

Lamoille North Modified Unified Union School District
Meeting Minutes (draft)
December 19, 2016

Board Members Present: David Whitcomb, Lisa Barry, Bernard Barnes, Jan Sander, Richard Bailey, Raven Walters, Katie Orost, Bobbie Moulton, Angie Evans, Deb Baker, Jeff Hunsberger, Jim Osborn, Laura Miller, Bill Sander, Chasity Fagnant, Angela Lamell, Andrew Beaupre, Wade Chivington, Mark Neilsen.

Others: Catherine Gallagher, Michele Aumand, Deb Clark, Charleen McFarlane, Sherry Lussier, Wendy Savery, Kate Torrey, Mary Anderson, David Manning, Melinda Mascolino, Brian Pena, Dylan LaFlam, Jim Osborn, Amanda Tilton-Martin

Minute Taker: Sue Trainor

Call to Order, Adopt the Agenda, Announcements: Whitcomb called the meeting to order at 6:29 p.m. Gallagher notified the Board that Marilyn Frederick's son had passed away and read a note from Frederick. Whitcomb asked for a moment of silence. Two items were removed from the agenda due to Frederick's absence: Discussion of Format of Ballot Articles and Possible Action, and Discussion of Locations of Budget Input/Informational Meetings. B. Sander made a motion to adopt the agenda with those changes, seconded by Neilsen. The motion passed unanimously.

Public Comment: Aumand then read the following email from Eileen O'Brien of Johnson who expressed her thoughts about the direction the Board would take in regards to Belvidere students continuing to attend the Waterville School on a long-term basis:

"As a resident of Johnson, I voted in favor of the creation of the new Unified School District. Now as I watch the District try to work out the details of this new organization, I have become increasingly dismayed that it will not provide the benefits that it should to many of the towns that signed on - in good faith - to this opportunity.

I voted in favor of the Unified District so that our communities could reap the financial benefits put forward, and because I understand the constraints put upon our citizenry by high property taxes. I voted in favor of the Unified District so that our communities could join to share educational resources, and with the hopes that we might even be able to provide expanded opportunities for our children.

I did not vote in favor so that one community could take our District dollars and spend them outside the District by tuitioning their students to an out-of-District school. I do not recall this being part of any discussion prior to the vote on a Unified School District.

It is certainly unfortunate that Waterville chose not to join in our District. But now we, as a Unified District, need to make decisions based on the overall needs of the entire District. Similarly, Waterville chose to stay on their own and will now make decisions based on their own needs. If I understand correctly, they still have an opportunity to join up with us if they decide that is in their best interests. But if they choose not to, then we should work within the communities which have decided to join forces, and ensure that our own schools have the financial support they need, before we consider supporting out-of-district schools. And as a Board that is mandated to work in the overall best interests of its member communities, I am hard-pressed to understand how sending our tax dollars outside the District is going to accomplish the stated goals of this Unified District.

As an aside, we have already allowed one member town (Hyde Park) to approve a bond vote for their own school improvements, for which the payment responsibility will now lay on all member communities. A bond vote, I might add, that was pushed as affordable only because the rest of us would be assuming a good part of the long-term debt.

It is unfortunate that this new Unified School District appears to be starting out without much emphasis on the word "Unified". Perhaps this is just growing pains and in time we'll get better at working together to maximize the potential benefits of this Union. I encourage the Board to maintain focus on the long-term goal of improving educational opportunities within our District while also considering the cost-effectiveness of their decisions on all District taxpayers."

Routine Business/Consent Agenda Items:

Minutes of the November 28, 2016 Meeting: B. Sander made a motion to approve the minutes as printed, seconded by Moulton. The motion passed unanimously.

Discussion with Act 46 Consultant and Legal Experts: Gallagher introduced Emily Simmons, the Director of Legal and Policy Services for the Vermont School Boards Association, who had been with the VSBA since the inception of Act 46, and Sean Toohey, a private sector attorney from Lynn, Lynn and Blackman who specialized in civil litigation. Gallagher encouraged questions and asked for a civil and respectful discussion.

