

LAMOILLE NORTH SUPERVISORY UNION BOARD MEETING
MONDAY, AUGUST 24, 2015
GMTCC COMMUNITY EDUCATION CENTER

Board members present: Belvidere – Angie Evans, Valerie LeGrand; Cambridge – Jan Sander, Bernard Barnes, Laura Miller, Mark Stebbins; Eden – Jeff Hunsberger, Matt Mitchell; Hyde Park – Raven Walters, Dan Regan, Brian Marshall, Patti Hayford; Johnson – Katie Orost, Lauren Philie, Pierre Laflamme; LUSD #18 – David Whitcomb, Carl Szlachetka, Deb Baker, Eve Gagne, Beth Bailey, Balu Raman, Mark Nielsen, Krista Swahn, Adam Howard; Waterville – Becky Penberthy, Amanda Tilton-Martin, Marshall Pahl. Others: Edith Beatty, Marilyn Frederick, Brian Schaffer, Sherry Lussier, Wendy Savery, Michelle Aumand, Charleen McFarlane, Diane Reilly, Kate Torrey, Cat Gallagher, Joe Ciccolo, Jeff Francis, Bernie Juskiewicz, Dave Sharpe, Steve Dale, Andrew Martin

Note: All votes taken are unanimous unless otherwise noted.

1. *Call to Order, Approval of Agenda and Public Comment*

D. Whitcomb called the meeting to order at 6:01.

MOTION: C. Szlachetka moved to approve the agenda, B. Penberthy seconded, and the motion was passed.

2. *Approval of Consent Agenda Items*

MOTION: J. Sander moved to approve the executive committee minutes of January 26, March 23, June 18, and August 11, 2015, C. Szlachetka seconded, and the motion was passed.

MOTION: C. Szlachetka moved to approve the minutes of May 18, 2015, M. Mitchell seconded, and the motion was passed.

MOTION: B. Penberthy moved to approve the Clerk's Report on Directors' Orders, C. Szlachetka seconded, and the motion was passed.

3. *Act 46*

D. Whitcomb said the executive committee talked about forming a committee to study Act 46, but that doesn't mean we will accept consolidation; it just means we will study it.

E. Beatty said the board needs to hear the executive committee's recommendations and then decide whether or not to form a study committee. We have to discuss the composition of the study committee.

D. Regan said the executive committee decided to recommend that a study committee be formed. The executive committee's recommendation was that each district have 2 representatives on the study committee, for a total of 12. That recommendation may need to be discussed or superseded this evening. The executive committee also agreed we must do nothing in this early stage that would jeopardize our ability to get grants to help us in the process. The issue of how the committee will be composed is an important one.

D. Whitcomb said D. Regan is well-informed about Act 46 because he has been to meetings in Montpelier about it. He wanted to go as well, but the superintendent failed to invite all the board chairs. He wants people to ask questions of the legislators. At E. Beaty's suggestion, he invited Dave Sharpe to speak.

D. Sharpe said the legislature recognized that there are serious problems with education statewide. They have seen extremely tiny schools. There is one area with 4 high schools graduating a total of 60 students. Course offerings at those high schools are not sufficient for students to attend college in Vermont. The three goals of Act 46 were equity, quality and sustainability (what taxpayers can afford.) Legislators believe larger districts will accomplish those goals for many of our students. They ask that we focus on what is best for students. VSBA said when they testified about the legislation that it is a pretty good idea if it is done right. VSBA influenced the legislation and since it passed they have hired personnel and are working to help school boards figure out the process.

Bernie Juskiewicz said the per pupil cost of education in Vermont is one of the highest in the country and the student-teacher ratio is one of the lowest. The student population has decreased by 20K since 1997. Graduation rates are good but only 58% of students go on to postsecondary education. All legislators have heard from the public a desire to do something about property tax. The legislators tried to have respect for individual districts. This bill gives tools, incentives and guidelines for reorganization. Districts can decide where they want to go and how they want to do it. Legislators think it will end up being better for students, districts and the state.

D. Regan said D. Sharpe made a good point that whatever we decide ought to be with the students in mind. He thinks many of us would embrace that sentiment. For some areas where there are micro schools it is obvious what consolidation might do for teaching and learning. It is not so clear for the schools in the LNSU. What do legislators see as consequences of Act 46 for teaching and learning? He would like help in beginning to make the case that teaching and learning will improve due to Act 46.

