

Ipswich School Committee

Thursday, March 7, 2024
MS/HS Ensemble Room
134 High Street, Ipswich
7:00 PM

MINUTES

1. Call to Order

KE called the meeting to order.

Present: D. Freehan (DF) M. Perry (MP)
 J. Donahue (JD) J. Connolly (JC)
 S. Sopic (SS) J. Poirier (JP)
 K. Eliot (KE)

Also Present: Dr. Brian Blake, Superintendent of Schools (BB)
 Tom Markham, Director of Finance and Operations (TM)
 Jimmy Bornstein, High School Student Representative (JB)

2. Reading of the District Mission Statement

JB read the mission statement.

3. Announcements

- The next regularly scheduled School Committee meeting will be held on Thursday, March 21st at 7:00 PM.
- The School Committee will present the FY25 Budget to the Finance Committee on Tuesday, March 12th at 7:30 PM in Meeting Room A at Town Hall.
- The Policy Subcommittee will meet on Wednesday, March 13th at 5:00 PM in the MS/HS Guidance Conference Room.
- The School Facilities Working Group will meet remotely on Tuesday, March 19th at 5:00 PM.
- The Communications Subcommittee will meet remotely on Tuesday, March 19th at 5:45 PM.
- Bean Counting will be held on Saturday, April 6th from 9:00 AM-12:00 PM in Meeting Room A at Town Hall.

4. Special Acknowledgements

No special acknowledgements were presented.

5. Remarks from the Chair

KE shared that on January 30, 2024, the School Committee received notification from the Ipswich Educators Association (IEA) regarding a demand to bargain successor contracts for three of the district's six collective bargaining units, including the teachers, education support professionals, and the paraeducators. Those contracts expire between July 31st and August 31st of this year. Included in their demand to bargain letter, was a request to begin negotiations after February break, as well as in open session. The School Committee took the IEA requests under advisement and after much deliberation and discussion, the School Committee did not agree to engage in open session bargaining. Historically, contract negotiations in Ipswich, as well as many other communities in the Commonwealth, are conducted in executive session for a variety of reasons. The School Committee is committed to a collaborative process and will do their best to provide the community with regular updates as they make their way through this process. The School Committee Negotiations Subcommittee looks forward to getting this process started and ultimately agreeing on fair, equitable, and sustainable contracts for all the bargaining units as efficiently as possible.

6. Public Comments¹

¹ Public comment is not a discussion, debate, or dialogue between individuals and the School Committee. It is an individual's opportunity to express an opinion on issues within the School Committee's authority. While the Committee and/or administrators will not typically respond during Public Comment, the Chair, as presiding officer of the meeting, may choose to if s/he seems it expeditious. Further, should the Chair believe that an issue falls outside the purview of the School Committee, s/he may request that citizens direct it to the appropriate person or

KE read the statement on public comment located at the bottom of the meeting agenda.

Becky Slawson, Ipswich Educators Association: Thanked the School Committee for considering the IEA's request for public, open bargaining. The IEA is disappointed in the School Committee's decision. Ms. Slawson wanted the community to understand that the IEA is committed to transparency. The community can expect to see all of the documents the IEA presents at negotiations. It's disappointing that the School Committee is not committed to transparency.

7. High School Student Representative Report

JB talked about topics covered at the most recent Student Advisory Council meeting. The group continues their discussion about a spring event around the opening of the new outdoor space behind the middle/high school. The high school parking lot is overcrowded right now, but that will subside with seniors leaving for the BRIDGE program. There was a discussion on the process for high school students to apply to be a representative on the Paine Grant Committee.

8. Presentations

A. IEA Snapshot: Journalism Course

Demi McShane, High School English teacher, shared a brief overview of the senior journalism course.

