

**WILTON-LYNDEBOROUGH COOPERATIVE
SCHOOL BOARD MEETING
Tuesday, January 20, 2026
Wilton-Lyndeborough Cooperative M/H School
6:30 p.m.**

The videoconferencing link was published several places including on the meeting agenda.

Present: *Dennis Golding, John Zavgren, Michelle Alley, Erin Collins, Darlene Anzalone, and Diane Foss*

Superintendent Peter Weaver, Business Administrator Kristie LaPlante, Principals Tom Ronning and Principal Stacy Maghakian (online), Assistant Principal Katie Gosselin, Director of Student Support Services Ned Pratt, Technology Director Nicholas Buroker, Curriculum Coordinator Samantha Dignan (online), and Clerk Kristina Fowler

I. CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Golding called the meeting to order at 6:30pm.

II. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

III. ADJUSTMENTS TO THE AGENDA

Ms. LaPlante requested to remove YTD Report and add this to the next agenda or one after.

*A MOTION was made by Ms. Collins and SECONDED by Ms. Alley to accept the adjustment to the agenda.
Voting: all aye, motion carried.*

IV. BOARD BUDGET DISCUSSION

- a. FY 2026-2027 & Warrant Articles**
- b. Exterior Athletics Projects**
- c. Open Enrollment**
- d. Vote on Warrant Articles**

Warrant Article language was provided. Ms. LaPlante informs the group that the article for open enrollment has been vetted by the attorney. She used the 15% that the Board discussed back in December and the parameters Superintendent Weaver put in his report. If the Board chooses to change that amount, we will need to know that. That is the only article language that is new to the Board. The Board has voted to approve \$190,000 for the Building and Roadways Capital Reserve fund. We're just waiting to finalize the CBA with the support staff to add the amount to article 6. Hopefully tonight, once the Budget Committee meets, we can finalize the district operating budget which is article 5. The Board will need to finalize all articles on February 3rd. A question was raised regarding whether there is an article for athletics. Ms. LaPlante reported she will explain that in the next segment. A question was raised whether the Board is sticking with HS only for open enrollment, this was confirmed. A question was raised if the article is written as discussed as it seems complicated. Ms. LaPlante agrees there is a lot of legalese in it, it does not allow any students out, is for HS only, and caps off at 15% to let students in. A question was raised who would present it. Mr. Zavgren spoke regarding open enrollment, he read that when students are inbound there is up to 80% of tuition funds coming in, he asked what the expected low amount of money per inflowing student. Ms. LaPlante responded that it would all depend on the sending district's tuition rate, the per pupil cost. She was asked to provide a ballpark, rough estimate. Ms. LaPlante responded with \$17,500 as the 80% (rough number). A question was raised if we should spell that out in the article. There may be people who would say it is a good thing to get revenue from students coming in. Chairman Golding noted that it does not need to be in the warrant but is something we would explain. Ms. Anzalone spoke about needing a way to explain the zero percent out as it will be confusing. Saying we would have to pay for it is probably a better way to word it because plenty of students left with the parents covering the cost. Superintendent expressed that clarity would be in the presentation. We will have a public hearing on February 10; the slide deck may need to be updated based on feedback for the district meeting. Families now have the opportunity to have their children attend other schools. The difference is being able to take the tuition money, the public dollars that we raised locally and take it with you to attend another school that is an open enrollment school. That is an important clarification. A brief discussion was had.

Warrant Article 4-Open Enrollment

*A MOTION was made by Ms. Foss and SECONDED by Ms. Collins to accept Warrant Article #4, Open Enrollment as written.
Voting: all aye, motion carried.*

Warrant Article 5-Operating Budget

Pending operating numbers from Budget Committee.

Warrant Article 6-CBA between School Board and Support Staff

This is not finalized yet.

Warrant Article 7-Special Meeting for Defeated CBA

A MOTION was made by Ms. Alley and SECONDED by Ms. Collins to accept Warrant Article #7, Special Meeting for Defeated CBA as written.

Voting: all aye, motion carried.

Warrant Article 8-Building/Equipment & Roadways Capital Reserve

A MOTION was made by Ms. Alley and SECONDED by Ms. Collins to accept Warrant Article #8, Building/Equipment & Roadways Capital Reserve, amount of \$190,000 as written.

Voting: all aye, motion carried.

Ms. LaPlante stated the deadline is February 3.

