

SEPTEMBER 25, 2025 ATHLETIC COMMITTEE MEETING

CALL TO ORDER

Ms. Tovar: Called meeting to order at 12:30.

OPENING CEREMONIES

Pledge of Allegiance

ROLL CALL

Kim Tovar, Melissa Mongillo, Erica Nuzzo.

Ken Marcucio, absent.

Also Present:

Dr. Matthew Conway, Superintendent of Schools

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

Ms. Tovar: Anyone from the public who wish to speak? Anyone from the public who wish to speak, two times. Anyone from the public who wish to speak, three times. We will close public portion.

GIRLS HIGH SCHOOL VOLLEYBALL

Dr. Conway: Last Monday afternoon, all the NVL districts, schools, received this notification from a Leslie Wolfgang, who is a parent in Waterbury is also the director of public policy for the Family Institute of Connecticut and an attorney. She filed a Title 9 complaint with the US Department of Education, which is the appropriate source for any filing of Title 9. And with regards to her child it appeared plays in a game. She lives in Waterbury at a different high school, when they played Willoughby, she filed this complaint because of discrimination. Because of her, as a parent, a female athlete played against a team who had a transgender student on that team. Both from Waterbury. This complaint served as notice to all districts in the NVL, who had played or were on the schedule to play Willoughby that if they went forward and played Willoughby they would be named in the complaint as well.

So, there had been multiple filings across the State in different districts similar to this. Our first phone call was one, I sent it to Kyle for notification to review. And two, with CIAC, had

RECEIVED

By Marc J. Garofalo, MPA, MCC, MCTC at 9:04 am, Nov 26, 2025

multiple conversations with Glenn Lungarini, the executive director, to get CIAC's position as they've been handling these complaints for the past couple of years. Really since the new federal administration in the change in the Department of Ed at the federal level. And you've probably seen this in the media with other States and districts as well. Most notably in Connecticut. Cromwell was the last one in the past two months to go through a similar process.

So, while we're not the team with the transgender athlete, as we've seen in other districts. Because we were going to play them, it is why we were named in the complaint. Now, Kyle's, while none of the complaints resulted in any type of fines or withholding of federal funds. Could it down the road? It is anybody's guess. The CIAC and the other, my understanding from Glenn, the other districts are going through a similar process, but where they're specifically in violation having been accused of being in violation by having a transgender student on a team, none of those cases have gone anywhere. And everybody's kind of at a stay until the supreme court is supposedly going to make a decision on the Federal Department of Ed's position on this through an executive order only, not through federal law yet on, can the president do this. So, they won't make that finding until June. So, everybody's kind of in a stay until then.

Current law, federal and State are what is in place today. Even though the President has issued an executive order, what appears to be happening is everybody is following the current State and federal law which says, a school can have a transgender athlete on their team. So, what we did is I reached out to Glenn, got the background and so forth from him. Reached out to him again after talking with Kyle and Jen and Jen and how we're going to move forward and stayed in touch with Darin the Superintendent in Waterbury.

Because we had less than 24 hours to respond to this. Any other district had, you know, four days. So, they weren't playing them until the following week. We had less than 24 hours. I might have got my dates mixed up. We got it on a Thursday afternoon. We were playing them on Friday.

Ms. Tovar: Did we end up playing them?

Dr. Conway: What we did is, CIAC in that phone call I had at 8:30 Friday morning with Waterbury, with the NVL AD's I sat in on that phone call to hear their advice from Shipman to see if Shipman and Goodwin or Goodman is CIAC's attorney. Education experts in terms of law. So, their advice on that call was, districts can do whatever they want to do but here's the law. And there's nothing against the law in playing them. If you forfeited, we were told that morning, CIAC would then rule on the forfeit. And one of two rulings would come out. And what has come out in terms of all other forfeits for any reason you give up

RECEIVED

By Marc J. Garofalo, MPA, MCC, MCTC at 9:04 am, Nov 26, 2025

the right to play in post season tournament. So, if your team does well enough, they would be disqualified from playing in the post season because you forfeited a game.

