

Board of Education Regular Meeting (Tuesday, December 9, 2025)*Generated by Kimberly Grilli on Friday, December 12, 2025***Members present**

LaToya Dowdell-Burger, Libby Gray, Kathleen Walsh, Seth Bower, John Kershner

Meeting called to order at 7:13 PM**A. Opening Items**

Procedural: 1. Pledge of Allegiance

Discussion: 2. Five Principles of Cruiser PLC

Procedural: 3. Roll Call - All present

Discussion: 4. Review of Belief Statement and Board Norms

B. Agenda Approval

Action 2025-304: 1. Adoption of Meeting Agenda

Move that the Board of Education approve the agenda.

Motion by Libby Gray, second by LaToya Dowdell-Burger.

Final Resolution: Motion Carries

Yes: LaToya Dowdell-Burger, Libby Gray, Seth Bower

No: Kathleen Walsh, John Kershner

Action 2025-305: 2. Move that the Board of Education remove Mr. Kershner and Ms. Walsh censures.

Discussion:

- Ms. Walsh - Just received board packet today. Did not have the 48 hours to review. Does not satisfy the basic fairness of our process.
- Mr. Kershner - My attorney is conflicted out and cannot be here. The agenda process here looks more like an ambush. There's a long-standing practice that a draft agenda is circulated internally to the board members before the final public agenda is posted on the internal draft. It did not appear on that draft. It only appeared later and here it is right now. So it does not satisfy the basic fairness of our process. I would add that we had an executive session which I vehemently opposed and with which Kathy refused to attend and in that I requested that if any further action be taken that I be given an opportunity for a public hearing with my representation to be there.
- Mr. Bower - I did try to hold a special meeting regarding this and I didn't get your availability, Mr. Kershner. Mrs. Walsh was unavailable. We were unable to have the meeting. but I'd also like to Ask Mr. Grube, when was the agenda sent out via mail and via email, please.
- Mr. Grube - It was published last Thursday afternoon and hard copies were prepared and mailed Thursday afternoon.

Motion by John Kershner, second by Kathleen Walsh.

Motion Fails

Yes: Kathleen Walsh, John Kershner

No: LaToya Dowdell-Burger, Libby Gray, Seth Bower

Action 2025-306: 3. Move that the Board of Education approve a 20 min recess

Motion by John Kershner, second by Kathleen Walsh.

Final Resolution: Motion Fails

Yes: Kathleen Walsh, John Kershner

No: LaToya Dowdell-Burger, Libby Gray, Seth Bower

Action 2025-307: 4. Move that the Board of Education approve the agenda. Wait until Adoption of Meeting agenda then go to 20 min recess.

Motion by Libby Gray, second by LaToya Dowdell-Burger.

Final Resolution: Motion Carries

Yes: LaToya Dowdell-Burger, Libby Gray, Kathleen Walsh, Seth Bower, John Kershner

Action 2025-308: 5. Move that the Board of Education remove the Treasurer Eval (executive session) from the agenda.

Discussion:

- Ms. Walsh - I did not have 48 hours to review. Policy - AFB-A and AFB. Several required steps weren't followed. Did not receive the agenda or supporting materials in advance, had little notice that an evaluation was already happening, and was sent a large number of evaluation documents only the night before the meeting, making it impossible to review them properly. In addition, individual board members requested evaluation materials without board approval, the board president went beyond authorized role, and the required structured evaluation process outlined in board policy was not followed.

- Ms. Gray - The evaluation process is a two meeting process. The first one which would be tonight is one where the superintendent and the treasurer bring their responses to their prior evaluation with how they reached their goals. I've been on the board for 12 years. It's not proper to have new board members evaluate the prior year superintendent when they have not been a part of the board at that time. That's why it's important that the board does their evaluation now before the end of our terms.
- Mr. Kershner - It is not normal to do two evaluations. The next time you do the board input, that should be a much longer process.
- Ms. Dowdell-Burger - This is not a one night event. It is a two night event. The board president didn't just go out. It is his job to coordinate getting the information for the board to then look at. It's never been a group effort. That's why you have a president, to get the information to set the agenda, to get things moving.

Motion by Kathleen Walsh, second by John Kershner.