D. Sharpe said he is in no position to comment on this district. In his district, Addison Northeast, there are 5 elementary schools and a union high school. The smallest has 60 students. The boards in the district recommended forming a study committee. The fear is, "My school will close." He thinks some of the micro schools will close whether or not they follow the requirements of Act 46. He thinks many will be able to survive and thrive better under a larger district. New Haven might be a good example. Its population could swell if the district decides students should go to the school closest to them because many people in Bristol are actually closer to the New Haven school than to the Bristol school. He believes many smaller schools will actually be in better shape within a larger family.

B. Bailey asked, if one town opts out of consolidation, will Act 46 override state rules about withdrawing from a union district? Withdrawing from a union is quite a procedure and every town in the district must vote.

D. Sharpe said legislators were concerned about orphan districts. In his area, Huntington opted out of Chittenden East. He doesn't know if they will continue with that decision, but right now they are an orphan district. Legislators are concerned about how students will be successful in those districts. There are several districts Huntington could join. If it does not join one by 2019, the Secretary of Education may require it to join one of the nearby larger districts. It is clear that the Secretary of Education is given authority to move districts into larger districts in the end.

D. Baker said D. Sharpe had said not to worry about local control and then he said the Secretary of Education has the final say.

D. Sharpe said there are 4 years of local control. That is deliberate. In Montpelier they would probably make a lot of mistakes if they chose what was best. That is why boards should take action and do what is best for students in their districts.

D. Baker said she doesn't see how consolidation will save money for taxpayers.

D. Sharpe said the legislature took testimony from the business managers' association that it would save about \$30 million. We have a student-teacher ratio issue. A business manager from Essex Junction said in his testimony that he could immediately have 3 fewer staff members in his business office with consolidation. Even though they buy fuel collectively, the process of handling the buying and auditing is time consuming. In Chittenden East, despite the fact that Huntington hasn't joined, they expect \$300K of savings in the first year and more as they move forward. D. Sharpe spoke with C. McFarlane here, who agreed that consolidation would make her life simpler. If all 5 LNSU elementary schools wanted to offer French to students, now each school would need to approve that and there would be 5 different teaching contracts. If all were part of a single district it would be an easier process.

D. Baker said we already share services in elementary schools. We have a unified master contract. The high school belongs to a statewide coop for buying supplies. She does not see where this will save us any money. Lamoille Union has 800 students, just under the limit to be a district. She doesn't think legislators thought this law out completely.

K. Orost asked if M. Frederick could give examples of where consolidation would save us money.

M. Frederick said studying this is important. We won't realize whether we can save money unless we study it. We could save money on audit costs. When she worked in a single district they used to spend \$14K on the audit. We have 9 entities that have to be audited. We spend close to \$80K for audits. If we had a single district, the cost would be more like \$20K. Each district has treasurer costs. The highest amount one of our districts spends for a town treasurer is \$17K per year. We don't need more than one treasurer and we have 7. M. Frederick has to produce a report for the state on all expenses and revenues for each district. Each of those reports takes her 2 days. If we had a single district she would only have to do one. It takes her 18 days now to do all of them. (*M. Pahl ar-*

rived at 6:36.) Are we going to get rid of the business manager if we consolidate? Probably not. But her focus could probably be used in a different way. Combining technology could be beneficial. She feels all kids need access to the same services. In remote areas we have to be able to combine efforts to maximize services for kids. When she first came here, our schools did not have fast internet. Now we have the largest and fastest network in the state, but it took many years to get there. In a single district it would have taken a fraction of the time.

D. Whitcomb said we pay out \$37K a year to VSBA, the Vermont Principals' Association and the Vermont Superintendents Association. If we have only one board, will we pay less? Will we have fewer superintendents with Act 46?

B. Juskiewicz said we have 60 superintendents. Some are superintendents for a district of 300-400 students, similar to the size of Cambridge Elementary. Once districts re-form, hopefully there will be fewer. He can see savings with that. If we can get from 60 down to 30 there will be savings. The bill doesn't say we will get rid of teachers but it may allow us to improve student-teacher ratios. This year at CES a teacher retired and the school decided to absorb the position unless there was an influx of students.

J. Ciccolo said he worked in Cambridge, Massachusetts in a district with 12 elementary and high schools, a big budget, and lots of local control. It is possible. He is now the principal of a small school. He has one custodian who has to take care of the whole building in summer. There is a lot that needs to be done at schools during the summer. If all the LNSU schools were part of one district there could be a facilities deployment system to deploy a team around the SU and get that work done more efficiently. If someone from food service calls in sick at his school, he will have to cook. There are a lot of challenges for a little school. If he needs an electrician for a small job he has to hire one. But he knows there is an electrician on the Lamoille Union maintenance staff. His students will never realize the greatness and availability of technology the way they could if they were sharing with the rest of the SU.

