

--- FILE COPY ---

**MILFORD SCHOOL BOARD Minutes  
(SCHOOL ADMINISTRATIVE UNIT No. 40)  
December 6, 2010**

- 1. Call to Order** Chairman Bragdon called this meeting of the Milford School Board to order at 7:04 p.m. on Monday, December 6, 2010, in Lecture Hall #182 at the Milford High School. Those present, together with interested citizens, were:

**School Board Present** Peter Bragdon, Paul Dargie, Carolyn Halstead, Len Mannino, and Bob Willette.

**Staff Present** Robert Suprenant, Superintendent of Schools; Katie Chambers, Business Administrator; and Laurel Johnson, Assistant Superintendent of Schools.

**Recorder** J. Bradford Seabury.
- 2. Board Member Comments** Chairman Bragdon asked if there were any comments from Board members. None being brought forward, he continued to the next agenda item.
- 3. Public Comments** Chairman Bragdon asked if there were any introductory comments from members of the audience on other than the budget item. None being brought forward, he continued to the next agenda item.
- 4. Reports and Presentations**

  - a. Superintendent's Report** Superintendent Suprenant reported that he had distributed to members of the Board copies of a letter from Bill Cooper, Director of Building and Grounds, thanking Progress Software for its generous donation of used furniture to the School District. He explained that Progress Software was reassigning some personnel with the result that the School District was the beneficiary of a significant amount of furniture that could be used in classrooms and offices.

Superintendent Suprenant noted that holiday events were approaching, stating that the High School Holiday Concert would take place in the High School cafeteria on Wednesday, December 22<sup>nd</sup>, starting at 8:30 p.m., and the Middle School Band and Chorus concerts were scheduled for Tuesday, December 14<sup>th</sup> and Wednesday, December 15<sup>th</sup>, starting at 7 :00 p.m. in both cases—adding that the High School store also would be open for business for parents on December 7<sup>th</sup> and 14<sup>th</sup> from 5:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m.

Superintendent Suprenant reported that students had been able to acquire 777 pairs of socks and used coats in its annual holiday clothing drive, saying these would be donated to SHARE.

Superintendent Suprenant noted that the fall sports season had concluded, with success both for teams and individual students. He reported that All-State winners from Milford included Courtney Hawkins in Cross Country, Gillian Corcoran in Field Hockey, Bri Leonard in Volleyball, and Morgan Andrews in Soccer. He then reported that the football team had been selected for the Team Sportsmanship Award by the Referees Association and that there had been four first team All-Staters on the team: John Forte, Max Goudreau, Matt Keefe, and Matt Scott.

Superintendent Suprenant then concluded by reporting that the School District had held its first Parents Workshop on Understanding Bullying the previous Thursday evening at the Heron Pond School, stating that the new Bullying Policy had been reviewed with about 30 parents in attendance, with Miss Sharon Cowen from UNH Extension Services serving as guest speaker. He noted that the next session, for the parents of High School and Middle School students, was scheduled for January 10<sup>th</sup>.

**b. Update on Jacques Memorial Building Project** Business Administrator Chambers reported that a Certificate of Occupancy had been received, and Director Cooper and his crew had been moving into the building things had been stored in the basement. She then discussed details of the finishing up activities that had been accomplished in the past few weeks.

**c. Independent Auditor's Report** Chairman Bragdon noted that there was sample language documentation in the packet. Business Administrator Chambers discussed the new regulations requiring an actuary analysis of post-employment benefits every other year, noting that the auditor would be looking for updates. Explaining that Administration had only become aware of these new requirements recently, she pointed out that making these changes might change the budget figures by no more than a few thousand dollars, but that the cost of having this survey done would cost \$15,000. She expressed a belief that not having it done would simply mean that the School District would not get a fully satisfactory report, and she recommended that the work not be done.

Chairman Bragdon noted that no action would be required by the Board unless some member wished to make a motion. Mr. Mannino asked why the hiring of an attorney to manage the process had not picked up this requirement. Ms. Chambers said it was actually an actuary, not an attorney, saying it was a new requirement that had not been known at the time when the audit was done. Mr. Dargie obtained confirmation that not doing this would only result in a note on the audit statement. No motions were brought forward, and Chairman Bragdon went on to the next item.