Final Resolution: Motion Fails

Yes: Kathleen Walsh, John Kershner

No: LaToya Dowdell-Burger, Libby Gray, Seth Bower

Action 2025-309: 6. Move that the Board of Education approve the agenda. Call to question - Fails because not a 2/3 approve.

Motion by LaToya Dowdell-Burger, second by Seth Bower.

Final Resolution: Motion Fails

Yes: LaToya Dowdell-Burger, Libby Gray, Seth Bower

No: Kathleen Walsh, John Kershner

Action 2025-310: 7. Move that the Board of Education remove the Supt Eval (executive session) removed from the agenda.

Discussion:

- Ms. Walsh - I did not have 48 hours to review. Policy - AFB-A and AFB. Several required steps weren't followed. Did not receive the agenda or supporting materials in advance, had little notice that an evaluation was already happening, and was sent a large number of evaluation documents only the night before the meeting, making it impossible to review them properly. In addition, individual board members requested evaluation materials without board approval, the board president went beyond authorized role, and the required structured evaluation process outlined in board policy was not followed.
- Ms. Gray - The evaluation process is a two meeting process. The first one which would be tonight is one where the superintendent and the treasurer bring their responses to their prior evaluation with how they reached their goals. I've been on the board for 12 years. It's not proper to have new board members evaluate the prior year superintendent when they have not been a part of the board at that time. That's why it's important that the board does their evaluation now before the end of our terms.
- Mr. Kershner - It is not normal to do two evaluations. The next time you do the board input, that should be a much longer process.
- Ms. Dowdell-Burger - This is not a one night event. It is a two night event. The board president didn't just go out. It is his job to coordinate getting the information for the board to then look at. It's never been a group effort. That's why you have a president, to get the information to set the agenda, to get things moving.

Motion by Kathleen Walsh, second by John Kershner.

Final Resolution: Motion Fails

Yes: Kathleen Walsh, John Kershner

No: LaToya Dowdell-Burger, Libby Gray, Seth Bower

Action 2025-311: 8. Move that the Board of Education approve to remove all the Board policies from the agenda.

Discussion:

- Ms. Walsh - I didn't have a board packet and there's like a bunch of policies to read. How am I supposed to do this? There are 36 policies. I wasn't at the meeting but did listen and the superintendent said he would send a document. Before Thanksgiving there was no document sent, no changes. So there's no way I can go through all of these changes. At the November meeting there was only 6 of the 30 plus policies discussed by the board and we have a responsibilities to discuss all the policies.
- Mr. Grube - Mrs. Walsh, you had the policies almost a month before the previous meeting. We discussed any questions that were available. The board was going to respond to me by the end of business on Tuesday if there were any additional changes to the items that we addressed. There was a question for me to check with OSBA, which I did. I followed up with OSBA's response. I didn't receive any other feedback. So the few changes we made at the last board meeting were the policies that were revised and sent back out.

Motion by Kathleen Walsh, second by John Kershner.

Final Resolution: Motion Fails

Yes: Kathleen Walsh

No: LaToya Dowdell-Burger, Libby Gray, Seth Bower, John Kershner

Action 2025-312: 9. Move that the Board of Education approve to remove F4 and F5 (Censures from the agenda)

Motion by John Kershner, second by Kathleen Walsh.

Final Resolution: Motion Fails

Yes: Kathleen Walsh, John Kershner

No: LaToya Dowdell-Burger, Libby Gray, Seth Bower

C. Call to Order**D. Public Participation**

Information: 1. Guidelines for Public Participation - Elizabeth Simcox and Brian Barnwell - Mr. Barnwell (Attorney) - we are here to address the censures. I work as an attorney on Transparency and Open meeting rights. The Board has hired an investigator and State law does not allow this. Board members, by allowing the censures can tie up the new Board. Board members have 1st amendment rights and protected rights. It will be a civil rights lawsuit against the Board. We need to focus on the students. Next year, Board can turn the page and start fresh. Reject these resolutions. Zach Sweeney - I am here as a parent of a student at Dunloe. Child has skipped days. We should have been notified of the absences and missing school. ORC states on an unexcused absence the school should have called the parents. Notifications should have been sent out to parents. Please review this and plan a backup plan, maybe a text or email could be sent. My number was opted out of the system and I should not have done that. I think a parent should not have option to opt out. New Board member, Ashley Zimmer is sick, but would like to say this - I am against the censure of the two Board members. I do not see where the Board approved counsel for these censures. We need to be productive. Also, new Board members should have been asked about date for Organizational Meeting and Pro-tem President.