B. Sander explained that Belvidere had originally been tuitioning students to Waterville. Now with the Modified Unified Union District in place and Waterville no longer being part of the District, he wondered why they couldn't just continue to tuition students to Waterville. He asked what was in Act 46 that made this impossible. Simmons stated it was not specifically Act 46. It was the construct the State had for districts that operate with a tuition that determined where students attended. Before the merger, Belvidere didn't operate the grades for which the students used tuition to attend. Since the merger, there were four towns in the new District that operate those grades. Therefore, it was no longer a foregone conclusion that the students in Belvidere would be able to tuition to Waterville. Act 46 didn't change the authority. The situation resulted more from State law where it stated tuition should be paid where the school district didn't operate a school. Simmons stated that she and Toohey both thought there was a different authority under the Statutes to make a decision to tuition the students. B. Sander asked if there were anything to prevent tuitioning the students. Simmons said no.

In a further attempt to address Sander's question as to what was different now that they were a modified union, Toohey stated that a single school district did have the authority to tuition out students if an elementary school wasn't available. However, Belvidere was now part of a merged district and this new merged district offered elementary schools. The Board couldn't offer to tuition some students in one legal school district out but keep other students going to the District school. Previously the one legal entity was Belvidere. Now the one legal entity was the Modified Unified Union.

Chivington asked is there was anything preventing the Board from approving the tuition. Toohey stated there was case law in Vermont stating that if a school couldn't offer to tuition some of its students out and not others, the option under the Statute was to either operate an elementary school in your district or tuition out. The Board can't do both under the Statutes.

Simmons stated Sean had stated a blanket rule. She stated there was an exception in the Statutes that stated that "notwithstanding that, a school district that operates an elementary school, (that would be the MUU), may pay tuition for elementary students who reside near a public elementary school in an adjacent district upon request of parent and in the Board's judgment education can be more conveniently furnished

due to geographic considerations.” She stated if a parent came to the Board and requested to attend a school that was more geographically convenient, the Board had the authority to grant that request.

Chivington asked if it had to be a per parent request. Simmons stated the Board did need to follow the law and each parent would need to request tuition. If the Board made the policy decision to use this section of law to provide educational continuity for Belvidere students, as stated in the Articles of Agreement, the process could be streamlined through the use of a form letter that the parents could sign.

Baker stated she reviewed the plan of action that the Department of Education approved for this MUU and within that plan it stated that Belvidere students would be tuitioned to Waterville for three years. Simmons explained that Baker was referring to Article 17 of the Articles of Agreement that four towns approved and two towns didn't. The Articles were binding on those school districts that approved them, the MUU. They were not binding on the two towns that did not approve the merger. The Articles could not direct those two towns on what to do and they don't cover the obligations of those two towns. They were important articles and were certainly a promise to those towns that voted to approve the Articles, but they were not airtight legally because they don't bind those two towns.

B. Sander asked if Waterville were willing to continue the practice of accepting Belvidere students, did that overcome the obstacle. Toohey stated the option to permit parents to submit a letter to go to Waterville would allow them to do that. He noted that Article 17 was written from the perspective of all the towns joining. It didn't mean there wasn't another way to continue the practice and what both attorneys were suggesting was the way to accomplish it was to base it on the geographic proximity.

Chivington stated it was binding for the towns that did vote for the merger and, therefore, wasn't it binding that the MUU Board would have to allow Belvidere to continue to tuition to Waterville for three years. Simmons said it was similar to writing a check that you couldn't cash. It was a good faith effort but it was not an action of the MUU Board to have them actually attend a school that was outside of their district. The form letter would be the clear way to accomplish what the Board wants.

B. Sander asked if it made a difference that the schools were all in the same Supervisory Union. Emily stated the law wasn't written on the basis of the SU, so it wasn't binding here. B. Sander asked what would happen after three years. Simmons stated that under the section of the Law that she was referencing, the decision had to be made annually. The Article said three years and she thought that was good guidance for the Board on how long to hold these obligations that were promised to the students in the Articles. However, Title 16, Article 821C, require an annual request by parents and an annual determination by the Board.

An audience member asked who would pay the tuition once the Board approved a placement to Waterville. Simmons stated the MUU would pay the tuition. Following a question about the tax implications of this, Simmons stated she didn't know the cost associated with it. She stated it would make sense to lay out the specifics of the finances and noted it could be a wash. The way the education funding system worked, things tended to level themselves out because the whole state pays for the education dollars.

Another audience member asked if the parental letter was the only option. Toohey stated they had spoken with the AOE about this issue and this was their position as well. Toohey stressed that the decision would need to be based on geographic reasons. An audience member asked if Belvidere could decide to reopen their school. Simmons stated which physical schools to operate was a choice for the MUU Board. While it was legally allowable, she wasn't sure that it was a straightforward decision for next year's students.

