

Green Mountain Unified School District  
Board  
Wednesday, March 21, 2018  
CTES Art Room  
6:00 p.m.

**I. ROLL CALL/CALL TO ORDER:**

Board: Joseph Fromberger, Marilyn Mahusky, Deb Brown, Doug McBride, Jeff Hance, Kathy Muther, Kate Lamphere, Erin Lamson, Fred Marin (6:37pm)

Staff: Meg Powden, Cheryl Hammond, Pam O'Neil, Jenn Harper, George Thomson, Katherine Fogg, Amanda Tyrrell, Todd Parah

Other Board Members: Wayne Wheelock,

Public: Shawn Cunningham, Sara Stowell, Trevor Barlow, Christine Balch, Bill Dakin,

Ms. Mahusky called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. The board introduced themselves.

**II. APPROVE AGENDA:**

Ms. Brown **moved** to approve the agenda. Ms. Lamson seconded and the motion to approve the agenda carried with no opposition.

**III. APPROVE MINUTES:**

A. February 13, 2018 Regular Meeting

Ms. Lamphere **moved** to approve the minutes of the February 13, 2018 regular meeting. Ms. Lamson seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

**IV. COMMUNICATIONS:**

A. Public Comments

Ms. Mahusky thanked the public for coming and giving their input. She advised that the board appreciate hearing what they're doing right and what they are doing wrong.

B. Board Comments

None.

**V. OLD BUSINESS:**

A. FY2018-2019 Budget

Ms. Mahusky reminded the board that the 2018-2019 budget failed at its recent vote, so the board needs to reevaluate the budget and determine what changes they can make to it so that the public will support it. There had been discussion about holding a finance committee meeting after the vote but Ms. Mahusky felt that they needed to get direction from the board before proceeding. The proposed budget draft is in the board packet for their review. Ms. Mahusky asked for board comments about the budget. Mr. McBride suggested that the board and possibly the finance committee meets to evaluate why the budget was voted down, and then address those reasons. He felt it would be a mistake to revise the budget without identifying what those reasons were and if they went into a new budget vote without identifying those reasons they would likely end up with another no vote. He felt that the board should be more courageous in their budget creation. He felt that the voters were looking at the Act 46 promises and felt that the budget they presented to the voters made it seem like the Act 46 merger was overpromised and under-delivered.

Mr. McBride noted that the merger promised more educational opportunities, but when they look at the budget, it shows a Dean of students at an elementary school and a .17 foreign language teacher and a few other things, but many voters don't feel these small things meet their idea of educational opportunities promised to the voters with the Act 46 merger. The Act 46 study also promised economies of scale and that the district would realize modest savings from this merger, yet on average the cost per pupil has increased about \$500 on a consolidated basis. This year the budget is up about 3.4%.

Mr. McBride suggested that they should start with a level-funded basis on a cost per student basis. That would roughly cut \$400,000 from the budget. The special education budget went down about \$200,000. If they eliminate the dean of students position, that would save another \$100,000. If they removed the \$180,000 from the budget that they added in to expand benefits to a new group of people with the merger,

that would also help. Then they can look at the Act 46 enhancements that were discussed during the Act 46 study committee work and define in broad strokes which of those things are necessary and should be added to the budget at this stage. He noted that BRHS will be shutting down in another year or two and all of those students will be looking for a place to attend middle and high school. If this board addresses the budget this year and reaches for the stars in offering stellar programming, they have a better chance of attracting the BRHS students. If they became a school of excellence, they can pick up other students beyond the BRHS students. If they can attract 100 tuition students, they will have less revenue problems and can continue to enhance the programming.

Mr. McBride shared 3 ideas of how to begin that process. He suggested that the school could be a two language school, with a true immersion program. Foreign language wouldn't just be for those students that opted to take it. He also suggested having a world-class STEM program. The math assessment scores are woefully low and they need to focus on that to become a better school. He also suggested having a world-class apprenticeship program. He suggested that they direct Ms. Powden's and her staff to create a budget that has those ideas incorporated in it, then present it to the board.