## **5. New Business**

**a. Education Jobs Fund** Superintendent Suprenant reported on the distribution of \$41,000,000 to schools in New Hampshire as part of the Education Jobs Fund, saying Milford's share would be about \$250,000, which could be used in just about

any desired manner, in compensation or benefits for essentially any existing or new position except at the SAU level, although the NH-DOE Deputy Commissioner was suggesting that a public hearing be held with respect to expenditure of the revenue. He said he would like to know tonight if the Board wanted to do that, so that he could post the hearing. Chairman Bragdon noted that just because a hearing was held would not bind the School District to using it this particular year; he then expressed a belief that there would be a hearing at the next regular meeting. Superintendent Suprenant confirmed that it was not part of the stimulus fund but was a one-time distribution. In response to a complaint from members of the audience about not being able to hear the discussion, Chairman Bragdon then reviewed the discussion.

Mr. Todd Boudreau, 9 Windsor Drive, said he did not understand why the money could not be used for SAU personnel. Chairman Bragdon explained that the SAU (Supervisory Administrative Unit) was a separate entity from the School District itself. Mr. Boudreau asked for and received confirmation that the money could be used this year or next year, but only after a public hearing was held.

Ms. Halstead asked if it could be used partly this year and partly next year. Chairman Bragdon concurred, noting that another hearing would have to be held next year if the money were not all used this year.

Ms. Linda Pelchat, 21 Riversedge drive, asked if this were the fund that had been in the paper for three towns having said they would not participate. Superintendent Suprenant and Chairman Bragdon said they were not aware that Milford had turned down any money.

Mr. Jim Mulvey, 3 Birch Lane, asked when the public hearing would be heard. Chairman Bragdon said it would be at the next meeting, in two weeks. Mr. Mulvey then asked why the money would not be used this year, saying he felt it definitely should be used this year. Chairman Bragdon pointed out that the budget being discussed this evening was for next year.

No further questions or comments being raised, Chairman Bragdon said he would skip to Item 6c at this time because of the large number of people attending out of interest in the budget cuts.

## **6. Old Business**

- c. 2011/2012 Proposed Budget** Chairman Bragdon reviewed past events, explaining that the Board had asked the Superintendent to come back with a list of priority cuts that would amount to a \$1,000,000 reduction in the budget. Superintendent Suprenant noted that he had handouts but wanted to discuss the issue before handing them out. He noted that the health insurance number had not been received when this matter first came up, and the number was now

available, adding that it would be a 7.2% increase instead of 10%, which meant that about \$200,000 could be taken out of the presentation of a million dollars in cuts. He said he had come up with about \$320,000 to \$400,000 in cuts on his own but then had needed to meet with the principals for the rest, assigning them to come up with a percentage of the remaining \$600,000, based on the percentage of enrollment in their schools, pulling SPED students out of the calculations—thus Principal Craven had to come up with 29%, or about \$155,000, while Principal Foss had to get 9%, or about \$42,000. He noted that his directive to the principals had been to make sure that the reductions had the least possible impact on students.

He acknowledged that some programs would have to be eliminated, saying he thought alternatives could be provided in some cases. He said about 22 positions would be affected—some eliminated, some with time reduced. He then distributed his list, emphasizing again that it was based on the least impact on education—but he noted that the health insurance figure remained a fluid number, based on the number of health insurance subscribers in the School District, with this number changing almost on a monthly basis.

