



Approved: June 3, 2026 (as amended)

**HOLLIS SCHOOL BOARD
MAY 6, 2026
MEETING MINUTES**

A regular meeting of the Hollis School Board was conducted on Wednesday, May 6, 2026, at 6:00 p.m. at the Hollis Upper Elementary School.

Carryl Roy, Chairperson, presided:

Members of the Board Present: Raphael Zack, Vice Chairperson
Anne Wake-DePasquale, Secretary
Jonathan Fontaine
Jessica Lahens

Members of the Board Absent:

Also Participating: Gina Bergskaug, Superintendent
Dorothy Flaherty, Asst. Superintendent of Curriculum & Instruction
Lauren DiGennaro, Asst. Superintendent of Student Services

AGENDA ADJUSTMENTS/CORRESPONDENCE

Requests were made to amend the agenda to include discussion of how the Board and public communicate, an update on the issue of open enrollment, and discussion and deliberation on committee appointments.

There being no objection, the agenda was amended, as requested.

CONSENT AGENDA

A copy of the Consent Agenda is attached.

MOTION BY MEMBER WAKE-DEPASQUALE TO APPROVE THE CONSENT AGENDA, AS PRESENTED
MOTION SECONDED BY MEMBER LAHENS

ON THE QUESTION

Noted was that the absence of an effective date implies the end of the school year.

MOTION CARRIED
5-0-0

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Hollis School Board – **Organizational Meeting** April 1, 2026

The following amendments were offered:

- Page 8, Line 12; “years” should be singular
- Page 8, Line 23; delete “come” before “approach”
- Page 8, Line 49; insert “what” before “was”
- Page 8, Line 50; correct the spelling of “breadth”
- Page 11, Line 15; correct the spelling of “been”

MOTION BY MEMBER WAKE DE-PASQUALE TO ACCEPT, AS AMENDED
MOTION SECONDED BY MEMBER ZACK
MOTION CARRIED
5-0-0

Hollis School Board – **Non-Public** April 1, 2026

MOTION BY MEMBER LAHENS TO ACCEPT, AS PRESENTED
MOTION SECONDED BY MEMBER WAKE-DEPASQUALE
MOTION CARRIED
5-0-0

PUBLIC INPUT

Residents providing input were asked to state their name and address for the record and that input be focused on items included on the agenda. The public input period is not intended to be a back-and-forth discussion, but rather an opportunity for the Board to hear from residents before acting on items appearing on the agenda.

Chair Roy declared the period for public input open at 6:08 p.m.

PRINCIPALS’ REPORT

As of 4/24/26, enrollment numbers remain unchanged from last reported with a total of 685; 388 at HPS and 297 at HUES.

Superintendent Bergskaug highlighted items from the report provided as part of the [agenda](#) packet. Included were recent and upcoming events.

Member Wake-DePasquale commented on the HUES talent show, and congratulated Principal Fowler and all of the teachers on the hugely positive event that took place at the high school. She spoke of seeing children ages 10-13 going up on stage in front of all of their friends, and of witnessing a very supportive and positive event. Students were also selling their artwork. Thousands of dollars were raised to benefit the Nashua Children’s Home. The teachers then put on a wonderful show that they had clearly been rehearsing for many hours.

Member Lahens noted the enrollment report shows the numbers remain unchanged, but at the bottom of the Board report the total identifies an increase of 2 with 1 added to Pre-K.

Superintendent Bergskaug stated she would have to refer to the April report to see if the PreK intensive needs program identifies enrollment at 105 or 104. She noted the reports were done over April vacation when not all staff were on hand to help contribute the numbers.

Superintendent Bergskaug commented on the \$31,000 raised from the mybooster fundraiser for the PTA.

Member Lahens asked which building the School Psychologist will be at. Lauren DiGennaro, Assistant Superintendent of Student Services responded that the district is hiring for two positions. When the hiring is complete a determination will be made on the best fit for each building. That process is moving forward.

Member Wake-DePasquale asked if HUES will have the Environmental Science class next year, and was told it will.

Member Fontaine asked if the winter damage to Drury Lane has been addressed. Superintendent Bergskaug stated the original thought was that would be part of the expansion project. Without an expansion project, that is not covered anywhere. However, as we get closer to year end and additional funds free up, the hope is to come to the Board at the next meeting and request the ability to utilize fund balance (if available) to do the needed repairs; culvert needs to be rebuilt.

DISCUSSION

1. Suicide Prevention Plan

Assistant Superintendent DiGennaro provided a PowerPoint (can be viewed [here](#) beginning at tape counter 27:20).

The framework of the Suicide Prevent and Response Plan (Plan) comes from RSA 193-J (effective July 2020). However, even without this RSA, our students' social and emotional wellbeing are always at the forefront of what we do.

Used to create this Plan were the 4 elements of suicide prevention: annual training, education for students, crisis prevention resources and partnerships.

Educating our staff begins at the start of each new academic year when the school counselor reviews the building safety protocol with staff at the opening meetings. Staff discusses when and how to use this protocol, under which conditions the protocol needs to be followed.

In alignment with RSA 193-J, staff are trained annually. We utilize the Vector Training K-12 edition, which meets the requirements of the RSA.

All staff have a Suicide Protocol Chart in an easily accessible place within their classroom.

A key component to student wellbeing is positive relationships and engagement. Adults in the building work to foster positive relationships and build on student strengths both in and out of the classroom. The schools use Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS) meetings to give staff time to talk about student needs, individual student concerns, and gain input from a variety of stakeholders, e.g., specialists, teachers, counselors. This practice supports a wholistic view of student support.

School counselors proactively build rapport, trust, and consistent connection with students. Emphasis is on creating a safe, supportive environment where students feel comfortable seeking out adult help. Core

counseling curriculum includes friendship skills, building healthy peer relationships and social connection, mindfulness, developing awareness of emotions and self-regulation strategies, anger management, recognizing feelings and using coping tools, problem-solving, step-by-step approaches to handle any challenges, challenging negative thoughts, promoting positive self-talk and resilience. These skills really support early identification of emotional distress and strengthen protective factors for students.

Research speaks to building community within the school buildings. Both schools work to promote a positive school climate and culture. They do this through assemblies, theme days, morning announcements, etc.

As a district with Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS), we can identify where our prevention measures align within each level of MTSS. Tier I is your classroom and building culture. We look at things like open houses and building-wide expectations. Tier II may be more targeted supports for students that require it; having lunch bunch, quiet lunch options, check-ins with school counseling or with any of our staff who a student feels is a trusted adult. Tier III is more intensive; the student may have a Section 504 Plan, IEP supports or access to more intensive interventions like school psychology services.

On the website, under Resources, is a [School Counseling](#) tab. If you click on that you will see the school counselors in each building, a link to the Hollis School District Suicide Prevention Plan, Safety Prevention Resources and a list of contacts.

Should a student express an intent to harm themselves or others the safety protocol is followed. It is important that the person reporting the intent does so in real time, e.g., if a teacher reads something a student has written or hears something that a student has said, they immediately contact an administrator or school counselor. They do not leave the student alone, and it is immediately addressed.

The student will never be left out of sight and the school counselor and administrator will meet with the student to hear what the student is feeling. Parents are called and brought into the conversation to meet with the school counselor and administrator who will explain that the student will need to be seen by a licensed mental health practitioner before returning to school.

The parent is provided with resources, information, and forms to be provided to the outside practitioner so they understand what the student is being seen for. Upon the practitioner's clearance for the student to return to school, a reentry meeting is scheduled.

The reentry meeting begins the post-intervention process. The school counselor, administrator, parent and student meet to discuss the practitioner's recommendations as well as what support is needed for the student to return to school and feel safe and supported. A release may be signed for the school counselor or administrator to speak with any outside providers in order to bridge the support from home to school. Regular check-ins with the school counselor are often part of that reentry plan especially in the beginning, and then it is determined how that is weened off.

Depending on the severity of need, a referral may be made to Section 504 or the special education process. If the student already has one of these plans in place a team meeting will likely be called to discuss any supports or potential changes to the plan that may be necessary.

