

Ipswich School Committee
MS/HS Ensemble Room
134 High Street, Ipswich
Thursday, December 1, 2022
7:00 PM

Minutes

1. Call to Order

Mr. Stevens called the meeting to order at 7:01 PM.

Members Present: G. Stevens (GS) K. Eliot (KE)
 J. Donahue (JD) P. Kneedler (PK)
 J. Poirier (JP) D. Freehan (DF)
 E. Cannon (EC)

Also Present: B. Blake, Superintendent of Schools (BB)
 J. Bornstein, High School Student Representative (JB)

Absent: C. Herrick-Stella, Director of Finance and Operations (CHS)

2. Reading of the District Mission Statement

J. Bornstein read the mission statement.

3. Announcements

- The School Committee is scheduled to meet on December 15th at 7:00 PM in the MS/HS ensemble room.
- The Communications Subcommittee will meet remotely on Tuesday, December 13th at 6:00 PM.
- The Budget Subcommittee will meet on Wednesday, December 14th at 5:00 PM in the MS/HS guidance conference room.

4. Special Acknowledgements

- The girls high school volleyball team are state champions for the second year in a row.
- The high school cheerleading team were league champions and placed 4th overall in the state.
- The middle school collected over 1,300 items to be donated to the Ipswich community food pantry, The Open Door.
- The Ipswich Education Foundation received a drum set for the high school jazz band from an anonymous donor.
- The middle school production of Shrek was well received.

5. Citizen' Comments (15 minutes)

- *Maria Walters, Green Street:* shared an idea about building a school in stages. The design and infrastructure are in place for a larger school, but the construction would happen over time and not all at once. She suggested doing this in a campus style. She felt it was a less expensive option and could result in more community support.
- *Gary Champion, Palomino Way:* thought it was important that everyone was aware that during the last MSBA process, the cost to the town was \$2 million over four years. That effort resulted in broad support of a combined school until it was time to pick a site. At the time, it was agreed by the School Committee and many others that Doyon would be the site and that decision received support from the MSBA. The vote for that school fell short by 38 votes at Town Meeting, but achieved a majority at the ballot. Many people believe that a re-vote on the project would have been successful. The School Committee will need to provide the best option for the education of students that costs the least to taxpayers.
- *Ana Laguarda, Mt Pleasant Avenue:* thanked the School Committee for the job they signed up for. She felt worried because the community is already divided again. She asked that the School Committee explain very clearly how they arrived at any decision or point of view. She recognized that it is hard for schools across the state to find people to work in the schools. She would love for the School Committee to explain what teachers have to say about whatever perspective they take on. She acknowledged that Ipswich has really great teachers and the district needs to keep them. The first priority should be to listen to the teachers and not random citizens. She asked that the School Committee think about the people who are actually working with the students in the schools and incorporate them into the decisions.

- *Chris Carroll, Upper River Road*: said that as someone coming to this meeting fairly strongly in favor of two smaller schools, he echoed others by saying that the community is looking for a project in the best interest of teachers and students. The School Committee was asked to keep an open mind, demonstrate their work and how they come to conclusions. That will make the community understand the process.
- *Gina Reddick, Washington Street*: asked the School Committee to consider not taking away the town playground. She said that taking away the playground would not get the committee any buy-in from the community.
- *Todd, Washington Street*: echoed what Gina said. If you take away the park, where will the kids play?
- *Carl Gardner, Woods Lane*: emphasized that the School Committee is representing the full community. Ipswich has established two strong school communities that need to be supported. He felt there was an opportunity to compromise that is both creative and affordable, and something the community can get behind.

6. High School Student Representative Report

JB shared that students overall had a positive first quarter and felt classes were engaging. He discussed the fall sports season, stating that it was an overall good season for all sports.

JB talked about the presentation from Katie Greer on technology/social media and said that students felt the presentation was not needed because students have heard the message she was relaying before. JB then talked about how the presentation left a negative feeling for a lot of students due to an incident that occurred between the speaker and a student of color. JB attended the Restorative Circle held by HS assistant principal, Ms. Collura.

JB discussed a potential fundraiser that involved painting senior parking spaces.

7. Presentations

A. IEA Lesson Snapshot Presentation: Recognizing Patterns in the Periodic Table

High School chemistry teacher, Anna Kjellson, gave a brief overview of a lesson she does with her students where she asked them to recognize trends within the periodic table.