B. Whittier Tech School Committee Member Interviews: Garry James, Carol Sullivan

The School Committee has the responsibility of appointing a representative to serve on the Whittier Regional Technical School Committee. The representative serves for a three year term. The School Committee was notified in early 2024 that the current representative's term will end on March 31, 2024. The School Committee has done outreach to see if there were community members interested in serving in this position. Two letters of interest were received- one from Garry James (GJ), the current Whittier representative, and one from Carol Sullivan (CS). Both applicants were seated together and asked a series of questions. The School Committee planned to take the responses under advisement and vote to appoint one of the two applicants at the March 21st meeting.

- *Please introduce yourself and tell us about your background.*
 - GJ: Gary introduced himself. Spent the last 25 years in education.
 - CS: Moved to Ipswich 40 years ago. For the past 33 years, worked for Essex Tech. Over that time, CS had worked in various positions within the school. Was part of the process of building Essex Tech, as it is now. Now currently retired. CS talked about her various volunteer positions she served on.
- *Tell us why you are interested in serving on the Whittier Tech School Committee.*
 - CS: I love Ipswich and I love education, and I really love vocational education. Vocational/technical education is a really special place.
 - GJ: I have enjoyed being on the School Committee. Whittier is a fascinating place. It is such an impressive program and school. I would like to remain so I can see the completion of wherever we are going at this point. I would like to see it processed to its finality.
- *Describe how Whittier Tech and Essex Tech's provision of vocational education serves the best interest of Ipswich's students and their families.*
 - GJ: The person who works on my car is a former student of mine. I know I can call a plumber because two of my former students are master plumbers. These schools serve a population that I think are special. I think we have to be open to kids wanting a new or different experience that, unfortunately, Ipswich does not offer. I've had Ipswich kids share that one of the reasons they don't choose Whittier is because of the music program in Ipswich. It's a unique place and it is a family.
 - CS: I agree with exactly what GJ said. Ipswich High School is wonderful. A comprehensive high school is not for everybody and college is not for everybody. Seeing our students go into the community and get things done that need to get done. People are respecting the trades and realizing how important it is for the town. We need to work more at getting Ipswich business tied into the co-op programs. It really gives students another option.

body so that the matter is given proper consideration. Public comment is limited to three (3) minutes per person and a total of 15 minutes, overall.

- *Some of the shortcomings of the recent Whittier school building project was the transparency and communication with the town and the boards. How would we improve that going forward?*
 - CS: We have to have the School Committee representative report to the School Committee every month. The representative would need to keep key officials within Ipswich informed on various developments at Whittier which impact Ipswich and get input from Ipswich boards to share with the Whittier School Committee. There should be a responsibility, on an as needed basis, to meet with the Select Board, Finance Committee, and make presentations to Town Meeting. There should be no surprises. We should also get the word out about what Whittier does.
 - GJ: In the past, I was invited to the School Committee. This hasn't happened with the current School Committee. We need to work on that. We do need to meet and there has to be a meeting for Whittier representatives to share. There does have to be more transparency.
- *What is your view of the regional agreement and the interest of many communities to revisit and modify it.*
 - GJ: I was always told, "it is what it is". I wish it was more equitable, but I'm not sure how that would happen. I get protective of Whittier and I know we do a terrific job. I wish sometimes we would get more credit for that.
 - CS: I read the agreement. They need to get a task force together and go to the state and get this revised. I don't know how you'll ever get anything passed when Ipswich is paying an enormous amount of money when you only have 20 students going there. It was a different time in 1967 when the agreement was written. The towns have to take this one. Towns are talking to each other about this.
- *What approach would you pursue to address the Whittier building needs and build community support?*
 - CS: I've been watching the Whittier School Committee meetings and I believe the superintendent is going to be doing an analysis of exactly how they are going to be able to approach the building needs and keep the building going. They are starting to look at it. The biggest thing we need to do is get the 1967 agreement changed. No one is going to pay that much money. I think we need to have the senior citizens up there to have lunch. We need the vocational students to help with projects around Ipswich to show return on investment.
 - GJ: We need to do more community service. We need to showcase what Whittier students are doing and what Whittier is offering. We need to encourage people to visit our website.
- *Who do you think should do the showcasing for Whittier? Is that the responsibility of the School Committee representative?*
 - GJ: I could certainly bring that to the committee.
 - CS: We can help get in touch with people that can make a difference. We can certainly spread the word.
- *This committee work will involve building consensus with competing interests both in Ipswich, but also across a diverse Whittier School district. Do you have experience building consensus and what would be your process?*
 - GJ: I'm a good listener. I am certainly always willing to listen. I would like to help get to a point where there would be consensus.
 - CS: I agree with Garry. Watching the Whittier School Committee meeting, they obviously know there is a problem. If we work together with our towns and bring our town information that could help. The School Committee is desperate to get the word out and build consensus. I would like to work with them to do that.