A Board member asked if this would allow parents to send their students to a different school closer to their home. Toohey stated it was a possibility for any neighboring town, but by Statute it was the Board that had the authority to make the decision. The parent could appeal to the Secretary of Education but it was a matter that was typically left to the Board's discretion. He noted this action had been possible before and was still possible.

An audience member asked if the Board would have to provide transportation to two different schools if every Belvidere parent didn't sign the letter. Additionally, would the letter that parents signed have to stipulate which school they wanted to attend. Simmons stated that the default without the parent asking for an exception would be for the students who were part of the district to attend school within the district. It would be the MUU Board's decision where those students would attend school within the MUU. The opt-out would be to request to go to Waterville instead. The Supervisory Union would provide the transportation.

Chivington stated the Board hadn't seen any numbers to compare the cost to do anything else and he thought the Board needed to see that in detail to analyze. He asked what the staffing and bussing would cost. Clark stated that detailed analysis had not been done. Evans asked what the cost would be if Belvidere opened up its own school. Toohey reminded the Board that one of the goals of Act 46 and the merger was efficiency and finances, with financial incentives to do so, and those were all things that needed to be considered.

Osborn asked the attorneys to address why Section 5 under the Governance and Alternative Structure, Subsection c of Act 46 didn't apply to the Board. Simmons informed the Board that Osborn was switching gears and asking about the future of the Supervisory Union while Act 46 played out for the next 2 ½ years. Osborn believed that if the Board adopted this, the District versus Union question would be solved. Simmons read the following at Osborn's request:

(c) Alternative structure: Supervisory Union with Member Districts - An Education District as envisioned in subsection (b) of this section may not be possible or the best model to achieve Vermont's education goals in all regions of the State. In such situations, a supervisory union composed of multiple member districts, each with its own school board, can meet the State's goals, particularly if: (4) the combined average daily membership of all member districts is not less than 1,100. Other factors are if the districts consider themselves to be collectively responsible for the education of all pre-K through grade 12 students residing in the supervisory union. Other factors: the supervisory union operates in a manner that maximizes efficiencies through economies of scale and the flexible management, transfer, and sharing of non-financial resources among the member districts; and the final factor is the supervisory union has the smallest number of member school districts practicable, achieved wherever possible by the merger of districts with similar operating and tuitioning patterns.

Osborn stated there were two structures of governance: the preferred and then the one that was just read from Act 46. Osborn read it to mean that if the supervisory union provided those four things, then you could have separate boards, and that that union could still act as one. He noted that Sander kept referring to the Union operating above the School Districts and Osborn wondered why the MUU couldn't continue to operate as they do now, tuitioning Belvidere to Waterville.

Toohy explained the next step for the non-merging districts was to present alternative structures to the State, and the deadline for doing that was November of 2017. The burden was now on the non-merging districts to show that the way they were doing things now or that they were proposing to do things in the future was the best way to meet the goals. He reminded the Board that a study had already been done and reviewed by the State saying that the Unified Union met the goals. In order to overcome that, the Board would have to show that by keeping it a separate stand-alone school district the Board could do a better job of meeting those goals. Toohy said it was a pretty high burden to meet. Osborn disagreed with Toohy's analysis.

Simmons explained that the two districts not part of the Union had a deadline of November 30, 2017. At that time a detailed proposal would need to be submitted to the State Board, explaining the realities of the situation and what the town would like to have the State Board approve. The State Board of Education would take that under consideration and in 2018 a plan would be published for the whole State that would either leave the school the way it was or would involuntarily merge the school with another district.

Whitcomb asked if the attorneys knew of any other districts that were experiencing the situation that Waterville and Belvidere were experiencing. Toohy stated there wasn't anything that was exactly the same. This situation was complicated by the fact that there was a school sending students to another school within a supervisory union, and it was certainly an unintended consequence of merging. He reminded the Board there was a structure coming from the State level, with timelines and expectations, and certain incentives had been put in place to encourage a merger. Toohy stated it was going to be a challenge operating as a separate school district outside of the MUU.

Whitcomb asked if the Legislature might review this again after seeing the issues involved. Toohy stated the reality was the way things were was a creature of the State Statutes. The State was providing the structure for these changes and there would be a certain amount of flexibility, however, they also had certain requirements and expectations. While he thought it was possible that someone could come in and change the Act, given the timeframe and the requirements that were on the books now through 2020, he didn't think it was likely. Simmons explained a lot of districts were holding votes on Town Meeting Day in order to benefit from incentives offered to merge. They were attempting to meet the deadline of July 1, 2017. All Act 46 incentives expire after that date. The Legislature, which meets from January through May, would have to act very early in the session in time to signal to the districts the realities they were working with. That is a very quick turnaround and unlikely to happen.