Discussion was had regarding creating a capital reserve fund for athletics. Ms. LaPlante reported that the Board and Budget Committee had discussed the possibility of creating a capital reserve fund for athletic improvements. Mr. Hofstetter was tasked with taking a look and meeting with vendors to determine out of our athletic facilities which projects could go on in the CIP. Although there was no vote taken, the Board strongly discussed using the existing policy for the Facilities Committee which has a dollar threshold and a length of time before you can spend funds. Mr. Hofstetter did a walkthrough and met with our fields maintenance vender and there are only about 4 projects that would end up going in the CIP using the dollar value threshold. There is a lot of work to be done but it's not anything that meets the CIP threshold. Working with Superintendent Weaver and Mr. Hofstetter, they discussed a time when the Facilities Committee identified a lot of miscellaneous maintenance projects that hadn't been completed and for about 3 years, \$50,000 was to be put into the operating budget and it's called the 3-year Facility Improvement Plan. After reviewing the scope of the projects and improvements that need to be made, it is reasonable that these projects can be undertaken with a similar model of investing about \$30,000 a year for 3 years, which is in line with our current funding to tackle those projects. In 3 years, some of those minor improvements will get the investment they need and will be back to an acceptable standard. Some projects are painting, some infield work, and building a doghouse for the water system. When we looked at what could go on a Capital Improvement Plan (CIP), again using the Facilities Committee idea for funding and planning, we have projects like the soccer field lights, fencing around the softball field, baseball field, and tennis courts. There is no plan at least not now to completely overhaul a baseball field or softball field etc. Mr. Hofstetter has been meeting with vendors and making outreach, but he does not have costs, this is not prime time for vendors to be doing this work. We discussed taking time to come up with these projects, obtaining costs but won't have this by February 3. It puts the cart before the horse to ask for money we don't have identified projects or costs for. Ms. Anzalone raised concern regarding the tennis courts and would like to see a very detailed plan for everything that is needed to get it fixed and then decide how we want to move forward. Ms. LaPlante noted that is why we are asking for more time to come up with the sound data. Ms. Anzalone does not think we need to hold off on the fencing and lighting (going up to the fields), it is a liability if someone were to get hurt. Ms. LaPlante clarified, they want to come back to present to the School Board, if we do a CIP for athletics, this is what it would look like and from that the Board can decide if they want to move forward with a warrant article to start funding that, maybe they want to do a one-off warrant article to tackle an individual project. She thinks it is a good idea but does not have the information in time to accurately represent to the taxpayers what these projects are going to cost. She confirms the plan had been \$50,000 going into it originally but some projects have come off and the amount was reduced to \$27,500. Mr. Hofstetter is working to find out the cost of the projects. Keeping the same concept as facilities but using it for athletics for exterior upgrades and improvements. Chairman Golding asked if they were ready to move on and if yes are there are any further questions on open enrollment. Superintendent was asked if there was any information regarding other districts he could share. Superintendent responded he suspects most schools won't have a warrant article supporting allowing students to leave and take 80% of tuition raised by taxpayers. He thinks there are a lot of questions about what the legislature will do. In terms of us internally as a small district, he thinks it could make it unmanageable if we can't cap how many kids that are taking 80% of the tuition that is raised out of our district. He does not know what that does to the community in terms of taxes. He doesn't know how we staff that not knowing how many kids and how do we build a budget based on variables. There are a lot of those unknowns. In his conversations with other Superintendents, we're expecting significant changes at the state level. He expects we will be having this conversation again about the landscape of public education and how do we respond to that to support our district the best way we can. There is a lot going on, not just open enrollment. We have to wait and see what happens, we have to do a really good job of educating our community members at district meeting. It is important we are clear about benefits and potential costs so that people can make an informed decision one way or another.

The Superintendent's Report, Student Support Services Report, and review of minutes were moved here as the Board finished their budget and warrant article business earlier than expected.

V. 7:00PM JOINT BOARD & BUDGET COMMITTEE SESSION

Present: Bill Ryan, Alyssa Lavoie, Craig Alley, Bridget Mooney, Jonathan Vanderhoof, Rob Silva, and Harold Melcher

a. FY 2026-2027

b. Warrant Articles

The committee met prior and reconvened at 7:12pm.

