

Green Mountain Unified School District Board

Regular Meeting Minutes

Thursday, May 16, 2019

Chester Andover Elementary School, Library

6:00 p.m.

I. ROLL CALL/CALL TO ORDER:

Board: Fred Marin, Jeff Hance, Kate Lamphere, Joe Fromberger, Lois Perlah, Doug McBride, Deb Brown, Michael Studin, Rick Alexander, Wayne Wheelock

Staff: Lauren Fierman, Deb Beaupre, Katherine Fogg, Michael Eppolito, Sharon Jonynas, Sue Willis, Leslie Kenney, Angela Hurd, Jessica Clay, Amy Hamblett, Amanda Tyrrell

Student Reps: Laurel King, Rileigh Thomas

Public: Shawn Cunningham, Dan Tyrrell

Mr. Fromberger called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. He invited the board members to introduce themselves.

II. APPROVE AGENDA:

Mr. McBride requested to address the issues he raised at the last meeting. Mr. Fromberger suggested adding them to the board comments section of the meeting. Ms. Lamphere noted that the April 25 minutes were in email, but not in the packet. Ms. Brown **moved** to approve the agenda as printed. Mr. Alexander seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

III. MINUTES:

A. April 25, 2019 Regular Meeting;

Ms. Perlah **moved** to approve the minutes of the April 25, 2019 regular meeting. Ms. Brown seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

B. May 9, 2019 Special Meeting

Mr. Fromberger noted that they were given the minutes of May 9 at this meeting, and they were included in the board members' email. Mr. Marin **moved** to approve the minutes of May 9, 2019 meeting. Mr. Alexander seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

IV. PRESENTATION:

A. 2020 GMUHS Field Trips

Ms. Fierman advised that the first field trip is for the 2019 Long Trail Summer Hike. Mr. Mastrangelo and Mr. Garvin are the chaperones. The trip will be held this summer. They have held this hiking trail trip in the past. Ms. Brown noted that at the meeting where Sue Holson gave information about what is the board's purview and what isn't, she had suggested that the board doesn't need to approve that. There was discussion about this board historically approving overnight trips. Ms. Fierman noted that this board's practice has been to hear about similar school trips, including safety concerns, educational value and other topics. Ms. Mahusky suggested that the VSBA rep felt those were best practices and she was encouraging the board to think beyond the questions that the administration would be considering like chaperones and safety.

Ms. Mahusky questioned the educational purpose of the trip. Ms. King noted that last year's trip was the most life changing experience she has had. The students bonded during those two weeks

in a way that couldn't have been achieved in school. They are outdoors and learning how to survive with not many resources. She felt that while it didn't fit a proficiency, there are still many essential skills and dispositions met—communication, collaboration, etc. The dates are June 30 through July 3 and will begin at the Duxbury Road Trail Head. They will be hiking approximately 50 miles and will finish at the Middlebury gap. Ms. Brown **moved** to approve the trip as presented. Ms. Lamphere seconded.

Ms. Mahusky suggested that the board needs to have a discussion about whether or not trips of this sort need to have board approval. There is a VSBA training on June 1. There was discussion about whether or not the board is going to follow the best practice as relayed by Ms. Holson. There was discussion about the field trip policy going to the policy committee.

Ms. Jonynas reported that she and Mr. Mastrangelo are planning a field trip to Yosemite National Park. She read information about the park's geography and history, including the various falls and natural features. She explained that the students will visit Yosemite, as well as San Francisco, including a college visit. The trip is planned for September 30, 2020-October 4, 2020. She noted that the trip is planned this far in advance because it is pricey and the students will do fundraising ahead of time. The trip is all inclusive and all meals and flights are included. The trip is for only high school students so the current 7th and 8th graders will be involved.

Mr. Marin **moved** to approve the trip as presented. Mr. Studin seconded. There was discussion about including the BRHS current 7th and 8th graders if they are attending GMUHS after the BRHS closure. Ms. Mahusky questioned the educational goals of the trip. Ms. Jonynas noted that many students haven't traveled outside New England. She also noted that a college visit to Stanford will be something that most students won't get to do. Ms. Jonynas reported on a trip that took a group of students to Chinatown and noted that it is good to get students out of this culture. Mr. McBride suggested trips that are equally magic that aren't quite as expensive. There was discussion about earning the money to go on the trip through fundraising. The motion carried unanimously.