The School Committee will take this under advisement and vote at the March 21st meeting.

C. Special Education Parent Advisory Council (SEPAC) Presentation

Moriah Marsh talked about the Special Education Parent Advisory Council (SEPAC). The SEPAC is an organization that every community is supposed to have that serves with both an advisory and participatory role. Parents collaborate with each other and the president works closely with the Director of Pupil Personnel Services. The responsibilities of the SEPAC are to advise the district and support parents. Membership is open to all parents/guardians of students with any sort of disability and also for parents with concerns about their child's progression, services, etc. The SEPAC collaborates with the Director of Pupil Personnel Services on the Basic Rights presentation that takes place annually and connects on questions/concerns from parents. The SEPAC will continue to be a place where parents can find support. A plan for the future will be to provide some additional training about testing, differences between IEP vs. 504 accommodations and evaluations. Joint meetings with local SEPAC organizations and social gatherings for SEPAC members are also in the plans.

KE asked how the SEPAC and/or the district introduces the group to new families. Ms. Marsh talked about sharing a flier at IEP meetings. There is more collaboration that could be done with the district. KE also asked about how the School Committee liaison had been going and whether there were any improvements that can be done with the collaboration. Ms. Marsh said the relationship has been going well and the insight that is brought to the group is helpful.

JP said the point of this presentation was to raise awareness for SEPAC and that membership for this group is really just being a parent in the district. As a parent, it is refreshing to see other people at the meeting and to know that you are not alone. As a liaison, there are opportunities that we can do to help. JP encourages everyone to look out for future meetings.

D. Paine Grant Committee Member Discussion/Appointment

At the beginning of the year, the School Committee announced they were seeking applications for people to serve on the Paine Grant Committee. This group primarily meets in April and May to review staff and teacher submissions for funds that have been provided by the Feoffees Trust. There is a rubric and an application form. There is a kickoff meeting for the Paine Grant Committee and then the group has about a week to review the grant applications and generate questions for the applicants. The applicants then present their grant to the Paine Grant Committee. The committee takes a couple of meetings to rank the applications and establish a recommendation for approval by the School Committee. The following positions were open for the upcoming year:

- Administrator
- High School Student
- Community At-Large members
- Community Business Representative (2)
- Elementary Parent

The School Committee previously appointed one business representative. Peter Ginolfi, principal at the middle school, has volunteered to serve as the school administrator on the committee.

The School Committee had received applications from Kate Henry, Alexis McIntyre, Betsy Totten, Karen Lafarge, and a renewal from Johann Knets. Not all applicants were in attendance at the meeting. A lot of the candidates were known by members of the School Committee, so JP suggested that they may speak on behalf of those applicants. The interest in these positions was overwhelming and there are more applicants than available positions.

