

LAMOILLE UNION DISTRICT #18 BOARD MEETING MINUTES  
LAMOILLE UNION LIBRARY  
TUESDAY, JANUARY 2, 2007

Board members present: B. Bailey, D. Baker, J. Eisenhardt, D. Grant, S. Hamlyn-Prescott (6:09), C. Hickory, P. Ingvaldstad, D. Osborn, K. Roberts, W. Sander, D. Wells, D. Whitcomb. Others: T. Bailey, C. Hindes, S. Fortune, D. Jewett, M. Spaulding, M. Frederick, J. Teegarden, G. Chicoine (6:04).

**Note: All votes taken are unanimous unless otherwise noted.**

**1. *Call to Order, Introductions, Announcements and Public Input***

**A. Call to Order – 6:01**

**B. Announcements**

P. Ingvaldstad said the VSBA wants a representative from each board to the GRN (Grass Roots Network.) K. Roberts explained that the GRN is a way for board members to keep in touch with state legislators about what is going on during the legislative session.

**2. *Directors' Orders and Minutes of the December 19<sup>th</sup> Meeting***

**A. Directors' Orders**

**ACTION: D. Grant moved to approve expense orders for District #18 in the amount of \$282,875.97, seconded by W. Sander.** Notable expenditures include: \$117,740 3<sup>rd</sup> quarter assessment to LNSU; \$59,828 Transportation; \$34,513 LNSU retirement contribution; \$23,412 SPED; \$21,429 Sanel Auto Parts – GMTCC Auto Technology. There have continued to be finance charges from Aubuchon. M. Frederick said Aubuchon allows less than the usual 30 days to pay. Central office is looking to see if they can increase that. **The motion was passed.**

**B. Minutes of the December 19<sup>th</sup> Meeting**

**ACTION: W. Sander moved to approve the minutes of December 19, and the motion was seconded.** D. Wells noted that on p. 4, under Monthly Financial Report, it should read that this year's deficit is \$193K less than projected, not \$193. He also said that his comment on p. 5 should read "continue to rack up those surpluses," not "rake up." **The motion to approve the minutes with the above changes was passed.**

**3. *Discussion and Possible Vote on District #18 and GMTCC 2007-2008 Budget***

(S. Hamlyn-Prescott arrived at 6:09.) D. Baker suggested having the executive session first, as the matter to be discussed might impact the budget, but T. Bailey and S. Hamlyn-Prescott felt there would not be a big impact, so P. Ingvaldstad decided to leave the executive session for the end of the meeting.

M. Frederick and J. Teegarden discussed changes to the GMTCC budget figures. The latest FTE figures from the state have come out, and are higher. They significantly affect the total assessment and tuition rate for the tech center. With the health insurance increase reduced to 8.5% and new FTE figures reflected, the in-

crease without construction debt is now \$61,038.08 (2.33%). Per pupil tuition is \$5,989.36. The proposed budget is \$3,174,923.

M. Frederick gave the HS/MS budget overview. The proposed budget for all packages is now \$13,788,096. With just the A and B packages, it's \$13,513,921. Without the deficit and with A-B packages, it's \$1,277,825. Without SPED the increase would be 3.63%. Without SPED or the deficit, it would be 8.25%. Once we consider the additional offsetting revenues in SPED and other areas, the resultant increase in assessment is 3.527% (down from the 3.96% presented at the last meeting.) For schools that are not already over the threshold cost per pupil, that increase would not put them over the threshold that gives a penalty. For those that are already over the threshold (Eden and Belvidere), it's the elementary school pressure that's putting them there. It has to do with elementary tuition.