Mr. Fromberger felt that the board needed to live in the here and now. While he appreciates Mr. McBride's ideas the reality is that taxpayers will have to support that. Mr. McBride felt that was a fair comment and they cannot again overpromise and under-deliver again. But they need to start making incremental change in order to attract the hundred students from Black River. In order to continue to improve and grow programming, they will need the revenue from the BRHS tuition students. He felt that the cost is a fair question, but they need to do something grand and exquisite. He did not know how much these ideas would cost but suggested that the business office would need to determine the cost by seeking input from schools that are already doing these initiatives. He also suggested that there are many corporate grants available for STEM programming and apprenticeships.

Ms. Lamphere suggested that before they make changes to the budget, they need to determine why the budget was voted down. Instead of speculating, they should ask the community members in this room that voted it down why they did. Ms. Lamphere had heard from some people that the budget didn't pass not because it was too high, but because it didn't deliver on the promises. She advised that she would like to hear from more people, including the teachers and staff as well as the community. She would like to hear what the priorities are whether it's languages or STEM or something else that they should be prioritizing.

Mr. McBride reminded the board that they spent 18 months hearing from teachers, parents, community members and board members about what the priorities should be within a merger and STEM and foreign language were top priorities at that time. Ms. Mahusky disagreed with Mr. Fromberger that Mr. McBride's ideas were "pie in the sky". While they might not be able to fund all of these initiatives in this budget cycle, they should be able to develop 3 to 5 year plan that begins making those changes. She felt that if they developed an actual plan in which they could demonstrate that they are moving toward foreign language at the elementary schools by taking this step, this step and this other step, the voters would be more receptive than they were to just having high school kids go down and help out with foreign language at the elementary schools. She also felt that they really needed to identify ways that they can attract the Black River students not just by default, but because the students want to go to GM—where they are *choosing* to go to the school. She reported on the recent Norwich University award from NASA. She noted that some of these students are from this area, therefore she felt that there must be additional resources available that they can find to help with these initiatives. Ms. Mahusky also felt that they needed to learn what was going on in each of the schools. She felt she knew what was going on at Chester Andover, Ms. Brown might know what's going on at Green Mountain and Mr. McBride might know what's going on at CTES, but they don't all know what's going on in each of the schools. That is something they needed to change as a board. She noted that it's possible that some of these things are happening at some of the schools and they need to identify ways to incorporate them in all the schools. She suggested that they need to refine some of the initiatives.

Ms. O'Neil reported that she recently came back from the NEASCC conference and one of the things that was presented was on community engagement. Some schools are attempting to engage the community by holding community forums not at the school but at public places where the community members already are gathering, such as cafes and diners. Ms. Mahusky noted that the VSBA is holding a presentation on community engagement forums on April 15 or 16. Ms. Lamphere suggested developing a strategic plan over the next 3 to 5 years including input from the community and the teachers and then build the budget based on that strategic plan. Ms. Powden noted that the board needed to work backwards from a vote date so that they can warn the vote and plan the budget accordingly. Ms. Lamphere suggested that the rushed timeline was the exact problem that got them a no vote in the first place. Ms. Stowell thanked the board for looking at community involvement and for hearing that the community needs transparency.

Ms. Stowell suggested the board can come back with a budget proposal and concrete steps to address the transparency, the community involvement, and looking at TRSU budget. She suggested looking at a special education study over the last 10 to 15 years so they can see where special ed funding is spent. What type of person is attending what type of programs? How much are those programs? And do they make sense to host in-house rather than tuition out? Then the board and the community will know which types of programs they can't possibly serve and which ones they can. Ms. Stowell also she felt that a .17 FTE foreign-language position is ridiculous. She speaks two languages and has volunteer taught foreign language at the school and the only thing that can be done in .17 FTE is to have kids hear a foreign language and not be frightened of it--but not actually learn it.