K. Swahn said her concern is that the talk about savings sounds a lot like losing jobs. Students won't be able to stay here in Vermont after they graduate because we are losing jobs. We will see savings, but if we take 3 people out of the business office there are 3 people who just lost their jobs. She is concerned about people working in our communities who might lose their jobs.

B. Schaffer said so far this evening there hasn't been one statement on improving outcomes for kids. He wants to bring a different perspective. As high school principal he sees in our SU structure that we have developed silos. When you develop silos you create challenge for kids in a PK-12 system. He would like the board to consider breaking down barriers to kids and making sure we have a more integrated, seamless approach with equal access to technology. He would encourage moving forward with a study. If there is more cohesion he guarantees students will be better off in our SU.

V. LeGrand asked where the incentive money is coming from.

D. Sharpe said we live in a closed loop system. It is coming from the education fund that taxpayers are putting money into. The earlier a district gets in, the better off taxpayers in that district are.

V. LeGrand asked, so those not moving forward as quickly will pay for others' incentives? Other board members said yes. The legislators did not reply.

B. Juskiewicz said CES started a gifted and talented program about 10 years before other elementary schools took it up. If LNSU were all one district, all would have had it.

M. Nielsen asked if D. Sharpe and B. Juskiewicz could talk about the negatives to Act 46.

D. Sharpe said the biggest fear is loss of local control and school board members losing power. He wants to commend the staff people who have spoken. Our constitution requires us to provide an equitable education for our students. He believes if LNSU moves forward the boards will do the best thing for students and keep costs under control for taxpayers.

B. Penberthy said the most compelling argument she has heard tonight is about focusing on K-12 education, but her concern is that we should have been focusing on that already and we have had a hard time with it. She is not sure if this bill will help. The board needs to remember to keep kids front and center and money second.

Steve Dale asked if people feel they know enough about what is in the bill to make a decision on whether or not to do a study.

B. Barnes asked if there is a long term study on the savings and how it will impact jobs.

Steve Dale said there was a lot of testimony about individual places but circumstances are so different in different places it really requires a local area to do a study to answer what the effect will be for them. It will be important to look at our data and our situation.

B. Barnes said most of our kids are leaving the state after college and that is because of industry. Has the governor asked what we are going to do to keep the student population up?

D. Sharpe said our teacher corps is aging. We can expect a lot of retirements. Reducing staff is likely to be done with attrition, not laying people off. The percentage of students going on to post secondary education is a real problem and a real economic driver. We need to inspire more students to go to college and create pathways so they can do that. That is an economic driver for our state. There are companies in Vermont who can't find the employees they need in our state because our students aren't educated to a high enough level.

B. Barnes said middle class families are having a difficult time so the graduation rate is suffering.

D. Sharpe said there is a nationwide issue of losing the middle class and wage stagnation. Vermont is not immune from that. Our unemployment rate is relatively low but our wages are not sufficient. It is a problem we share with much of the country. He doesn't think we will solve it with an education bill. The number of low income students who have aspirations and are educated to competence is not good. We have much work to do in educating them.

D. Baker asked what will happen to the property the school districts own. For instance, Belvidere owns about 80 acres of land.

S. Dale said that issue has to be solved. In the consolidation process that will be negotiated. Some districts have taken better care of their facilities than others. If districts are coming together, those who have put money into their facilities won't want to put money into others' facilities. Part of the study committee's work will be to talk about how to resolve issues around indebtedness and ownership. If there are concerns about ownership they will have to be worked through so consolidation can be defended to the electorate.

B. Raman asked if it is possible to have the state stepping in and buying properties.

S. Dale said he hasn't heard of that. B. Juskiewicz said not at this time. D. Sharpe said if a building is closed or sold because of the creation of a larger district, the district is exempt from repaying the state for any money the state has invested in the building. That will be an advantage for some districts.

S. Dale said Act 46 is an umbrella bill that spells out a general direction and incentives and disincentives. Below that are Act 153 and Act 156. Those remain in effect and have incentive money and consulting money built into them. Below that is Section 706 of Title 16, the law that says how a unified district is created. That is the law that guides the study committee process. Section 706 describes creation of a study committee. It says membership of the committee will be proportional to equalized pupil count or at least related to it in some way. He knows the executive committee was interested in more equal membership, but the law says there must be some proportionality. No matter what the makeup of the committee is, if it is a contentious process it usually doesn't succeed because all towns do not support it.