B. Discussion/Follow-up to phone call with the Massachusetts School Building Authority (MSBA)

After the last School Committee workshop, GS, KE, JD and BB had a phone call with Dianne Sullivan and Jack McCarthy from the Massachusetts School Building Authority (MSBA) to get some clarification and additional information about the SOI process. First, the group discussed what, if anything, should be done differently with an SOI submission this year after having a failed project. MSBA shared that there are no additional requirements for a submission after a failed project.

MSBA also shared that it was favorable to narrow sites down early in the process. The more sites that need to be studied as the process moves forward, the more money it would cost. The site location does not matter as long as it meets the education plan.

The group was reassured that each SOI submission is looked at with “fresh eyes” and while the MSBA knows the history of the last failed project in Ipswich, a new SOI will not be looked at with prejudice. The MSBA will look for applications that demonstrate 100% need and urgency. Districts must also indicate in their SOI whether there is interest in the potential consolidation of schools. This indication is non-binding. The MSBA made clear that the town is in charge of sites and alternative sites. It is not in their purview to push or recommend specific locations.

While the Accelerated Repair Program is on hold for this coming year, the MSBA said they expected the program to be back for the following year. When asked about whether it was possible for two projects to be accepted at once, the MSBA said it was typically uncommon. It was clarified that two Core Program applications for a district could not be accepted at one time, however, an Accelerated Repair project and a Core Program Project could be accepted at the same time.

The MSBA stressed the importance of getting a consensus from the School Committee, Select Board and Finance Committee. The MSBA also felt it was a good idea to have consensus from Town Meeting.

A takeaway from the call, GS felt, was the importance of town wide consensus and the need to narrow potential sites down.

KE talked about the paperwork that was submitted to the MSBA after the last project failed. The required document outlined why the district thought the project had failed and the nature of the failed vote. The document mentioned site locations as part of the

reason for the failed vote. The School Committee should work to address sites and narrow down potential locations in preparation for a new SOI submission.

There was a discussion regarding a project timeline should the district use a “model school”. The SOI submission period opens in January and applications are accepted through April. If invited into the program this round, the district would receive an invitation around December 2023. Typically, it then takes 3-4 years before a town vote takes place to fund the project and then another 2-3 years before the school opens. The MSBA said that communities do have some control over the timeline. If towns can narrow down decisions and come to consensus, the timeline could be shortened. Choosing a “model school” could also shorten the timeline by roughly a year.

It was asked if the timeline would be the same for consolidation of schools versus replacing two schools. The MSBA said that while there is more planning that takes place with consolidating schools, the timeline would not differ.

JD also confirmed that towns receive the same reimbursement percentage using the model school program.

C. Review of the Logue Group listening session data/report

The reports from the first and second round of listening sessions, as well as the feedback from the staff survey were all completed and returned to the district from the Logue Group. The general themes from the second round of listening sessions seemed to mirror a lot of themes from the first round. Not much, GS said, came as a surprise.

Community feedback included in the report from the second round of listening sessions included a lot of questions around cost, health and safety concerns, and concerns about the current buildings. There was feedback about how the positive culture in each school does not come from the buildings themselves. To some people, the location of a school could impact the culture. KE was surprised how few teachers talked about one school versus two schools. Teachers emphasized their love for their students, but also the need for better facilities.

GS felt there was a lot of optimism from teachers around the ability to address accessibility and equity. The general theme, he said, was that enough was enough and something needed to be done about the state of the buildings.

JD said the report did include specific teacher comments about the size of the school.

JP asked for more sufficient time to look at the data and asked that the School Committee make publishing the data for public viewing a priority.

To KE, a lot of the comments were around specific details like what would happen to bussing. While they are all valid questions, a lot of those will be answered as the process moves forward. The public will have a lot of opportunities for input on how to address these problems and get the answers they need.

PK shared the most impactful statement she read from the staff survey results, “what we really need is a safe, healthy building for teachers and students”. That is it, PK said, it is that simple.

GS agreed to have this discussion and review of data on a future meeting agenda.

D. Elementary Equity/Accessibility-Recap of discussion with principals/staff

KE explained that the issues of equity, accessibility, and meeting the needs of vulnerable families in town were a common theme among survey feedback from community members and teachers. KE asked for a meeting with the two elementary building principals, teachers and BB to look further into the needs of these families. KE felt that it was important to fully understand the need in order to better address it. JP was also a participant in the meeting.