M. Frederick showed a pie chart with the breakdown of HS expenditures by area. Around 65% of expenditures go to the classroom. D. Grant asked if the figure for Legal & Administration excluded legal costs for SPED. M. Frederick said yes. The proposed HS budget is now \$9,856,533 (up \$995,785). D. Wells said a third of the increase is because of construction - without construction, the increase is around 5.5%, right? M. Frederick said yes. D. Wells said he was a lot happier with that figure than with the 8.5% increase M. Frederick had given for the increase without offsetting SPED revenue. P. Ingvaldstad said one of the selling points for the GMTCC construction was that it would only cost the voters about 1.5% more, so why is it 3% more? D. Wells and J. Teegarden said the construction was supposed to cost 1 to 3 cents more, not percent. P. Ingvaldstad suggested the board should tell the voters that, and also show the increased cost in cents at the meeting. T. Bailey suggested we should also show how much Hardwick or Morristown is paying. K. Roberts asked how the state takes the construction debt away from the assessment calculation. M. Frederick said they don't currently do that, but she wants to see if the debt could be broken out, because that would lower the cost per pupil.

M. Frederick showed a pie chart of MS expenditures. C. Hindes said around 64% of expenditures go to the classroom. T. Bailey suggested everyone should read John Nelson's opinion piece in the Burlington Free Press about the idea that 65% of school funds should go to classroom instruction. That number has no basis in best practices. S. Hamlyn-Prescott said the board had asked to see how the ADM figures had changed for the last 3 years. M. Frederick said she had forgotten to include that in her presentation. The proposed middle school budget is \$3,931,565 (up \$13,341.) M. Frederick said she had changed what was budgeted for food service since last time. She had budgeted based on a potential shortfall for this year, but M. Spaulding had showed there shouldn't be a shortfall. M. Spaulding explained that currently his salary is not part of the food service or operations and maintenance budgets, but in the FY08 budget, it is, and that caused part of the increase in food service. M. Spaulding suggested a small portion of his

salary should be in transportation also. M. Frederick said she might have done that.

W. Sander asked, are we counting the same students twice - for the high school count and the tech center count? M. Frederick said they're weighted differently. Cost per pupil is not based on individual students - the state uses FTE's to determine it. It's not as simple as asking if each person is counted once or twice. Everyone at the high school is counted at least 1.25 times. W. Sander asked how the LU students attending the tech center are counted. T. Bailey said they are counted in the high school enrollment, but they also are counted for the tech center. S. Fortune said students come from each of the member towns, and we charge a certain amount of money for them. But she has to pay the tech center for kids who go there. She doesn't know an easy way to explain it to the taxpayers. The town has to pay the high school for students who come here, and some spend all or part of their day at the tech center. C. Hickory said it's the same as talking about students who go to GMTCC from People's Academy. W. Sander asked if the HS numbers M. Frederick has include those who go to the tech center. She said yes. She pointed out that the tech center is not even looking at today's students, they're taking the average of the last 3 years' figures. The board discussed how per pupil cost is calculated - not by taking total pupil count and dividing the whole budget by that.

M. Frederick reviewed the proposed Service Plan and operations and maintenance increases, including the safety and security C package items. K. Roberts asked about the rationale for having security cameras. She said if they're only intended to give us a record after the fact, then what we've budgeted will suffice, but if they are intended to be preventative, we need to budget staff time to watch them. M. Spaulding said he thinks that staff time is anticipated. C. Hindes said it depends on what kind of system we get. If there is a small window on each of the 4 administrators' monitors, it will constantly be observed. K. Roberts said there is an attendant personnel cost for observation. M. Spaulding said the cameras are to monitor entrances so we know who is coming into the building. K. Roberts said the receptionist will be watching the cameras and not doing another task. C. Hindes said what they want from the cameras is in a gray area between getting after-the-fact info and seeing what's happening during an incident. D. Jewett said just having cameras is a deterrent. P. Ingvaldstad said he didn't see why a buzzer system should be as expensive as M. Spaulding had said it would be. S. Hamlyn-Prescott said maybe we should change the description in the budget to "surveillance cameras" to make it more clear how the cameras would actually be used. W. Sander said that the new construction includes conduits so in the future they can add surveillance systems. D. Osborn asked, will there be a blind entrance there? M. Spaulding said it will be more like the high school than the middle school. It was agreed to call the cameras "surveillance cameras." S. Fortune said it is important to know after the fact who did bad things. It is also important to remember that the safety committee has looked at this carefully. They always ask, do we want to defend ourselves from the enemy without or the enemy with-

in? And the answer is always that we're not sure. K. Roberts asked if any kids are on that committee. S. Fortune said no.