Chairman Golding requested to hear where the committee is at with the budget. Ms. Lavoie asked to hear from Ms. LaPlante with her updates. Ms. LaPlante spoke about sending the budget draft 5 out on Friday with the changes highlighted. A lot of the changes reflected in draft 5 are in transportation, which is a net decrease of \$61,579. Other changes are an increase in facilities repairs, some salaries, SPED OOD tuition, open enrollment, and Building & Roadways Capital Reserve. She spoke about transportation, voicing appreciation for Milford who has been amazing to let us partner with them on the RFP process. We did this for all our transportation needs. Previously when we switched from Steve's Bus to the open market, we only had 1 vendor submit a bid. This year we had 3 regular ed and 5 SPED bids that we narrowed down to 2 prospective vendors. At the Board's last meeting they authorized us to move forward with Butler if that's what Milford is doing. Milford has not decided 100% yet. The cost in the budget is the maximum exposure so that if we go with either vendor, we can make sure our costs are covered. We don't expect to have a number finalized by February 5. If Milford goes with Butler, what can they do and what can we do to make sure we're getting the services that we need. That is a net decrease from the prior draft of \$61,579 and she noted in her memo where those lines are. As the heating season started, we are having an increased number of coil units and unit ventilators that are failing at WLC and some minor issues at FRES. Because we are only in the 1st few months of the heating season Mr. Hofstetter has asked to add some money back into the budget. She has added \$16,000 for WLC building repairs and maintenance and \$4,000 for FRES. A single unit ventilator coil is just under \$5,000 as an example. We are not adding too much given the scheme of what we see for improvements or what we see for repairs. In a subsequent final review of our staffing and any changes, we did add back in \$9,697 between 2 different areas of the budget for wages and benefits. The School Board added in \$100,000 for SPED OOD tuition and the Budget Committee wanted more information on that if it was an adequate number. The School Board will be moving forward with \$100,000 in the operating budget for additional OOD tuition. This is based on kids that we know right now. There is a possible student who might need services, but it is way too early to determine which means it is way too early to budget that for next year. Open Enrollment is technically a net increase of \$4. When she initially built the budget, she used the FY 26 funding just as a placeholder and made that note along the way. Funding for the CIP would have been \$236,000 but when she dug into the project savings and what we are looking at over the next 5 years we can flatten that curve to bring it down to \$190,000. She corrected her memo to say the Facilities Committee didn't have a quorum, therefore didn't vote on the \$190,000. She spoke about looking at the document as one whole, but the budget will appear in 2 different warrant articles on the budget or on the warrant. One will be the operating budget and that covers the food service fund and federal grants that is \$16,570,977, which is an increase of 3.58% from FY 26 and the 2nd warrant article will be for Building & Roadways Capital Reserve and that will be \$190,000 which is a decrease of \$82,000 from FY 26. All in all, the total asks from the communities if these numbers go forward is an increase of 2.94% over FY 26 and that includes a substantial increase in health insurance of 34.6% and dental 6%. We have net increases of \$30,000 to facilities for building insurance, repairs and maintenance and replacement equipment. We have a net increase of \$22,000 in food service for the cost of food and about \$30,000 for math curriculum. Our budget is reflecting a \$65,679 increase in our CTE tuition including transportation for our students, which is a big jump and \$175,000 in OOD tuition. There are a lot of costs that make up the increases, but they are all increases that directly support our students or our infrastructure. She can send out information as well. Ms. Lavoie spoke that when she reviewed the benefits, noting this has to go through checks and balances when she meets with Ms. LaPlante, but she came up with a different increase, and she sees 30% in building insurance. Ms. LaPlante responded it is the cost of claims literally nationwide, and we factor in how the market performs as a whole. As far as health insurance that is the average plan increase cost. It doesn't necessarily consider any individual plan changes. That is the overall plan increase in the amount with Cigna Schoolcare. As far as the net number to budget, she doesn't have that number right now because there are a lot of moving pieces. When she says 34.6% it is the cost of healthcare premiums not necessarily 34.6% of our budget or increase within our budget. A question was raised about what the driver behind the significant math curriculum increase was. Ms. LaPlante responded it was discussed back in October, she believes at one of the meetings with the principals. She doesn't have that expertise. It was asked to send a note out on this. Ms. Lavoie spoke about a significant increase in iReady this year and there have been questions about how we like it, are we getting enough out of it to increase the spending. She asks if this has been discussed. Chairman Golding replied that administration is working on answers to those questions right now they feel like they are in a good spot. Ms. Lavoie noted it is increasing by over 300%, taking what she associates with iReady and comparing it to last year's budget. Ms. LaPlante will look at that. Mr. Vanderhoof spoke of draft 5 vs. FY 2026 and he believes it compares apples to oranges. To get an accurate percentage we should either include all warrants passed or back out the warrants for 2026. Ms. LaPlante explained that voters added back in \$168,300 from the floor. If you add article 4 operating budget, \$15,841,908 plus the \$168,300 added in from the floor, the total operating budget became \$16,010,208 which is the amount of the local taxation and federal grants. There was a brief discussion. Ms. LaPlante confirms the highlighted number is all in if everything passes. Last year there was a request to break it out to show what came from taxation, being the general fund, food service and federal grants, separate within the budget. Last year the Budget Committee requested to break it out so that it is easier to understand what portion was grants. A question was raised what is the total of federal grants, proposed budget and amount added on the floor. Ms. LaPlante responded \$16,010,208. She asked if there are any additional questions or is the Budget Committee ready to move forward with a number. Chairman Ryan responded they are meeting after this. Chairman Golding asked if they wanted to review any other warrant articles. Chairman Golding confirmed warrant article 4 is open enrollment article which the Board voted unanimously to move forward with tonight, the cost is \$4 in the budget. Article 7 is for a special meeting if the CBA is defeated, they also voted to recommend this one. There is not a figure for the CBA yet. They will meet on this again