The person currently serving as the Elementary Parent has expressed interest in continuing to serve in the position. BB asked if there were any applicants that could also be considered for that position. It was determined that at least one applicant could qualify as an elementary parent. KE said that Johann had expressed interest in continuing to serve on the Paine Grant Committee. He is currently the parent of a 4th grade student and an educator in another district. KE felt that if this person has served on the committee and would like to continue, they should. JP added that he has worked with Johann on the committee and also supported him continuing in his role. There has been significant turnover on the Paine Grant Committee and some felt it would be beneficial to have Johann continue in his capacity.

- *Motion to reappoint Johann Knets as the Elementary Parent representative to the Paine Grant Committee was made by KE and seconded by DF. **The motion passed unanimously in favor.***
- *Motion to appoint Peter Ginolfi as the Administrator to the Paine Grant Committee was made by DF and seconded by SS. **The motion passed unanimously in favor.***

Betsy Totten, a parent of high school students, introduced herself and shared why she was interested in serving on the committee. JP spoke on behalf of Katie Henry, who would qualify for the Community Business Representative. Ms. Henry is a parent of a second grade student in Ipswich, a business owner in Ipswich, and has volunteer experience in Ipswich. JP then spoke on behalf of Alexis Surpitski McIntyre who also owns a business in town. She is active in the community through various volunteer roles and is a parent of middle and high school students. JC spoke on behalf of Karen Lafarge who said she is creative, proactive, dedicated, and has solid character. SS spoke about Ms. Totten and her experience and expertise. He then talked about Ms. McIntyre and her experience.

There was a discussion on which candidates would qualify for each position. There are two applicants that are business members and would qualify as the Community Business Representative. The four candidates could all qualify for the Community-At-Large

position. KE suggested that the School Committee consider appointing the candidates who applied first, noting that there is not necessarily a specific skill set needed to fill these positions. Because the application deadline was open, DF felt it may not be fair to the candidates who applied later and didn't know they may not be considered due to the timing of their submission.

- *Motion to appoint Alexis Surpitski McIntyre as the Business Representative to the Paine Grant Committee for three years was made by DF and seconded by SS. **The motion passed unanimously in favor.***

JC made a motion to appoint Karen Lafarge as the Community-At-Large member of the Paine Grant Committee, but no second was made.

- *Motion to appoint Betsy Totten as the Community-At-Large member of the Paine Grant Committee was made by JD and seconded by SS. **The motion passed with 6 in favor and 1 opposed.***

E. MSBA Statement of Interest (SOI) Review and Discussion

This discussion was led by the School Facilities Working Group. SS shared that the intention of the SOI is to receive state funding assistance intended for repairs and/or building a new school building. The intention of the SOI and what information is included in there is to identify deficiencies and the needs of the schools. Nowhere in the SOI are questions about or communication about what the district would do. Those discussions and plans come after an SOI is accepted by the Massachusetts School Building Authority (MSBA). The focus of the SOI is identifying issues with the existing schools- the physical structure and the overall educational environment. It is identifying unmet needs of students due to deficiencies in the buildings.

The vote that will be taken at the March 21st meeting is similar to the vote that the Select Board will take. The vote is for the approval to submit the SOIs, one for each elementary school, to the MSBA. The School Committee is not voting on each individual question and response. It is important to the School Facilities Working Group that the entire School Committee has seen the SOI and have been given the opportunity to ask questions about it. The working group is also getting information from the elementary principals to be included in the SOIs. SS suggested that this process is similar to the way the School Committee reviews policies or the newsletter.

In the School Committee folder, there were two sets of documents for review. There is a redacted SOI for both Winthrop and Doyon that was made available on the district website. The redacted sections of the SOIs identify safety and security information. SS reviewed the dates for review and submission. The School Committee has been asked to review the SOI documents in the School Committee folder and provide feedback no later than March 15th. The principals were also asked to provide feedback specifically to the impact of the systems and structure on the educational plan. The School Facilities Working Group will finalize the SOIs by March 19th so they can bring it to the full School Committee on March 21st. KE and SS will also be meeting with the Select Board and ask for a vote of approval to submit the SOIs. The goal is to be ready to submit the final SOIs by April 2nd. The deadline for SOI submission is April 12th.