M. Frederick showed what the warning for the annual meeting and the ballot article for approval of the Sweeney House sale might look like. The wording she came up with has been approved by Paul Giuliani. There was discussion about whether the sale would be voted on at the annual meeting or put on the Australian ballot. W. Sander said we don't want to be bound to sell the property. K. Roberts said we should clarify we're not selling the entire property. B. Bailey said we should make it clear it will be sold as either a single family or multi family house. Some suggested saying "possible sale." D. Whitcomb said the voters have to have previously authorized putting this on the Australian ballot. D. Whitcomb said the article M. Frederick came up with is not asking the voters for approval to sell the house, and we need to ask that. He said we shouldn't put money into the house before selling it. M. Spaulding asked, do we want to decide before going to the voters whether to sell it as a single or multi family house? P. Ingvaldstad said if we don't, there are three choices and that will split the vote. M. Spaulding said selling 4 acres makes the most sense to him, and P. Ingvaldstad agreed.

**ACTION: B. Bailey moved to have on the ballot whether or not the voters want to sell the Sweeney house and 4 acres of land, seconded by D. Whitcomb.** K. Roberts asked if we would need to have an expenditure line for the amount we need. Several people pointed out that we can't sell the house without spending the money for subdivision, and that we need to put in a new septic system because it doesn't meet the requirements for subdivision. **It was agreed to amend the motion to add "and borrow an amount not to exceed \$55,000 to meet subdivision requirements."** **The motion was passed with W. Sander and K. Roberts opposed.** W. Sander said he was opposed because of the wording – it locks us into sale rather than leaving it open.

S. Hamlyn-Prescott asked if the budget amount shown on M. Frederick's sample Australian ballot was for all packages A-C. M. Frederick said yes, but she and K. Roberts pointed out that the warning could be changed. S. Hamlyn-Prescott said at the last meeting there was general agreement that if the assessment could be kept around 3.5% and still include the C package, that would be all right.

**ACTION: S. Hamlyn-Prescott moved to approve a FY08 middle and high school budget of \$13,788,096 and the motion was seconded.** K. Roberts said she was not comfortable voting on a percentage increase without knowing how many students we have. W. Sander said it would be nice to be able to tie expenditures into cost per student, but it is not necessary. P. Ingvaldstad said we really need to know the cost per student, and how it compares to past years, to defend the budget, but it shouldn't make a difference when voting on it. **The motion was passed with K. Roberts opposed.** D. Baker said we need to spend time at the next meeting figuring out how to face the taxpayers.

**ACTION: S. Hamlyn-Prescott moved to approve a FY08 GMTCC budget of \$3,174,924, and the motion was seconded. The motion was passed.** D. Osborn said she would like to thank M. Frederick for all her presentations and S. Hamlyn-Prescott for giving the board the background to understand them.

4. ***To Hear and Act Upon Administrative Issue / Possible Executive Session Regarding Personnel***

P. Ingvaldstad explained that, as S. Fortune had stated in a letter she sent to the board, she wants to resign as of the end of June. She and her family have decided that is what is best for them.

**ACTION: D. Baker moved to go into executive session, inviting T. Bailey and G. Chicoine to remain, at 7:33, seconded by W. Sander, and the motion was passed.** The board consented out of session at 7:49.