Pamela Johnson Spurlock proposed the French exchange trip for 2020. They did it last year and want to do it again. There are currently 10 students who have expressed their interest in attending. Ms. Spurlock noted that there are about 10 students who come from France to Chester. The trip is approximately April 1-April 15 depending on the best price for flights. There can be payment plans and there will be fund raising for students. Ms. Spurlock gave information about the proposed itinerary. Four of the students from the sister school have come to GMUHS for a few months, and there is one GM student attending the sister school in France for two months. This is an immersive experience. They plan their own itinerary and there is very little down time.

Mr. McBride noted that this is an incredible opportunity and they are lucky to have the staff to organize and prepare these trips. Mr. Studin **moved** to approve the trip as presented. Mr. Alexander seconded. There was discussion about at least one parent having a passport in case there is an emergency. The motion carried unanimously.

V. **OLD BUSINESS:**

A. **Policies, Third Read, Approval (C07, H08, H09)**

Mr. Marin reported that the policy committee has recommended approval. Based on previous meetings, there were changes suggested and the policy committee reviewed the suggestions and made changes. He reviewed the changes. In policy C07, the language was changed that board members are encouraged, rather than board members will. In policy H08, the last sentence was

changed to be that the superintendent or designee will develop the PR plan subject to board approval.

Ms. Perlah **moved** to adopt policy C07, H08 and H09 as presented. Mr. Hance seconded. Mr. McBride questioned if the requirement that new members attend district orientation session is a state requirement or the board's. He also questioned if new members, who have served in the past, such as Mr. Wheelock would be required to attend. Mr. McBride **moved** to table the motion regarding policy C07 and refer the policy back to the policy committee to remove the words "and other opportunities designed to familiarize themselves and all aspects of board operation. Ms. Mahusky seconded. She also noted that board members should be encouraged to take the training opportunities, rather than required. In addition, there are not district orientation sessions. Mr. McBride will forward his suggestions to the policy committee. The motion carried with one opposed.

Mr. McBride noted his concern with the language in policy H08, section 7. He felt that the referral to the designated individual would make the issue easier to deal with however he felt that board members should still be approachable. He suggested referring the policy back to the policy committee for review of section 7 and removal of the language "and board members and staff members will refer all inquiries to the designated individual." Ms. Mahusky noted that the intent of this policy doesn't prohibit a casual conversation, but if there is an issue that requires that the board feels requires that level of designation, the board would want the issues referred to whomever they have designated so that the same message is relayed. Mr. Studin suggested using the words "are encouraged" instead of "will". Ms. Mahusky suggested that it would be approval to remove "staff members". There was discussion about referring the policy back to the policy committee. Mr. Fromberger suggested that the policy committee consider the suggestions made by the board members and review what needs to change if anything. Mr. McBride **moved** to table further discussion of policy H08. Mr. Hance seconded. Mr. Marin noted that the board has the authority to make the changes at this meeting. Mr. McBride read his suggestion and felt that it should include language regarding speaking on behalf of the board. The board suggested ending the section at "or specific incident". Mr. McBride **moved** to approve the policy with the deletion of the sentence in section 7 after "...or specific incident". Ms. Mahusky seconded.

Mr. Marin **moved** to take from the table policy C07. Ms. Brown seconded and the motion carried unanimously. Mr. Studin **moved** to change the last sentence of the 2nd paragraph to "New members are encouraged to participate in opportunities designed to familiarize themselves with all aspects of board operation." Mr. McBride seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

Ms. Perlah **moved** to approve policy H09 as presented. Mr. Alexander seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

B. Policies, Second Read/Approval (C09, F33)

Mr. Marin noted that the policy committee recommends approval of the policies. The policy was returned to the committee with concerns regarding the language and noted that the policy now indicates that the board will engage in goal setting and self-evaluation in consultation with the superintendent, and the language clarifies the relationship between the board and the superintendent regarding these processes. Mr. McBride felt that the policy shouldn't be passed. He noted that mandating meeting with the superintendent annually with goal setting is inappropriate. He felt that the board's job is managing the superintendent, and having the superintendent evaluate the board is not appropriate. He also felt that this type of goal setting seeks to "homogenize" the board and he felt that this was inappropriate and they should "rejoice" in the differences and felt that each board member is professional enough to take on these

responsibilities themselves. He felt that the board members report to the tax payers who can vote them out if they are unhappy. Ms. Lamphere noted that this is a recommended policy and best practice. Mr. Marin noted that the board should set goals annually and evaluate their achievement of goals set in prior years. He noted that the inclusion of the superintendent is because the superintendent is supposed to act as an advisor to the board about policies, changes in education regulations and advise the board accordingly. Ms. Lamphere noted that the policy wasn't about giving up individual personalities, but about working together and developing goals and being productive intentionally.