E. Recognitions and Presentations

Recognition: 1. Recognize Seth Bower and Libby Gray - Board Members Transitioning Off of Board

F. Board Items

Action 2025-313: 1. Approve the Date and Time of Organizational Meeting on January 13, 2026

The Groveport Madison Schools Board of Education is required to establish the date and time of the 2026 Organizational Meeting and elect a pro-tem chairperson of the meeting. The suggested date is Tuesday, January 13, 2026 at 6:30 pm at the Groveport Madison Schools District Service Center and to appoint Kathleen Walsh as Chairperson of the meeting. The regular 2026 School Board meeting will begin at 7 pm.

Motion by Seth Bower, second by LaToya Dowdell-Burger.

Final Resolution: Motion Carries

Yes: LaToya Dowdell-Burger, Libby Gray, Kathleen Walsh, Seth Bower, John Kershner

Action 2025-314: 2. Membership in Legal Assistance Fund

It is recommended that the Groveport Madison Schools Board of Education join the Ohio School Boards Association Legal Assistance Fund at a cost of \$250. (Resolution language is below).

Whereas, the Groveport Madison Schools Board of Education wishes to support the efforts of other boards of education to obtain favorable decisions and,

Whereas, the Ohio School Boards Association Legal Assistance Fund has been established for this purpose.

Therefore, the Board hereby resolves to participate in the OSBA LAF for calendar year 2026 and directs the Treasurer to pay to the LAF \$250.00 [Pursuant to R.C. Section 3313.17]

Motion by Libby Gray, second by LaToya Dowdell-Burger.

Final Resolution: Motion Carries

Yes: LaToya Dowdell-Burger, Libby Gray, Seth Bower, John Kershner

Abstain: Kathleen Walsh

Action 2025-315, Discussion: 3. Board Policy Review-Second Read

The Board recommends approval of 2nd read of Board Policy.

Discussion: Ms. Walsh had questions on the board policies and the rest of the board answered her questions.

Motion by Libby Gray, second by John Kershner.

Final Resolution: Motion Carries

Yes: LaToya Dowdell-Burger, Libby Gray, Seth Bower, John Kershner

Abstain: Kathleen Walsh

Action 2025-316: 4. Approve Censure Resolution-Kershner - John is represented by counsel and the Board should have went through his attorney. His response and he read the letter from Freeman, Mathis and Gary law firm.

The Groveport Madison Schools Board of Education approves the Censure Resolution for Board Member Kershner.

Discussion:

- Mr. Kershner -

As I've said before, this district is represented by counsel, and it is troubling that this board chose to communicate directly with me instead of through my attorney. That is a basic legal principle. The fact that a legal response prepared by Freeman, Mathis & Gary was never shared with this board—despite being sent to Kegler Brown a long time ago—shows a serious breakdown in process and communication.

The First Amendment clearly protects the right of elected officials to speak freely on matters of government policy. This principle goes back to James Madison and has been reinforced many times by the U.S. Supreme Court, including cases such as *Bond v. Floyd*, *Republican Party of Minnesota v. White*, and *Houston Community College v. Wilson*. Open discussion of government affairs is a core part of representative democracy.

The board's policies that discourage or prohibit public criticism of the superintendent or require members to "speak with one voice" are unconstitutional. These policies chill protected speech, act as prior restraints, and do not meet strict scrutiny standards. As a governmental body, the BOE cannot lawfully restrict First Amendment rights without a compelling justification, and none exists here.

Elected officials are not the same as ordinary government employees. Case law makes clear that board members do not give up their First Amendment rights by holding office. The public is the true employer of an elected official, and any attempt to regulate their speech to constituents must meet the highest legal standard, which these policies fail to do. Voters have an absolute right to know where their elected representatives stand on issues affecting the district.