But they would have to rule on that. So, the forfeit goes to the CIAC committee and they rule on that. But you risk that being the rule is one. They did share on that call there would be no postponements whatsoever, no rescheduling opportunities to avoid a forfeit. You would have to forfeit if you weren't going to play. Hearing that, I just didn't think that was fair to Derby because we had less than 24 hours to make a decision. We had less than 24 hours to get legal counsel. We have less than 24 hours to notify our parents of those athletes. And then they meet with the athletes themselves.

So, I did reach back out to Glenn after hearing that and Glenn did agree after talking with his legal counsel. And again, every minute we're talking about this is a minute less that we have to make a decision. So, I did hear back from them about 11 a.m. that Glenn initially told me in my initial phone call that he, not just him, he has a board that he has to respond to and their legal counsel but he would grant a postponement for us given the time frame. But how they would do that. He had to get back to me. So, he got confirmation from his side that if we move forward with it, it would be for administrative purposes. Because once you postpone, you're now basically also calling the media's attention to this game and the athlete and the federal complaint all in one by just postponing. But we would all respond for administrative purposes. Waterbury would have to agree to this as well.

So, once I got that from Glenn, I shared with Darren right away. I had the conversation with Glenn, waiting for final confirmation from Glenn and from what we would then finally do. I talked to Darren after hearing from Glenn at 11 o'clock. I asked Darren for information, the Superintendent for information earlier in the day. We found out that this athlete actually played last year as well, but nobody ever even knew about it because it wasn't a federal complaint. So, our kids didn't know anything different or if they knew it wasn't shared but we did not know that at the time that this complaint came in the night before that this actual athlete played last year on the same team and no complaints filed. No, you would have not known any different.

I also confirmed with Darren that the individual is not the type of athlete that you would see in or I've seen on the Internet where it's an individual who was overpowering the other athletes. So, there wasn't the physical piece that you had to worry about though that could happen as I'm saying it to myself. I understand it if an actual, I shouldn't say it that way that if a biological female spikes the ball and a biological female gets injured, it's part of the game. But we all know if a biological male spikes the ball regardless of circumstances or athletic ability or strength and a biological female is injured, that creates another story.

RECEIVED

By Marc J. Garofalo, MPA, MCC, MCTC at 9:04 am, Nov 26, 2025

So, processing all of that, but Darren did confirm at about 11:30, 11:45 at 11:30 that the individual played last year. Because it all weighs into the decision of what we have to do. And, in all of this, our female athletes, it was a half day for us because of the open house. It just happened all on the same day. So, you're trying to then get all this information, come to a decision and then be able to talk to the parents and athletes. And the decision went back and forth multiple times in this process. And considering the attention it's also going to bring, again, that part in the background kind of, that's going to bring to our athletes negatively or positively depending upon what side you sit on, the families and the district.

So, at the end of the conversation with Darren, I was still back and forth. Talked with Jen and Jen again after that conversation. And we decided let's now move forward. Now that we have all of the information that we have at this particular time. Let's move forward with calling each parent individually because there was only initially eight. Again, that morning I'm thinking 20 on the team. Only eight of the individuals play on varsity and would be in the game. So, let's get those phone calls made to the parents. And then also there was a planned meeting with the athletes at 1 p.m. So, it gave us time to call the parents then meet with the athletes. Seven out of eight parents had no problem with it. Go ahead and play. One parent out of respect for everybody's position in this did not want her daughter playing against a biological male. And that she wanted to go to the game but participate on the sidelines but not play in the game. And that girl also in the team meeting, she did not want to play against a team with a biological male but would go to the game.

So, we decided at that point to move forward with the game having administrative support, Jen Olson attending the game because Jen Moffat was going to be at the football game that evening. So, went ahead, played the game. Nothing out of the ordinary during the game. The athlete in the complaint had limited playing minutes anyway. I don't know the reason for that but had limited play time anyway in the game and no injuries occurred or anything else. We play them again on October 14th.