An audience member asked when the change would take place. Simmons stated July 1, 2017. The audience member asked if there was a plan as to where the Belvidere students would go at that time.

Whitcomb stated the Board had not made that decision yet. B. Sander stated his assumption was that Belvidere parents wanted their children to go to Waterville, and Waterville wanted to maintain the relationship. B. Sander urged the Superintendent and Belvidere parents to get to work in putting the plan suggested by the attorneys in motion to end the uncertainty. Toohey explained one option could be letters from individual Belvidere parents asking to be placed in Waterville. Another option would be that in April the schools could merge, and then in July, 2017 they could be part of one unified union and then that single legal school district could send the students from one town to another school in the union.

Orost asked if someone on the Waterville School Board could inform the Board if there might be a revote. Amanda Tilton-Martin stated the Board was aware that some petitions were circulating, but she didn't know how far along they were in the process. When the Board was presented the petitions they would go from there. Osborn noted the Board couldn't put the issue on the ballot. Simmons explained that the electorate of Waterville could petition the Board to warn the question. At that time the Board would have to warn the question. Additionally, within the approved MUU Articles, any district had one year to reconsider and join the Union district.

An audience member from Waterville stated she believed that Waterville would still vote against joining and wondered if it were possible for Belvidere to revote. Simmons stated the time for reconsideration of a merger had passed, so no. Toohey stated there was a separate statute which required two separate votes if any school wished to join a unified union. The union would have to vote that they wanted the school to join, and the district would have to vote that they wanted to join the union. He noted that by voting in April of 2017 to merge, the schools would get in under the July 2017 deadline that triggered a lot of the other issues in terms of the incentives or penalties for not merging.

An audience member noted that new and additional information would be needed before a change in the vote would occur and asked if there had been a detailed study on what it would cost to absorb Belvidere into Eden. Clark said there was not. Beaupre asked if there was a plan to do that in-depth study. Clark said it could be done but she hadn't been directed to do so.

Baker said that Cambridge and Waterville had been part of the District #18 Board but had chosen not to join the MUU. She wondered why they didn't have to pay tuition. Toohey stated that his understanding was that the high school was part of the MUU. There was a Board that included members from Cambridge and Waterville, but only for grades 7-12. That was because a district could only become a MUU if they had a unified high school already, and once merged, the towns shared the high school. Baker stated the original vote was to join K-12, not 7-12. Toohey stated the district could either form a Unified Union or, if everyone didn't join, a Modified Unified Union. By statute, that required including the Unified Union High School that existed and the towns would still be represented on the high school level.

Chivington asked about Article 17 and stated a scenario being discussed was to reopen Belvidere, and possibly blend some Eden and Belvidere grades. He asked whether Eden would be in violation of Article 17 if that were to occur. Toohey stated it was difficult to conceptualize Article 17 without having a unified union. The Article was written as though all of the towns had merged into one district. Article 19 addressed a modified union, representation, etc. Toohey thought it would be a challenge to say in July that they were going to operate a school that hadn't been in operation previously.

Chivington explained that Belvidere and Eden had both joined the new district and yet, if the decision were made to blend Eden and Belvidere, without Eden's consent students couldn't be moved for the next 3 years. Toohy stated Article 17 stated, "students might attend the elementary school in the town of residence. With parental consent the Board may adjust enrollment based on individual circumstances." Simmons disagreed, stating that if she were an Eden parent who had voted for the merger, she would think the Board was going to keep children at the Eden School for three years. She noted that this was not ironclad, as the sentence before that Article stated "Unified Union School District", and this group was a Modified Union. Whitcomb stated a consultant had assisted the Board in writing the Articles of Agreement. The Secretary of Education accepted those articles. Now it seemed that it didn't work the way it should have, as two towns chose not to join. He asked the attorneys to give the Board something they could take to court and win.

An audience member was concerned about the Unified vs. Modified Union distinction and whether the Modified Union Agreement was binding. Toohy stated his comments about Article 17 simply allowed for some flexibility on a student-by-student basis and the articles were binding. Simmons explained that Article 17, especially, was written in view of a big district with a lot of elementary schools and what could be said would happen over the next three years.