We want every student to feel safe, supported and known by adults in school. This work really starts with the relationships staff form with students every day and the proactive skills we try to teach students to help them navigate challenges. At the same time, we want to be clear that every concern is taken seriously. When something is brought to our attention, we follow the established protocols to respond quickly, involve our families, and make sure the students get what they need both inside and outside of school.

This is truly a collaborative effort. It involves our staff, our families, and our community organizations and partnerships.

Most importantly, we want everyone to know that every concern is addressed; we follow-up, stay connected, and we continue supporting students as we transition them back into the school environment.

Member Lahens spoke of appreciation for the thoroughness of the Plan and that it has an equal eye towards how we proactively create an environment for the students where this isn't an issue, and also if there is an issue how we address it.

Understanding that the Greater Nashua Mental Health is unfortunately understaffed and underfunded, she questioned if there is any sense of is their response time actually an hour. Assistant Superintendent DiGennaro responded it is very quick especially if they are coming from a school environment. We have seen a great response time. The mobile support unit has been excellent. We also have a list of surrounding practitioners that can be provided to families that often have a response time within 24 hours. Last resort scenario is going to an urgent care or emergency room.

Member Lahens remarked one of the major risk factors for suicide is impulsivity. She did not see that specifically identified, and is unsure if that is part of the Vector training or if there are some things there that we should bring more attention to.

Assistant Superintendent DiGennaro remarked that is a complicated piece. There is a lot of research with the expressing the suicide intentionality and the actual action and when that action is taken. There is a lot of research that there may be impulsivity, but there may be more impulsivity in speaking or expressing it versus the actual action of it. It is involved in the training and something that we have discussed. That is part of the reason we don't do all of the risk assessment with students and have them sent out to be seen. We will gather the preliminary information and will ask if there is any plan, do you have anything on you, etc. All of that information does go to a clinician. That is why there is that double layer to that piece of the puzzle. We are able to assess what do we need to know right there in that moment while we have the child in front of us, and then we know that level of urgency when we speak to the parents.

Member Wake-DePasquale spoke of the previous plan commenting that things are much clearer now for everyone involved. It is a great deal of work.

2. Revenue/Expense Report

As of the report dated 4/28/26, on the expense side of the ledger, shown is a balance of \$146,142. On the revenue side, a balance of \$96,416 in excess of what was anticipated/budgeted.

The balance in the area of regular education is the result of hiring savings (hiring at a lower salary than that of the previous holder of the position) as well as unfilled positions.

The deficit in special education (\$356,912) is due to contracted staff, e.g., school psychologist. We now have 2 contracted paraeducators. There was also a shift in student needs.

The overage in instructional staff is due to an unfilled position.

The area of facilities shows a deficit (\$74,828) due to the cost of snow removal exceeding the budgeted amount, utilities, and an issue with the boiler.

Savings in the area of benefits (\$219,044) are due to unfilled positions and plan changes.

Remaining from the approved FY26 Warrant (site improvements/architectural services) is \$14,091; waiting on a final invoice.

The result is an Unreserved Fund Balance (UFB) of \$242,557. Allocations to the Maintenance Trust in the amount of \$125,000 and the SAU Building Trust of \$23,970 would result in a projected fund balance of \$93,587. At this point in the fiscal year, all final purchases are being closed out and encumbered funds released, which will result in a much better idea of what the fund balance will be in time for the June meeting.

Yet to be identified is a Retained Fund Balance. Superintendent Bergskaug stated that to be typically discussed following the audit. Last year the Board approved an amount of \$284,000. This year it will be based on what remains at year end.

Member Lahens asked why there is a savings identified in the area of transportation. Superintendent Bergskaug responded that when we double a run we pay for the one bus driver. Although it is not ideal, that can result in cost savings. We are in year 3 of a four-year contract. There was an additional bus in our original contract. We reduced the number of buses by one based on where students reside. We were having a hard time gaining a driver that resulted in double runs and a consolidation.

Member Lahens commented on the Federal revenue being lower than what was anticipated. She asked if this is the usual pace at which funds are expected. Superintendent Bergskaug stated this year all Federal funds were delayed in terms of their arrival. She would envision we would hit our expected budgeted amount.

Asked about the description of the expenses under School Board SAU assessment and what that refers to, Superintendent Bergskaug stated the descriptions are category titles identified within the accounting world for school districts. Asked where the bulk of the expenses comes from, she noted \$95,000 is the contingency fund.

Member Fontaine asked if there is anything in the Maintenance Trust for the current year. Superintendent Bergskaug stated what was approved in March of 2026; all of those projects were slated for HUES. The hope was that the HPS project would pass. There were four items. A Public Hearing will be conducted in June to expend funds. The projects would then begin for the summer.

Member Fontaine asked whether there was an approved allocation to the Maintenance Trust in FY25, and was told there was.

Vice Chair Zack asked if the goal would be to get the projected fund balance to zero or to return funds to offset what has to be raised through taxation to support the FY27 budget. Superintendent Bergskaug responded we always assume that we are going to return some small amount. The goal would be to do what we promised we would. However, Drury Lane is in poor shape. We have recognized that for a few years and were hoping to address it through the proposed project. With that no longer an option, we cannot ignore it any longer. That will be a Board level decision; if not having enough to do both what is the greater need.

Next month an updated revenue and expense report will be provided as well as a cost proposal for Drury Lane. If it seems to be something that can be addressed with the fund balance then there will be a formal proposal to request that, which the Board can support or deny. She will also come with the figure that was shared at Town meeting with what is expected to be returned to the taxbase.

3. Meal Price Adjustment

Each year the Food Service Director is charged with evaluating the food service program. The program is self-funding, e.g., monies come in and are transferred back out of the budget. There is the need to ensure we are not losing money in food service.

As a result of having a positive fund balance at the end of FY25, the district is exempt from the requirement to increase school lunch prices. As lunch prices were last raised in the 2024-2025 school year, the Director of School Nutrition and the Business Administrator recommend utilizing this exemption and keeping lunch prices unchanged.

However, breakfast prices have not increased since the 2022-2023 school year. During that time, food costs, regulatory requirements (including lower sugar standards and domestic juice procurement), and staffing costs have all risen. For these reasons, recommended is increasing the price of breakfast from \$1.75 to \$2.00.

4. Enrollment Committee

Member Wake-DePasquale spoke of the need for the committee to be re-authorized. She is not only requesting the reauthorization of the committee but to also redefine it.

Two years ago, then Superintendent Corey and she put together the Mission and Charge for the Enrollment Committee. At the time, the mission was to study increasing enrollment and to analyze the effects of that increase, e.g., identify problems, identify and explore potential solutions, look at space constraints, financial impacts, staffing, and recommendations in the light of a potential renovation or expansion.

Following the last meeting, she met with Principal Izbicki as well as Superintendent Bergskaug to discuss this. They all agreed naming it the Enrollment Committee was appropriate at the time as that is what was being studied. We accomplished many of the goals; have studied enrollment, reviewed the data, identified problems and explored possible solutions.

Provided was a revised version of the committee's Charge (included as part of the [agenda](#) packet).

Member Fontaine asked the Chair if discussion of the charge should be delayed until discussion of reauthorizing the committee. Chair Roy was acceptable to that approach.

The Public Input period was declared closed at 6:40 p.m.

Member Wake-DePasquale stated in June, the Board can expect Principal Izbicki to make a presentation to the Board on how she is planning to negotiate the situation she is now in. In lieu of the fact that the bond was not passed, she has to now change the way she is going to work with her current space. There were several changes made with an understanding they would be temporary, e.g., when we moved the library to the classroom that it is currently in, we told parents (at the June 2024 meeting) this is going to be temporary, when the preschool was put in the hallway we indicated that would be temporary, and when the case managers and specialists were put into a tiny office too small for them it was stated it would be temporary as was our administrators in a copy room/walkthrough. Those situations are no longer acceptable.

When that plan is shared we hope what will be called the Primary School Building Expansion Committee will meet in June and be able to provide feedback to Principal Izbicki allowing time to consider recommendations and implement changes before the start of the next school year.