The study committee will study cost, educational benefits, incentives and disincentives and analyze the advisability of consolidating. The committee will be comprised of members from each of the districts of LNSU. Each individual board will be asked to agree to the makeup of the committee as decided by this board and to authorize spending of no more than \$25K. The committee will need the approval of the electorate to spend more than that. The study committee does not include representatives from the LUSD board. Each elementary district board will need to choose the people from their district who will serve on the committee. One from each district has to be a board member. The others can

be board members or citizens or high school board members. The executive committee discussed that if the study committee acts expeditiously the option should be left open to seek an accelerated merger before next July 1. If people feel we need more time after getting into the process we can slow it down and wait for the next tier of incentives. Starting the committee now gives the option to move as quickly as people want. If we wait a few months we will probably lose the option of asking the electorate to go for the accelerated incentives.

Going to the electorate on town meeting day means having to warn the vote by the end of January or beginning of February. The state board meets on February 19, so the report would have to be submitted to them by about January 5. That gives us about 3 and half months. The executive committee was thinking of possibly holding a special meeting for the vote later, in May or June, which would give more time. Tonight we are not setting an end date.

M. Mitchell asked if we are locked in after we give our report to the state.

S. Dale said the committee will be creating a report which will lay out all the information and analysis and make a recommendation on whether to go forward. It will include what the articles of agreement would be (addressing things like ownership, whether small schools can be closed, etc.) It has to be submitted to the state Board of Education to be checked for legality, then it will go on the warning for every town. The accelerated merger doesn't happen if every town doesn't agree. There are other options available, but for the maximum incentives, every town has to agree. Once the report goes to the state board it is up to the voters.

M. Mitchell asked, what if we go down that track and then realize we forgot something?

S. Dale said if it is something that needs legal adjustment that could be done. If it's more like realizing the whole thing was a huge mistake, once the voters vote it is like when the union high school was created. Every community has to vote to disband the entity. A decision to consolidate can be reversed with a vote of all the communities.

D. Baker asked what will happen if Lamoille Union becomes part of a new district. Will every town have to vote to disband LUSD #18?

S. Dale said his understanding is that Lamoille Union would be subsumed into the new district as a result of the vote. The voters will have agreed to create a K-12 district instead of a 7-12 school.

D. Baker said she read in Act 46 that it would be possible for LNSU to form a PK-6 district. Is that true?

S. Dale said the bill is intended to encourage PK-12 districts. It may be possible to create a PK-6 district but he is not sure it is advisable.

D. Sharpe thanked the board for inviting him and B. Juskiewicz to the meeting. He reiterated that board members should think about what is best for students. B. Juskiewicz said he is happy to participate any time people want him to. D. Sharpe and B. Juskiewicz left at 7:24 and D. Whitcomb left temporarily to talk to them, asking D. Regan to take over running the meeting.

E. Beatty said the executive committee wanted representation of the different districts on the study committee to be equitable. They reached a consensus that each district would have 2 representatives. But S. Dale warned that might not fly. She has been working with S. Dale and others to get information about the requirements. Our attorney said we have to have proportionality.

D. Regan said there seems to be tension between having equal representation and being eligible for grants. The examples he has seen show that the report and analysis represent an enormous amount of work. If we could outsource that to a consultant paid for by grant funds we would save our time to engage with the community. He urges the board to come up with a plan for committee representation that will pass muster with AOE.

J. Sander said she was one of the people pushing for equal representation and she still feels very strongly that that would be best, but we have to be realistic. In her opinion it would not be wise to jeopardize our ability to get grants. She is willing to reconsider having equal representation.

C. Szlachetka said one of his concerns with requiring 2 members from each town is that, based on his experience with board or committee activity, it is difficult to get people to come to meetings even though they say they will commit. Requiring 2 board members could increase problems with people not showing up to meetings and then saying they didn't know about the committee's decisions. He would support shaving down the number of representatives and probably being more in line with statute.

R. Walters said she doesn't see any logical way for us to ignore these requirements. We shouldn't jeopardize getting grants.

MOTION: R. Walters moved that the study committee structure reflect the recommendations of the business office to achieve proportionality: 1 member from Belvidere, 1 from Waterville, 2 from Eden, 3 from Johnson, 3 from Hyde Park, and 3 from Cambridge. J. Sander seconded.

