

# NEGOTIATIONS SUB-COMMITTEE MEETING-October 31, 2014

---

## HOOKSETT SCHOOL BOARD TUITION NEGOTIATION SUB-COMMITTEE MEETING

With PINKERTON

MINUTES

Friday, October 31, 2014

Location of Meeting: Pinkerton Academy

### CALL TO ORDER

J. McHugh called the Sub-committee Meeting to order at 6:00 pm.

### ATTENDANCE

Hooksett Members: Dr. Phil Littlefield, Joanne McHugh, Amy Boilard, Michael Berry

Pinkerton Members: Brad Ek, Mark Wright, Dr. Timothy Butterfield, William Nevius, Kimberly Smith, Griffin Morse.

### PROOF OF POSTING

Dr. Littlefield provided proof of posting.

### DISCUSSION

J. McHugh: The Board discussed the proposal presented by the Pinkerton Negotiating Team at the last meeting and there were some questions.

-The proposal for a 10 year contract with no minimums for 3 years with the 4<sup>th</sup> year minimum based on previous 3 year average; what happens if Hooksett does not meet those minimums?

M. Wright: Once we set the minimum in the 4<sup>th</sup> year, Hooksett is financial committed. The reason for the minimums is so we can have certainty. That minimum becomes the floor of your financial obligation.

J. McHugh: There are some communities looking into Charter Schools. If students choose those schools, would those numbers come out?

M. Wright: It is the total number of students which we base the percentage upon. That is in Hooksett's advantage.

J. McHugh: Therefore the private students are counted in the "Total Students"?

M. Wright: Yes

## NEGOTIATIONS SUB-COMMITTEE MEETING-October 31, 2014

---

Dr. Littlefield: Would the 3 year average remain in perpetuity or would it be a 3 year rolling average?

M. Wright: It is a number that “sticks” for the length of the contract. That presents some risk to both sides. It would be too complicated to recalculate that number year after year.

J. McHugh: The 3 year average would begin when?

M. Wright: It would start in 2015-2016 after the 1 year agreement. We should let those existing agreements run.

J. McHugh: In the current agreement, Pinkerton is not a school maintained by the district. If we go to a 10 year contract, would it become a school maintained by the district?

Dr. Littlefield: As you know, the 1 year agreement is going before the State Board of Education on November 17, 2014 and is being held up by the Attorney General because it didn't include language that he liked. After speaking with him he has agreed to pass it along to the State Board of Ed advising that it is unenforceable. Why was that language important to you? We don't use the language “Maintained by the District” or “School of Record”. If you have a tuition agreement, the school is maintained by the district and therefore you can assign students there. That language in a 10 year agreement would be problematic.

M. Wright: It was there because in the initial agreement it said 75 students and then it was amended to no minimum. If Hooksett isn't willing to commit to a long term contract and give us students, our initial concern was that you were making agreements with other districts and they would cherry pick students. If Hooksett wasn't going to commit, we weren't going to commit to take a student. If we get a long term contract, Pinkerton would be more comfortable with a “School of Record”.

J. McHugh: Auburn and Derry's contracts state the date of notification as October 1<sup>st</sup>. We have been using a December 1<sup>st</sup> date.

M. Wright: That came up at our sending town meeting. A later date reduces everyone's timeframe. The issue is getting the tuition number to the towns for their tax rate.

Dr. Littlefield: With the other four (4) communities, it is simple. Hooksett is in a unique position. There was less angst with the other towns when they learned their tuition rate was going down. Auburn's number is easy because there is only one (1) choice. Hooksett has different paths. For us to have preliminary numbers on October 1<sup>st</sup>, we would have to begin the

## NEGOTIATIONS SUB-COMMITTEE MEETING-October 31, 2014

---

selection process in 7<sup>th</sup> grade. If Hooksett voters are asked to approve an agreement and were told they would have to make those selections in 7<sup>th</sup> grade, the contract would be doomed. We could probably give soft number by November 1<sup>st</sup>.

Bill Nevios: The December 1<sup>st</sup> number is totally negotiable. We could look at the possibility of November 1<sup>st</sup>. We have flexibility there.

J. McHugh: The Hooksett School Board has adopted a policy which states if a student is unhappy with their High School selection, they must remain for the completion on one year.

Dr. Littlefield explained the points of the adopted policy.

J. McHugh: Can you explain how the policy can change every 5 years?

M. Wright: Five (5) years is an opportunity for both sides recalculate minor pieces of the contract and both sides must agree.

J. McHugh: We can put in an “Opt Out” in five (5) years?

M. Wright: Your opt out position is your five (5) year notice.

A. Boilard: Do “all students” include Special Ed?

B. Nevios: Yes, we have 534 Special Education students at Pinkerton.

J. McHugh: I think the next step would be for Pinkerton to put the language into a contract.

M. Wright: What we’ve described gives a definitive enough framework that would allow us to draft a contract to be reviewed. I assume we will move forward to draft a contract that will be circulated and discussed.

J. McHugh: I think in order to have the final discussion, we went through the questions; I think we have to start somewhere and I think if we have a draft contract, we can hash it out.

M. Wright: I’m hearing having the contract is the way to move this along. We have done amazing work in the two (2) meetings and we have the momentum. It would be helpful if you could communicate what the important bullet points are so we don’t miss anything. That would be very helpful.

Dr. Littlefield: Do you think we could have something in hand for the November 18<sup>th</sup> Hooksett School Board meeting?

## NEGOTIATIONS SUB-COMMITTEE MEETING-October 31, 2014

---

M. Wright: I would hope to get something to you for that meeting. Once we get it to our attorney, it should be quick.

M. Berry: Do you feel you have the consensus of your Board to move forward with the proposal?

M. Wright: We don't feel we have overstepped the authority we have been given with regard to the contract. The Board is aware of the proposal.

Dr. Littlefield suggested using the language from the attorney from the last contract.

Auburn was required by the State Board of Ed to provide an additional addendum because Pinkerton was not communicative. The Hooksett contract was all inclusive.

### **ADJOURNMENT**

J. McHugh adjourned the meeting at 3:30 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Lee Ann Moynihan

**NEW BUSINESS**  
Lee Ann Moynihan