Ms. Mahusky questioned the consequences of not passing a budget in time. Ms. Powden explained that typically for operating districts they would go into a default budget which is 87% of the current operating budget. The GMUSD is in a unique situation as they don't operate currently. She has emailed Brad James and the AOE about their situation and is waiting to hear back. Ms. Mahusky felt that this is necessary information to have before determining which way they will plan a budget.

Mr. McBride noted that this is a difficult time with not passing a budget but felt that they should be seeing it as an opportunity. Very few schools have 100-150 kids available to attract. If they can get the hundred more students budgeting problems would go away and they could end up with a fantastic school system as a result. If they let the opportunity pass, the school will just get smaller than it is currently.

Ms. Mahusky questioned if there were members on the board that wanted to form a committee to develop community engagement forums--looking into what the schools are already doing for the students and looking forward at what more they can do. For example what's involved in a language immersion program? She suggested they could have different languages at each elementary school and then kids have a choice of which school they would want to attend. Then the board would also need to look at middle school and high school foreign-language so that the elementary learning isn't lost because a child has the choice whether or not to continue learning a foreign language.

The board can also look at STEM programming and apprenticeships. Ms. Lamphere felt that they needed to have an assessment of what they're currently doing and what the priorities are moving forward. They need to distill the Act 46 information. Ms. Muther noted that they need to not just get in the schools for input—that only gets the parents' input. There are more voters out there. She suggested going to a grocery store or nursing home to poll voters. She suggested finding out what those people want as well. Mr. McBride suggested surveying the voters about why they voted the budget down such as through survey monkey. Ms. Muther noted that there are people who aren't online. Ms. Brown advised that sending emails will hit the most people the quickest, but paper copies can be put in public areas like grocery stores, post offices or town offices. Mr. McBride suggested also using the news outlets for information.

Ms. Lamson felt that they have a responsibility to acknowledge what the schools are doing currently. While these things can get better, they have a lot of great things going on in the schools. For example GM has a wilderness immersion program and there are a group of students planning a school trip this summer to Oregon to hike on the west coast. This committee needs to not just hear what the community wants but also share with the community what the schools are already doing.

Mr. Barlow noted that the board members have been voted in because the community trusted them to do right by them—financially and educationally. He challenged the board to develop their list of priorities and present a budget that meets their interpretation of the community needs and defend it. He also noted that they need to do a better job marketing the programs at the schools—what they can do in the future and what they're already doing.

Mr. McBride questioned the TRSU budget and how that budget would need to get changed to accommodate the GMUSD budget changes. Ms. Powden questioned why Mr. McBride felt that the central office and special ed budgets would need to change in order to accommodate the GM changes. Mr. McBride noted that this is exactly his question. If they don't have control over half of their budget, the board needs to know this Ms. Powden noted that the TRSU budget was approved by the full TRSU board, but last night when the LMHUUSD board organized, they also questioned whether the SU budget should be reopened. She noted that she plans to bring the question to the executive committee meeting tomorrow but it will ultimately be up to the full TRSU board if they want to reopen the budget and approve a different budget.

There was discussion of the timing to warn for a vote. Ms. Powden suggested that they can still work on the GMUSD budget and then if the TRSU reopens their budget, that will have some impact. Mr. McBride clarified that Ms. Powden was saying that the GMUSD budget is completely editable by the GMUSD board. Ms. Powden explained that the TRSU assessment is not editable by the GMUSD board. Ms. Mahusky explained what is included in the TRSU budget. This is the central office operations including staff and operating expenses. It also includes the special education budget which is dictated by IEP's and also has staffing implications. She explained that all of the para educators are in the local budgets but that the teachers and professional staff are in the SU budget.