Disagreement and debate among board members are not a problem—they are expected and healthy. Courts have long recognized that representatives must be given wide latitude to express their views so the public can be fully informed. Attempts to censure or punish a board member for protected speech can amount to First Amendment retaliation. Even actions short of removal may qualify as adverse if they would discourage a person of ordinary firmness from speaking freely. The investigator's recommendations, taken as a whole, risk chilling speech and discouraging open participation by board members.

For nearly two years, I have formally requested that all notices, agendas, and board materials be mailed to my home because electronic postings have repeatedly changed after publication. These concerns are not speculative—they were personally witnessed and documented by legal counsel. Proceeding with punitive action that was not properly noticed, mailed, or listed on the agenda violates Ohio law and basic due process requirements.

The executive session held to discuss a "public official" was improper, as that term does not apply to me under Ohio law. At the same time, my legal counsel has been prevented from appearing due to unilateral actions taken by the board president without board authorization. This has denied me a fair opportunity to be represented and further undermines the integrity of the process.

The investigation into a sitting board member was initiated without board approval, without proper funding certification, and outside established district policies. The superintendent does not have authority to investigate elected officials, and no formal board resolution authorized this investigation. As a result, the investigation was improper and legally void. Outside legal counsel and the investigator benefited financially from an engagement that lacked proper authorization. As legal professionals, they had a duty to confirm that their work was lawful and properly approved. Instead, the investigation expanded beyond its original scope, raising serious concerns about conflicts of interest and misuse of public funds.

The recommendation to change the oath of office to require loyalty to board policy shows a misunderstanding of both statutory and constitutional law. Ohio law clearly sets the oath of office, and local boards do not have authority to alter it. Forcing allegiance to board policy also raises serious First Amendment concerns, further undermining the credibility of the investigative report.

This investigation was unauthorized, improperly funded, constitutionally flawed, and affected by conflicts of interest. The board should stop relying on the report, refer the matter to the prosecutor and auditor, preserve all related records, reaffirm that only the legislature can change the oath of office, and review the conduct of outside counsel and the investigator.

- Ms. Gray - I want to first make a public apology to the employees who were part of this complaint. The complaint was filed in November of 2024, and it has taken over a year for the investigation to happen. My personal opinion is that it felt like the process was dragged out for specific reasons. It is really sad that it has taken this long for a report to be given to us because interviews were delayed or cancelled.

All I can say is that in the private sector, this would not happen this slowly. It would have been handled. If there were 25 violations, it would not have gone that far. It is really sad that our employees have had to go through this and deal with it day-to-day, coming to work every day knowing the problems exist because of the board. This should not happen. This is not the way a district should be run.

It saddens me that board members feel they can be involved in day-to-day operations, get into the weeds, and publicly comment negatively about employees. We are supposed to be lifting up our district, not tearing it down. Everything the public sees about our district is negativity, and because of that we cannot celebrate our positives. We cannot have a board meeting without someone being snarky. I hope going forward that the new board acts professionally.

Motion by Libby Gray, second by LaToya Dowdell-Burger.

Final Resolution: Motion Carries

Yes: LaToya Dowdell-Burger, Libby Gray, Seth Bower

No: Kathleen Walsh, John Kershner

Action 2025-317: 5. Approve Censure Resolution-Walsh

The Groveport Madison Schools Board of Education approves the Censure Resolution for Board Member Walsh. Ms Walsh refuses to vote because it is invalid and violates her rights as an elected official.

Discussion:

- Ms. Walsh -

Questions focus on whether the investigation was properly authorized and documented:

- Did the board ever vote to authorize an investigation of a board member?
- Where is the resolution authorizing outside counsel or an investigator?
- Who approved the investigator's engagement letter, scope of work, and contract?
- Does any board member possess a copy of the investigator contract?
- Questions addressing whether the district followed its own complaint and investigation policies:
- Which compliance officer received the complaint, and how was it routed?
- Who initiated the informal complaint process required by policy?
- Where is the written formal complaint with required elements (date, location, witnesses, remedy)?
- Was written notice of allegations provided?

- Was the right to submit a written response within five business days provided?
- Was an informal resolution opportunity offered as required?
- Was the policy applicable to board members, especially if the investigator stated it does not expressly apply?