soon. The Board voted unanimously to appropriate to the Building & Roadways Capital Reserve the sum of \$190,000 this evening. The Board only has 1 more article to figure out and hopefully that will be soon. A question was raised whether there is not going to be a warrant for athletics. Ms. LaPlante reviewed when the School Board discussed it back in December there was a consensus that they would want any expenditure policy to mirror the facilities committee capital improvement policy which sets a dollar threshold from which you can expend it. Using that as a basis Mr. Hofstetter met with our maintenance vendor and evaluated where our athletics facilities are. Using those thresholds there are really only 4 projects it appears that would qualify to be on the CIP. That would be baseball fencing, soccer and tennis courts and soccer lights. We do not have enough information to say what those are going to cost and where they would come in line. We are looking to bring that up again next year and go through the process of what the projects would look like, cost etc. so we would have accurate information for taxpayers about what we would be looking for in capital improvements over the next number of years. The second piece is that Mr. Hofstetter is evaluating the facilities and our needs, there's a lot of deferred maintenance that has happened throughout our exterior athletics facilities. Several years ago, when the Facilities Committee was working on updating the CIP, there were a bunch of projects that were identified that were in need of funding but didn't meet the CIP. From that there was a line item called the 3-year Facility Improvement Plan. The original intent was to fund that at \$50,000 a year for 3 years to knock off some of these projects. As the year started to evolve, some of the initial projects were falling off it. For example, we originally thought we would have to replace lockers, but it was learned students don't use lockers as much as they did. The recommendation at this point from Mr. Hofstetter, Superintendent Weaver and herself is to carry that funding forward in future budgets to be able to knock off some of this deferred maintenance. Right now, there is \$27,500 in the 3-year Facility Improvement Plan. It is a work in progress because we do not have the costs on those, but it is an active research process right now to make sure the projects are properly vetted and we have good costs for them. Mr. Vanderhoof spoke of an option being discussed to amend the language of the Building & Roadways Capital Reserve so that the scope could be expanded. Ms. LaPlante noted we would not have the cost for district meeting. Mr. Vanderhoof recommended amending the language as you would be on the same track (not able to put money into it until next year if passed) except you would be adding the 4 projects instead of creating a whole separate fund for it. Ms. LaPlante was asked to recap the increase for SPED and the status. Ms. LaPlante reviewed the additional students is what is driving the \$100,000 in the operating budget. If we need another tuition, that can come from our IDEA grant (next year) but the costs that the Board has moved forward with are based on actual students that we have and not speculative students. If there is a need for additional, we would come back to the Board. A question was raised if there has been conversation about what happens (what is the impact) to the services that the \$100,000 has historically covered and now is not available. Mr. Pratt responded that we would visit next year's grant with a clean slate and this year we have been able to keep fairly fluid and anticipate doing that next year. The question was reiterated, if we are losing the \$100,000 for this specific cost how will that impact services covered under that. Mr. Pratt responded, going back a few years ago those grants were being used to provide contracted services for what we anticipated every single year. The Budget Committee and School Board agreed to take them out of the grant and absorb them in the operating budget. Since that time, we have been using it for projects that come up. This would be considered a project that would be coming up. What we would be doing the following year is either revisiting during the budget to process whether to include that tuition that was on the grant in the local budget or to continue to rollover if we have the ability in subsequent years' IDEA grant. A question was raised regarding increases in lines 331-332. Ms. LaPlante explained there was a staffed reading specialist position that was within the budget, it appeared under wages and benefits, but when they become a contracted service provider they go what she calls the other side of the budget, it is a contracted agency and appears differently from wages and benefits. Almost \$71,000 is the cost for the contracted service provider that was last year on the wages and benefits side. The way these things are segregated is through object codes. Anything within the 100 series is wages, the 200 series is benefits and 300 is for contracted service providers. That is how it is broken up but it is all the same bottom line. Ms. Lavoie voiced concern over coverage of several items listed under grants for the last 2 years and the possibility of needing another \$100,000, what happens to these services. Mr. Pratt voiced that he does not share the same concern. Next year's grant will be fairly stable based on the current students and the 2 additional we know. He is confident, barring any catastrophic situation, we will be able to fund it within the IDEA grant including if we have to spend \$200,000 on tuition. Clarification was asked for. Ms. LaPlante reviewed based on current students that were forecasted at the beginning of the budget season, we know of 2 additional students in need. When we started the conversation in December there was a potential for 3. There is \$100,000 for 1 and the other has lesser tuition and can go in the grant. There is potential for the 3rd that may come in later. Mr. Pratt added, we don't have any determination on that 3rd yet.

