

NEGOTIATIONS SUB-COMMITTEE MEETING-September 30, 2014

HOOKSETT SCHOOL BOARD TUITION NEGOTIATION SUB-COMMITTEE MEETING With PINKERTON MINUTES

Wednesday, September 30, 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 Nevious, Kimberly Smith, Griffin Morse.

PROOF OF POSTING

Dr. Littlefield provided proof of posting.

NEW BUSINESS

Mark Wright introduced the members of the Board of Trustees present at the meeting and each member spoke about their background and how they came to Pinkerton.

Mark Wright spoke about developing a long term relationship with Hooksett.

J. McHugh: The School Board gathered information from voters on why the previously proposed contract failed which appears to be the result of the Board not getting the information or the voters. The current Board addresses High School issues at every Board meeting and the Board sees the negotiations as two (2) parts; short and long-term agreements.

Brad Ek: I see Hooksett as unique district with students living in the north of Hooksett needing a choice with distance being a real concern.

Bill Nevious: Students need to feel good about going to school.

Griffin Morse: An important component between the districts is trust.

J. McHugh: Do all sending districts have to be treated the same?

Bill Nevious: We try to keep districts close in order to be fair.

NEGOTIATIONS SUB-COMMITTEE MEETING-September 30, 2014

J. McHugh: Sometimes towns have unique issues, like the students that live in the north side of Hooksett that might not choose Pinkerton because of the distance.

Dr. Tim Butterfield: The contracts are similar but how they can be different is up the Board of Trustees.

J. McHugh: Is there a not to exceed number for students or a capacity issue?

Mark Wright: We have the capacity to accept all Hooksett students. We are at 75% capacity now.

Dr. Tim Butterfield: I would like data on distance and transportation time from Hooksett to compare to other sending districts like East Hampstead.

J. McHugh: One of the issues we face in Hooksett is a long history with another district. What is your definition of long term contract?

Bill Nevious: Unlike Hooksett, most of sending districts are looking for longer contracts. It is not Pinkerton driving this.

Brad Ek: We would be looking for at least 10 years with 75 to 80 percent of students coming to Pinkerton.

Dr. Littlefield: I challenged Pinkerton to accept Hooksett's uniqueness and take a chance. Hooksett cannot be like everyone else. There are 3 issues:

1. Minimum number of students required to attend
2. Hooksett community believes in "Live Free or Die" They don't like to be told what to do
3. Length of the contract

I hope you will be flexible unlike past negotiations which were rigid and formal.

The two biggest issues are length of contract and the minimum number of students.

J. McHugh: The best selling point for Pinkerton is a positive experience for the current Pinkerton students.

Mark Wright: I challenge Hooksett to get the information out that students are choosing Pinkerton.

Dr. Littlefield: If we get a decent contract, we will sell it.

NEGOTIATIONS SUB-COMMITTEE MEETING-September 30, 2014

Mark Wright: I'm concerned with the quantitative issue and I think it should be a qualitative issue. If a community believes in the school, they wouldn't care about the quantitative issue. What we need to do is convey the qualitative issues.

A discussion ensued regarding the timing of a second meeting between the committees.

Bill Nevious asked what Hooksett feels is an acceptable minimum and length of contract.

J. McHugh stated zero minimums and a 5 year contract.

The next meeting will be Friday, October 17th at 2:00 pm at Pinkerton Academy.

ADJOURNMENT

Chair McHugh adjourned the meeting.

Respectfully submitted,

Lee Ann Moynihan