Mr. Studin suggested that it makes sense for any organization to set goals and evaluate their achievement or not. There was discussion about the policy not outlining how the goals are set or how they are evaluated. Mr. Marin suggested a board retreat or designated a portion of meetings to evaluate specific pieces of the organization. Ms. Lamphere noted that part of this would be determining how to work together productively.

Mr. Studin questioned how Mr. McBride would like to see the policy changed. Mr. McBride noted that the superintendent shouldn't be included. The board will be evaluating itself and the policy was changed to this language because the superintendent is still the expert on the goals, but it is still ultimately up to the board for their own evaluation. Ms. Mahusky suggested changing the language: "At least annually, the board will engage in goal-setting in consultation with the superintendent. The board will annually participate in self-evaluation activities. Ms. Brown suggested adding "when appropriate" at the end of the existing sentence. Ms. Beaupre noted that the VSBA representative suggested that the board needs to trust the work of the superintendent and other professionals they have hired and to do that they need to evaluate their mission and vision, develop goals from those. This drives the board work and the budget and that will determine whether the board has met their goals.

There was discussion about the definition of "when appropriate". The board suggested "when decided by the board". Ms. Brown **moved** to adopt the policy C09 with the first sentence amended to say "At least annually, the board will engage in goal-setting and self-evaluation activities in consultation with the superintendent when the board decides". Mr. Alexander seconded. There was discussion about a board of a major company not likely setting goals and self-evaluating without consultation with the company's CEO. There was discussion about the difference between this goal setting and self-evaluation and those of the superintendent. Ms. Brown noted that this language allows the board some flexibility about whether or not to consult with the superintendent. The motion carried with one opposed.

Mr. Studin noted that on policy F33, the first line of implementation has a typographical error with an extra "t". Mr. Marin advised that the policy committee recommends adoption of this policy. It has been vetted by the administration and nursing staff. He acknowledged that it isn't perfect, but felt that it was the best way to deal with prescription and non-prescription medication. Mr. Studin questioned why it wasn't perfect. Ms. Lamphere noted that it isn't perfect because the nurses struggle with non-prescription medication, but they need a policy to cover dissemination of medications that the parent (not a doctor) wants their child to take. There was discussion about the non-prescription medication. This policy covers medications that are not available at the school, such as Tylenol, but rather covers medications that the parent would send in. There was discussion about the procedure that accompanies the policy.

Mr. Alexander **moved** to table policy F33 and requested congruency between the grade school and high school and requested that the policy committee provide information about the practice at each school. Mr. Studin seconded. Mr. McBride questioned the necessity of the diagnosis on the

doctor's order. There was discussion about the HIPAA coverage and confidentiality and whether this is necessary. Mr. McBride noted that the policy indicates that the non-prescription medication can only be left in the custody of the nurse, but not all of the schools have a nurse on staff at all hours. There was a suggestion of adding "or designee". Ms. Beaupre noted that there is a UAP that could handle these. The motion to table the policy carried unanimously. There was discussion about aligning all of the paperwork in each school.

C. Proficiency Based Education Update

Mr. Eppolito presented information on the proficiency-based education process. Mr. Eppolito noted that this presentation is available on his website. He discussed the proficiency-based education practice in Maine and why it didn't work and why the legislation was rolled back. He noted that it is difficult to assess how well PBE is performing at different schools since it is a range of practices. There were some specific findings about what Maine's PBE focused on and what it didn't. He noted that it didn't focus on changing teaching practices or assessment practices. They didn't align instructional design, develop or use proficiency language with students or examine student work with proficiency in mind. They only focused on selection of standards and the PBE grading and reporting procedures. He noted that special education students felt the change more than others primarily because their special educators were already using most of these practices. He noted that some of the SAU's in Maine have remained committed to the work. Mr. Eppolito gave some history on the education system, including the Carnegie Unit system and the beginnings of setting standards. The Core Curriculum included communication, problem solving, personal responsibility and social responsibility. Soon after, the guidelines for portfolios and framework of standards were published. He noted that in 2002, High schools on the move developed principles for personalized learning and standards-based graduation requirements. Then in 2014 the education quality standards were revised to include language requiring proficiency-based education.