VI. PUBLIC COMMENTS

The public comment section of the agenda was read.

Mr. Bob Newton, Lyndeborough spoke of having a few questions, mostly on the meeting materials. He spoke regarding the Superintendent's Report, in the 1st paragraph the Superintendent is talking about the NH Edies awards and he guesses that is in process but there is a line in there "The feedback gained by looking inwards at that strengths and weaknesses of the school as well as the commentary from the Edies select committee will only serve to improve and strengthen our school". Mr. Newton asked if feedback had been received yet. If we have, what is it? Chairman Golding noted we will get back to him. He questioned the increase in SPED of \$100,000 from Ms. LaPlante's memo, it has come up a few times in district meeting, is that \$100,000 the gross spend or the net spend? He asks if we expect any offset to come from grants, state or federal funding or is \$100,000 purely out of the taxpayers' pockets? Ms. LaPlante responded, yes, out of the grants and that's gross spend. It does not include

any revenue that we might get in subsequent years if it qualifies for catastrophic aid. Mr. Newton asked if we normally get some offsets to it. Ms. LaPlante responded if we have students that meet the threshold for catastrophic aid, but she would not have any way of knowing what that would be and it would be in the following year, not in the year it is expended. SPED has to report out their students and the qualifying costs in the fall and then the state does their piece. For example, the beginning of January, we just got our catastrophic aid for our students in the 24-25 school year. Mr. Newton asked if it hurts us at all, does it put us in a bind. Ms. LaPlante responded theoretically. Mr. Newton added, but temporarily. Ms. LaPlante confirms the revenue will always be covered in the following year. Mr. Newton spoke of a complaint, not sure if it was the Board or administration a couple of times at district meetings he has attended that the state and “feds” do not pay us all that we are owed for SPED and he is concerned about that because everything we are owed by them is statutorily required and if we are not collecting everything we are due, he would like to know how big the gap is and why we’re not collecting it. Chairman Golding responded it is one that has been asked for years. They’ve historically not paid us the amount they promised years and years ago. The only way we can combat that is to talk to our local representatives in the state house and get them to fund it. Mr. Newton asked how much money we are talking about. Chairman Golding thinks the number used back in the day was about 40%. Mr. Newton expressed that as a member of the audience at district meeting, we raise this question, and we’re told we never get what we’re owed but never told how much we’re missing or why. As an audience member his patience is wearing thin. He would like an analysis of that every single year. He is asking the Board and Budget Committee to quantify what the gap is and why. He spoke regarding a hypothetical situation, is it possible that the reason we were not collecting it is because we are not taking the proper steps to collect it? Is it something in our administrative processes that we’re not doing? Ms. LaPlante responded, no, that is not true. He looks forward to getting the answers to both of his questions. He spoke of the warrant articles, it starts with article 4, he asked what the others are. Ms. LaPlante responded 1-3 are for elected officials. Mr. Newton spoke regarding article 4, open enrollment and questioned on the 3rd line, after (High School) as ... he asked if it is missing an “an”. Ms. LaPlante responded that it is the exact language she received. Mr. Newton questioned the grammar; it doesn’t seem correct. He suggests following up with whoever gave that language and see if it has a typo or is missing a word in it. We are a school district after all he added. He asked if there is an incremental cost to our district when a student comes in and we get 80% of per student cost. He asked if that is pure profit for us, pure offset to our expenses, or does it cost us more money to have an incoming open enrollment student coming in. Chairman Golding responded, he doesn’t think it does, at one time we discussed being able to take in 40-50 students before it will cost us anything. Mr. Newton agreed and expressed it is very much like an oil refinery or other high fixed cost operation where as long as you’re operating below capacity your incremental throughput does not incur any real cost. Chairman Golding responded that is why we’re going to use 15% for now. Mr. Newton said he is asking as an audience member, and someone will probably ask you to do this. Chairman Golding noted we will have a full presentation on February 10 (regarding open enrollment) by the School Board. Mr. Newton asked what the purpose of article 6 is. Chairman Golding responded that is where we put the amount in for the CBA which is being negotiated. The target date is before February 3. He confirms it is separate from the teacher’s CBA. Mr. Newton spoke regarding an October budget meeting, he does not know if the School Board was privy to this, but he gave the Budget Committee a list of questions and would love to see them answered at district meeting whether it is the School Board or administration. He asked for the number of students, cost of each student in the schools, what is the student teacher ratio in each grade etc. The Budget Committee has the list, and he gave a copy to the Superintendent. These are questions that have been asked for years and years and have never been answered, he looks forward to seeing them.