The other piece of the SU budget is the transportation budget. GM's assessment is for all of the transportation expenses for these three schools. There are also technology assessments from the TRSU budget. This year the TRSU board moved two positions from the TRSU budget into the local budgets (one to GMUSD and one to LMHUUSD) because these staff members only work in those assigned schools. In the current budget, GMUSD is essentially subsidizing the LMHUUSD technology position. She noted that there isn't a lot of wiggle room in the TRSU budget. The TRSU board can make changes to the SU budget where salaries and benefits are concerned for nonunion employees. However, the only positions the TRSU could cut would be central office staff positions. Mr. McBride felt that adopting a budget with such a large portion outside of this board's control was challenging to accept. Mr. McBride felt that this board should have voice in this budget decision. Ms. Mahusky explained that the GMUSD board has representatives on the TRSU board and therefore a voice in their budget decision. Mr. McBride noted that this board has a job to present the new budget and having so much of the off-limits is challenging. There was discussion about bringing the question to the SU executive committee to reopen the TRSU budget.

Mr. Fromberger explained that if they want the TRSU board to reopen the SU budget, they need to request it of the full board, but ultimately that is up to the full TRSU board whether or not to reopen it. If they do reopen it, the superintendent would then need to come up with a new budget based on direction from that board; then the full board would discuss that budget draft and either approve or decline it.

Ms. Tyrrell noted that she heard a lot of feedback from various people that she interacts with and most of them felt that the vote failed because of the central office budget. Ms. Brown questioned why the voters don't get a vote in the SU budget. Mr. Fromberger explained that the state statute requires that each public school is supervised by superintendent who needs to have a budget to do that job. The state also determined that the SU board will develop and vote on the SU budget to provide for the superintendent's responsibilities. Ms. Tyrrell questioned the percentage of this SU budget based on the local budgets as compared to other SU's percentage in their local budgets. There was discussion about the cost to run the central office such as salaries rent etc. In the past the SU budget was only a small piece of the school budget but now because the SU budget includes special education and transportation based on state statute, it is a bigger challenge to accept just a chunk of money from the budget is going to the SU without a vote of the local board. There was discussion that the state didn't then keep up with these changes and let the voters have a voice in this new SU budget.

Ms. Mahusky asked the board what they wanted to do with the SU budget request. There was discussion about approving a budget by the next meeting in order to warn the budget for a late May vote. Ms. Powden reminded the board that they had suggested that they may want to look at the committee for expanded programming. She suggested that the board could charge that committee and begin meeting soon. There was discussion about this being part of the finance committee or some other committee.

Mr. McBride suggested that the vision comes first before the finances. Ms. Lamphere agreed and noted that the vision committee needs to look at the priorities discussed during the Act 46 meetings and then develop a long-term plan. Mr. McBride suggested this committee could run in parallel to the finance committee so that they can see about the cost and financial impact of these various priorities. He gave an example of purchasing a canned STEM program from Microsoft or the Gates Foundation and look at what other schools are already doing. He also suggested also looking at Sen. Sanders' apprenticeship program idea. There was discussion about these apprenticeships, trade jobs, running small businesses and tech center involvement. Ms. O'Neil noted that some of this work is already being done John Donarum who works .6 fte to help connect students with these internships and with flexible pathways. Ms. Lamphere noted that the committee can ask what the school is doing now and what the board needs to do to help make it better. Mr. McBride noted that the school to work initiative is not the same thing as the apprenticeship programs that he's speaking of. There was discussion about the Act 46 ideas and then determining what finances are needed to do them.

Ms. Stowell noted that the board could approve a level funded budget that does no harm, but advised that the board needs to have a plan to go to the voters with. She felt that they should ask to reopen the SU budget and

then also talk to the state whether it be the AOE, Brad James, Rebecca Holcombe or Phil Scott, to look at ways to change how the SU budget is approved on particularly since it has so much impact on the local budget.