Superintendent Suprenant noted that the 30 items on his list of projected cuts were listed in order of least impact. He then reviewed the items on the list, providing additional detail about each item, and he noted that the items from #16 down were the difficult ones, affecting people. He cautioned that attending members of the public should not associate a specific person with the eliminated positions, as union rules would mean the last-hired would be the first to go and people would change positions accordingly. He noted that one of the part-time tutor positions being eliminated was currently vacant. He also noted that the remaining funds in Item #12 represented less than 1/3 of 1% of the budget for new equipment. With respect to Item #15, he noted that \$100,000 of the remaining \$400,000 ARRA money was for MOE (Maintenance of Effort) expenditures and could be used for the IT replacements/upgrades being cut out of the budget. With respect to Item #26, he noted that he was recommending elimination of a music teacher as part of a change from day-time music classes to after-school music sessions, as was done in most other school districts, thereby minimizing of having students pulled out of class during the school day. He noted that Item #29 consisted of dropping the 2-year-old GED program, expressing concern that this would result in four to six at risk students dropping out of school—commenting that this program also had tuition revenue, but the Board's direction had been to cut spending, only. He then concluded by explaining that Item #30 was a recommendation to eliminate the Readiness program from the Milford School District, commenting that virtually all other school districts had found ways to educate these kids and research did not support it—noting that Kindergarten let the school personnel identify these children earlier. He then clarified that he would reinstate a primary teaching position if the School Board gave back \$75,000, rather than Readiness.

Superintendent Suprenant then added that the School District was currently negotiating with custodians, saying he did not know what that would cost—but he would recommend eliminating funding for science camp for 6<sup>th</sup> Graders to cover it.

Chairman Bragdon said he would first ask for questions from the School Board and then get the public after the break to change the tapes.

Mr. Mannino referenced Item #21, asking how long the position had been vacant. Superintendent Suprenant said it had been vacant since late spring.

Mr. Mannino referenced Item #26, saying it sounded like an instructional program that other schools were doing. Superintendent Suprenant noted there were two music positions at Heron Pond (General and Band); he said this proposal was to replace the in-day program with an afternoon program, as a survey had found that most other elementary schools did. He noted that the Middle School program did operate in the day, as there were other classes. He noted that this was not new, as there were lots of interruptions in core education program when kids were pulled out of classes. He acknowledged that perhaps few Elementary School kids would take band if it were changed to an after school program.

Mr. Mannino asked about the GED program. Superintendent Suprenant said 10 of the last 16 had successfully completed it, and two of the others were planning to repeat it.

Mr. Dargie referenced Item #20-, asking for a summary of elimination of the school resource officer, in view of the bullying issues. Superintendent Suprenant noted that there had not been a School Resource Officer this year, because the Police department had a number of vacancies and the Police Chief had said it could not be done until January or February at the earliest. He said the District had maintained a secure building without one, saying the value of the positions was that staff and students developed a relationship with someone who was there throughout the day, and it undoubtedly helped security, but the Police Department was very responsive to the School District when there were emergency calls. He said the School District would phone the Police Department in the absence of a School Resource Officer. He noted that the School Resource Officer was not a disciplinarian, but did help with investigations (particularly those of a serious nature). In terms of bullying, he continued, the School Resource Officer did not do that level of investigation, which was handled by school staff.

Chairman Bragdon called a brief break to allow the community television tape to be changed.

Mr. Dargie asked what happened in Item 24 on the 5<sup>th</sup> day of the school week if ISS supervisory time was reduced to a 4-day week. Superintendent Suprenant said the two assistant principals would provide the coverage for the fifth day.

Mr. Willette commented that teachers were being eliminated but co-curricular positions were not. Mr. Willette asked if there were not two new coaching positions this year; Superintendent Suprenant said there should be the same number as last year. Superintendent Suprenant said he thought the School District got great value from co-curricular positions for the education of those students involved.

Ms. Halstead asked why it was a reduction from the Administrative budget rather than a decrease from the past year's budget, saying she understood the contracts called for increases, so the School District would be spending more money. Chairman Bragdon expressed a belief that she was asking for a column saying what was left behind and how much of an increase it was from the prior year, adding that this information could be obtained.