A takeaway from the meeting was that there are needs everywhere in town, at both elementary schools and most likely in the middle/high school, as well. Families have varying support in town depending on the community organizations they are connected with. Some families are dealing with significant mental health issues. A total of 17% of students at Doyon and 26% of Winthrop students are registered for free/reduced lunch, although it is believed that number is underreported.

Transportation, while perceived as a downtown issue, is really an issue throughout town. JP talked about the length that some students are currently on buses and the large gaps in between arrival times for students at Doyon. JP acknowledged that these issues should be addressed now and wondered how the district could work with our transportation provider to improve the circumstances.

KE said her impression was that teachers felt like helping families and providing supports was a large part of their day and also a lot of work. While there is a lot of gratitude for services provided throughout town, the feeling is that schools are more reactive than proactive and a new building could change that for the better.

JP shared that he was at the meeting to learn more about educational equity among the two schools. He said that the teachers and administrators at the meeting unanimously agreed that they did not feel there was an inequity amongst the two schools. There was some discussion around Title 1 funding which is now just at Winthrop School.

There was a discussion about breakfast options for students. While the schools do provide breakfast, delays with transportation shorten the time students have to eat. There was a discussion around potential solutions to this issue including offering a “grab and go” option.

A question was raised about the opportunity for teachers in both schools to meet and work together. Teachers acknowledged that their rigorous schedules often don’t allow for meetings with the teachers from the other schools. More often teams are meeting within their respective building. It was added that teams do meet with each other as part of professional development days and depending on where particular grades are in the curriculum review cycle.

EC raised concerns about educational equality among the two schools and how one school has continued to outperform the other. JP added that statistically, the measure of difference between the schools is small enough that one or two students can change the percentages. Statistically, there is little difference in performance for each school and is not something that the Director of Teaching of Learning, as well as building administrators were concerned about at this time. EC asked for a more detailed presentation of that information at a future meeting.

Feedback from the listening sessions included a comment from a teacher that implied that staff can tell what elementary school a student came from and acknowledged the cultural differences at the schools. GS said that students should have shared experiences.

E. School Committee Workshop Recap: Review and discussion on the workshop framing questions; Discussion and potential vote to remove Winthrop School as a site for a combined school; Discussion and potential vote to remove Town Hall as a site for a combined school; Vote to remove Bialek Park as an option for a school site

The School Committee recently held a workshop as a tool to find common ground among members and kickoff the building project(s). Questions and topics that were discussed at the meeting included:

- What elements of a project can we agree on?
- What locations are we looking at?
- What configurations are available to us?
- Are there any options we can rule out?
- What considerations/limitations are there for the various options? (such as timing, phasing, cost, relocation of students)
- Discussion around options for potential ballot vote

At the workshop, committee members agreed on the following:

- There is a need/urgency to file an SOI in spring 2023
- Need a project that the committee feels confident can pass
- Educational equity
- Consideration of cost
- Green building
- A school building used as a community hub
- Small feel/community feel
- Eliminate the gray zone
- Put the building on a property that does not include Chapter 97 approval

It was agreed at the workshop that next steps would include a call with the MSBA for clarification on the SOI process.

Before moving forward, K. Eliot asked if the committee would like to update “educational equity” to “educational equity and excellence”. All members agreed.

G. Stevens expressed concern over having too many potential sites as options prior to submitting the SOI and suggested eliminating sites or configurations that the committee does not think are worthy of moving forward.

J. Donahue felt that the most progress was made in the last half hour of the workshop where the group discussed building consensus. JD felt that the crowd at tonight’s meeting was there because there was unfinished business that should be addressed by the School Committee before taking any votes.

GS asked why the School Committee would keep potential sites on the list that were deemed unviable or were not supported during the last project. For example, a large school on the Winthrop property was not supported. If sites were already studied and determined to be either not suitable or not supported, why study them again?

While JD said she did not disagree with GS, she said the committee has not had time to digest the listening session data and was not clear on how to build consensus moving forward. KE asked what people would need to be ready to vote, stating that the committee does not need to decide to form consensus through a ballot vote in order to make some of these decisions tonight. Based on the list the committee agreed to at the workshop and information from the MSBA call, KE believed that the committee was ready to discuss potential options to remove from the list.