There was discussion about the vision and plan that the voters will “buy into”. Ms. Mahusky noted her concern with the budget driving the decisions about the vision rather than the decisions driving the budget. Mr. Fromberger noted that the German apprenticeship program is a great program but it will be a challenge to adopt quickly. There was discussion about implementing one initiative or maybe step one of three different initiatives. Ms. Mahusky noted that they still need to be mindful of the budget dollars. She also reminded the board that fitting these initiatives into the student-teacher day is also a challenge they need to deal with. The board discussed possibly adopting a lesser expensive “great idea” because they can afford it, than one that is more of a priority but that they can’t afford at this time.

The board consensus was to appoint a vision committee consisting of Mr. McBride, Ms. Lampson, Ms. Lamphere, Ms. Brown and Ms. Mahusky. Mr. McBride questioned if the committee meetings can be conducted via email since they are short on time. There was discussion about sending an email such as looking at a particular website, but no substantive conversations can happen via email they must wait until the public meeting. The meetings would need to be warned at least 24 hours in advance because they are special meetings.

The committee will also need to invite people in to educate them about the initiatives. They will need to promote what the schools are already doing and how these initiatives can continue to improve the schools. There was also discussion about seeking grant funding for these innovative ideas. The SU doesn’t currently have a grant writer but the position has been advertised.

Ms. Tyrrell suggested including educators in these discussions because they have a wealth of knowledge in grant writing. The committee will want to invite the staff that has expertise in those areas they are discussing. For example, when they’re discussing foreign language immersion, they will want to invite the foreign-language staff. Ms. Stowell also suggested getting teacher input on promoting these initiatives and news outlet support on promoting the initiatives, including explaining how a topic is helping with education. The media can “investigate” the educational value of various projects and initiatives. The PR committee is working on these ideas and will also seek input from the educators.

## B. Committee Updates

### i. Facilities Committee

The facilities committee has not met for a little while. Mr. Fromberger is planning to do a walk-through of the GM building with Mr. Parah. He plans to then do a walkthrough of the CAES and CTES buildings. Ms. Mahusky suggested that Mr. Marin could join him and then report back to the committee. Ms. Brown noted that the GMUHS board approved the purchase of a tractor tonight that could be used for all three schools year round. Ms. Lamphere noted that they would need to purchase a trailer to transport it. Mr. Wheelock volunteered his trailer if it needed to be moved right away.

### ii. Policy

Mr. Marin reported that the committee is going through the required and recommended policies. They are making adjustments and adapting the policies as needed. Their goal is to get them to the board for approval before GMUSD begins operation in July. The committee is also waiting for representatives to join them from the LMHUUSD board. Ms. Powden reported that the LMHUUSD board has appointed reps last night to both the policy and the PR committees.

### iii. PR

Ms. Lamphere reported that the PR committee has met a couple of times. They have done an assessment of the programs that each school is doing. The committee has also looked into the use of newsletters, social media and news outlets to showcase these programs and accomplishments at each school. The committee is now focused on having each principal do a regular report sharing each school’s highlights to celebrate what they’re doing. The committee is looking at what other schools are doing to publicize themselves. Their focus is to celebrate the excellence of the schools but also to attract other students to the schools. Ms. Fogg noted that some info is going out to parents via newsletters, but more information needs to go out to the community members. There may need to be a link on the towns’ websites.

### iv. Food Service

There have been no recent meetings of the food service committee. Mr. Fromberger reported that he will be meeting with Mr. Carroll to discuss his ideas and begin fleshing them out for the new school year. At that point the committee can then have a meeting to discuss the information that they will present to the board about the potential changes to be made.

## VI. NEW BUSINESS:

### A. Appointment of a Vice Chair

Ms. Muther **nominated** Mr. Fromberger to serve as the vice chair. Mr. McBride seconded the nomination. There were no other nominations. Mr. Fromberger was elected unanimously.