5. Board/Community Communications

A few community members have reached out questioning how the Board communicates with the public and how the public can communicate with the Board. Some community members have stated a desire to be and questioned ways in which they can be supportive.

Member Lahens suggested what is helpful to clarify for folks is that the Board is pretty limited in the ways we are able to communicate online. There is a law regarding what is called electioneering, which means that the Board is not allowed to post anything online that could be perceived as attempting to influence the outcome of elections.

We have been advised by legal counsel that the only thing we are allowed to post online is our agenda and minutes. Individual members of the Board are allowed to post their opinions on social media, but as a Board we are not able to do so. It can be very limiting in how we get information to the public.

Different means of communicating have been tried, e.g., bringing flyers to different parts of Town, which was found not to be very effective. It is an issue the Board is aware of.

Chair Roy pointed out if someone emails the entire Board, we cannot reply all. Usually, one of us will reply and then notify everyone else that we have replied directly to the person. A quorum of the Board discussing matter(s) over which it has supervision, control, jurisdiction, or advisory power outside of a publicly noticed meeting constitutes an illegal meeting. We can receive emails and they can be sent to the entire Board, however, the reply cannot be to all.

Member Wake-DePasquale commented that the Board has worked actively with Positively Hollis, works regularly with Hollis Brookline online, and even our public hearing notices go to Hollis Brookline online and the Union Leader. She spoke of the ability for members of the public to sign up to receive the agendas and minutes of meetings through email. Those wishing to can sign up to receive the information through the [SAU website](#).

A representative of the Board is a member of the Hollis Budget Committee. The agendas and minutes of those meetings are available through the Town website.

Member Lahens added members of the public are also permitted to attend Board meetings as well as meetings of sub-committees.

6. Open Enrollment

Superintendent Bergskaug informed the Board there were two open enrollment bills being considered. SB 101 was tabled in the House on April 23, 2026. That does not mean it cannot be taken off the table.

HB 751 started out as an outpatient substance use disorder treatment facility bill where a nongermane amendment was added that authorized parents to enroll their children in any public school. For that one we are waiting for the Committee of Conference (CoC) to be scheduled. There is a May 14th deadline to act on crossover bills. It has crossed over to the Senate. To deal with some of the discrepancies in the bills there needs to be a CoC. There remains uncertainty.

Member Wake-DePasquale remarked we are not out of the woods. She asked for clarification that should something be passed, it would not go into effect until FY28. Superintendent Bergskaug responded it depends on how the bills are worded. Many say July 1.

Member Lahens asked what would occur with the warrant article that passed should the bill pass, and was told what the district passed would be null and void. The warrant article protects us against what is currently in place if nothing happens at the State level in terms of amendments to the law.

Member Fontaine stated his recollection from previous discussions that there is no mechanism at present to ensure new Hollis residents have slots if this full open enrollment thing happened. Superintendent Bergskaug remarked she can speak to lots of what ifs, but there are constant amendments and discussion. It would depend on the final language.

Member Wake-DePasquale commented it should be known by May 14th when it is scheduled to be discussed.

7. Committee Appointments

The nominations of the Chair were identified as:

	<u>Liaison</u>	<u>Alternate</u>
Superintendent Performance Evaluation Committee	Jonathan Fontaine	
SAU 41 Governing Board Budget Sub-Committee	Carryl Roy	Jonathan Fontaine
Regional Services and Education Center (RSEC)	Jonathan Fontaine	
Hollis Policy Committee	Jessica Lahens	
SAU 41 Governing Board Policy Committee	Jessica Lahens	
Enrollment Committee	Anne Wake-DePasquale	Raphael Zack
Hollis Budget Committee	Raphael Zack	Anne Wake-De-Pasquale
SAU 41 Wellness Committee	Raphael Zack	
Town of Hollis Capital Expenditure Advisory Cmte.	Raphael Zack	

A request was made to amend the agenda to include an update from the Town of Hollis Capital Expenditure Advisory Committee.

There being no objection, the agenda was adjusted, as requested.

8. Town of Hollis Capital Expenditure Advisory Committee (CEAC) – Update

A request was made to include the update as a recurring agenda item.

Vice Chair Zack commented that there had been confusion over whether the committee was set up to last a year or whether it was a standing committee. A review of the minutes of the Selectboard identified it as a standing committee having two at-large positions having one-year terms. The remaining members will continue unless notified otherwise by the Selectboard.

The committee recapped the outcome of the Annual Meeting. There was discussion around areas of improvement in terms of communication and notification of upcoming projects within the committee membership as well as outwardly.

In terms of the expansion project, there was some advice given. He put forth what was discussed at the last meeting in terms of really having more time to go into the details would have been helpful.

The question of the spreadsheet came up; what do we give for an updated number? He stated the need to put a placeholder in for future expense.

Once the school building expansion committee is reorganized he would like that to be a topic of discussion.

Superintendent Bergskaug commented the spreadsheet has a different purpose for the different groups that are looking at it. She noticed some members of the Budget Committee had a difficult time understanding that we have to put items in there even if we really are uncertain they will come to fruition. They have to be identified in order to gain impact fees. For example, she has no intention of doing the middle school expansion at this time, however, it has to be listed so that the Towns can put impact fees in place for any proposed new developments.

If not there years in advance, there is a loss of the ability to apply an impact fee. She really does not plan to expand the middle school right now, however, the 40 new units that are going to be completed by the end of 2026 in Brookline very well could have a huge impact on enrollment in Brookline and at some point the middle school.

When looking at it from the CEAC point of view, it is not that in FY28 there is \$50 million going towards the middle school, that is not how we operate. We need to continue the conversation of how the different groups are utilizing these spreadsheets. We certainly don't say here we go in this fiscal year we are moving forward on all of these projects. That is not likely to happen.

Chair Roy stated that was something discussed at this year's presentation. They were pushing that there had to be a date assigned to future projects, and she explained we cannot know that. We will not assign a date. They were adamant that projects had to have a date assigned. She agrees if this is going to continue it has to be understood that projects are identified in out years as something that is coming, but we cannot identify whether it will be in the next 5-10 years, 10-15 years, etc.

Superintendent Bergskaug remarked the easy thing to say is the roof has a life of 30 years; I can tell you when the roof hits end of life. For those types of things, she can identify the expected replacement cycle. However, when we will potentially see more enrollment or when there could be changes at the State level in terms of requirements, those can be put in a year but we cannot say they will definitely happen.

Member Fontaine stated agreement and commented from his perspective that knowing that we have major uncertainty on the horizon, the soonest we might likely see a proposal come back in for the primary school is a year out. The soonest that might actually get approved and moved is two years out. He believes without a number, they should know that there is an incoming item two years out that is a school expansion that will be in the millions. We won't have a real number, but they are looking for when these big things will happen. Is it going to be \$20 million, probably not, the public has told us they don't want that, but if you mark it as \$20 million and it is not used in the way being indicated, it tells you there is a big expense coming within this ballpark of \$10-\$20 million.

He agrees with the statement and would urge our own input of the if you want to know what is coming as a big item with a range, in a year, you don't need or want a specific date, and until we know you don't necessarily want a specific amount. It can vary.

Member Lahens commented she believes that all to be true, but also appreciates that members of the Budget Committee have said things like we can certainly afford some of this stuff if we can plan it at certain times. Being able to plan the timing of when we rebuild the wall at the town dump versus when we do something with police, fire, etc., that is meaningful and she does appreciate that. To the extent that we can provide information on timing it is helpful.

Member Fontaine stated the key difference there being this wasn't supposed to be the budget committee; this was supposed to be advisory.

Member Lahens remarked for the advisory committee that is still true because the advisory committee is also giving data to the Budget Committee about these are expected expenses for the Town and if we can manage these things at different points in time, this is the impact on the budget. She still believes that to be relevant.

Member Wake-DePasquale remarked for the public it is important to understand the difference in putting a date on a need in the COOP, specifically the middle school, versus the need at the primary school. In the COOP there are many unknowns. We don't know how many families will move into that development in Brookline, what age the children would be and when they would be entering middle school making that impact. We only have the data of the children that are in the school now.