The MSBA confirmed on their call that if a district is accepted into their program, the district then has a readiness call. GS felt the School Committee could never confirm with the MSBA their readiness to move forward if they had a site like Bialek Park because of the extensive legal issues around obtaining the land. It is not a viable option to move forward with and could be removed from the list of potential sites.

There was disagreement in the process of removing options for potential school sites and a discussion on the need to agree on how to come to a consensus before these types of votes are taken. GS felt that the committee could not move forward with what a small portion of the community wants when the areas have already been studied and found to be either not viable or unsupported by a majority.

It was asked what the committee was doing to get ready for an SOI submission and whether a decision was made to move forward with a ballot vote or a vote at town meeting to garner consensus for a project. GS suggested that the committee seek a ballot vote after the Town Meeting. Asking for a non-binding ballot vote before April seemed to be too challenging. It was also noted that the MSBA does not need a ballot vote for an SOI submission.

The MSBA will require two SOI submissions, one for each school. JD was concerned that eliminating potential sites/configurations now would be eliminating too much at this time. KE clarified that an SOI was to show need and urgency for a new school building(s).

The committee decided to begin with discussing Bialek Park. KE said she felt nervous pursuing a site that the district does not currently have access to and will be challenging to get access to. GS added that the Select Board has tasked the School Committee with bringing the best possible project forward to them. Use of Bialek Park was denied by the Select Board during the last project. With a sense of urgency and need for a building(s), using Bialek Park as a site would be too much work and take too long to acquire.

JD expressed concern about taking votes out of order and the potential to remove three in-town sites. BB clarified that the other two votes for in-town sites are to remove a combined building at the sites, not removing the sites altogether. The committee already knows the sites are not big enough for one large, combined school.

- *Motion to remove Bialek Park as an option for an elementary school project was made by E. Cannon and seconded by P. Kneidler. **The motion passed unanimously in favor.***

The committee then discussed a potential vote to remove Winthrop School as a site for a combined school, starting with a question regarding the need for additional parking spaces at the site if a combined school was built. GS confirmed that the engineering study from the last project identified the need for 80 additional spaces and noted traffic issues.

Based on feedback from the listening sessions and the survey feedback, EC said that no one wanted a giant school built on the Winthrop site. When people thought about what was a palpable combined school, the vision included horizontal buildings, a small feel and a community feel. Nowhere did EC hear any suggestion from anyone that said Winthrop was the right site for a combined school.

The conversation continued around what was considered a combined school at the Winthrop site. What if the school at Winthrop was not 800 students, but instead 600 students with another school at Doyon? KE said that this specific discussion and potential vote is around putting all elementary school students in one school at the Winthrop site. Split configuration was not part of this vote. EC added that the site was not big enough for a combined school and in drawing from the past project and feedback, the community did not love the idea of a vertical, four story building.

JP stated that he would not support removing Winthrop as a combined site. There is still the potential use of the fire station and a study on the use of the Hammet Street parking lot to consider. While he understands the dislike for a large, vertical building, the School Committee is still unsure that a campus style school could fit on the Doyon site. He felt there were too many unknowns and potential new opportunities to make a decision at this meeting. If the committee were to vote to remove this location as a potential site, JP felt it was closing the door to revisit in the future.

The discussion continued about the potential for parking at the Hammet Street parking lot and whether that was the best for teachers.

PK suggested that at one point during the last project, there was enthusiasm for a combined school at Winthrop. KE said that at that time, the School Committee had committed to one large school and the Winthrop site was going to be too tight.

It was suggested that the School Committee consider configuration before location. That conversation, JD felt, was for a workshop discussion.

For each SOI submission, the School Committee must indicate whether they would consider a consolidation or not. JD expressed concern for taking away Winthrop as a site for a combined school when the School Committee is still uncertain whether Town Hall could be a viable option. She heard in the listening sessions that many people wanted small schools and many people wanted an in town or downtown school. Removing the option for a combined school at Winthrop would indicate that the School Committee is not listening.

KE said that people hear what they want to hear, stating that she understood people wanted space and nature. DF added that many people wanted one school at Doyon and EC said that she heard a desire for a campus style, small, intimate setting. JP asked if the School Committee knew if they could accomplish those things at the Doyon site. This discussion was about Winthrop. Does the School Committee know if these needs could be met at Winthrop?