Ms. Moffat: 14th, I believe, yeah.

Dr. Conway: No other teams that have since played them. I don't know of any other issues or concerns but wanted to bring the fact that we have this complaint to the committee and then to the full Board for information, you know, should anything down the road occur as a result of this with the Federal Department of Education or not. Kyle's take on this initially was he doesn't know of any case where somebody named the other teams, the way these other teams are being named would have if it has any merit then would request be removed from the initial complaint. Anyway, should it go forward? Should it be taken up by the Federal Department of Ed. Should we receive any notice from the Department of Ed. Moving forward, I'll certainly forward those to the committee in this format for discussion.

RECEIVED

By Marc J. Garofalo, MPA, MCC, MCTC at 9:04 am, Nov 26, 2025

But he didn't see any merit to their complaint with regard to Derby's participation of an event that was scheduled that we otherwise would have had to forfeit. And then, you know, jeopardize postseason play or anything else as a result of that forfeit.

In addition to the media attention negative and positive that it would have brought, not just to us as a district, which I could care less about and actually you know what, this is a neat opportunity. This is a case study I can read about or a case study I can be a part of is the way I see it as an opportunity even getting the initial complaint. You're not going to get this every day. But in any event all parents were, my number one goal in and from getting the complaint in the get-go was, what do the kids want and what do their parents want, bottom line.

Ms. Tovar: I was happy to hear that the student and parent both equally agreed. So that, you know, it would have been a tough situation had the student wanted to play but the parent not wanted them to play. So, you know, I'm glad that there was a united front on that at least.

Ms. Olson: Doc, I just want to explain that yes, that was at the initial moment before the game. The student has since, and I think it's important, has since, after seeing the play may have a potential different feeling now about.

Ms. Mongillo: Will we be making the same calls again or are we, how are we handling the next game considering there might be minds changed?

Dr. Conway; So, we're playing Willoughby again.

Ms. Moffat: October 16th actually.

Dr. Conway: Given it's a small number. And I do like giving the parents an opportunity to be asked individually so they don't feel any pressure.

Ms. Mongillo: Pressure.

Dr. Conway: As a group, but certainly calling them again, sharing the information. I think it's worth that investment in those minutes calling them. And then with the athletes as well. In this particular situation, maybe it's the athlete and the parent together talking it through. Maybe there's an opportunity to play in the game when that biological male is not in the game and you substitute your player in or are you at a comfort level today knowing the physical, having witnessed the physical capabilities of that player to play. So, that's where we're at today.

Ms. Tovar: So, I have a question. Again, never having dealt with something like this. Why would we be named in this?

RECEIVED

By Marc J. Garofalo, MPA, MCC, MCTC at 9:04 am, Nov 26, 2025

Dr. Conway: It's a tactic. And again, Kyle sharing he believes there's no merit to attaching all these other teams to it. Waterbury is the district that followed federal and state law today, allowing the athlete to play, the biological male to play on a female team, they really hold, should there come something of the case in June they really hold that liability. And can you hold somebody liable to something that somebody that followed federal and state law at the time? I'm sure this will go on for years. Even after June, there will be an appeal should it go a different way by any party, there will be an appeal. If it doesn't go their way we've seen just over the past year that has happened in each case. And decisions go back and forth between the courts.

So, it's kind of interesting to have at least have a little stake in the game on this as opposed to just the sidelines. But I think putting the families at the front of this for us is the approach. And we worry about the legal stuff as it plays out months after the game has taken place. But might dictate what happens moving forward. It might have a totally different response next year based upon that June decision.

Ms. Tovar: Yeah, we're not doing anything wrong basically.

Dr. Conway: No, we're not.

Ms. Mongillo: Her point is that we're not following the executive order. Is that correct?

Dr. Conway: That is correct.

Ms. Mongillo: We're ignoring the executive order. We're following the current law.