In contrast, we are currently over capacity at the primary school as evident by preschool in the hallway, case managers trying to educate children in an office, etc. That is very different than what could potentially happen in the middle school. That is why it is hard to put a date on the middle school. We still have these unknowns and would also be converging from another town. While Hollis is expanding in ways that we have already determined from our meetings with the Town Planner and his consultant, it is very difficult to see that.

Not everybody may know that you can go to the Town website under Notify Me and sign up to receive agendas and minutes from the CEAC to be aware of the work that group is doing.

Vice Chair Zack remarked something he will bring back to the committee for the future spreadsheets is some way to clarify certainty for a project when there is a known date, e.g., roof, and when there is something that we want on the spreadsheet to be able to indicate that the certainty of the date is very low. He believes the real value is keeping projects in the list so that when they do come about there has already been awareness. Having as much information as possible in advance will serve the community well.

DELIBERATIONS

- To see what action the Board will take regarding Reauthorizing the Enrollment Committee

MOTION BY MEMBER WAKE-DEPASQUALE TO CONTINUE THE ENROLLMENT COMMITTEE FOR THE 2026-2027 SCHOOL YEAR WITH THE OFFERED CHARGE ADJUSTMENTS

MOTION SECONDED BY MEMBER LAHENS

ON THE QUESTION

Member Lahens stated it to be a deliberate choice to change the title of the group from Enrollment Committee to the Hollis Primary School Building Expansion Committee, and asked Member Wake-DePasquale to speak to that.

Member Wake-DePasquale stated in both of her conversations with Principal Izbicki and Superintendent Bergskaug, it was agreed that it is very clear that the school building itself is no longer sufficient for the number of students we have and certainly for the number of students that are coming. The committee name could be changed to building renovation and expansion committee. We do still believe that renovation and expansion need to happen. It needs to change from what it was originally proposed so work will need to be done. We need to make it clear to the public that this is what we are working towards. It is important to note that we would keep the Enrollment Committee website live. It contains many historical documents that should be available to the Town. It contains a great deal of information as well as a link to what was the proposed renovation. The language is already there identifying that this was not approved.

Should this be reauthorized and the committee renamed, there will be live links to both of those pages.

It is felt this more clearly communicates the goal of the committee to responsibly plan. We have included language around developing a fiscally responsible plan for renovating and expanding the building to ensure a safe and effective learning environment for staff and students and effective planning and decision-making for the district's growth.

It was also a deliberate choice to add “safe and effective”. We had discussed the kinds of things we need to focus on. They all agreed that it really came out in our exploration that there are safety concerns that in this process we decided really need to be our #1 priority, and that is part of this expansion and renovation; ensuring we have that Department of Homeland Security approved level of standard for our entrance, that we have a fire lane, that kids are in classrooms, etc.

The Board discussed the potential name of the committee. Member Lahens commented particularly because the title of the Enrollment Committee had the ability to be misleading, for the sake of being clear about what we are doing she believes it could be meaningful for the committee name to include “renovation and expansion”.

Member Lahens noted the language “advising administration” and asked if it is deliberately not also addressing communicating to the community or is that better captured elsewhere?

Member Wake-DePasquale responded if you look at areas such as staffing and scheduling questions, those are the responsibility of the administration. Navigating current space constraints, that is administration. Developing a fiscally responsible plan for renovating and expanding the building she would say, if breaking it down, that is more part of the Board's territory. Perhaps we could change the wording to include “and also”. We could also wordsmith this more. She does not feel there is a particular time for approving the Charge.

Member Lahens suggested adding the note of also advising the Board would be meaningful as well as something about communicating with the community. That is a lot of what you were doing under the Enrollment Committee. That is also part of the work you are doing.

Member Wake-DePasquale suggested the committee could be formed and the Charge could be revised.

Chair Roy stated the motion would authorize the committee for the 2026-2027 school year, which doesn't start until July 1st.

Superintendent Bergskaug suggested the motion be amended to reauthorize the committee, effective immediately. She believes the committee should get together. The important part of committee work is looking at this statement, and if there is feedback then that final version could go back to the Board in June.

Member Wake-DePasquale stated there to have been a good deal of outreach from community members wishing to be involved on the committee. If reauthorizing tonight, she was going to announce and reach out to those individuals requesting they attend the June meeting to hear Principal Izbicki's presentation and then begin work from there. The Charge also proposes increasing membership.

Member Fontaine stated appreciation for the language provided. He does not agree with moving this to an expansion committee or limiting it to HPS in particular. Fundamentally, what we have been told by the public and to some extent what we have all expressed is that this committee needs to also explore other

options that aren't just Hollis expansion. That is what the town has told us they want us to explore. Ultimately he still believes it will end up with an expansion, but believes it wraps in the committee's target to say its expansion or bust, which is how he is concerned it will come across.

He thinks the committee's purpose is not an expansion, but rather to monitor and address the capacity issues within the district. Those issues may pop up in other areas and he would not want to have to establish another committee when we are trying to deal with it as a whole, as a district. We have been told explore some other options. Keeping it as a capacity issue district-wide lets us do that, and makes it clearer that we are going to consider other things within the district.

He agrees we have clear data that there are significant academic, administrative, and safety challenges. This committee, from his perspective, would be working to monitor both the capacity and enrollment and propose remediation for the issues identified. Leave it very open ended in that particular way so that it isn't enrollment, we're not worried about enrollment, we're worried about capacity and the enrollment thereby related to it. At this point we are out of capacity.

Member Lahens commented on her belief it is less the mission and more the need being spoken to.

Member Fontaine remarked he actually has the mission rewritten as well. That is his perspective to some extent because our job is not to tell the administration how to solve the problems, our job is to advise if they would like us or to help set policy around it. Them coming to us and saying I'm having to do this or these other things then we can say I see your problem and even if it is an intermediate proposed solution that we can fund or do as a Board then we have that option and it is not just expansion.

Superintendent Bergskaug noted some of the feedback received was that the Enrollment Committee was not transparent in title, and that nobody knew that we were actually looking to expand the building. She believes the best thing to do is reauthorize the committee. Wordsmithing in this forum is not the appropriate time or place. We should process this and maybe send feedback to Member Wake De-Pasquale. She believes the Building Renovation and Expansion Committee is sort of appropriate because no matter what there will need to be some renovation and some expansion whether that is at HPS, HUES, the Farley Building, etc.

Member Fontaine reiterated if you say primary expansion people are going to say we are expanding HPS.

Superintendent Bergskaug suggested the Hollis Building Renovation and Expansion Committee.

Member Fontaine stated he has a problem approving a committee where the mission target is unclear or at least not agreed upon.

Chair Roy suggested authorizing the committee to continue as the Enrollment Committee right now and allow them to bring back a proposed charge for the Board to approve at the next meeting.

Member Wake-DePasquale asked for clarification what was being stated was that the current Enrollment Committee meet.

Member Fontaine asked what work has to be done this month that cannot wait until next month.

The response was advertising to gain additional membership. Member Fontaine responded without the definition of what that committee is going to actually do you are just advertising for a committee that will get a mission statement.

Superintendent Bergskaug replied this is a public conversation through which the public is hearing the possibilities. We need to authorize the committee. If there is interest, individuals could come to the next meeting where the final proposal for the mission of that committee will be established. Everyone interested in participating will have the opportunity to hear it, see it (attached to the meeting agenda), and then that would be authorized.

Chair Roy stated the comment was that you are inviting people to possibly join a committee that has no direction. It does. This authorization, without the offered charge adjustment aspect to the motion, is to continue the enrollment committee for the 2026-2027 school year, period. That is what we are saying; let's authorize that. It will continue what they have been doing and then they can come to us at the June meeting and say this is what we would like to change the charge and title to and we can vote on that at that time. Until then they continue with the charge and membership they have had.

Member Fontaine stated concern that if what comes before the Board in June is not approved, the committee is still authorized under its current charge. If feeling it should change before being reauthorized he would vote in opposition to the motion.