### B. Appointment of a New Board Member

Ms. Mahusky reported that they learned the process for the appointment of a new board member to the unified school district board. She reported that the process is slightly different than appointing board members in the past. This board needs to appoint a new board member in consultation with the select board of the town with the vacancy. She reported that this board notified the Chester Select Board of a vacancy. The board asked for letters of interest and received one letter from Michael Studin. He is currently serving on the CAES board and has been participating in the GMUSD finance committee meetings. He was unfortunately unable to attend tonight's meeting as he is working.

Mr. Fromberger **moved** to appoint Michael Studin to the vacant board position. Ms. Lampson seconded. There was discussion about the conversation with the Chester Select Board. Ms. Mahusky reported that once this board makes a decision they will share it with the select board and ask for their approval. The motion to appoint Mr. Studin as a board member in the vacant position carried unanimously. The board welcomed Mr. Studin.

### C. Appointment of Board Bargaining Council—Support Staff

Ms. Mahusky reported that Ms. DesLauriers and Ms. Muther were the support staff negotiations reps and now that Ms. DesLauriers is no longer on the board they need to appoint somebody else to serve on that council. Ms. Mahusky reported that she felt that it was a good learning experience. Ms. Muther and another board member would represent the board and they would negotiate a new contract with the support staff. The administration will join in the negotiations. There was discussion about the current contract being a one-year contract that ends in June. The goal is to have a new contract in place by July when the district begins operating. Ms. Fleming, Mr. King and Ms. Dickey have all served on the support staff negotiations committee in the past. There was discussion about meeting times and frequencies. The board consensus was to appoint Mr. Hance to serve on this committee.

### D. GMUSD Board Retreat

There was discussion about whether or not the board still wants to have a retreat, and if the goal would still be to develop vision. There was discussion about having a TRSU retreat. Ms. Lampson suggested that they could wait for now until the Vision committee finalized their work and the budget discussions are complete and see if they still needed a retreat.

## VII. ADMINISTRATOR REPORT:

### A. School Safety

Ms. Mahusky reported that there was a report in the board packet on the supervisory union safety analysis that was done all of the SU schools. Rob Evans, the AOE safety liaison, visited TRSU in December and conducted an audit of all six schools in the SU. The administration is focused on the opportunities for improvement at each school. The report is not delineated by specific schools so Ms. Powden has asked the principals to make note of what needs work in their own schools.

Ms. Fogg met with Chief Cloud recently to discuss the police department and fire department coming to a safety committee meeting and planning together with the crisis team. The crisis team has monthly meetings currently and they're working to make the building more secure especially when students are in the school. This includes afterschool times. They are working to make that process more user-friendly. The school is currently not being unlocked until 5:15pm and during other events when there will be a lot of traffic, such as parent-teacher conferences or a play. They're taking feedback from families and making changes as needed.

Ms. Fogg reported that they are also looking into getting a defibrillator, but they are about \$1000. Ms. Lamphere reported that her work recently got a grant for a defibrillator. She will look into that and report back to Ms. Fogg on that.

Mr. Thomson reported that CTES has a defibrillator and recently just got new pads for it. He reported that they have to keep doing training with the staff, but the device is very user-friendly. The pads need to be replaced periodically and it needs to be inspected regularly. CTES is kept locked throughout the day and into the evening except when there is an event in the evening. Mr. Thomson reported that the school just purchased walkie-talkies to communicate during after school hours, and have left instructions for parents at the entry. They also have worked to educate the parents on how to deal with this change in security. The only feedback they have received thus far was from three or four parents who appreciated the change in keeping their kids safer.

Mr. Thomson reported that the governor has asked schools to invite their police departments, in this case the VSP or the sheriff, into the school to survey a list of 25 security issues. CTES has done that and this will be an opportunity for more training and to learn what else they can do to keep the children safe. Mr. Thomson also reported that after each drill, the crisis team reviews the drill and gives feedback about things that were learned at each drill. There was discussion about the plan to meet with the VSP and the fire department at the school. While CTES is in VSP territory, if there were an actual police crisis Ludlow and Chester police departments would respond. There was discussion about including law enforcement and first responders in drills.