Ms. Halstead asked what the actual increase would be over the budget voted on last year, saying there was still an increase, as called for by the contracts—adding that she understood the proposed budget was about 10% above the budget voted on by the voters last year. Superintendent Suprenant said the increase of the proposed budget was 3.6% over last year's approved budget; Ms. Halstead said that even with the new reductions this was still an increase. Superintendent Suprenant clarified that the budget presented to the Board represented about \$1,300,000 in more spending over last year's \$35,000,000 budget, adding that there was about 3.6% in new spending, with 86% of that \$1,300,000 required for wages and obligations. Ms. Halstead noted that there was one contract in negotiation and three other unions involved in contracts, asking how it worked for the next three years. Superintendent Suprenant said there were four organized groups. First, there was the Milford Teachers Association, for which next year would be the third year of a 4-year agreement, noting there were about 200 members, including full-time and part-time. Then there was the MESSA (support staff, about 90 instructional assistants and teacher aides, including Special Ed aides), and next year would be the third of a 3-year agreement. For the administrative association, consisting of 15 members (principals, directors, curriculum coordinator), he continued, next year would be the second year of a 4-year agreement. Finally, there was the Milford Educational Professional Association, which was currently in negotiation, so he could not give any details. He then said there were about 61 nonaffiliated people, referenced in line #6 of his list, for which he was now proposing a 1% increase. Ms. Halstead asked what the increases had been for those groups whose contracts were currently in effect. Superintendent Suprenant suggested that the HR director could provide up-to-date figures for the increases at the time of the negotiations for those contract; Ms. Jen Burk confirmed it was the aides had received 4% last



year and 4% this year, and 4% next year; Superintendent Suprenant noted that the aides had previously gone for at least two years without any increase, during negotiations. He said the teachers' agreement was resolved in November of 2008, about a month after the market crashed, and no one had anticipated the economic recession would continue as long as it had; he said the teachers got 1.5% the first year (two years ago), 2.5% the second year, 3.5% this year, and 3.5% next year. He then reviewed the administrators' increases; Ms. Burk confirmed them as being 1.5% last year, 2.5% this year, 3.0% next year, and 3.5% the following year. 30.3% so about the dangers are present in Superintendent Suprenant noted that administrators' raises were based on merit, with no built-in base. Chairman Bragdon noted that the budget now being put together had the administrators at 2.5%, the aides at 4%, and half of the teachers (those at the high end of the scale) at 3.5% while the rest were at 6.8%.

Chairman Bragdon noted that the first 16 items amounted to \$450,000 in total reductions, requiring another \$550,000. He asked if there had been any discussion with any of the unions about reducing the raises. Superintendent Suprenant said he had met with the leaders of the associations and had shown them a chart indicating that a 1% decrease rather than the negotiated increases would result in a \$600,000 savings, which would eliminate the need for eliminating any positions. He said the leaders had passed that on to their members, but no concessions had been offered.

Chairman Bragdon referenced Item #19. Superintendent Suprenant said the students had to take both their health credits in their freshman year, but Dr. Craven was going to spread it out over two years.

Chairman Bragdon referenced Item #24, asking if the savings was from going to four days. Superintendent Suprenant answered in the affirmative.

Chairman Bragdon asked, if a position were eliminated that was currently held by someone with other certification, could that person then stay and use the other certification so the lowest ranking person would be laid off—adding that he presumed that the numbers plugged in were for the person currently holding the position, which would be different. Superintendent Suprenant said that presumption was incorrect.

Ms. Suzanne Schedin, 10 Ox Bow Road, identifying herself as the current vice-president of the teachers' association, said the originally proposed budget was very reasonable, with no frills, for the education of Milford's children and that to make these cuts went against everything the staff stood for with respect to education. She said she felt her children were worth it and that it was not feasible to keep a level budget for two or three years in a row, concluding by saying she felt there were other options that had not been looked into, and stating that the \$300 increase in the taxes was less

than a cup of coffee a day. Chairman Bragdon asked what else had been suggested; Ms. Schedin discussed furlough days and looking at the steps.

Ms. Amanda Bentley, 44 Highland Avenue, read a prepared statement, saying it seemed the Board did not value the classified staff, and that cutting the hours meant the loss of medical benefits, which was overwhelming and cruel. She then commented on the things that these people did, expressing a belief that these were valuable activities, carried on by widows and people who were already working multiple jobs to support their families.

Ms. Linda Pelchat, 21 Riversedge Drive, said she had worked for the School Department for 28 years, saying the support staff at the elementary level was what kept the schools going--adding that they all had to be qualified. She said a lot of the aides were single, and loss of their health benefits would be devastating.