GS reiterated that one of the items the School Committee agreed to at their workshop was that they are in favor of a project they know can pass. He said the School Committee needs to lead the project and advocated for taking the Winthrop site off the list for a combined elementary school. This eliminates the potential for putting a massive school downtown.

The last failed project was for a combined school that could support 775 students. A feasibility study could indicate that a combined school would need to be larger than that previous number. A school of that size would be too tight on the Winthrop site.

JP added that the School Committee does not know if a campus style would fit on any potential site at this time. He felt that a potential for consensus would be jeopardized if the Winthrop site was removed.

- *Motion to remove Winthrop School as a site for a combined school was made by E. Cannon and seconded by K. Eliot. **The motion passed with 5 in favor and 2 opposed.***

The School Committee then discussed a potential vote to remove Town Hall as a site for a combined school. GS suggested that the discussion center around the school owned property around Town Hall, not the building. It was noted that the town would not discuss the lease of Town Hall or the use of the building until the School Committee had a plan in place. GS clarified that a $\frac{2}{3}$ majority vote would be required to change the usage of Town Hall.

The environmental concerns generated from the last project were listed and discussed. Those concerns could require significant clean-up costs. There is some uncertainty about what is buried beneath the surface and if the district digs up something, they are responsible for the clean-up. These concerns contributed to this site being removed as an option during the last project.

There was a discussion about the size of the site and the space needed for bussing queues and parking. There was also concern over putting a large school in the middle of a densely populated residential area.

JP felt that the site was not adequately investigated last time and that, coupled with the fact that two viable downtown options had been removed, should be reason enough to keep this site as an option.

There was a feeling that by removing this site as an option, every ability to compromise for an in town school would be removed. KE said she would love to find a compromise and at least investigate a larger school downtown. The reality, however, is that the three sites discussed tonight are either not viable or come with too many unknowns. KE felt that urgency and need trumps the risks associated with these sites.

JP asked about the potential of using the school owned property around Town Hall, as well as Town Hall for a combined school sight. GS said in theory, the School Committee could submit an SOI and at the same time explore the use of Town Hall. School funds would need to be used to investigate the cost to renovate Town Hall.

During the MSBA call, GS asked about using/renovating other municipal buildings as part of a school project. It was confirmed that it could be done as part of the Core Program and examples were shared of another community that purchased an old parochial school and renovated it.

JD suggested a potential compromise for an in town school that included the use of the Town Hall building. She suggested submitting an SOI for Winthrop and Doyon and indicating the potential to combine the schools. There could be the potential to add an addition to Town Hall making it large enough for a combined school. JD worried about setting a precedent that no combined school would/could be built on the land around Town Hall. She added that people could compromise size for location.

JD noted that over 200 people participated in the listening sessions and surveys which is over the number needed for a quorum at Town Meeting. The School Committee should listen to the feedback from the listening sessions. DF added that of the staff who participated in the survey, 67% responded that they were in favor of one school, but did not specify location.

The discussion continued around the potential to reclaim Town Hall and add an addition. JP said a disadvantage to using the Town Hall site during the last project was the disruption to Town Hall. He then suggested a motion to not remove the Town Hall site under the care and custody of the school board for consideration of a combined school. JP felt this would allow the site to remain an option and leave time to explore a combined school on the site and the change of use for Town Hall.

It was agreed that no action was needed on this potential vote. The school-owned land at Town Hall will remain a potential site location.

F. Elementary Building Project Working Group: Update; Status of the Working Group; Next Steps; IEA Representation

The Elementary Building Project Working Group feels that they have accomplished what they were tasked to do- organize the documents from the last project and identify any pertinent information that can be used in creating an SOI for a potential new project(s). At this time, the working group has not identified any other tasks and would like to know if the group should continue and if so, what is the charge?

There was a discussion about the need for a communication plan moving forward to share the status of the buildings, the urgency and need for this project(s), and general education around the project(s). EC felt that it should be the full School Committee

sharing that information. It was suggested that a School Committee liaison work with the SOI Committee to compile information and communicate with the public.

It was agreed that another School Committee workshop was necessary and should be scheduled for early January. JD discussed the need for the workshop to be recorded and noted that the MSBA suggested that meetings should be broadcast to the community as much as possible. JD said it would be helpful for the community to better understand the process if they knew what the School Committee was thinking.