B. Sander stated there seemed to be consensus to maintain Belvidere going to Waterville. It was clear there were ways to accomplish that. He asked that the Board proceed by directing the Superintendent, Waterville and Belvidere to get this lined up for the next year at least. Belvidere had voted in good faith and Sander believed it was incumbent on the Board to see that their expectations were realized.

An audience member stated she was a taxpayer of Belvidere. She hoped the Board would look at other options in the district, as she didn't think Belvidere received the best deal where they were tuitioned now. Another audience member noted this wouldn't be the first time that Belvidere students were seriously affected. He noted that Waterville had previously voted four times not to have Belvidere students. Now the audience member thought Waterville only wanted Belvidere students because of the tuition. Baker noted she had been on the board when they both opened and closed the Belvidere school. She felt that Belvidere had always been treated unfairly. She asked what it would cost to reopen the Belvidere School. She was disappointed that while budgets needed to be voted on in a few weeks, none of the Boards had information on this. Another audience member expressed concerns about safe transportation, as well as how much time children would have to stay on the bus each day.

Osborn asked the attorneys who had judicial review of this and where to file a lawsuit. Toohy stated the decision could be challenged at the local courthouse. Osborn asked if it were decided that Belvidere could not tuition to Waterville, could one of the Belvidere parents go to the courthouse and get an injunction to stop it. Toohy stated a citizen could challenge a law and request a stay or preliminary injunction to stop something from happening. However, a very high standard would need to be met.

Osborn suggested bringing Article 17 to the judge and asking for an injunction until it was solidified. Toohy said it was possible to challenge it that way. He noted, however, that traditionally courts gave great deference to state agencies that were charged with certain tasks, such as the Agency of Education. They certainly gave deference to the State Legislature who wrote the laws. Courts wouldn't rewrite laws

unless they find that the law to be in conflict with some other constitutional provision. The ultimate question would be what was the challenge and what was the basis of that challenge. Would it be a basis to overturn what the Legislature and the Agency and the State Board have said was the goal of Vermont with Act 46. Toohey stated it was a daunting challenge to overcome those degrees of deference for the people who wrote the laws. He explained the State had made their decision through the Legislature and they were going to implement their decision. If citizens chose to challenge the law that might result in a change, but for now it was the law. Until a court made a decision on the matter, the State had the authority to tell the local entity how education was going to be administered.

In response to an audience member expressing frustration that the State could impose a merger, Toohey explained it was the classic carrot and stick. The State told the towns that this needed to be done. If they did it immediately, the town would receive tax incentives, grants, etc. Otherwise there would be a penalty and the students could be told to move to a different school district.

An audience member asked whether tuition would have to be paid for students who went to Bishop Marshall. Toohey said no, because students were not being tuitioned generally. It was being done because of geographic proximity. Additionally, the Statute addressed about public schools, not private schools. Toohey thought it was a good question but that was why it was a Board decision on whether to grant access to another school. Simmons noted it needed to be decided on a case-by-case basis and impressed upon the Board that for precedent purposes they needed to be very clear on why they were agreeing to tuition students.

Whitcomb encouraged people to get in touch with their legislator. B. Sander again asked if people wanted to give the Superintendent some direction. Toohey wanted it to be clear that there were two options. One would be a consolidation vote for the two towns to join the Union. The other option would be to take action as a Board by saying it had been planned that there was going to be a grandfathering period. Based on the circumstances, a different approach was needed now and a structure needed to be put in place so students knew where they would be going to school.

Clark stated she had been asked to provide budgets with and without tuition. She could work to develop what it would cost to move students somewhere else. She stated she would like the minutes to reflect that she was asked specifically for this analysis. She thought she could have it available for the next MUU Board meeting. B. Sander suggested convening a subcommittee of members of the Administration, Belvidere and Waterville to review and make recommendations on alternative pricing on the options discussed. Discussion ensued as to when Belvidere and Waterville would be meeting in order to discuss the budget before the final numbers were presented on January 16th to the full Board.

FY 18 Budget Update and Possible Action: Clark presented the Board with the combined preliminary elementary school budgets, creating a blended tax rate. The equalized pupil count was 717, revenues were \$1.8 million before taxes and educational spending totaled 9.9 million, for an equalized pupil spending of \$13,856. The figures included the tuition to Waterville. The tax rate now was \$1.295, which included the \$.08 savings incentive. The tuition being sent to Waterville was \$402,000, which was the same rate per student as last year, with 34 students being projected from Belvidere.