Dr. Conway: Right.

Ms. Mongillo: But the executive order is what's not being followed. And that's her point.

Dr. Conway: At this point, they're not. Colleges are. But universities have changed the policy. It could have been because of the executive order. It also could be that the university sides with the executive order. Who knows? It could be a variety across the board.

Ms. Tovar: I also think they're pulling up a lot of funding because colleges are more out in the light. They're pulling funding from colleges left and right. And they're being forced to fire teachers and coaches and staff members.

Dr. Conway: And even that has gone back and forth with the funding. While the court's funding has been pulled, they've appealed it. And court's say that no, you've got to give them the funding back. And that'll go back and forth for the next forever.

RECEIVED

By Marc J. Garofalo, MPA, MCC, MCTC at 9:04 am, Nov 26, 2025

Ms. Mongillo: I just have to say from our perspective, I have to commend you all for how this was handled. This could have been pushed out, put on your desk and dealt with it later to be dealt with. You consulted legal. You consulted parents. You swiftly moved through a very sensitive topic very carefully in such a short, this was swiftly handled with care and concern for all involved. And I, you know, you kept our chairman involved as you informed as well just in case there was any feedback there. So, I appreciate all of that. And, you said it before, this comes down to the kids. I feel bad for the kids on every side of this, including the Willoughby players where they could have potentially been punished for this as well. And so, I'm glad we played. And no one missed out on playing. Jen, I appreciate you went all the way to Waterbury to make sure there and, you know, we appreciate that. This next game we're playing, is it home?

Ms. Moffat: Yes. Home on October 16th.

Dr. Conway: From a parents' perspective if you can help me if this was asked of you. If you don't mind and if you don't even share it, I'm just asking, they were very open. And part of what they shared I think also was weighed on decisions if other parents were asked the specific thing or shared their specific opinion as opposed to, yeah, we don't mind. But even though they might think personally they think this is wrong for athletics, they would never take away their child the opportunity to compete. And wanted them to play because it's a chance to play as opposed to their personal preference on biological male playing in a female sport, which I thought was a good answer. I do want to thank Glenn. There'll be no postponement, no rescheduling of any kind that he was immediately going to back away from that. He is the executive director of CIAC.

So, it's good to see that even as people make initial decisions that there's consideration and flexibility. And knowing type of decision and pressure a district might be under and the different stakeholders. We need to be mindful considering and being a holder prior to moving forward. And again, thank you Jen and Jen for taking the extra time on this issue live and contacting the parents to make sure we were covering the most important pieces of this. And that is consideration of their views and values over the game and other people's rules.

Ms. Mongillo: Doc, you'll present this at the next Board meeting?

Dr. Conway: Yes.

ADJOURN

Motion that the Athletic Committee adjourn its meeting. Passed with a motion made by Ms. Kimberly Tovar and a second by Ms. Erica Nuzzo.

RECEIVED

By Marc J. Garofalo, MPA, MCC, MCTC at 9:04 am, Nov 26, 2025

Kimberly Tovar	Yes
Erica Nuzzo	Yes
Melissa Mongillo	Yes
Ken Marcucio	Absent

Ms. Tovar: Adjourned the meeting.

Ms. Nuzzo: Second.

Marianne Samokar

Recording secretary

RECEIVED

By Marc J. Garofalo, MPA, MCC, MCTC at 9:04 am, Nov 26, 2025

Game Day Worker Compensation for Area Districts

This document provides a comparison of game day worker compensation and required reporting times across neighboring school districts.