- Questions concerning fairness and legal protections:
 - Were targeted board members deprived of legal counsel during the investigation or findings review?
 - Did counsel advise whether proceeding while a member was unrepresented creates a due process violation?
 - Is there agreement that a public hearing was required before taking action?
 - Why was a promised opportunity for legal response not provided?

- Questions about public process and openness:
 - Did the board deprive the public of the opportunity to comment or observe deliberation?
 - Were actions taken improperly in executive session?
 - Should the matter be reviewed for Open Meetings Act compliance?

- Questions focused on exposure to legal consequences:
 - Is the board aware that acting on an unauthorized investigation may be ultra vires and eliminate immunity protections?
 - Has the board received a written legal opinion addressing 14th Amendment or Section 1983 liability?
 - Has any board member consulted personal counsel regarding potential Section 1983 exposure?
 - Has insurance or indemnification coverage been confirmed for these actions?

- Questions regarding political speech and retaliation:
 - Which statements, votes, or criticisms are alleged to be unprotected speech?
 - Has the board considered whether the censure constitutes retaliation for protected political speech or dissent?
 - Does conditioning service on mandatory training constitute compelled corrective action triggering First Amendment analysis?

- Questions about ethics and impartiality:
 - Did any board member consider whether the process creates an appearance of coercion or retaliation?
 - Should members with personal conflicts or pending litigation have recused themselves?
 - Was legal guidance sought regarding conflicts of interest in taking action against litigation opponents?
 - Does the timing of the censure suggest retaliation?

- Questions related to internal governance and notice:
 - Why was the censure absent from the internal draft agenda but included on the public agenda?
 - When did board members first see the censure language or resolution?
 - Why were materials not distributed equally to all board members?

- Questions about the reliability of the investigation and conclusions:
 - Does the censure resolution misstate or exaggerate the investigator's findings?
 - If multiple allegations were not proven, why is the report presented as entirely negative?
 - Were allegations verified against emails, recordings, transcripts, or other objective evidence?
 - Did the board confirm that the investigation itself was legally conducted?

- Questions about whether all required evaluative steps were taken:
 - At what point did anyone assess whether allegations were knowingly false or malicious?
 - If policy requires a credibility and motive analysis, why proceed with censure before completing it?
 - Did the investigator or board assess whether allegations were exaggerated, misleading, or retaliatory in nature?

- Ms. Gray - Reading from the investigation report:

Mrs. Walsh had five days to submit a written response to the complaint. An extension was requested by counsel for Mrs. Walsh and was granted by me on March 7, 2025, making the response due on March 14, 2025.

On March 14, 2025, counsel requested a copy of my engagement agreement with the Board of Education in order to understand the scope of the engagement. A copy of the agreement was sent to counsel on March 19, 2025. On the same date, I communicated that if I did not hear back regarding Mrs. Walsh by March 31, 2025, I would proceed with the investigation without her participation.

To be sure, on April 2, 2025, I emailed Mrs. Walsh's counsel and asked how Mrs. Walsh would like to proceed. To date, no written response had been submitted. I also attempted to schedule an interview with Mrs. Walsh as part of the investigation. Together with the notice delivered on February 27, 2025, I provided my availability for an interview on either March 13 or March 28, 2025.

After the deadline for a written response had passed, my March 19, 2025 communication to counsel, as discussed above, indicated that I would proceed without Mrs. Walsh's participation if I did not hear back by March 31, 2025. No request for an interview was made, and no alternative dates were offered by the respondent. My investigation therefore continued without Mrs. Walsh's participation.

Nonetheless, on July 25, 2025, I offered yet another opportunity for Mrs. Walsh to be interviewed. This opportunity was accepted, and as a result, an interview with Mrs. Walsh was scheduled and held on August 1, 2025. Mrs. Walsh was represented by co-counsel and was provided the opportunity to respond to all allegations made. Mrs. Walsh's responses are reflected in the final confidential investigation report.

This demonstrates that Mrs. Walsh was provided a copy of the agreement and that her legal counsel was given multiple opportunities to present her position. Despite these opportunities, no response was submitted until the interview held on August 1, 2025.

