.

### 2. January Meeting Schedule

Suzanne Buck reviewed the January meeting schedule for the board:

January 9th at 6:30 p.m. -- virtual public meeting/budget Q&A session

January 13th at 6:30 p.m. -- regularly scheduled board meeting to approve budget & warnings. Board photo will also be taken then for the budget book.

January 17th at 5:00 p.m. -- if needed, a special hybrid board meeting to approve any

adjustments to the FY26 budget and warning language. The Executive Committee recommended holding this meeting earlier, since it is the beginning of a holiday weekend.

## H. Report of the Board

10 min

### 1. Communications & Engagement

Tricia Allen

Tricia Allen provided an update on communications & engagement efforts around the FY26 budget. There is the virtual Q&A meeting scheduled for January 9th at 6:30 p.m. Dr. Baker and team will be compiling some slides from the latest budget presentation to provide information as needed, but they are also planning to be fluid and allow for Q&A to flow as needed.

Chip Malcom noted that the January 9th meeting is different than the budget presentation to be held at the Annual Meeting on February 25th. The January 9th opportunity affords more input since it is happening prior to Board approval, and the February 25th presentation will be the board-approved budget.

Tricia also noted that the C&E Committee is meeting on January 7th to discuss additional budget outreach efforts, including the possibility of securing a spot on MCTV to discuss the FY budget.

#### a. Budget Public Engagement Update

Dr. Baker gave a slide presentation to provide context for the proposed FY26 budget and tie it back to the Strategic Plan. She noted the parameters the Board had set before the budgeting process began: a focus on equitable distribution of resources across the district, a feasibility target of no more than 2% increase in education spending, and spending in support of the Strategic Plan goals. The Administration prepared for the process with training equity-based financial management, approaching with a zero-based budget strategy, and restructuring the budget into 7 expense-type funding blocks to provide transparency in how the district's money is being spent. Slides are available at

Other highlights:

Attention to Data & Policy:

- Uniform implementation of the D6 class size policy and comparable staff-to-student ratio (Policy D4) to support equitable resource allocation (Policy C29)
- Alignment with statewide focus on affordability.
- Resource distribution based on state & local student performance data.

Staff & Community Feedback:

- Staff input gathered in Spring 2024
- Community conversations & survey in Fall 2024
- Staff Q&A and community Q&A in January 2025

How the Strategic Plan shows up in the FY26 Budget:

**BELONGING**

- New Director of Equity, Inclusion & Restorative Practices (position split from Nicole Carter's position) will spearhead this effort and work with Director of Teaching & Learning to embed this work into the curriculum
- Student Response Coordinators (modeled after Mike Dudek's current work at Mary Hogan) at all 3 Middlebury schools to prevent and address identity-based harm, and will provide expertise and support to the rural elementary schools
- Create and maintain District-wide student conduct database



## ACCESS

- Equity supports related to student performance data
- Organizing budget into new block structure to

## 2. Policy Committee

Jamie McCallum

### a. First Read: D6 Class Size

Suzanne Buck informed the Board that the earliest the policy can return to the board agenda for the second read would be for the Feb 10th board meeting (since it needs to be warned 10 days before the next board meeting, which is too late for the January 13th meeting and the January 27th meeting has been cancelled).

Jamie McCallum presented the updated version of the revisions to Policy D6 -- Class Size, with additional highlighted language in the Policy Contingencies to address board member concerns about equity and transportation. He shared his own observation about how the current policy is used in the budgeting process and how important it is. He acknowledged some of the imperfections of the proposed changes, but emphasized how it solves critical problems.

James Malcom noted that the policy most importantly equips the Superintendent with the means to address circumstances when class sizes do not comply with the minimum number of students. Jason Chance reported that he attended the last Policy Committee meeting due to his equity concerns, and felt comfortable with the proposed revisions and Dr. Baker's ability to implement it in an equitable manner. Jamie McCallum stated that he would clean up the draft with the latest revisions for the second and final read in February.

Mary Heather acknowledged the importance of how the revisions provide a process for the Superintendent to address noncompliance with minimum class size numbers, but again advocated for changing the minimum class size number from 10 students to 12 students. She said she could propose this as a motion to amend in the second read if necessary, and justified her position by noting that: 12 is the minimum number of students needed to report student proficiency data in a grade cohort; 12 student classrooms are more financially sustainable; setting the minimum class size at 12 students establishes the foundation for data-driven decision making in the Board's long-term problem solving effort with school attendance boundaries -- all of which aligns with the ACSD Strategic Plan. She does not believe there is sufficient pedagogical reason to keep the minimum class size at 10 students (whether for single grade or split grade classrooms), and that there is good reason to set it at 12 students.

Dr. Baker asked for clarification, noting that only Mary Hogan School and 4 single-grade classrooms in Cornwall currently meet the 12 student minimum to report student proficiency data. Achieving what Mary Heather is requesting for data-reporting purposes would not be possible without reconfiguring the schools -- which the Policy Committee may be tackling next.