Mr. Eppolito reported that the state gave the schools guidelines of how they might achieve PBE. The schools should have measurable and explicit objectives, assess in a meaningful way, and students advance upon demonstrated mastery and students receive early intervention and support. He noted that when they began, they started with selecting standards and outlining how achievement looks. Ms. Lamphere questioned how the standards are determined. Mr. Eppolito noted that they determined which standards were required for graduation and which ones were important (but not necessary) for graduation. There was discussion about whether the state provided any funding for this conversion. Mr. Eppolito advised that the state provided some grant money to attend some early training.

Mr. Eppolito noted that in the coming years they will need to begin using student work to refine and revise instruction. They also need to develop core instructional practices and develop a portfolio system and design a reporting system. Mr. Studin questioned at what point they evaluate whether this is working or not. Mr. Eppolito advised that they are in a constant state of evaluation and are constantly refining. Ms. Lamphere questioned how teacher trainings have changed with the PBE. Mr. Eppolito noted that these frameworks have been laid out for the past 20 years, but some essential work hasn't been done yet in the systems that teachers become employed in. Ms. Beaupre noted that it is difficult to work and learn at the same time, so they often need to work during the summer and paying the teachers to do is a financial challenge. Ms. Thomas noted that it is great that student voice will play a part, but it is frustrating that this year's juniors are having half of their high school career in one system and the other half in another, particularly in relation to college.

Ms. Hamblett felt that learning this work during the school year is helpful because she can apply what she is learning every day. Mr. Eppolito noted that one of the biggest mistakes in this SU is not including students from the beginning. He noted that there have been a lot of mistakes made in the implementation but the work is getting better because they have been reflecting on the mistakes. He encouraged students to say what they would like happen with regard to their education.

Ms. Fierman noted that there is a different grading report for each different audience. She noted that the standard grading was effectively a reward or payment for work or a punishment. The new system is to tell the student what they are doing right and what they can do to fix what is wrong to move learning forward. However, in the outside world, the question is how quickly and well did you learn this topic. She noted that the “P” and “PD” will relate to a specific number for those purposes. She noted that the purpose for grading for feedback is changing.

Mr. Studin questioned how the proficiencies translate to grades for colleges. Ms. Fierman noted that by the end of the year they should be able to present an “honor roll”. Ms. Fierman noted that part of a junior’s transcript will have traditional grades. She noted that P means that they have “met expectations” and PD means that they have excelled. There was discussion about how the grading is relayed to the parents. There was also discussion about the weighted 4.0 scale. There was discussion about college acceptances and feedback. Ms. Fierman noted that they have received feedback from colleges that indicate that they know how to deal with the grading and regardless of how the grading is submitted, they will revise the grading to their own system. She noted that many schools are paying attention to the classes that students are taking, rather than just the grades. Ms. Fierman noted that the criteria for selecting the top student for the Green and Gold doesn’t describe grades, rather it describes the various things that contribute. Mr. Studin noted that when the school has compiled how the conversion will look to share it with the board.

VI. COMMUNICATION:

A. Student Representatives

The board suggested that the students should go first in the future. Ms. King noted that GMUHS hosted Queer Prom. This is a state-wide event and over 200 high school students came to the school. It is an all-day event that begins at 8:00 a.m. There are workshops during the day and brought a lot of positive attention to the school. There was discussion about how each school is picked. This Saturday is the GM Junior Prom and will be held at the Okemo Base Lodge. Grand March begins at 6:30. The record for varsity softball is 10-3 and varsity baseball is 11-0. The track team has been competing but having a rough season due to the weather. AP exams are done for Juniors and Seniors and SAT scores were released today. Ms. Thomas noted that there was a survey about PBE and she shared the responses from the students. The students felt that the PBE expectations were completely clear and they want to make sure that teachers take the time to review what has been done to clear up inconsistencies. She felt that the students have seen the inconsistencies. They know that the PBE is state mandated and can be frustrating about the implementation. Ms. King has taken the time to read her transcript and it is understandable.