Clark was asked if a motion needed to be made to request that she provide numbers for alternative scenarios. She requested that be done. Evans then made a motion to direct Clark to provide two financial scenarios: to send students to Eden School, and to open Belvidere School for Belvidere students. Andrew Beaupre seconded. Whitcomb noted that while there was discussion of Belvidere students being sent to Eden, no one had been to the Eden Board to discuss the matter. Eden may not have room for additional students. B. Sander said that would be part of the study. Chivington then highlighted the need for geographic consideration to the student's home in Clark's analysis.

The motion was then adjusted to read: Request that Clark provide financial scenarios for the following, while including geographic considerations:

a) Sending students to Eden, b) to Waterville, c) to Johnson, d) open Belvidere school, e) split them between Eden and Johnson. Neilson called the question, Hunsberger seconded, and the Board voted unanimously to call the question. The Board then voted unanimously to give Clark the authority to do the analysis. There was then discussion as to whether the entire Board could vote on this matter. The determination was there was a quorum and the vote was unanimous.

GMTCC Budget: Sherry Lussier, Director of GMTCC, provided the Board with a presentation on her proposed budget. She explained to the Board that her budget needed to be voted on now, as there were five sending schools in the region that needed the tuition numbers for their budgets. Lussier explained that 87% of a student's tuition came from the State, with 13% staying with the local school. The tuition rate was based on an average of the last 6 semesters. Lussier explained that a \$66,348 surplus was being added to the revenue for next year in order to bring tuition down. She noted that last year she had been frugal in addition to writing grants and ended up having to return \$106,000 to the sending schools. Teacher salaries and benefit costs were decreasing due to one less teacher. The Co-op teacher would also be leaving which would reduce costs. Program expenses will decrease by \$26,615. Maintenance and Property costs were increasing due to the Agriculture and Forestry program and over the past two years had increased \$100,000. Last year's budget was \$3,489,284; this year's budget would be \$3,451,883. This was a reduction of -1.07% or \$37,401. The average number of students was 154, with the per pupil tuition being \$7,073, down \$50 from last year.

B. Sander asked for the enrollment figures for the Farm Program. Lussier said there were two; nine had signed up but due to the requirement of participating in the summer they had backed out. Sander was concerned about the overall enrollment and asked if Lussier was working at increasing the number. Lussier stated she spent a lot of time on that. She noted that Act 77 law stated that high schools have a work placement person who could place a student in an internship directly from the high school. The Tech Center had an employability rubric, the business they work with had to have insurance, provide safety trainings, etc. These things were not necessarily happening in the high school. Lussier explained all other tech programs in the state were experiencing the same issue of enrollment and they were beginning to research a different funding mechanism.

Lussier then explained the technical centers were divided into 16 regions throughout the state, and high schools were assigned to specific tech centers. GMTCC's assigned schools were Stowe, Peoples Academy, Hazen Union, Craftsbury Academy, and Lamoille. However, if a different tech center offered

a program that wasn't available at GMTCC, the student could go there. For instance, GMTCC was the only center to offer a full HVAC program.

Bill Sander then made a motion to approve the budget as presented, seconded by Andrew Beaupre. The motion passed unanimously.

Discussion on Announced Tuition Rates and Possible Action: Clark explained that tuition in the State of Vermont needed to be announced by the 15th of January. If Eden, Hyde Park, and Johnson had tuitioning students coming in, the proposed tuition would be \$13,500 per student. The proposed high school tuition would be \$14,700. Clark noted that the school could charge less than the announced tuition. However, once the tuition was announced, the charge couldn't be increased.

Sander noted that being part of Cambridge he wouldn't be able to vote on the elementary school portion of the vote.

Clark requested a motion to announce tuition for the school year 2017-2018 as follows:

Grades K-6: \$13,500. Hunsberger made the motion, seconded by Moulton, to approve the tuition. The motion passed unanimously.

Grades 7-12: \$14, 700. B. Sander made the motion, seconded by Beaupre, to approve the tuition. The motion passed unanimously.

GMTCC: \$15,415 of which \$7,073 local portion/\$8,342 was State contribution. B. Sander made a motion, seconded by Moulton, to approve the tuition. The motion passed unanimously.

Other Business: There was no other business.

Adjourn: B. Sander made a motion, seconded by Moulton, to adjourn the meeting at 8:49 p.m. The motion passed unanimously.

Next Meeting:
January 16, 2017