M. Nielsen asked how rigid that number is. Could extra people show up at a meeting to give input?

S. Dale said this would be the official makeup of the committee and the number of voting members. The committee can decide how it operates and how it includes people. A community with 1 representative could designate a person from the community to come to every meeting. At the end, when the committee takes a vote and submits a proposal it will be the voting members who will do that.

B. Penberthy said based on the number of students she thinks Cambridge should have 4 voting members for the numbers to be proportional. A. Howard agreed. If Eden, with 252 students, has 2 votes and Cambridge has 575 students, his math tells him it would be a disservice to Cambridge if they did not have at least 4 representatives. Hyde Park and Johnson have about a third fewer students than Cambridge and it is proposed that they have the same number of votes as Cambridge.

MOTION: R. Walters moved to amend the motion to change the number of representatives from Cambridge from 3 to 4, seconded by B. Penberthy. It was clarified the amendment does not mean any other towns are having their number of representatives decreased; it increases the total number of committee members.

R. Walters asked if there was any rationale the board should be aware of for the original proposal that Johnson, Hyde Park, and Cambridge should all have 3 representatives.

E. Beatty said she has gotten a lot of opinions about this and the consensus seems to be that pure proportionality is not required, but an allegiance to proportionality it. The numbers are not exactly proportional. If they were, Belvidere would have less than half a representative. The recommendation was also trying to stay in line with the will of the executive committee to have more equality.

S. Dale said 4 for Cambridge is obviously more accurate than 3.

The motion to amend passed.

B. Raman said this makes the committee membership an even number. Should it be odd in case of a tie?

K. Swahn said she thinks S. Dale said earlier that if the vote were that close it would not be in our best interest to move forward anyway.

The amended motion was passed.

D. Whitcomb took over as chair again.

4. *Consolidated Support Staff Master Agreement Presentation*

E. Beatty noted that Belvidere, Waterville, and Johnson will not need to vote on the consolidated support staff master agreement. All the other districts, including LUSD, are part of it.

C. McFarlane said this agreement is for July 1, 2014 through June 30, 2017. Administrators are comfortable implementing the changes in this master agreement.

MOTION: J. Sander moved to enter executive session to discuss the consolidated support staff master agreement, premature public knowledge of which would place the municipality as a substantial disadvantage, with administrators invited to re-

main, including the superintendent, business manager, HR director, and principals. The motion was seconded and passed and the board entered executive session at 7:50. The board came out of executive session at 8:07.

D. Whitcomb asked why the LNSU board is being asked to ratify the contract before the other boards go into individual meetings to do so. C. McFarlane said the LNSU board votes to approve the contract for central office support staff and other boards vote on the contract for their own support staff.

MOTION: C. Szlachetka moved to ratify the Joint Support Staff Master Agreement for July 1, 2014 – June 30, 2017, M. Mitchell seconded, and the motion was passed.

5. ***Recess for Individual Board Ratification of Consolidated Support Staff Master Agreement and Vote to Create Act 46 Study Committee***

The meeting was recessed at about 8:10 so individual boards could meet.

6. ***Call to Order to Resume LNSU Meeting and Report Outcomes***

The meeting was called back to order at 8:32. Some board members had left, but C. McFarlane said a quorum was still present. Present were A. Evans, L. Miller, B. Barnes, J. Sander, M. Stebbins, C. Szlachetka, D. Baker, K. Swahn, B. Bailey, B. Raman, M. Mitchell, J. Hunsberger, D. Whitcomb, K. Orost, R. Walters, D. Regan, B. Marshall, and P. Hayford.

The Cambridge, Hyde Park, Eden, and LUSD boards all reported they had voted to ratify the support staff master agreement.

The Cambridge, Hyde Park, Eden, Waterville, Belvidere, and Johnson boards all reported they had voted to agree to the creation of an Act 46 study committee.

7. ***Authorize Food Service Contracts***

M. Frederick said in February we went out to bid for food service for Johnson and Cambridge. In late May, the state informed us of new guidelines for bidding food service agreements. We learned that we had not complied with the new rules because we did not advertise in a statewide newspaper. So we needed to redo the bid process. Bids are due August 27. M. Frederick spoke with The Abbey and they assured her they will still operate to start the school year unless they hear differently. This board won't meet again soon enough to review the bids, so M. Frederick is asking that the superintendent and business manager be authorized to award the contract. She reminded the board that a couple of years ago food service became the responsibility of the LNSU board.