Mr. Steve Vetak, 5 Georgetown Drive, noting that he was a teacher and a coach, said he had asked whether the School Board would guarantee the jobs would be safe if they took the 1% increase proposal, and he was told the School Board could not promise that. Superintendent Suprenant explained that he had sat down with all the associations, with charts showing the same figures in the first two columns and showing there were two ways: to continue with the reductions--one being reduction of 12 to 15 full-time staff members, with the other being that everyone would stay, with a 1% increase but giving up steps, saving \$695,000. He said he had said he could not guarantee there would be no reduction of staff, because he could not speak for the Board; he then commented that the associations could have said they would take the 1% only if there were no further reductions. Mr. Vetak then spoke in support of the aides, saying he would rather see co-curricular activities go than have someone lose jobs; he said he knew the impact of sports, but it was a luxury for any school to have any sports programs--noting that the football team sometimes was looking for players because it did not have enough. He said the impact on the staff personnel was more important than having kids playing ball, adding that he was more than willing to pay extra taxes to keep people working, and that the impact of sports was not more important than education. Chairman Bragdon stated that there was about \$390,000 in co-curricular salaries.

Ms. Paula Durand, speaking as a taxpayer, said \$1,000,000 was a nice round number, asking where that figure came from. Chairman Bragdon said it was more looking at keeping the increase to 1%, given that retired residents were not getting an increase and there were about 1500 unemployed residents--adding that it was actually about a 1.4% increase. Ms. Durand said she felt the \$1,000,000 cut was too devastating, and she asked what the Board members' first impressions of the proposals would be.



Chairman Bragdon asked the Board members to speak in response to the question.

Mr. Willette said he was one of the people not getting a raise--noting that this was not a cut of last year's budget but a cut of this year's proposed budget.

Mr. Mannino said he had concerns but would be interested in making some sort of agreement and would like to see the Board discuss it with the Superintendent, adding he would probably not want to vote on it tonight.

Mr. Dargie said he felt the cut went too far, saying there had been aggressive cuts last year. He said the Board had to worry about taxes, but also had to balance that off in thinking of how to help kids, and he hoped that there would be some relief in using all or part of the job fund money, to be determined at the next meeting.

Ms. Halstead spoke of her experience with another school board, which had made drastic cuts and had a rough time. She said seeing the sacrifices they made meant that fiscal responsibility also had to be taught. As an educator, she said, she had to cut back, saying there was a wide range of people being affected, but it was going to be hard for some people to pay taxes and that side had to be considered as well—but the only way to get things done was to work together.

Mr. Bragdon said that the Superintendent had done a great job, in what he was asked by the Board to do. He said there might be some disagreements, but the Superintendent had done a good job in trying to find those things rated on their affect in the classroom. He noted there were numerous things being presented on how to do things for less money—adding that he also was not prepared to vote on the matter tonight.

Ms. Durand repeated her belief that \$1,000,000 was too much of a cut, saying no one in the room was taking their job for granted, and she noted that the aides all came early and stayed late, expressing a hope that the Board would have further discussion and find other ways to proceed—adding that it would be disastrous not to take the fund money at this time.

Ms. Marsha Feder, a Hollis resident, said no one wanted to see anyone fired but losing services that made the Milford schools as good as they were would be disastrous, adding that the association members had made a good faith agreement with the Board and felt it should be honored. She expressed a belief that everyone would be open to talking about other things, but had only been presented the two options.

Mr. Jim Mulvey said there were instructional aides being reduced to part-time, so that their benefits would be lost. He said these six women should be able to retain their fulltime position and benefits for the benefit of the students.

Mr. Steve Kempf, 21 Ches-Mae Lane, expressed concern that the School Board was becoming a political entry, saying its purpose was to make sure that the children got a good education. He said \$500,000 might be reasonable, but \$1,000,000 was just a political headline. Recalling last year's discussion, he said he had been bothered by the statements of the School Board that they did not have to consider what the voters wanted. Chairman Bragdon said he did not want the School Board members responding, as he did not want a debate.