Mr. Bill Crouse spoke regarding line 202 in the budget. He asks the group to consider the historical spend on that line and what has been suggested for this coming year. The description he reads as to the purpose and previous conversations that we’ve had this evening about athletic projects and ones that don’t make it to the CIP threshold. He is curious as to how we can cut that fund vs. growing it. He asks that it be given some consideration. Regarding line 245, athletics transportation, it seems we have a fairly fixed number on that, he asked if it includes full transportation of MS teams unlike what is happening now. Ms. LaPlante confirms it does. Mr. Crouse asked if the new contract would contain penalties. Ms. LaPlante confirms it will. She took the schedules for the last 2 years and came up with the average hours and miles based on invoices and that is how she came up with the estimate for it. It does include all MS and HS for our fall, winter, and spring sports except for the ones that we can obviously transport in the van, track and fields or cross country, swim, etc.

Superintendent called out all the phone numbers and names joined in the meeting asking if they wanted to comment.

Mr. Jeff Jones, Wilton gave best wishes and luck to Principal Ronning, he will be missed and hopefully you’ll hear this many more times. We will miss you. He spoke of the big impact Principal Ronning made on the district. He expressed congratulations on getting a lead with Mason. He thinks it is a positive step toward building some scale in this cray environment we are in.

301 Either you are a taker of students or you're a giver of students. If you're a take, then you're going to survive. If you're a giver
302 you're probably not going to last. Congratulations on that and keep the lines of communication open to neighboring districts. He
303 thinks it will pay off. His last point was to bring up something Mr. Vanderhoof said about the budget. He suggests being clear
304 when you present the bottom-line operating budget. He thinks you're understating the amount of \$82,00, that is a change from
305 FY 26 in the way that we presented last year at least. Be clear with taxpayers what exactly that number represents.

306
307 The Budget Committee departed at 8:06pm and will reconvene in another room.