Member Fontaine questioned whether the committee, under its current charge, would be able to solicit new membership for the possible revised charge with approved changes. Member Wake-DePasquale stated her belief she would because the name Hollis Enrollment Committee and what we were working on is known. Also, given the fact that she has already had people reach out to her leaves her unconcerned about people attending.

AMENDED MOTION BY MEMBER WAKE-DEPASQUALE TO CONTINUE THE HOLLIS ENROLLMENT COMMITTEE THROUGH THE 2026-2027 SCHOOL YEAR, EFFECTIVE IMMEDIATELY

MOTION SECONDED BY MEMBER LAHENS

MOTION CARRIED

4-1-0

Member Fontaine voted in opposition

Member Wake-DePasquale stated she would post the date of the next meeting on the Hollis Enrollment Committee website and will ask Principal Izbicki to place it on the school's website.

- To see what action the Board will take regarding the Committee Appointments Proposed by the Chair

MOTION BY MEMBER WAKE-DEPASQUALE TO APPROVE THE APPOINTMENTS OF THE CHAIR AS PRESENTED

MOTION SECONDED BY MEMBER ZACK

ON THE QUESTION

Member Fontaine commented that one of his children is looking to be enrolled at one of the RSEC facilities. He does not see it as a conflict, but wished to state so for the record as he is nominated to serve on the RSEC Board. He does not see it as any different than his children attending these schools.

Superintendent Bergskaug stated that has not been an issue in the past.

Asked for additional information on the role of RSEC, Member Fontaine stated it to be a collection of services that are offered throughout the region and used by multiple SAUs to augment special needs.

Superintendent Bergskaug added that Hollis/Brookline, Milford, and Amherst Superintendents serve on the board and school board members have seats on the board. She is currently the Chair of the RSEC board.

MOTION CARRIED

5-0-0

- To see what action the Board will take regarding the Recommendation of the Business Manager relative to the price increase for breakfast

MOTION BY MEMBER FONTAINE TO APPROVE THE RECOMMENDATION OF THE BUSINESS MANAGER TO INCREASE THE PRICE OF BREAKFAST FROM \$1.75 TO \$2.00 BEGINNING AT THE START OF THE 2026-2027 SCHOOL YEAR

MOTION SECONDED BY MEMBER ZACK

ON THE QUESTION

Asked if it is typical to end the year with a surplus in the food service account, Superintendent Bergskaug responded there are times when we do and times when we go into the negative. We are not permitted to retain a surplus. Those funds have to go into expenses associated with food service, e.g., refrigerator replacement. The food service account is one where funds come in and then are transferred back to the food service account.

Asked if we cover a shortfall out of the budget, she stated that to be a requirement.

Asked if the lunch and breakfast revenue is combined, Superintendent Bergskaug spoke of the full audit conducted in Brookline this year. Never before has the State of New Hampshire not come up with any findings. We received a glowing review. It is 100% attributable to the efforts of the Food Service Director. What she does is evaluate lunch separate from breakfast. We are in the black in the lunch sales and need to make an adjustment in the breakfast area.

Because we participate in the Federal program where we can support free and reduced lunch prices, one of the guidelines is this full evaluation of our accounts. If not in the black, we are required to adjust pricing.

Member Lahens commented on confusion over being in the black for lunch and not for breakfast. She asked if that is due to the structure of the programs. Superintendent Bergskaug remarked we don't know who will get breakfast on any given day where lunch is more predictable. We did not increase the breakfast prices when we last increased the lunch prices.

Member Fontaine questioned if there is the need to plan for a particular level of participation for breakfast based on past participation, e.g., is there a mandatory number of meals that must be prepared on any given day? Is there spoilage being experienced? Superintendent Bergskaug stated the Food Service Director does a great job of planning for multiple options. While we have to provide an option, it is not always the same option for every student if we run out. There are certain favorites and they sell out. It is also a social piece; if a friend is going to breakfast.

Noted were the increased expenses associated with product and employees.

Superintendent Bergskaug added it is regulated so highly by the Federal Government that it is a formula. Basically, they are saying you have to increase your breakfast prices to stay compliant with their formula structure.

Vice Chair Zack commented on his belief when last the Board voted on an increase in the lunch price there was information provided on surrounding districts and their price structure. He asked if there is a sense of where we stand in comparison.

Superintendent Bergskaug responded there is the need to make an adjustment to breakfast prices across all three of the districts within the SAU. Outside of SAU 41 she was uncertain what the comparison is.

MOTION CARRIED

5-0-0

- To see what action the Board will take regarding the Proposed Policy Memo

Policy JICJ - Unauthorized Communication

Given its 1st Reading;

**MOTION BY MEMBER LAHENS TO ACCEPT THE FIRST READING, WAIVE
SUBSEQUENT READINGS, AND ADOPT POLICY JICJ – UNAUTHORIZED
COMMUNICATION**

MOTION SECONDED BY MEMBER ZACK

ON THE QUESTION

Member Lahens stated this to be a policy that must be reviewed annually. No changes are proposed.

MOTION CARRIED

5-0-0

Policy BEDB – Agenda Preparation and Dissemination (New to District)

- 1st Reading: April 1, 2026

Given its 2nd Reading;

**MOTION BY MEMBER LAHENS TO AMEND BY REPLACING THE LANGUAGE
UNDER THE HEADING OF CONSENT AGENDA, ACCEPT THE SECOND READING,
WAIVE THE THIRD, AND ADOPT POLICY BEDB - AGENDA PREPARATION AND
DISSEMINATION, AS AMENDED**

MOTION SECONDED BY MEMBER ZACK

ON THE QUESTION

The proposed policy language is around utilization of a Consent Agenda to address the handling of nominations, retirements, etc. No changes have been proposed since the time of the first reading.

Superintendent Bergskaug spoke of discussion around whether the Consent Agenda should be a standing agenda item. She is of the opinion it should be, and in the instance where there is no information to share, the Consent Agenda would be blank.

Member Fontaine asked what the procedure would be if there were an item(s) within the Consent Agenda that member(s) did not wish to support. Superintendent Bergskaug stated it to be a decision of the Board; the Consent Agenda can be voted upon holistically, and if there is an item within it that a member does not wish to support they could simply vote against it in totality or the Board could choose to address each item individually.

MOTION CARRIED

5-0-0

Policy JCA – Change of School or Assignment – Best Interests and Manifest Hardship

- 1st Reading: April 1, 2026 (as amended)

Given its 2nd Reading;

**MOTION BY MEMBER LAHENS TO AMEND POLICY JCA - CHANGE OF SCHOOL OR ASSIGNMENT – BEST INTERESTS AND MANIFEST HARDSHIP, IN ITS ENTIRETY, BY REPLACING IT WITH THE COPY PROVIDED WITH THE AGENDA, AND ACCEPT THE SECOND READING, AS AMENDED
MOTION SECONDED BY MEMBER ZACK**

ON THE QUESTION

Member Lahens spoke of significant feedback provided by legal counsel around changes which have been incorporated.

Member Fontaine commentated it appears that school rather than class is now the main component, and asked if that is an accurate interpretation.

Lauren DiGennaro, Assistant Superintendent of Student Services, stated what the policy is intended to address is the student’s school assignment. Within a school building, if a parent wants to request a change of class that would be done through the building process. This is a Superintendent process that has to do with actual school location not the actual class within a building.

Member Fontaine spoke of confusion around the title being change of school or assignment.

Assistant Superintendent DiGennaro stated it refers mostly to school. She will inquire with legal counsel believing “classes” should not be included in the first sentence. The intent of RSA 193:3 is school.

Chair Roy questioned if the title should be “Change of School Assignment”.

Assistant Superintendent DiGennaro remarked other districts have removed the “or” and others have not. She will confirm with legal counsel.