Chairman Bragdon said legally the Board had no other obligation than to spend money appropriated by the voters, saying the only authority that the voters had was to determine what that bottom line figure was. He pointed out that it would not be wise to respond to 100 people who showed up at the meeting wanting something else.

Mr. Jeff Frankiewich, 31 Clinton Street, urged the School Board to let the voters decide whether they wanted to pay the additional \$300 or go to the default budget. He said he did not feel they had a choice last year, as it was not that big of a difference at the time of the Deliberative Session. He said he felt for townspeople who were on a fixed income and he knew families were struggling, but he also knew that there were people in town who had the ability to pay, saying he felt it was time to start thinking about a different way of funding the schools, and he asked that the School Board consider petitioning for appropriate funding.

Mr. Todd Boudreau, 9 Windsor Drive, said he gave Superintendent Suprenant credit for putting together the list, but he was a father of two kids in the school and felt a \$1,000,000 cut was a little too arbitrary, saying there had to be a way to come up with programs so that kids would get a full, rounded education, asking if perhaps an arbitrator should be hired; he then expressed a belief that it would be difficult to teach if someone lost their benefits. He noted that he had run his small business on a budget also, but he felt consistency was needed; and he then asked if he could offer to provide some sort of support for a hard-number budget, and if there were other federal programs that could help.

Ms. Tricia Shea, 235 Stable Road, spoke of a discussion with her husband, saying he could not understand why the program for exceptional students was cut. She referenced the 3.6% increase of the original proposal, saying 86% of that was contractual. Chairman Bragdon said it was personnel but not necessarily contractual. Ms. Shea said those without a contract had no choice, but when the citizens voted for the contract three years ago, they

had known what the yearly increases were going to be, and the voters had agreed to those, so she would think cutting that would be a bit steep., She urged the School Board not to vote until after hearing a presentation from the Budget Committee. Chairman Bragdon said he did not intend to call for a vote tonight.

Ms. Cheryl Webster, 41 Osgood Road, said she was one of those aides who would be reduced, noting that she was one of the lowest paid aides but had come here from a second job tonight, adding that her husband had lost his job. She spoke of the accumulated years of experience of the aides and described the activities that they did and their involvement with the students, saying the aides were struggling, also.

Ms. Carla Boudreau, 9 Windsor Drive, spoke of her children in the school system, saying she had started making choices nine years ago when she gave up her full-time job, and she would figure out how to pay the \$300. She said the kids were the most important things that people had, and the aides were making it possible. She then noted that Heron Pond was not making progress, saying it was not a time to cut the people who were definitely affecting the children, adding that the large number of people attending tonight indicated that people wanted to help.

Mr. Bob Williams, Mcdian Road, said it was all about communities, and eliminating important people meant that the children would suffer. He then asked if anyone from the Town had asked the School Board to reduce he budget. Ms. Halstead said she had. received such requests, Mr. Willette said he was a State Representative and that there was great thought in Concord about reducing spending, saying the State was taking less responsibility in sending money to the towns, shifting the responsibility to the communities. He said people were talking to him about reducing costs.

Mr. Williams said it did not make sense to take people affecting education out of the schools. He then asked if anyone had taken the time to do any type of research as to how the cuts made last year had affected the students. Chairman Bragdon said that was a good idea but he did not think anyone had done so yet.

Ms. Jennifer Pelletier, 94 Cmstock Drive, said she was a single mother, saying she needed the help of these people for the benefit of the kids, saying the kids were excited to see them each day. She expressed a belief that improvements would go backward.

Mr. Chris Spencer, 246 Badger Hill Drive, spoke of his kids in the school, expressing concern that politicians never looked at the long-term effects of reductions, and he questioned what the quality of the replacements of the people who would leave would be. He then asked which School Board members had children in the Milford system; Mr. Mannino and Mr. Dargie

raised their hands. Mr. Spencer expressed a belief that they should be looking at the list carefully, saying this was talking about affecting people's lives.