Motion by LaToya Dowdell-Burger, second by John Kershner.

Final Resolution: Motion Carries
Yes: LaToya Dowdell-Burger, Libby Gray, Seth Bower
No: John Kershner
Abstain: Kathleen Walsh

Action 2025-318: 6. The Groveport Madison Schools Board of Education moves that prior to taking any action against Ms. Walsh that the Groveport Madison Schools Board of Education refer this action to the Auditor of State and Franklin County Prosecutor's Office to ensure compliance with the Open Meeting Acts and 1st Amendment rights and rights to a public hearing.

Motion by John Kershner, second by Kathleen Walsh.
Final Resolution: Motion Fails
Yes: Kathleen Walsh, John Kershner
No: Libby Gray, Seth Bower
Abstain: LaToya Dowdell-Burger

Action 2025-319: 7. The Groveport Madison Schools Board of Education moves the censure be withdrawn from consideration and the Board Table it indefinitely and address, whether the Board ever lawfully authorized the hiring of the Investigator Weiker, whether policy AC/ACA/ACB can be used at all as a basis to discipline an elected official, whether this Board wishes to expose the District and its members to constitutional challenges and further litigation by formally punishing protected speech. I remain fully prepared to follow the law and Ohio and US Constitution and all Board policies that are validly adopted and applied in a lawful manner.

Motion by Kathleen Walsh, second by John Kershner.
Final Resolution: Motion Fails
Yes: Kathleen Walsh, John Kershner
No: LaToya Dowdell-Burger, Libby Gray, Seth Bower

G. Superintendent's Agenda

Action 2025-320, Presentation: 1. 2025-2026 Gifted Plan - Revised to make it an action item to adopt the gifted plan 1st libby 2nd Latoya 4 ayes and Kathy abstains because she did not have the time.

Motion by Libby Gray, second by LaToya Dowdell-Burger.
Final Resolution: Motion Carries
Yes: LaToya Dowdell-Burger, Libby Gray, Seth Bower, John Kershner
Abstain: Kathleen Walsh

Action 2025-321: 2. Move to take 5 minute recess at 11:41 pm

Motion by Kathleen Walsh, second by John Kershner.
Final Resolution: Motion Carries
Yes: LaToya Dowdell-Burger, Libby Gray, Kathleen Walsh, Seth Bower, John Kershner

Action 2025-322, Discussion: 3. Department Reports - to accept the dept reports as presented
To accept Dept reports as presented

Motion by John Kershner, second by LaToya Dowdell-Burger.
Final Resolution: Motion Carries
Yes: LaToya Dowdell-Burger, Libby Gray, Kathleen Walsh, Seth Bower, John Kershner

Action 2025-323: 4. Approve Tree Trim/Removal Agreement
The Superintendent recommends that the Groveport Madison Schools Board of Education approve the Tree Trim/Removal Agreement with AEP.

Motion by Libby Gray, second by LaToya Dowdell-Burger.
Final Resolution: Motion Carries
Yes: LaToya Dowdell-Burger, Libby Gray, Kathleen Walsh, Seth Bower, John Kershner

Action 2025-324: 5. Approve Resolutions for Groveport Madison LSD-District Wide (OTS and (Lepi) and Groveport Madison LSD-District Wide (Gandee)
The Superintendent recommends that the Groveport Madison Schools Board of Education approve the Resolutions for Groveport Madison LSD-District Wide (Lepi) and Groveport Madison LSD-District Wide (Gandee)

Motion by LaToya Dowdell-Burger, second by Libby Gray.
Final Resolution: Motion Carries
Yes: LaToya Dowdell-Burger, Libby Gray, Seth Bower
No: Kathleen Walsh, John Kershner

Action 2025-325, Minutes: 6. Approve the November 11, 2025 meeting minutes
The Treasurer recommends the Groveport Madison Local Board of Education approve the minutes for the November 11, 2025 regular Board meeting.

Motion by Libby Gray, second by John Kershner.