MOTION CARRIED

5-0-0

Policy GBEBB – Employee-Student Relations

- 1st Reading: April 1, 2026 (as amended)

Given its 2nd Reading;

MOTION BY MEMBER LAHENS TO AMEND TO INCLUDE REFERENCE TO THE RSA, SECTION A2 TO READ: “THE EXCHANGE OF PURCHASED GIFTS FROM STAFF MEMBERS TO INDIVIDUAL STUDENTS IS DISCOURAGED AND PROHIBITED WHEN THE GIFT IS OF MORE THAN DE MINIMIS VALUE (\$50). THIS DOES NOT INCLUDE PRIZE BOXES, CLASSROOM SUPPLIES, ETC.” AND SECTION A4 BY INSERTING

“SCHOOL RELATED” FOLLOWING “IN ANY”, AND ACCEPT THE SECOND READING OF POLICY GBEBB - EMPLOYEE-STUDENT RELATIONS, AS AMENDED MOTION SECONDED BY MEMBER ZACK

ON THE QUESTION

The Policy Committee is looking for some feedback on this policy. A good deal of editing was done for presentation for a first reading last month. The Board engaged in discussion during that meeting. The Policy Committee struggled with the amount of money for class gifts and referring to the de minimis value.

As a district, one of the ways we try and manage any concerns around even the perception of students receiving a different kind of treatment based off of a gift they provided the teacher or how much money they contributed to the room parent who purchases gifts is through a room parent’s handling of funds. At the beginning of the year the room parent reaches out to parents to convey if wishing to donate something it can be done through them. The teacher is unaware of what is donated.

Also, if you have 16 students in a class and every parent donated \$20 to the room parent for gifts the de minimis limit would be exceeded.

The committee was uncomfortable raising the de minimis value to something really high; doesn’t feel appropriate. Another concern is putting teachers in a situation where they might be accepting gifts that are over the de minimis value; what do you do when receiving a gift basket, e.g., how do you estimate value?

There are times when teachers or staff receive something dropped off for them. If refusing a gift that is over the de minimis value, are you sending it back home with the child? That is putting the child and teacher in an uncomfortable situation. If something is dropped off, it may be unclear how you return it.

The Committee grappled with those issues, and at the same time, we do have a need to be protective of students whose families might not be able to contribute. We have a responsibility to be attentive to the fact that not everybody can contribute and we don’t want there to be the perception that you have to contribute.

At present, the language does not feel finalized in terms of how we manage that. Feedback from the Board was sought.

Dorothy Flaherty, Assistant Superintendent of Curriculum & Instruction, noted the \$50 was not a random figure. They looked through a lot of ethics laws and recommended practices. The \$50 was the common recommendation.

Member Lahens added if we say the de minimis value is \$50 and room parents are in receipt of \$300 they are way over. That is probably the case most of the time. We could take out the language of the de minimis value and say something like gifts of minimal value or something similar.

Member Wake-DePasquale remarked she looked up the RSAs listed on the policy. She does not see how they pertain to a money value. RSA 186:11, IX-f requires schools to “Adopt a Policy Prohibiting Transportation for Medical and Health-Related Appointments....”

The other RSA mentioned is 169-C - “Services, Placements, and Programs Required for Minors From Certain Providers Qualified for Third-Party Payment”.

Assistant Superintendent DiGennaro stated there is not an RSA with a price value. That is left at the discretion of the Board. The Board can decide to eliminate this part of the policy in its entirety or if desiring to address teachers giving gifts to students and not the other way around, that is possible as will.

Assistant Superintendent Flaherty added a lot of that falls under the Code of Ethics.

Member Fontaine remarked the referenced RSA specifically is, he suspects, in direct correlation to section A 14, which reads: “Unless following a published District emergency health or medical emergency protocol or policy, staff shall not accompany or transport a minor to any medical appointment, mental health appointment or visit that includes any type of mental health evaluation, treatment, or counseling, or any other health-related appointment or visit, without the knowledge and written approval of the minor's parent or guardian.”.

Member Wake-DePasquale commented on the amendment that now reads: “The exchange of purchased gifts from staff members to *individual* students”. If we are talking about individual, her opinion is that there is a difference identified between that and the anonymous contributions that are made to the PTA. The PTA gives gifts to our teachers all the time that are given by parents. When the room parent gifts money and a gift to a teacher it is essentially from the PTA because the money is being given to someone that is put in that position by the PTA. It is not from an individual.

Assistant Superintendent Flaherty stated the guideline is that it would be a class gift, and that no names would be attached to it. A teacher would not know who did and did not contribute.

Member Fontaine stated, as written, none of that matters because the provision says *from staff to students*. There is no longer any provision that stipulates that we are talking about the other way around.

Member Lahens stated there to have been a recommendation that, if addressing that, it should be addressed in this policy. That was part of the feedback received from the State.

Assistant Superintendent Flaherty noted the current language is really from teacher to student, however there was a recommendation that some boards may want to stipulate it in reverse. It is not required.

Member Fontaine remarked, as written, this does fulfill a large portion of inappropriate ethical favoritism from staff to student. If we didn't accept the recommendation from the State, while he agrees with the quandary to some extent, if it is ridiculously difficult to define in a fair and unbiased way in the other direction, he does not see a reason to take up the recommendation.

Asked for her input, Assistant Superintendent Flaherty commented that she is influenced because it is very different from where she came to the district from. In Massachusetts, you cannot accept a gift valued greater than \$50.

Superintendent Bergskaug spoke of having had to reject gifts valued at greater than \$50. That is insulting to the family.

Assistant Superintendent Flaherty stated her larger concern is if a gift is going to be a substantial gift that it be a class gift, and that no names be attached. If you have a lot of gifts coming in individually from students to teachers and you have a student in the room that knows that they cannot afford that or

make something, they will feel bad if they start seeing expensive gifts coming in. It is trying to send the message that we very much appreciate the support, but we also don't want to put our teachers in difficult situations and recommend you do something that is a token that shows your appreciation.

It doesn't have to be in policy, but could be a suggestion/statement as we approach the holidays, etc.

Member Fontaine stated appreciation for the sentiment of the impact to the students depending on their family's financial state. He is not of the opinion that we should add wording to the policy. There are quite a few policies around ethical components or at least a culture.

Being uncertain of how many individuals in our district are actually giving gifts of significant value to teachers versus gifts given as a class, he is unclear whether there is a problem in that area.

Member Lahens commented she believes the Principals felt there was not a problem, but the Policy Committee also felt the need to take it seriously.

Member Fontaine reiterated he does not see there to be a problem at present, and of the opinion of not adding language to the policy at this time.

Member Wake-DePasquale remarked in her years in the district she has learned from her children what some teachers have received from other families because things were made public in front of other children by the adult in the room. Perhaps something does need to be said about keeping those things private. She commented she has personally known more than she probably should have. There may be a problem.

MOTION CARRIED

5-0-0

Policy JLCE/EBBC – Emergency Care and First Aid (replaces JLCE)

- 1st Reading: April 1, 2026 (as amended)

Given its 2nd Reading;

**MOTION BY MEMBER LAHENS TO AMEND BY INSERTING THE LIST OF RESPONSIBILITIES FOLLOWING THE FIRST PARAGRAPH, BY REPLACING “PARENTS/GUARDIANS” WITH “LEGAL GUARDIANS” IN EACH INSTANCE IT APPEARS, AND BY REPLACING “WILL” WITH “CAN” IN THE SENTENCE THAT BEGINS “OPIOID ANTAGONISTS”, AND ACCEPT THE SECOND READING OF POLICY JLCE/EBBC - EMERGENCY CARE AND FIRST AID, AS AMENDED
MOTION SECONDED BY MEMBER ZACK**

ON THE QUESTION

Member Lahens spoke of notes around making the policy more readable.

Member Fontaine noted line #4 should read “notifying legal guardians” not “notifying parents”.

Chair Roy questioned the reasoning behind changing “will” to “can”, and was told the School Board is not mandating it, the Nurse will make the decision of whether we will have it available. This is saying that we can have Narcan.

Chair Roy suggested replacing “can” with “are permitted”.

The Board agreed with the proposed amendment.