Ms. Carol Chaplin, instrumental band teacher, noted that her position had come up for discussion three times in the past. She commented on the impact on the students who were already at the school, saying less students would come in the afternoon because of transportation problems. She spoke of the educational benefits from music training, saying she would like to pull together some facts and figures, as she had more students now than in 2008, and she would like to compile some sort of study to show what she did. Chairman Bragdon said any information submitted to the Superintendent could be forwarded to the Board, but the next meeting would probably be the last opportunity for the Board to put together a budget to be put in the warrant—noting that the voters could address it again at the Deliberative Session on Feb 10<sup>th</sup> or at the budget hearing on January 18<sup>th</sup>. Ms. Chaplin said she had 40 odd students at Heron Pond now, saying the High School program would eventually be impacted if kids stepped out now.

Mr. Robert Moody, 44 Highland Drive, said this seemed to be a situation of the haves and the have nots. He said the administration seemed to be looking for a 1% increase, asking if that included the administrators. Chairman Bragdon noted that administrators were not a part of the union. Mr. Moody said a 1% or 2% cut of people at the administrators' level might not have much impact, but it might be life or death for people at the low end of the spectrum.

Mr. David Alcox, 78 Wellesley Drive, said it was sad that every year they had to come to speak of saving jobs, which meant cutting what the community was all about. He said he thought teachers were the best bargain, in terms of what they did for what they got, and he spoke of the voluntary things done by some of the people, saying he found people in other communities were jealous of what Milford had (facilities and programs). Every time the School Board asked the teachers to produce, he said, they did—noting that there were two pages of accomplishments in each year's report. He suggested that the voters would be willing to pay the additional money if there were adequate promotion, telling the community how much it was getting for what it was paying.

Mr. Steve Erdody, 19 Johnson Street, saying he had kids here, and that his wife and brother taught here, commented on the benefits he had received from sports as a student here. He said Milford had a dynamic program, not just an adequate one. He stated that teachers were cited as valuable assets, and should not be cut.

Ms. Jan Stone, identifying herself as a former educator in Nashua, expressed concern about line 22, pertaining to the reduction of Six Heron Pond instructional aides from full-time to part-time, saying that, if those highly trained paraprofessionals left, new people would have to be trained, which could not be done quickly, as these were highly qualified people.

Ms. Linda Pelchat, 21 Riversedge Drive, said the paraprofessionals should be treated as such.

No one else coming forward, Chairman Bragdon asked Superintendent Suprenant to get a copy of the current co-curricular listing for the next meeting, and he then asked him to address why Heron Pond was in need of improvement and how these changes could affect it. Assistant Superintendent Johnson said the reason was that the Heron Pond school did not make adequate progress in both reading and math in a sub-category and in SPED and in another sub-category. She said she did not see anything directly that would not be done with the proposed changes, saying it was relative, but the proposed changes were made carefully, based on the least impact on the kids. She said she did not see anything that would change with respect to the need for improvement.

Chairman Bragdon said the Board would not be taking action on the budget at this time but would be discussing it again at the next meeting, along with the Education Jobs fund. He then declared a break at 9:47 p.m. so that the crowd could disperse, calling the meeting back to order at 10:01 p.m.

**a. LEIP  
Proposal**

Chairman Bragdon said this item was just waiting for the Board to take some action. He asked if members had looked at it and had any strong feeling.

Ms. Halstead said the teachers might be overwhelmed with the technology, but she differed, saying she remembered being present for the debate of allowing calculators and that she had found long-term damage from allowing them too early. She said she would caution against too-early IT work, saying she would like to see where every computer was, for some sort of accounting, which would help her process the information. Chairman Bragdon noted that the only reference in the LEIP report was maintaining goals, etc. Ms. Halstead said that was because they were trying to incorporate it into a broader span. Chairman Bragdon asked if that would prevent her from voting this evening; she answered in the negative, saying she thought it was a reasonable plan.

**Decision  
to  
approve  
the LEIP  
Report**

Chairman Bragdon moved to approve the LEIP report; Mr. Dargie seconded the motion. Mr. Willette asked what this did to the School Board, asking if it meant they had to follow the plan. Chairman Bragdon answered in the negative, saying it was a roadmap that used “may” instead of “shall” in most cases. Superintendent Suprenant said the LEIP committee had deliberately left it up to the School Board’s discretion, saying each and every item was important for kids but economics was also important. He said he envisioned this as not a lot different from what was currently being done, but a couple items in each area would be a target goal for the coming year. **Vote:** All members voted in favor, and Chairman Bragdon declared the motion to have carried unanimously (5–0).