Ellen Whelan-Wuest expressed concern about a 12 student minimum because there are some schools where no grade has 12 students. She also said that the Committee did discuss and consider this. She noted that the next step will be big thinking about school configuration and that the Board needs to decide how it will engage in that process. She

is concerned that changing the minimum class size to 12 now would trigger Policy D6-related movement of students around the district because almost none of the rural schools have grade cohorts that large. She worries that it would potentially disrupt having a meaningful process for this larger conversation. She acknowledged the validity of setting that minimum class size as a long term goal, but does not support changing it in the policy now.

Steve Orzech noted that consolidation is a way to accomplish achieving 12-student single grade classrooms, which the Board refuses to discuss. However, while he agrees with Mary Heather about moving toward 12-student classrooms, he also noted the need to approve a policy that solves the immediate problem. We cannot ignore a good solution because it is not perfect.

Jason Chance asked where the 10-student minimum came from, or what research it is based upon. Dr. Baker and Courtney Krahn responded that the 10-student minimum is based on Education Quality Standards to provide a base standard of diverse perspectives in a classroom, but is not grounded in pedagogical research. Jamie McCallum asked about the citation that is provided in the policy -- Dr. Baker confirmed that it is the EQS, a "common-sense" standard that was set at the time to provide enough students to support group work and activities in a least-restricted learning environment.

Ellie Romp questioned saying the 10-student minimum is not research based while simultaneously stating that classrooms smaller than 10 significantly compromises the group aspect of the learning environment. She suggested finding research to support a minimum number, especially if the District will be moving students or closing classrooms based on it. Suzanne Buck weighed in, noting that will be difficult to find research to support a minimum number. She also said that Boards build their budgets around supporting student achievement and being able to demonstrate that accomplishment, and ACS D has not been able to do that for all of its schools. Ellie followed up and noted that if the class minimum standard is not research-based, the District should not characterize it as best-practice. Dr. Baker noted that the benefit of the draft changes to Policy D6 is that it provides the Superintendent some professional discretion in determining class sizes, so that the administrators have some flexibility in determining the best solution when these circumstances arise.

Mary Heather clarified her support for a minimum 12-student classroom in Policy D6, again noting that it is more financially sustainable and also positions the Board to move toward reporting student performance data when it tackles school attendance boundaries/reconfiguration. She is not advocating this as a means to trigger school consolidation or closure at this time; she agrees with Ellen's point about reconfiguration needing to be a broader intentional process.

Jamie McCallum reiterated Ellen's point about the Policy Committee's broader work coming next, and also noted that Policy D6 can be amended later -- it is not necessary to address this issue now "while it's open." The discussion about class size, whether being research-based or simply meeting the District's needs can come later as part of the larger conversation about the future of the District. Suzanne Buck agreed -- the Board can amend Policy D6 at any time.

Joanna Doria asked for clarity around the timeline for implementing the policy. Dr. Baker stated that the District Office would quickly create a procedure as soon as the Board approves the D6 policy, and is prepared to do so. Laura Harthan recalled that the deadline given to the Policy Committee to get this work done was February, so we are

on schedule. Jamie asked about moving forward from there and specifically what that looks like for Ripton. Dr. Baker noted that she would likely be asking ACSD families about whether there is enough interest in moving students to Ripton Elementary in early March so that they can determine whether the school would have enough a K/1 students to comply with the minimum class size. Joanna asked about the proposed budget, which only provides for 2 Ripton classroom teachers. If there are enough students interested in moving to a Ripton K/1 classroom, will the District hire another teacher? Dr. Baker noted that the budget provides enough resources for that scenario in both Ripton and Cornwall.

I. Second Public Comment Period

10 min

Public comments are encouraged and welcome at each regular board meeting during the period designated for public comment. Comments are limited to three minutes per person. Citizens will be called to make their statement by the board chair. Public comments regarding personnel, students or legal matters will not be heard by the Board.

No public comment.

J. Board Reflection

Suzanne Buck 5 min

Steve Orzech noted that there are conspiracy theories fueling some of the public comments regarding gender dysphoria, falsely assuming that schools are actually administering anti-puberty medications to transgender children. Dr. Baker assured that no such activity is happening or even being discussed in the schools.

Jamie McCallum offered his observation that the budget process has felt very good to him, and that it was helpful to hear feedback from the principals about how they were involved in the process. He offered gratitude for all involved.

Suzanne Buck thanked board members for the great conversations and for everyone's hard work and patience through the process. She noted how difficult it is to consider a budget that eliminates positions and acknowledged the impact of this work on ACSD employees.

K. Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 9:50 p.m.

Motion to adjourn.

Move: Mary Heather Noble Second: Jamie McCallum Status: Passed

Total Meeting Time: 1h 45m

Public comments are encouraged and welcome at each regular board meeting during the period designated for public comment. Comments are limited to three minutes per person. Citizens will be called to make their statement by the board chair. Public comments regarding personnel, students or legal matters will not be heard by the Board.