VII. NEW BUSINESS:

A. Recommendations for Hire

Ms. Fogg noted that they are recommending a 5/6 teacher for hire. There were 10 candidates and they interviewed 5. They are recommending MacKenzie Ramsdell. She reported on her education history as well as work history. She noted that the final hire is contingent upon all her paperwork going through with the state. There was discussion about the salary being places on the salary schedule. Ms. Powden has interviewed her and has delegated Ms. Fogg to make the

recommendation on her behalf. Ms. Brown **moved** to accept the recommendation to hire MacKenzie Ramsdell. Mr. Studin seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

Ms. Fogg noted that they have had 18 applicants for the assistant principal and have interviewed 4. They are recommending Kevin Fay, who is currently an assistant principal in New Hampshire. She reported on his education including his advanced degrees. He is highly recommended from his current school. He is excited about PBIS. There was discussion about Ms. Powden making this recommendation. There was also discussion about him serving as the Chief of Police in Marlow NH. Ms. Fogg noted that he would not be called out of school for emergencies in the town and the assistant principal position would be his primary focus. Ms. Mahusky noted her concern with hiring someone with a background in law enforcement who will be supporting PBIS, and questioned his enthusiasm for the system. Ms. Fogg noted that he is primarily an educator who has a part-time job in law enforcement. Mr. Studin noted that he sat in on the interviews and the committee felt that his discussion of PBIS demonstrated his support of the system, and in fact he has used the PBIS program a number of times in the past. He noted that Mr. Fay's experience in law enforcement would be a positive in the PBIS program, not a negative.

Mr. Studin **moved** to hire Kevin Fay as the CAES assistant principal. Ms. Brown seconded. The motion carried unanimously. There was discussion about how the salary would be negotiated, and that it should come to the board for their information.

B. Appoint Warrant Signer/Board Clerk

Mr. Fromberger noted that Ms. Muther was the warrant signer and has resigned. Mr. Studin **moved** to appoint Mr. Marin as the warrant signer and the board clerk. Mr. McBride seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

C. CTES Fence Bid Approval

Ms. Beaupre noted that they had thought that the safety fence was going to be about \$16,000 but the bid came in at \$8131. Mr. Beamon has interviewed the vendor and is satisfied that they can do the job. Mr. Alexander has contacted anyone regarding the quality of work of the company having made the bid. Ms. Beaupre noted that Mr. Beamon has done that research and shared information with her about them. Mr. Alexander requested to be sure that Ms. Hammond has assured that they have appropriate insurance. Ms. Hammond has spoken with both the fence company and with Mr. Beamon and wants to make sure that Mr. Beamon is convinced that the company can complete the scope of the work. Mr. Wheelock **moved** to award the bid for installation of a fence to 802Fence company of Shorham VT to install the CTES fence as described in the RFP.

D. CTES A/C Tech Room Repairs

Ms. Beaupre noted that the AC in the tech room failed just before testing. They have received a bid for replacement of the AC. Mr. Beamon had advised her that for a total of \$4500 AC can be installed in the principal's office, which will be helpful since she works in the summer. Ms. Beaupre noted that it is very warm in the office in the summer. The repair can be made for \$4500 or a replacement can be done for \$5000. Ms. Mahusky **moved** to approve the CTI proposal for \$5000 for a new AC unit. Ms. Perlah seconded. Mr. Alexander questioned if Ms. Beaupre and Mr. Beamon will have the time to seek a bid from other companies. He suggested that the board could approve the expenditure but suggested seeking other sources. Mr. McBride noted that the quote is challenging because it is a round number and doesn't outline the specific device and separates the parts versus labor and whether they are apples to apples comparison to the current bid.

Ms. Mahusky withdrew her motion. She **moved** to authorize the expenditure of up to \$5000 on the replacement of the Tech Room AC unit with the specifications to be approved by the board chair. Ms. Brown seconded and the motion carried unanimously. Mr. Fromberger, Ms. Beaupre and Mr. Beamon will work together.