Superintendent Suprenant expressed public thanks for the members of the LEIP committee, listed on Page 5 of the report.

**b. Policy Proposals**

**(1) Policy # 5055 Guidelines on Non-Resident Students (2nd Reading)**

Superintendent Suprenant noted that the policy in the packet was the draft, noting that he had provided members with the later, improved copy, which had not been changed.

Chairman Bragdon moved that the Board approve Policy #3515 for its second reading; Mr. Willette seconded the motion. **Vote:** All members voted in favor, and Chairman Bragdon declared the motion to have carried unanimously (5–0).

Mr. Willette requested to be taken off the Wellness Committee, saying it was a hardship for him to get to the meetings and a hardship for the committee, which was trying to schedule its meetings for his convenience. Chairman Bragdon ruled Mr. Willette off the committee.

**d. Default  
Budget  
Policy**

Chairman Bragdon said he had not worked on this over the weekend, but would bring it up at the next meeting.

**7. Housekeeping Items**

**a. Approval  
of  
Minutes**

Chairman Bragdon addressed the 11-15-10 meeting minutes, asking if there were any changes to be made.

Mr. Dargie referenced Page 5, saying the first sentence of the first full paragraph was not appropriate, as it appeared later on.



Mr. Willette referenced page 8, saying his wife's address was given incorrectly.

Chairman Bragdon then moved that the Board approve the 11-15-10 minutes as corrected; Mr. Dargie seconded the motion. **Vote:** All members voted in favor, and Chairman Bragdon declared the motion to have carried unanimously (5-0).

- b. Approval of Manifests** Chairman Bragdon addressed the manifests awaiting approval, listed as including Vouchers Nos. 14, 1092, 1093, 1094, 1095, 1096, 1097, 1098, 1099, 1101, and 1102. Mr. Dargie moved that the Board approve the manifests as listed; Ms. Halstead seconded the motion. **Vote:** All members voted in favor, and Chairman Bragdon declared the motion to have carried unanimously (5-0).
- 8. Public Comment** Chairman Bragdon asked if there were any closing comments from members of the audience. None being brought forward, he continued to the next agenda item.
- 9. Non-Public Session** Chairman Bragdon stated that the School Board needed to hold a short non-public session with respect to a personnel matter, under the provisions of NH RSA 91-A:3 II (c), *Matters which, if discussed in public, would likely affect adversely the reputation of any person, other than a member of the body or agency itself, unless such person requests an open meeting,* and (d) *Consideration of the acquisition, sale or lease of real or personal property which, if discussed in public, would likely benefit a party or parties whose interests are adverse to those of the general community.* Mr. Bragdon so moved; Mr. Dargie seconded the motion. **VOTE:** Ms. Halstead and Messrs. Bragdon, Dargie, Mannino, and Willette all voted in favor of the motion, which carried unanimously (5-0). Chairman Bragdon then declared the Board to be going into non-public session at 10:12 p.m., and all members of the public left the room at that time.

Superintendent Suprenant presented three early retirement requests that had been received. Following review of these requests, Mr. Bragdon moved that the Board accept the three requests; Mr. Mannino seconded the motion. **Vote:** All members voted in favor, and Chairman Bragdon declared the motion to have carried unanimously (5-0).

The Board then discussed a personnel matter, taking no action.

The board discussed a land acquisition matter, taking no action.

The board discussed strategy with respect to collective bargaining.

No further nonpublic business remaining before the Board, Mr. Bragdon moved to exit from the nonpublic session; Mr. Dargie seconded the motion.

**Vote:** All members voted in favor, with the Board returning to public session at 11:24 p.m.

**10. Adjournment**

All scheduled items having been addressed, Mr. Bragdon moved to adjourn; Mr. Dargie seconded the motion. **Vote:** All members voted in favor, with this meeting adjourning at 11:25 p.m.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Chairman of the School Board

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date of Signing