DF clarified that the vote the School Committee and Select Board will take is to authorize BB to submit the SOIs. SS read language from the vote language that will be used at the Select Board meeting and upcoming School Committee meeting.

SS talked about the priorities. The SOIs that were submitted for each elementary school last year selected the following priorities:

- #2: Elimination of existing severe overcrowding
- #7: Replacement of or addition of obsolete building in order to provide a full range of programs consistent with state and approved local requirements

The same priorities were identified in the two SOIs being submitted this year because the need remains the same. SS said the School Facilities Working Group did discuss also selecting priority #5: Replacement, renovation, or modernization of school facilities systems such as roofs, windows, boilers, heating and ventilation systems. The working group reviewed approved SOIs from other districts and noted that several of them had selected priority #5. In reading through it, it gave districts another opportunity to call out issues that some systems were contributing to. The intention is to further and better make a case on why Ipswich needs funding for each of our elementary schools.

SS shared that the SOIs will also include information about 3A zoning and the large building projects that are contributing to an increase in enrollment and overcrowding. JD noted that the 3A and Essex Pastures information did not end up in the public document posted online. JD said that the working group also discussed checking off priority #4: Prevention of severe

overcrowding expected to result in increased enrollments. The reason not to check that priority was because these projects are far out and the enrollment data, especially from Essex Pastures, was already included in the demographic study that was done by NESDEC. The enrollment information was included under priority #2.

KE asked JD to elaborate on the process for gathering information on the 3A zoning and Essex Pastures. JD shared that she spoke with the Town Planner and reviewed data available on the Town website. Information included the number of units that were approved currently and what additional units could be approved. The demographic study done by NESDEC has information about the 151 units at Essex Pastures that are already approved. That information was included in the research done. JD spoke about the work of the task force around 3A and how that information will be presented at Town Meeting in the fall. That requirement is in the future and takes into consideration what already exists in town, so it might not grow a population so quickly. DF added that the working group had a strong discussion on where this information warranted adding an additional priority. Based on the current information, the working group did not feel that the enrollment numbers would not change significantly at this time.

JC asked if teacher testimonials could be included in the SOIs. BB clarified that the SOIs were shared with the elementary principals with specific questions that the working group would like answered. Teachers will have an opportunity to weigh in. The MSBA would like the application to be concise. SS said that yes, the intent is to get information from the teachers and principals about the impact the schools have on the educational plan.

JC felt it would be nice to include a statement on the work of the teachers who work hard to keep the quality of education high despite the buildings.

KE wanted to challenge the thought in the community that the School Committee has to submit something different from the last SOI process. The School Committee was in agreement that they needed to review last year's SOI submissions with a fresh set of eyes. KE said she loved the addition of priority #5 this time around. KE noted that over 70% of the SOIs that are submitted each round are not accepted. Many SOIs are accepted down the road. It is not uncommon. The application that was submitted last year may not have been flawed, but instead Ipswich could have been up against other communities with greater need.

BB reiterated an earlier point made by SS that the submission of the SOIs and the purpose of the SOIs is simply to identify the deficiencies in the existing buildings and why the district needs funding support. Once an SOI is accepted, then begins the process of a feasibility study, community discussions and all the other steps anew. KE added that the feasibility study takes place well after the SOI is accepted. Once accepted, there is a 270 eligibility period before the feasibility study. Part of that period includes a detailed enrollment analysis. It's almost a year after being accepted where concrete solutions are discussed.

A couple meetings ago, JD said, the School Committee had similar discussions. JD feels one of the reasons the SOI was not accepted last year was because the district could not clearly identify what was different from the last go around other than aging of the buildings. JD said she proposed the idea of prioritizing Doyon this time around and also checking the box for potential consolidation. She feels there is a part of the community that feels if there is a combined school, it would be at Doyon. By prioritizing Doyon this time around, there would be more options to discuss. By prioritizing Winthrop, options would be taken away. There may be more consensus around prioritizing Doyon first.