308 **VII. BOARD CORRESPONDENCE**

309 **a. Reports**

310 **i. Superintendent's Report**

311 Superintendent reported earlier today Principal Ronning met with the WLC staff and informed them he will not be returning next
312 school year, he is taking up retirement and going to spend time with his family and take care of himself. With Principal
313 Ronning's permission, he thought it was important to just mention that to all of you as soon as possible because we are going to
314 need your support to be able to move forward with what we do with this position. Regardless of which direction the Board wants
315 us to move, his intention is to just start the ball rolling. His intention is to revisit the language of the posting tomorrow and post it
316 tomorrow. There are still some things we need to talk about. A question was raised if he could speak regarding the Mason
317 district and provide some details, are they interested in moving? Are they looking for something like we do with Milford, have
318 kids take certain classes here? Superintendent spoke about hearing something in public comment that resonated with him and it
319 had something to do with visiting schools that have been successful with standardized testing like our SAS scores. He met with
320 the Superintendent in Mason, along with Ms. Dignan, and really talked about their math curriculum and some of the supports
321 they have in the classroom to get the performance that they have from their kids on standardized tests. We wanted to talk about
322 the resources they have, their class sizes, philosophy, and all those things. The goal was to try to build that open partnership with
323 them to see what kind of strategies and interventions we could take back to our schools but also start to build a connection. What
324 kind of PD do they have for their teachers? Is there anything we could learn from that? The conversation shifted to where the MS
325 and HS students attend and why they drive through Wilton to go to Milford. He believes they have 80-90 students that attend
326 Milford both for MS and HS. It was a great conversation because it is a small district and we are in a small district. He believes
327 our demographics are pretty close as an adjacent community. She spoke of strengths and weaknesses of sending students to a
328 larger district. She would speak with her Board to see if they would be open to SAU 63 coming and celebrating what we do in
329 our MS/HS and answering any of their questions. She got back to me last week and they are open to having us come and would
330 we consider a date in April or May. He does not believe they are under contract for a certain number of years, but they have a
331 good tuition rate from Milford, they don't necessarily see anything wrong with that relationship. He spoke of some of the
332 benefits and drawbacks of a larger district. He spoke to Ms. LaPlante today about what team would we want to present, would
333 we have our class valedictorian from last year come back and talk about how SAU 63 really prepared him for the IVY League or
334 do we want a student that has a business in town and talk about how coming to SAU 63 prepared them for the world of work and
335 the world of entrepreneurship. Do we want a lead teacher to talk about our advanced courses, do we want students to talk about
336 our athletics? He thinks a team that really represents who we are as a school, so they have a true picture of what the opportunities
337 are and not just from the Superintendent. We have an opportunity for a robust conversation with another Board to see if there's a
338 way our paths can cross and make it a win, win for both our students and districts. A question was raised how something like
339 that works. Superintendent responded if it was us, we would have a town meeting to talk about it and whether their community
340 would support it for some to attend Milford and some WLC and have more than venue for education, he doesn't think they
341 would send all 80 students, but half a dozen would be great.

342 **ii. Director of Student Support Services Report**

343 Mr. Pratt reported sending out a report that he had not done in a few years. It pinpoints what makes up the staff. Currently we
344 have 43 district staff members and 8.2 contracted service members. Over the years it shifted a little bit, back in February 2021
345 we had 111 SPED students, now we have 122. We had 42 district positions and now have 43, we had 6.2 contracted service
346 positions, now we have 8.2 in a situation where the children's needs have increased. We often talk about SPED as a costly part
347 of what we do, and it is. Any service we provide is costly. Sometimes we think we are just adding staff all the time and we are
348 not. What we're doing is making sue of the staff we have and they've grown and he will provide a later report showing the
349 number of staff who have bee here for a long time and that is some of the most important statistics we can talk about is the
350 people who that want to be here and do a great job. They have a team approach. It is a simple table that he wanted to speak to
351 that says we really are trying to be cognizant of the students' needs of the district by working successfully with parents and also
352 being cost effective. Responding to a question about Title I, he noted it is separate from SPED, but they do come into each other,
353 we have some kids in Title I that their needs are getting hefty, and we'll often see them referred to SPED. He made a correction
354 to his report; the SPED Director is a .60 position not a 1.0 FTE.

355 **VIII. YTD REPORTS**

356
357 This has been removed from the agenda.

358 **IX. ACTION ITEMS**

359 **a. Approve Minutes of Previous Meeting**

360
361

A MOTION was made by Ms. Alley and SECONDED by Ms. Anzalone to approve the minutes of January 6, 2026, as written. Voting: four ayes; two abstentions from Chairman Golding and Ms. Foss, motion carried.