Final Resolution: Motion Carries

Yes: LaToya Dowdell-Burger, Libby Gray, Seth Bower, John Kershner

Abstain: Kathleen Walsh

Action 2025-326: 7. Approve Certificated Personnel Items

The Superintendent recommends that the Groveport Madison Schools Board of Education approve the following Certificated Personnel Items:

Motion by LaToya Dowdell-Burger, second by Libby Gray.

Final Resolution: Motion Carries

Yes: LaToya Dowdell-Burger, Libby Gray, Kathleen Walsh, Seth Bower, John Kershner

Action 2025-327: 8. Approve Non Certificated Personnel Items

The Superintendent recommends that the Groveport Madison Schools Board of Education approve the following Non Certificated Personnel Items:

Motion by Libby Gray, second by LaToya Dowdell-Burger.

Final Resolution: Motion Carries

Yes: LaToya Dowdell-Burger, Libby Gray, Kathleen Walsh, Seth Bower, John Kershner

Action 2025-328: 9. Approve Payment-In-Lieu Transportation Reimbursement

The Superintendent recommends that the Groveport Madison Schools Board of Education approve payment-in-lieu of transportation reimbursement. The Ohio law allows for public school districts to determine the impracticality of transporting resident students attending schools not located within the district after consideration of a number of factors. Upon that determination, the school district is permitted to offer payment-in-lieu of transportation to the parent/guardian. The Transportation Department has completed studies and residents in affected areas will be offered payment-in-lieu of for the 2025-2026 school year. The initial list of families being offered payment-in-lieu-of transportation is attached as Executive Content since it lists students' names.

Motion by Libby Gray, second by John Kershner.

Final Resolution: Motion Carries

Yes: LaToya Dowdell-Burger, Libby Gray, Seth Bower, John Kershner

No: Kathleen Walsh

Motion by John Kershner, second NONE. - I move that we correct Board Docs to reflect the actual names of the schools involved. Fails due to no 2nd

Action 2025-329: 10. Approve Special Education Contracts

The Superintendent recommends that the Groveport Madison Schools Board of Education approve the Special Education contracts.

Motion by LaToya Dowdell-Burger, second by Libby Gray.

Final Resolution: Motion Carries

Yes: LaToya Dowdell-Burger, Libby Gray, Kathleen Walsh, Seth Bower, John Kershner

Action 2025-330: 11. Approve Field Trip for GMHS Cheer Team

The Superintendent recommends that the Groveport Madison Schools Board of Education approve the GMHS Cheer Team's trip to Las Vegas, Nevada.

Motion by John Kershner, second by LaToya Dowdell-Burger.

Final Resolution: Motion Carries

Yes: LaToya Dowdell-Burger, Libby Gray, Kathleen Walsh, Seth Bower, John Kershner

Action 2025-331, Discussion: 12. Hosting a PLC Conference On-Site - Make a motion to move forward with investigation of cost and having a PLC 1st libby 2nd latoya All ayes

Board makes a motion to move forward with investigation of cost and hosting a PLC.

Motion by Libby Gray, second by LaToya Dowdell-Burger.

Final Resolution: Motion Carries

Yes: LaToya Dowdell-Burger, Libby Gray, Kathleen Walsh, Seth Bower, John Kershner

H. Treasurer's Agenda

Procedural: 1. Treasurer's Reports

I. Executive Session

Action 2025-332: 1. Recommendation to Adjourn to Executive Session 12:30 am Kathy and John left executive session at 2:15 am. Reconvene at 4 am

It is recommended that the Groveport Madison Schools Board of Education enter executive session for the purpose of considering the appointment, employment, dismissal, discipline promotion, demotion or compensation of a public employee or official in accordance with ORC 121.22.

Motion by Libby Gray, second by LaToya Dowdell-Burger.

Final Resolution: Motion Carries

Yes: LaToya Dowdell-Burger, Libby Gray, Kathleen Walsh, Seth Bower, John Kershner

J. Reconvene Open Session

K. Comments, Announcements, and Other Business

Discussion: 1. Board member comments and/or special announcements, and other business

L. Adjournment

Action 2025-333: 1. Motion to Adjourn

Adjourn at 4:01 am.

Motion by Libby Gray, second by LaToya Dowdell-Burger.

Final Resolution: Motion Carries

Yes: LaToya Dowdell-Burger, Libby Gray, Seth Bower