This process of involving law enforcement and first responders gives those groups the ability to practice and become more familiar with the schools. Mr. Parah reported that Chief Wilson met with him very recently and noted that he have been studies recently that encourage the fire department and first responders to come to the schools with the police department in the event of a crisis. Ms. Lamphere reported that that is why having a municipal police department is helpful, but also why they want the VSP to become more familiar with CTES since they have so many schools to be familiar with. Ms. Mahusky would like the administration to follow up with the board about the safety recommendations to ensure that they are being addressed.

#### **VIII. OTHER BUSINESS:**

There was a question about whether this board will be asking the TRSU board to open their budget. Mr. Fromberger explained that if this board or the LMHUUSD board asks the full TRSU board if they will open it, the TRSU board will consider it, but has the ability to open it or not as they choose. There was discussion about the executive committee meeting tomorrow evening. The executive committee is currently in existence until the state board authorizes the new TRSU board to begin operating. There was a question about how this board gives direction to the TRSU executive committee. The executive committee would be asked first, and then they would make the request to the full board if they chose.

Mr. McBride **moved** that the GMUSD board request that the executive committee for the TRSU ask the full TRSU board to open the TRSU budget for reevaluation and give the board members the ability to participate in its discussion, given that the GM USD budget failed and this board needs to look at all options before they resubmit the budget to the voters. Ms. Lamphere seconded. Mr. Fromberger reported that he was at the LMHUUSD meeting last night and a very similar discussion took place. One of the reasons that they didn't pursue it was that the board wouldn't know where the final TRSU budget would land. It could be higher than what it is currently. They also felt that there wasn't enough time to properly warn a budget if they were waiting on the TRSU to change their budget. In addition they didn't know the exact direction they wanted that budget to take. Mr. McBride noted that the feedback he has received personally and that the board has heard tonight was that the GMUSD budget needs to be reviewed and it wouldn't look good if there were a "sacred cow" portion that they can't touch. Ms. Lamphere noted that they are being asked to make cuts to schools and the board should not do that until they've looked at every option including the TRSU budget if that's possible. The motion carried with 5 votes in favor. It was clarified that this vote doesn't mean that the TRSU board will open the budget, but the reps from this board will ask them to.

#### **IX. EXECUTIVE SESSION:**

##### **A. CAES Principal Contract Negotiations**

Ms. Mahusky noted that if they decide to discuss the CAES principal contract negotiations, they will need to do so in executive session due to the confidential nature of the discussion.

Ms. Brown **moved** to enter executive session at 7:57 p.m. to discuss confidential principal contract negotiations inviting Ms. Fogg and Ms. Powden. Ms. Lamphere seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

The board returned from executive session at 9:08 p.m. There was discussion about the superintendent's recommendation to approve a 2 year contract to the CAES principal with a 2.5% salary increase for the next year. Mr. Hance **moved** to approve a 2 year contract for Ms. Fogg as the CAES principal with a 2.5%

increase in salary for next year. Ms. Lamson seconded and the motion carried. Ms. Mahusky explained that this translates into a salary of \$94,179 next year. The board thanked her for her hard work.

**X. AGENDA FOR NEXT MEETING:**

The GMUSD board will be meeting on Tuesday, April 10, 2018 at 6:00 p.m. at CAES. Ms. Powden asked that any special meetings that are held during a specific month are held at the school where the regular meeting is being held. For example the regular April meeting will be at CAES, but if there needs to be a special meeting after that in April, it should also be held at CAES. The May meeting will be at GMUHS, and the June meeting will be back at CTES.

**XI. ADJOURNMENT:**

Mr. Fromberger **moved** to adjourn at 9:10 p.m. Ms. Lamphere seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

Respectfully Submitted,

Amber Wilson  
Board Recording Secretary