X. COMMITTEE REPORTS

i. Budget Liaison

Ms. Lavallee is absent, we just had the joint session. This was skipped.

ii. Strategic Planning Committee

Ms. Anzalone reported the committee met last week; they have good plans but are not planning to present anything formal. They discussed some questions the committee had regarding getting more detail on some things but so far it looks pretty good. We need to schedule the next meeting which she will do offline. Superintendent had clarified when we gathered feedback we talked to the PTO at FRES and spent a lot of time talking about LCS. In the Roadmap, there is an indicator of reducing the facility footprint and do we need to keep it open. If we don't what are the options to move kids around, are there savings, increased cost etc. No decisions have been made; the process is to gather as much information and schedule a public meeting about LCS and share our findings. Such as where would the kids go, that is a driving question and why are we even considering this, is it a good consideration for the district? We would look at sometime in the spring, have rich conversations to see if this is the decision for SAU 63. As a parent, he would be concerned with younger kids possibly sharing bathrooms with HS students, but nothing has been decided. When the 6th graders moved to the MS there was a real concern that contact would be minimal and they made promises but it has not been minimal. He wants to hear good and bad from supporters and those not supporting it. If we close the earliest would be summer of 2027. We would have to fold it into the following budget cycle FY 28, then finish meetings and figure out that summer how to move the kids, including any build outs we need for offices etc. A question was raised how that would affect specials. Superintendent responded those are good questions we are trying to flush out. Would they have access to all of them or limited to 5 and 6 and would they all get PE? More and more research says kids need recess not just PE. They are legitimate questions and what do we lose in the end? Are the wins worth the losses? If we are not increasing specials, there are only so many. It would be tragic if we have to move to WLC and could not provide specials. We may need to have a subsequent meeting too; there may be a lot of questions that come up that we cannot answer.

iii. Negotiations

Chairman Golding reported January 23 is mediation and hopefully we will flush it all out and can report back.

XI. RESIGNATIONS / APPOINTMENTS / LEAVES

a. FYI-New Hire-Saige Paradise-ABA Therapist-FRES

b. Resignation-Raisa Koch-ABA Therapist-FRES

Superintendent reviewed the new hire and resignation.

XII. PUBLIC COMMENTS

The public comment section of the agenda was read. Superintendent called out all the phone numbers and names joined in the meeting asking if they wanted to comment. There was no public comment to report.

XIII. SCHOOL BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS

Ms. Alley thanked Principal Ronning for his big personality and focus on academics and for bringing up the ability for each student to feel like they can control their education and can be successful. Her boys appreciate him and are grateful for him. His personality will be missed for sure. It would be great for our next principal to stay longer, since she moved here in 2021, there have been 3 principals or at least 2. She is not really familiar with how long they stay, and it would be great to see when we search for one that we make sure we are looking for that although she knows things happen. As a Board hopefully we can answer all the questions we heard today and are in all of our presentations. We have a facilities meeting on January 27 at 4:30pm and will look at the 2027-2028 school year's potential projects.

Ms. Anzalone echoed what Ms. Alley said. Principal Ronning will be missed. She has seen a complete 180 from where it was before. As a parent and as a Board member. Staff morale is much higher; she thanked him for everything he has done. If he knows of anyone like him, she asks that he encourages them to apply.

Ms. Foss expressed that she hopes the public understands what a loss it is for us that Principal Ronning is leaving. He is always in good spirits, and she has heard other board members say that before he started here, he came to our board meetings. She thinks it is very rare that someone would be willing to go to that length, that someone is willing to put themselves in a position to actively make the community better. She thanked him and wished him the best.

Ms. Collins commented that Principal Ronning will be sorely missed and if there is anything she can do or as a Board to help support with the transition do not be shy. She added, it might be fun if you leave a brand-new pair of bright socks in the top drawer of your desk for the new person.

XIV. NON-PUBLIC SESSION RSA 91-A: 3 II (A) (C)

A MOTION was made by Ms. Alley and SECONDED by Ms. Collins to enter Non-Public Session to review the non-public minutes and for personnel matters RSA 91-A: 3 II (A) (C) at 8:20pm.

424 *Voting: via roll call vote, all aye, motion carried.*

425
426 **RETURN TO PUBLIC SESSION**

427 The Board entered public session at 8:34pm.

428
429 *A MOTION was made to seal the non-public session minutes RSA 91-A: 3 II (A) (C) by Ms. Anzalone and SECONDED by Ms.*
430 *Foss.*

431 *Voting: all aye, motion carried.*

432
433 **XV. ADJOURNMENT**

434 *A MOTION was made by Ms. Alley and SECONDED by Ms. Collins to adjourn the Board meeting at 8:35pm.*

435 *Voting: all aye, motion carried.*

436
437 *Respectfully submitted,*

438 *Kristina Fowler*

439