VIII. ADMINISTRATOR’S REPORTS:

Discussion was tabled until the next meeting since the reports were distributed to the board members.

IX. PUBLIC COMMENTS:

Ms. Willis, the president of the support staff association, thanked the board for holding their special meeting to approve the support staff agreement. She noted that after many hours of negotiations, the association ratified the agreement on December 21. She sent an email to Ms. Powden at that time. The association’s attorney waited several weeks for communication on the agreement from the district’s attorney. She outlined the many delays in the process. The association received a final version on April 16, the week of vacation. The association signed the agreement on the following Monday. She noted that if Mr. Leopold was at every negotiations session and as such, she questioned what the delay was in him finalizing the language.

Ms. Willis noted that the board’s discussion about the full pay on the early release Tuesdays was concerning because the para-educators are working on each of those partial school days, including on professional development and helping with the winter program.

She felt that the para-educators are angry with the non-communication, including the two grievances that have been filed in April 2018. One of the grievances involves pay for an employee put on administrative leave and there have been at least 3 situations where employees have been paid for administrative leave. She noted that on August 20, 2018, Ms. Powden issued a letter to an employee discussing their having been placed on paid leave. Another grievance centered around the para-educators having to pay to get fingerprinted by the state as a result of the merger since it is a new employer.

Ms. Willis also noted that there are some challenges with the insurance deductions for the HSA, but who can’t access those funds. She acknowledged that the new insurance is challenging, but so are the payroll deductions.

Ms. Willis also noted a letter that was sent to Ms. Powden regarding the placement of para-educators on the salary schedule on April 11. There have been issues with using para-educators as crossing guards and whether this is an issue with IEP’s. Ms. Fogg noted that she responded directly in person to the union rep, rather than via email. Ms. Willis requested the board’s help with how to communicate better regarding these issues to get resolution and responses.

Mr. Fromberger noted that the board will ask the superintendent to respond regarding the issues described. He suggested that she could include him in those communications. There was a suggestion about getting a timeline of the communications thus far. There was discussion about the superintendent having responded on some issues but not all. The board will request a report from the superintendent. Ms. Mahusky noted that Ms. Powden is not here to address some of these issues, including the grievances and it is inappropriate to continue in this vein without her being able to respond.

Mr. Cunningham noted that there is a line item for crossing guards in the budget and there has been zero paid out of the line. He suggested that the board look into it.

Mr. Tyrrell noted that he had communicated with the state regarding the size and composition of the SU board. The TRSU board has a waiver for its composition, however there are twice as many students in GMUSD than in LMHUUSD and felt that the representation should be appropriate. There was discussion about the SU board will be comprised of 3 seats for each operating district. There are two districts, therefore 6 board members, 3 from each. There was discussion about the waiver only being for the alternates who can serve on the board in the absence of one of the 3 members, not the 3-member composition from each school district on the board.

X. EXECUTIVE SESSION:

A. Student Academic Records or Suspension or Discipline of Students Title 1 V.S.A. § 313 (7)

Mr. Studin **moved** to enter executive session. Mr. Alexander seconded. Mr. Cunningham noted that the state statute indicates that the board needs a reason, not multiple reasons. Mr. Fromberger read aloud from sub-section 7 of section 313. Ms. Mahusky noted that the executive session needs to state which one of the items specifically. There was discussion about the board hearing what the report is and then knowing which one it applies to. There will be a report given by Ms. Fierman. Ms. Fierman noted that the reason is to consider the disciplinary records of a specific student.

Mr. Cunningham suggested that the board training not be done by the SU's attorney.

Ms. Mahusky **moved** to enter executive session at 9:11 p.m. to discuss disciplinary records of a specific student or students and invited the student/students' parent(s) and Mr. Eppolito and Ms. Fierman. Mr. Alexander seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

The board returned from executive session at 9:42 p.m. No action was taken.

XI. NEXT MEETING AND AGENDA ITEMS:

The next regular meeting will be held on June 20, 2019 at 6:00 p.m. at CTES. There will be an audit meeting at CTES on May 23, 2019 at 6:00 p.m.

XII. ADJOURNMENT:

Ms. Brown **moved** to adjourn at 9:45 p.m. Mr. Studin seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

Respectfully Submitted,

Amber Wilson
Board Recording Secretary