KE asked for clarification on what options would be taken away if Winthrop was marked as the priority school on SOIs. JD said that if the feasibility study deems one combined school, the community has said they don't want it on the Winthrop property. The school would then need to go on the Doyon property which is what JD feels led to a divisiveness in town during the last process. Because of the site at Winthrop, if a small school is what the community wants, it is difficult to build on the site while students are still in the building. Is the community going to support the cost of one large school? JD felt there were many more options if you put Doyon as the priority.

DF sought clarification and understanding on the reasoning behind supporting Doyon as the priority school. If the district is saying that Doyon is in such disrepair that they need a new school, how could it then be justified to keep it open for another several years to house students when/if Winthrop is done. SS explained that the selection of a priority determines which school is in worse shape, which is different from how the School Committee would proceed if one or both SOIs are accepted. The intention of the articulation of the priority is that Winthrop is in worse condition. In the last year, the School Facilities Working Group has looked at whether anything has changed to identify Doyon as worse off, but nothing has changed enough to change the priority.

JB asked if Ipswich would lose funding if they chose Winthrop as the priority, but ultimately built a new school at Doyon. The reflection of the priority is on the current state of the buildings and not what we would do going forward. DF added that the solution has to impact the students who are experiencing the worst conditions.

JP felt that by picking Winthrop as the priority, you would lose the ability to build a small school on the Doyon site first. If you select Winthrop as the priority, you could not say, without MSBA permissions, that you actually want to do a small school at Doyon. SS felt that this conversation feels so far ahead. JP asked if there was a regulation that states the priority school has to be the worst school. If not, the priority could be a school that is not necessarily the worst building. JP also noted that the MSBA did not do a site visit last application cycle, so their decision was based on what they already know about Ipswich or some other factors. There could be justification for switching the priority from Winthrop to Doyon. JP said the fear that he has is if you move forward with the same SOI and it's accepted, the town is going to say "you didn't listen to us" when it comes time to fund a feasibility study. JP feels this is our last chance and the School Committee needs to be cautious shutting a third or more of the voters out by saying we are not considering your option. SS suggested that the path JP was discussing prioritizes that one third over the other $\frac{2}{3}$ of voters.

JD looked at the ten elementary schools invited into the process this year. One of the districts did not have their priority school accepted, but had another school accepted. Of the ten schools, two were consolidated schools and the others were smaller schools. To say that Doyon would not get accepted is hard when we don't know if Winthrop will get accepted either.

DF said she struggled to understand why the School Committee would not put the students who are experiencing the most negatively impacted education first. If you take the SOIs line by line, there is a very objective comparison. DF felt that the School Committee needs to consider what school is going to stand out and get the town on the path to fix the problem. JP added that if the path is chosen and it sets off a subset of voters, that could kill the project. SS felt that the community acknowledges there is a need for new elementary schools. There is a difference in perspective on the solution. The SOIs allow the School Committee to proceed with a request for additional funding from the state towards a school building project. SS did not feel this would create a divisive situation, but rather allowed the School Committee to proceed by communicating where the biggest need is for our students and teachers. The priority school is not an indication or communication of a couple of different versions of configuration. SS felt it was misleading to the town to suggest that at this point. JP asked if selecting one priority over another eliminated a solution, to which SS and KE responded, no.

BB reminded the School Committee that the vote at the next meeting is simply whether to submit the SOIs and not on the contents of the SOIs.

JD said that the passion that comes from our community members about wanting to keep a school in town in part comes from the notion that despite the crummy buildings, students are getting an incredible education. JD did not feel it was about what kids are being impacted more. Students are receiving an amazing education despite the buildings. JD suggested the School Committee review the document and come back to this conversation at the next meeting.