MOTION CARRIED

5-0-0

EEAA-R – Use of Video and Audio Systems regulations (New to District)

Given its 1st Reading;

MOTION BY MEMBER LAHENS TO ACCEPT THE FIRST READING OF EEAA-R – USE OF VIDEO AND AUDIO SYSTEMS REGULATIONS

MOTION SECONDED BY MEMBER ZACK

ON THE QUESTION

Member Lahens noted the district has Policy EEAA and is looking to add EEAA-R, which makes the regulation clear. During the Policy Committee meeting, there was discussion around storage, and how that works. There have been some changes around Cloud storage and addressing cameras as there were times when things in the distance were not captured. It had been that recordings occurred when movement occurred near the cameras. The switch is to continuous recording.

Member Wake-DePasquale questioned Section B3; specifically, what is meant by school department's comprehensive emergency plan.

Chair Roy stated her belief that is the Emergency Operations Plan. That language should be changed.

Superintendent Bergskaug noted the regulations (Rs) are not required to be approved by the Board. They have been in place, just have not come before the Board previously. By having it approved by the Board it becomes more transparent to everyone in the community.

MOTION CARRIED

5-0-0

EHB-R - Records Retention Schedule (New to District)

Given its 1st Reading;

MOTION BY MEMBER LAHENS TO ACCEPT THE FIRST READING OF POLICY EHB-R - RECORDS RETENTION SCHEDULE

MOTION SECONDED BY MEMBER ZACK

ON THE QUESTION

Recent changes around requirements for document storage are part of what prompted bringing this forward. Changes in law around requirements for length of time certain records have to be retained will result in the ability to reduce the amount of storage the SAU is required to have.

Superintendent Bergskaug remarked Policy EHB essentially states the Superintendent will have a records retention schedule. By addressing this in this forum it provides additional transparency.

Asked if there is anything that stipulates if certain documents are required for legal purposes, Superintendent Bergskaug responded if there are documents required for legal action that is pending then yes, but there are times when we hit the retention cycle and things are discarded.

MOTION CARRIED

5-0-0

Policy IIB - Class Size

Given its 1st Reading;

MOTION BY MEMBER LAHENS TO ACCEPT THE FIRST READING OF POLICY IIB - CLASS SIZE, AS PRESENTED

MOTION SECONDED BY MEMBER ZACK

ON THE QUESTION

Member Lahens stated the need to review this policy yearly. The Policy Committee also looked at the policy thinking about the primary school's enrollment challenges. The State has made some changes to recommended class sizes. For our purposes, it was more of a reorganization of which grades were grouped together.

What was considered was do we need to make any changes to this for enrollment purposes. The Committee discussed the fact that for several years we have had a big increase in kindergarten enrollment. There was a concern that perhaps what happened last year with the addition of a kindergarten teacher preemptively, which ended up causing challenges for us when the kindergarten class sizes ended up being lower than expected.

Part of what was discussed was that the school would not ever hire an extra teacher if you were 1 child over at the end of the summer. Last year we had been in a period of ongoing increases to kindergarten enrollment and relatively early in the enrollment process, there were a lot of students already signed up and knowing the pace at which additional students are enrolled we expected there to be even more. That was not the case.

Discussed by the Policy Committee was the need for the policy to be flexible as we would not want a situation where we need to hire a teacher because the class size is exceeded by a single student. That language has always been in the policy, but we have moved it. Instead of having it at the bottom it is closer to the top.

What the policy does is allow the school Principal/Superintendent to have flexibility and to know that although we are saying the recommendation for kindergarten is no more than 18 per class, if there needs to be 19 or 20 then there will be 19 or 20.

Member Lahens commented on having reviewed enrollment numbers for kindergarten. In 2021, even though the policy states we want to cap class size in kindergarten at 18, we did have multiple classes with 19 (out of the 4 classes one had 18 students and the other three had 19). Principals will continue to exceed the 18-student cap if needed.

The Policy Committee discussed whether it makes sense to change the recommended cap. As it is now, we will exceed the recommended cap if needed. The concern with changing the cap from 18-20 is that it can still be exceeded, if needed. The concern with that is the fact that the physical size of the classrooms at HPS are not standard, and if reaching 22-23 students in a class some classrooms might not be able to hold that number of students. Then you may have discrepancies where one teacher has a much larger class than another. We don't want that situation to exist for our teachers. It also could cause potential issues with the union that one teacher has a much higher workload than another.

Assistant Superintendent Flaherty remarked it is a sense of protection for Hollis as well as keeping class sizes on the lower end, which has always been something valued in the community. In lieu of having that, if there are changes at the State level and we don't have what we want for class sizes, you could be held to the target ranges, which are significantly higher.

Member Fontaine noted the policy covers K-6; however, Pre-K is also in the building. Member Lahens commented on that being an interesting point given that we have Pre-K in the hallway. She believes that to be a fair point for the Policy Committee to discuss. Assistant Superintendent Flaherty stated her belief the recommendations from the State only go K-12.

Member Wake-Depasquale commented the Pre-K also is determined by special education law. There are students with special needs. Aren't those numbers already set and not really open to deliberation for policy? Assistant Superintendent DiGennaro responded for certain programs yes.

Member Fontaine remarked his question is, although set by policy, is it per child/teacher ratios. Assistant Superintendent DiGennaro stated the language regarding student/teacher ratio to be in State regulations for Pre-K. You would assume that the classroom/class would be a certain size, but there is no space requirement. Asked what the ratio requirement is, she stated it is dependent on the program, e.g., integrated, intensive needs, etc. The integrated you have 12 students you can have 1 teacher and depending on the needs in the class you will have Paraeducators. In the intensive needs it is 1 to 8 and Paraeducators as needed.

Member Fontaine stated his belief it would be beneficial to reference the law and include language stating these are the Pre-K constraints by policy.

Member Wake-DePasquale questioned why put a cap in place if saying it can be exceeded and essentially there needs to be no consultation with the Board. It is the Board's policy. It almost makes the point of having a maximum number completely null and void. She looks at the language of the DOE. They have a target and a maximum. She questioned why the district policy cannot mirror that approach where we set a maximum. The numbers now seem very arbitrary to her. This language that was in the policy did not stop what happened last summer from happening.

Superintendent Bergskaug provided a bit more history of the past decade; more than half of the summers we have dealt with a class size that has approached that maximum. Sometimes we are intentional about not hiring a new teacher based on factors such as no classroom, not a strong candidate pool, etc. We have intentionally decided to have 19 in three sections because we felt our trained teachers could handle the 19 students better than having to support a teacher that lacked the training we were looking for. Some years we move forward with hiring the teacher. Last year we were over and then two students dropped out. Then we didn't see any additional enrollments. We did go over and that is why we went forward and hired.

Superintendent Bergskaug reiterated we were over, expected to get additional, and then had to make a decision to go elsewhere and then we dropped below our maximum. That could happen any year. It just so happened that it happened this year and we didn't get any additional enrollments, which was not typical. You will always run that risk when making that decision.

Member Wake-DePasquale commented there is no judgement. She was in that conversation and remembers the struggle with that. Hindsight is 20/20. She asked if language could be included in policy around if not going to mimic the same language of the DOE, some language about looking to start the

year within these numbers so there is no pressure or concern about what if it goes over because if it does we started the year with the numbers. The conversation that happened lead to concern over whether we would have to hire someone mid-year. She does not ever want that to be a concern or consideration going forward.

Superintendent Bergskaug responded that she does not think we would ever do that. It doesn't make sense to disrupt a class that has already formed a classroom community.

Member Wake-DePasquale commented that had been a concern and part of the reason that decision was made, that we would violate policy and then have to hire someone. The people currently in the positions that make those decisions won't always be. She would like something to be in place to make it clear that that doesn't have to be a concern.

Chair Roy asked if the Board representatives to the Policy Committee had the needed information from this discussion to bring forth to the committee. She noted this is the first reading of the policy and additional discussion will take place.

Member Wake-DePasquale summed up the feedback around mirroring DOE language and/or putting something in the language about starting the year within policy.

Chair Roy stated her one concern with that is if we are one student over in one of the classes that would put us out of policy at the start of the year. Member Wake-DePasquale commented that is where a target and maximum number come into play. Chair Roy stated she does not believe the language would be sufficient.