MOTION: B. Bailey moved to appoint the superintendent and business manager as the board's representatives in reviewing and awarding the food service contracts, M. Mitchell seconded, and the motion was passed.

8. ***Ratify VSBA for Superintendent Evaluation***

D. Whitcomb said the executive committee voted to hire Harry Frank to work with a committee to do the superintendent's evaluation. But the executive committee does not have authority to spend money so the board needs to ratify that decision. A contract with Harry Frank for \$1000 has been signed.

MOTION: It was moved and seconded to ratify the decision of the executive committee to hire VSBA and pay a fee of \$1000 to help the board do the superintendent evaluation and the motion was passed with B. Bailey abstaining.

9. ***Other Business***

E. Beatty reminded the board that support staff have not yet ratified the support staff master agreement. We expect them to do it soon. That is why it was important to discuss the agreement in executive session. It is still confidential until it is ratified by them.

C. Szlachetka said all the talk today of unanimity of votes raised a caution for him. He would advise anyone on the Act 46 study committee to vote their conscience and not vote for consolidation if they are not in favor of it. There have been situations where a committee supposedly unanimously voted something and then people later said they didn't support it. That is not healthy.

M. Mitchell said we haven't discussed anything about the study committee other than who is on it. When does that discussion start?

E. Beatty said we will try to convene the committee in the 3rd or 4th week of September. She will apply for our grant. VSBA, the Principals' Association, the Superintendents Association and AOE are working on a project. An attorney has been hired to head that up. The attorney will furnish us with a list of possible consultants and E. Beatty, D. Whitcomb and the committee members will try to get the right match. Ideally we would have the consultant for the first meeting. The first order of business for the committee will be to appoint a chair.

J. Hunsberger asked, if a designated committee member from one town can't make it to a meeting are there rules about a sub for them? E. Beatty said the law may cover that. We can clear that up. Generally the member votes but others can be there. In the end, there needs to be full consensus or we go back to the drawing board.

L. Miller asked how much time commitment committee members should expect. E. Beatty said she thinks the committee might meet once or twice a month.

10. ***Adjourn***

MOTION: C. Szlachetka moved to adjourn at 8:40, B. Bailey seconded, and the motion was passed.

Respectfully submitted by,
Donna E. Griffiths

Actions taken at the LNSU Board 8-20-15:

1. *Call to Order, Approval of Agenda and Public Comment*
MOTION: C. Szlachetka moved to approve the agenda, B. Penberthy seconded, and the motion was passed.
2. *Approval of Consent Agenda Items*
MOTION: J. Sander moved to approve the executive committee minutes of January 26, March 23, June 18, and August 11, 2015, C. Szlachetka seconded, and the motion was passed.

MOTION: C. Szlachetka moved to approve the minutes of May 18, 2015, M. Mitchell seconded, and the motion was passed.

MOTION: B. Penberthy moved to approve the Clerk's Report on Directors' Orders, C. Szlachetka seconded, and the motion was passed.
3. *Act 46*
MOTION: R. Walters moved that the study committee structure reflect the recommendations of the business office to achieve proportionality: 1 member from Belvidere, 1 from Waterville, 2 from Eden, 3 from Johnson, 3 from Hyde Park, and 3 from Cambridge. J. Sander seconded.

MOTION: R. Walters moved to amend the motion to change the number of representatives from Cambridge from 3 to 4, seconded by B. Penberthy. The motion to amend passed.

The amended motion was passed.
4. *Consolidated Support Staff Master Agreement Presentation*
MOTION: J. Sander moved to enter executive session to discuss the consolidated support staff master agreement, premature public knowledge of which would place the municipality as a substantial disadvantage, with administrators invited to remain, including the superintendent, business manager, HR director, and principals. The motion was seconded and passed and the board entered executive session at 7:50.

MOTION: C. Szlachetka moved to ratify the Joint Support Staff Master Agreement for July 1, 2014 – June 30, 2017, M. Mitchell seconded, and the motion was passed.
7. *Authorize Food Service Contracts*
MOTION: B. Bailey moved to appoint the superintendent and business manager as the board's representatives in reviewing and awarding the food service contracts, M. Mitchell seconded, and the motion was passed.
8. *Ratify VSBA for Superintendent Evaluation*
MOTION: It was moved and seconded to ratify the decision of the executive committee to hire VSBA and pay a fee of \$1000 to help the board do the superintendent evaluation and the motion was passed with B. Bailey abstaining.
10. *Adjourn*
MOTION: C. Szlachetka moved to adjourn at 8:40, B. Bailey seconded, and the motion was passed.