JB asked if the School Committee needed to come to a consensus on the priority school. DF said that no, the School Committee did not and that it was BB's document to submit. The SOIs are signed by BB, KE, and the Town Manager. JD felt that the conversation about prioritization should continue, as she feels strongly about doing something different. JD suggested a motion to come back and discuss the prioritization at the next meeting. It was determined that a vote and motion was unnecessary to continue the discussion at the next meeting.

There was a discussion regarding whether a School Committee could make a motion to vote on a priority school.

BB then shared his thoughts on what the definition of a priority school would be. In his opinion, the definition of a priority school is one that is in worse condition. If the School Committee wants to change that definition, the SOIs would need to substantiate why there is a change in the priority. BB felt the School Committee needed to decide what the priority needs to look like.

MP asked for clarification on the two scenarios being discussed- prioritizing Winthrop or prioritizing Doyon. It was stated again that some felt that options would be eliminated for consideration if Winthrop was the priority school. SS asked for clarification on whether some members felt options were eliminated from a technical perspective or a town support perspective. JP felt it would eliminate some town support. MP said there is both a financial problem and a political problem and sometimes those don't line up. KE said her biggest concern was that if they don't get over the first hurdle, getting invited to MSBA, Ipswich will never get to the

next step and will be in a worse situation. KE asked whether the School Committee focuses on a school that professionals have deemed as the neediest school or focus more on gaining support from the town. KE acknowledged that is not an easy decision.

JP asked how Amherst reapplied the year that they were approved after a failed vote. JD said that Amherst made changes in their government and changed the number of students in the school.

The discussion continued about the potential outcomes of prioritizing Doyon over Winthrop. Other districts were mentioned there their priority school was not chosen, but the other school submitted was. SS again stressed that the priority school is determined by the current state of the buildings. Winthrop, SS said, is objectively in worse condition. Once accepted, that is when discussions begin on what is economically feasible and in the best interest of the students. Prioritizing Winthrop does not take options off the table.

JP felt that there should be a School Committee vote on the priority school, separate from the procedural vote to submit the SOIs. KE said the vote for the authorization to submit the SOI has specific language and cannot be changed. DF argued that taking a vote on the priority was unprecedented. The School Committee is not going to vote on any other content. JP then suggested that it may not be a formal vote, but rather a straw poll.

The SOIs will be revisited at the March 21st meeting.

F. Finance Committee Budget Presentation Recap

The administrative team presented the budget to the Finance Committee this week. A third night of budget presentations to the Finance Committee was scheduled for March 12th. KE felt the administrators did a great job and were thorough in their presentation. JD added that she admired how the elementary principals, when asked about MCAS, brought it right back to the budget. JD added that the administrators did a good job keeping their budgets lean. JD also added that KE also did a nice job ensuring that the Finance Committee stayed within their purview.

There was some conversation about the format of the presentation.

9. Superintendent's Administrative Report

BB's report included:

- Administrative team meeting focusing on the Finance Committee budget presentations
- School Facilities Working Group
- Northshore Education Consortium Board of Directors meeting
- Meeting with elementary administrators around Title 1 and ESSER funding
- DEI Committee meeting
- MASS Executive Board meeting

10. Subcommittee, Working Group and Liaison Reports

- **School Facilities Working Group:** Discussed as an earlier agenda item

11. New Business*

TM talked about the monthly budget reports and the budget is in a good place. Building principles and administrative assistants are beginning to plan for the end of year. It is the goal of TM to project end of year balances earlier. SS asked about the encumbrances and if they are reflected in the year-to-date balances. TM said some are encumbered. TM continued to review the revolving account balances.

12. Vouchers and Bills

All were reviewed and signed.

13. Consent Agenda

No consent agenda was presented.

14. Adjournment

➤ *Motion to adjourn the meeting was made by DF and seconded by JP. **The motion passed unanimously in favor.***