Member Lahens commented it is tricky to do a maximum number because the physical classroom sizes are all different. Member Wake-DePasquale stated there to be a difference between capacity and setting a maximum. The physical capacity of a room is not something that anybody here determines. A maximum is just saying we are not going to let anybody go over this number.

Chair Roy remarked if you have a physical classroom space that is significantly smaller than the one next door, you would then have to do that maximum based on your smallest physical space.

Member Wake-DePasquale stated this policy would not supersede that room's physical capacity.

Chair Roy asked are you then asking for language to be included in policy to say that?

Member Wake-DePasquale stated it does not have to, just like for the DOE, they don't have to determine that because if there is a classroom that cannot fit 25 students you are not going to put 25 in. They are just saying you cannot exceed it.

Assistant Superintendent Flaherty stated her belief the current language is stronger than putting in a target and a maximum because it says no more than and the Superintendent can override that. In a lot of districts when having a target and a maximum, especially in a bad financial year, you will automatically go to the maximum, and you don't have to have the Superintendent's approval.

Member Wake-DePasquale added she believes sometimes we need to do that. In the primary school, we are in a situation where we may need to do that in some of these rooms. Otherwise, we are picking and choosing who gets to have a tough situation. For example, preschoolers in a hallway, that is not equitable. Students who are being serviced being put into a smaller room and teachers moving all the time is not equitable either. Why are we picking and choosing what is and what isn't? There is a

situation where it is the best situation for the school, considering a host of unfortunate alternatives, to put more kids in the classroom just like it was chosen in FY24 when we made the decision for first grade and some of the classrooms were as large as 21 students because that was the best situation in a difficult situation. There might be a year when we have to put 24 second grade students in a room that can take up to 24 students because the Town has not approved renovations, the Town has not approved an expansion, this is what we have.

Member Lahens remarked she does not think we are prohibited from doing that. We are saying if the only option is to put 24 kids in the room, this policy allows us to do that.

Vice Chair Zack remarked to him the flexibility from the third paragraph does not match the language of no more than. When saying “no more than” that, to him, is stronger than the flexibility that indicates you can override with the Superintendent and Principal review. He likes the idea of switching either to a targeted maximum or a target; some kind of change to “no more than”.

Member Wake-DePasquale stated she was confused this summer and thought we were completing limited staff and had forgotten about years prior when the school decided to go over.

Chair Roy stated it did have to flex; had to and did during COVID. There were flexes up at HUES. There was, at one point, a Paraeducator in one classroom, however, those were older students.

Member Fontaine stated he is not a fan of the target and maximum numbers being applied to our policy. If he interprets what was said correctly, in a tight budget year, we could end up pushing students into different classrooms, shutting a class, and releasing a teacher because the maximum says I can cram these kids in and there is a budget shortfall. Someone from the public is going to say you have enough room that if you split this one and put it in these three you can let go of a teacher thereby reducing the budget. With the current wording, that does not happen.

Member Lahens stated capacity and cap size are different issues, but are interconnected, and it is difficult to completely address them as separate issues because they are just inherently connected.

She agrees there is some discrepancy in sort of the paragraphs that we have now moved to the top and saying “no more than”. On one hand she believes it should be a guiding principle that our policies be as clear as possible; definitively true. Also, there are times in policies that we have to build in some ambiguity.

She provided the example of the pediculosis policy. On one hand, lice don’t cause illness, don’t attack children’s ability to learn, we would not want to say that children cannot come to school if having lice. That is overly restrictive. Also, if you have lice and are just, over an extended period, not treating it, we also need to have language in policy that says we cannot prohibit you from coming to school, also we want you to be able to go get it treated. There are times in policy where you are trying to have a little space for contradiction. We can still look at rewording this language to make it clearer, but she also thinks that inherently there is a need to be able to address contradiction within this policy.

MOTION CARRIED

5-0-0

Policy JICK - Pupil Safety and Violence Prevention

Given its 1st Reading;

**MOTION BY MEMBER LAHENS TO ACCEPT THE FIRST READING OF POLICY JICK - PUPIL SAFETY AND VIOLENCE PREVENTION, AS PRESENTED
MOTION SECONDED BY MEMBER ZACK**

ON THE QUESTION

The Policy Committee discussed this back in January and waited on feedback from legal counsel. Feedback was received and is reflected in what is presented for consideration.

Member Wake-DePasquale referenced the paragraph titled “Prohibition of Retaliation and False Accusations”, and questioned the meaning of “without more” in the sentence that reads: “An unsubstantiated allegation of bullying, without more, will not constitute a false accusation against an alleged perpetrator.”.

Assistant Superintendent DiGennaro remarked something can be unsubstantiated but not false. You have to kind of substantiate bullying by saying bullying wasn’t defined as bullying so it is unsubstantiated. It doesn’t mean that a behavior didn’t exist; might have been misconduct, inappropriate, etc. It doesn’t mean it was a false accusation and that nothing occurred at all. It just didn’t rise to the level of bullying.

Member Wake-DePasquale asked how to amend the language to be clearer. Assistant Superintendent DiGennaro remarked the more could be evidence, information, witnesses, etc.

Chair Roy suggested replacing “without more” with “on its own”.

The Board agreed that language would work.

MOTION CARRIED

5-0-0

- To see what action the Board will take regarding Policy BEAA – Meeting Preparation

**MOTION BY MEMBER LAHENS TO RESCIND POLICY BEAA – MEETING PREPARATION
MOTION SECONDED BY MEMBER ZACK**

ON THE QUESTION

Assistant Superintendent Flaherty noted this policy is replaced by the adoption of Policy BEDB.

MOTION CARRIED

5-0-0

NON-PUBLIC

MOTION BY MEMBER FONTAINE THAT THE BOARD, BY ROLL CALL, GO INTO NON-PUBLIC SESSION PURSUANT TO RSA 91-A:3 II (a) THE DISMISSAL, PROMOTION OR COMPENSATION OF ANY PUBLIC EMPLOYEE AND (c) TO DISCUSS A MATTER, WHICH IF DISCUSSED IN PUBLIC, WOULD LIKELY AFFECT ADVERSELY THE REPUTATION OF A PERSON, OTHER THAN A MEMBER OF THE BODY OR AGENCY ITSELF

MOTION SECONDED BY MEMBER ZACK

A Viva Voce Roll Call was conducted, which resulted as follows:

Yea: Jonathan Fontaine, Anne Wake-DePasquale, Jessica Lahens, Carryl Roy, Raphael Zack

5

Nay:

0

MOTION CARRIED

The Board went into non-public session at 8:50 p.m.

The Board came out of non-public session at 9:25 p.m.

**MOTION BY MEMBER FONTAINE TO ACCEPT THE PROPOSED SALARY AND MERIT PAY
NOMINATIONS FOR ADMINISTRATIVE AND NON-UNION STAFF**

MOTION SECONDED BY MEMBER ZACK

MOTION CARRIED

5-0-0

ADJOURNMENT

MOTION BY MEMBER FONTAINE TO ADJOURN

MOTION SECONDED BY MEMBER ZACK

MOTION CARRIED

5-0-0

The May 6, 2026, meeting of the Hollis School Board was adjourned at 9:26 p.m.

Submitted by: Dawn MacMillan, Recording Secretary



School Administrative Unit #41

Hollis, Brookline & Hollis Brookline Cooperative School Districts

603 324 5999

4 Lund Lane, Hollis, NH 03049

May 2026

Nominations

Name	Position	Location	Lane/Step	Salary	Degree/Credentials
Aya Sugano	Grade 4	HUES	B+30/Step 17	\$84,865.00	Bachelors in Behavioral Science; California PolyTechnic; certified Elementary Ed (K-6)
Christy Ayer	School Psych	TBD	Masters/Step 20	\$95,053.00	Bachelors in Psych from LeTourneau University; Masters in School Psych from American International College; Certified School Psych (0046)

Resignations/Retirements

Name	Position	Location	Reason	Notes
Greg McHale	Grade 4	HUES	Resignation	Effective 4/13/2026
Jamie Gough	Case Manager	HUES	Resignation	