KE agreed that people want information on the decisions that have been made and the reasons behind them. While she agreed that some people want to watch the meeting, others would rather get the information from a weekly column.

G. Discussion on the makeup of the Athletic Subcommittee

A discussion took place about the potential to reorganize the Athletic Subcommittee. At an earlier meeting, the newly formed Ipswich Athletic Association presented to the School Committee on ways their organization could bring various athletic groups together and communicate through one unified voice to school administration and the athletic department. The group has asked to have a seat on the Athletic Subcommittee to ensure that their message is heard by the superintendent, athletic director and members of the subcommittee.

Historically, the Athletic Subcommittee has functioned differently than other School Committee subcommittee. The athletic director runs the meeting and reports out to the group. What has been missing is a strong voice advocating for the athletes themselves. It was suggested that the Athletic Subcommittee could benefit from a more cohesive group and better representation of all sports.

When thinking about changing the makeup of the subcommittee, BB urged the committee to consider the purpose of the Athletic Subcommittee and its charge. It could be seen as an overstep to have a district employee directly report to the School Committee by way of the subcommittee.

The purpose of the Athletic Subcommittee was discussed. Historically, the purpose was for the athletic director to report out on athletics. Some members feel that the subcommittee has been too narrowly focused on high school athletics. By broadening the subcommittee membership, the group could also work on addressing the many disjointed middle school and youth sports. It was suggested that the Athletic Subcommittee organize like all other School Committee subcommittees and have a committee member as chair. The athletic director would still be a member of the group, as well as representatives from all aspects of athletics in the district.

It was agreed that there should be more representation on the Athletic Subcommittee and that the group may need to be restructured. The question about the athletic director's role, as well as the role of the IAA member were discussed. Ultimately, it was suggested that the Athletic Subcommittee be dissolved and a new committee be formed that includes IAA representation, a liaison to the School Committee and equal representation of sports.

The School Committee's Athletic Subcommittee will not change until a new athletic committee is formed.

8. Superintendent's Administrative Report

BB discussed his schedule since the last School Committee meeting. His report included participation in the School Committee workshop, leadership team meetings, a meeting with the new Town Manager, a meeting with Endicott College representative, a meeting to discuss accessibility/equity at the elementary schools, a Professional Development Committee meeting, a Town Department Head meeting, a call with the MSBA, a Mutual Concerns meeting, an Athletic Subcommittee meeting and participation in a Race, Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion (REDI) foundation learning series course.

JP asked BB to speak to the incident that took place with the speaker at the high school. BB shared that there was an incident between the speaker and a student that left the student feeling singled out. Another interaction between the two individuals also took place outside of school. There is a disagreement about how it was resolved and not resolved. A meeting is scheduled between school administration and the speaker.

9. Subcommittee, Working Group and Liaison Reports

- **Athletic Subcommittee:** The softball field behind Doyon is in need of some rehab, the field attendance position at the high school has been filled, the Ipswich Education Foundation has made a donation for uniforms, middle school athlete waivers have been submitted for basketball and the swim/dive team. The softball team is seeking a coach for their spring season. Lastly, there was a conversation about getting uniform replacements on a four year rotation.
- **Mutual Concerns Subcommittee:** The group discussed the continued substitute teacher shortage, the cleanliness of the performing arts center and school safety.
- **STEAM Team:** The group is preparing for the STEAM Showcase this spring. The group is looking to increase community outreach and add more hands-on exhibits.

10. New Business*

GS asked if members would be okay with canceling the School Committee meeting on December 15th. There was consensus that canceling the meeting would be okay. With an additional workshop planned for early January, there was no need to meet again in December.

The Communications Subcommittee will be sending out their newsletter towards the end of December. The group will send the newsletter out to members ahead of publishing the final version. Members can respond individually with any comments or questions.

DF will share documents with members from the last school building project that show the potential for a multi-story building at several different sites.

11. Vouchers and Bills

All were reviewed and signed.

12. Consent Agenda

- *Motion to approve the consent agenda with the edits to meeting minutes suggested by D. Freehan and J. Poirier was made by G. Stevens and seconded by E. Cannon. **The motion passed unanimously in favor.***

13. Adjournment- KE/PK. Unanimous.

- *Motion to adjourn the meeting was made by K. Eliot and seconded by P. Kneedler. **The motion was passed unanimously in favor.***