**ACTION: W. Sander moved that the board accept with great regret S. Fortune's resignation, effective June 30, 2007, seconded by S. Hamlyn-Prescott.**

P. Ingvaldstad offered a big thank you for a well done job on behalf of the board. The motion was passed.

**ACTION: D. Baker moved to go into executive session to discuss a personnel issue, inviting T. Bailey and G. Chicoine to remain, at 7:51, seconded by B.**

**Bailey, and the motion was passed.** The board consented out of executive session at 8:40

**ACTION: K. Roberts moved to direct T. Bailey to prepare an immediate press release regarding S. Fortune's resignation, seconded by D. Wells, and the motion was passed.**

5. ***Request for Future Agenda Items and Adjourn***

**A. Future Agenda Items**

The board agreed to agenda consideration of proposed structural changes to the administrative configuration of Lamoille Middle and High Schools.

P. Ingvaldstad discussed the need to agenda a discussion of policy governance with David Ford and Win Goodrich. The board agreed to have this discussion following the LNSU meeting 1/22/2007.

D. Osborn expressed gratitude to all administration and people who worked to provide information necessary to approve the budget.

**B. Adjourn:**

**ACTION: S. Hamlyn-Prescott moved to adjourn at 8:45, seconded by W. Sander, and the motion was passed.**

Respectfully submitted by,  
Donna E. Griffiths

Actions taken at the LU District #18 Board Meeting 1-2-07:

2. *Directors' Orders and Minutes of the December 19<sup>th</sup> Meeting*

A. **Directors' Orders**

**ACTION: D. Grant moved to approve expense orders for District #18 in the amount of \$282,875.97, seconded by W. Sander.** Notable expenditures include: \$117,740 3<sup>rd</sup> quarter assessment to LNSU; \$59,828 Transportation; \$34,513 LNSU retirement contribution; \$23,412 SPED; \$21,429 Sanel Auto Parts – GMTCC Auto Technology. There have continued to be finance charges from Aubuchon. M. Frederick said Aubuchon allows less than the usual 30 days to pay. Central office is looking to see if they can increase that. **The motion was passed.**

B. **Minutes of the December 19<sup>th</sup> Meeting**

**ACTION: W. Sander moved to approve the minutes of December 19, and the motion was seconded.** D. Wells noted that on p. 4, under Monthly Financial Report, it should read that this year's deficit is \$193K less than projected, not \$193. He also said that his comment on p. 5 should read "continue to rack up those surpluses," not "rake up." **The motion to approve the minutes with the above changes was passed.**

3. *Discussion and Possible Vote on District #18 and GMTCC 2007-2008 Budget*

**ACTION: B. Bailey moved to have on the ballot whether or not the voters want to sell the Sweeney house and 4 acres of land, seconded by D. Whitcomb.** It was agreed to amend the motion to add "and borrow an amount not to exceed \$55,000 to meet subdivision requirements." The motion was passed with W. Sander and K. Roberts opposed.

**ACTION: S. Hamlyn-Prescott moved to approve a FY08 middle and high school budget of \$13,788,096 and the motion was seconded.** The motion was passed with K. Roberts opposed.

**ACTION: S. Hamlyn-Prescott moved to approve a FY08 GMTCC budget of \$3,174,924, and the motion was seconded.** The motion was passed.

4. *To Hear and Act Upon Administrative Issue / Possible Executive Session Regarding Personnel*

**ACTION: D. Baker moved to go into executive session, inviting T. Bailey and G. Chicoine to remain, at 7:33, seconded by W. Sander, and the motion was passed.**

**ACTION: W. Sander moved that the board accept with great regret S. Fortune's resignation, effective June 30, 2007, seconded by S. Hamlyn-Prescott.** The motion was passed.

**ACTION: D. Baker moved to go into executive session to discuss a personnel issue, inviting T. Bailey and G. Chicoine to remain, at 7:51, seconded by B. Bailey, and the motion was passed.**

**ACTION: K. Roberts moved to direct T. Bailey to prepare an immediate press release regarding S. Fortune's resignation, seconded by D. Wells, and the motion was passed.**

5. *Request for Future Agenda Items and Adjourn*

**B. Adjourn:**

**ACTION: S. Hamlyn-Prescott moved to adjourn at 8:45, seconded by W. Sander, and the motion was passed.**