Area District Compensation Overview

Seymour

- **Compensation:** \$50
- **Arrival Time:** 40 minutes prior to game time
- **Departure:** Leave at halftime

Oxford, Wolcott, St. Paul, Naugatuck, Woodland

- **Compensation:** \$50
- **Arrival Time:** 1 hour prior to game time
- **Departure:** Leave at halftime

Torrington

- **Compensation:** \$85
- **Arrival Time:** 1 hour prior to game time
- **Departure:** Leave at halftime

Crosby, Wilby, Waterbury Career Academy (WCA)

- **Compensation:** \$41
- **Arrival Time:** 1 hour prior to game time
- **Departure:** Leave at halftime

Holy Cross

- **Compensation:** \$40
- **Arrival Time:** 1 hour prior to game time
- **Departure:** Stay for the entire game

Watertown

- **Compensation:** \$50
- **Arrival Time:** 40–45 minutes prior to game time
- **Departure:** Leave at halftime

RECEIVED

By Marc J. Garofalo, MPA, MCC, MCTC at 9:04 am, Nov 26, 2025

Derby Public Schools (Current Practice)

- **Compensation: \$50**
- **Arrival Time: 2 hours prior to game time**
- **Departure: Leave at halftime**

Summary Comparison

Derby workers currently arrive significantly earlier than surrounding districts (up to 2 hours before game time) while receiving compensation comparable to many districts that require substantially shorter reporting times. Torrington remains an outlier with the highest pay at \$85 for similar responsibilities.

RECEIVED

By Marc J. Garofalo, MPA, MCC, MCTC at 9:04 am, Nov 26, 2025



CLIENT AGREEMENT FORM - Derby High School - New Deal

Rocket Alumni Solutions Inc. | 254 Chapman Rd, Ste 208 #1924 | Newark, Delaware 19709
RocketAlumniSolutions.com Support@RocketAlumniSolutions.com

Description: Derby High School - New Deal - Touch Screen Awards Display Software

Mock-Up Test Site:

<https://site.rocketalumnisolutions.com/home/66bdef637c36f018c756beb8?fromHome=true>

Rocket Alumni Solutions welcomes the opportunity to collaborate with you in developing a digital awards website (built for touchscreens & as a website) that boasts cutting-edge technology and unparalleled ease of use. Our user-friendly platform seamlessly integrates with touchscreen displays, ensuring a smooth and intuitive experience that "just works." Together, let's create an engaging showcase worthy solution for your community.

Rocket Alumni Responsibilities (as applicable):

- Make you a happy customer...and gain referrals.
- Provide and build website template
- Provide a URL to access the website
- Provide a URL, username, and password to access the website's content management system
- Provide unlimited white glove customer support and training
- Release weekly updates with bug fixes and improvements

Derby High School - New Deal Responsibilities:

- Install [the hardware](#) (similar to mounting a TV)
- Upload and manage content through the provided easy to use content management system
 - The Rocket team is available for 24/7 unlimited support & training
- Share your new showcase display with as many visitors as possible!
- Post your touchscreen link to social media, email it, text it, QR code, and attach to your existing website!

RECEIVED

By Marc J. Garofalo, MPA, MCC, MCTC at 9:05 am, Nov 26, 2025

Touchscreen “Plug & Play” Bundles

Purchased directly through TouchWindow.com

Self-install - Auto sets up immediately when connected to the internet (Ethernet or Wifi). The device downloads your content to avoid “streaming,” while still automatically pulling in new information that is added.

Rocket will provide a free 65” LG Createboard Pro with a 2+ year software agreement (client pays S+H)

No cancellation for convenience

(Contact us for additional sizes ranging 12” – 148” and Outdoor options)

Software Pricing

Pricing Options (Check / Highlight desired option): \$500 off if completed by 9/30/25

2 year subscription \$3,408.60 annually

3 year subscription \$3,232.79 annually

4 year subscription \$3,049.80 annually

5 year subscription \$2,870.40 annually

How’d you hear about us?

Referred by:

Saw an Install at:

Found in Online Search

Received an Email

Received a Call

Saw an Ad

Other:

Continued on Next Page

RECEIVED

By Marc J. Garofalo, MPA, MCC, MCTC at 9:05 am, Nov 26, 2025

Period of Service Details (fill in):

Today's Date: [] ----> End/Renewal Date: []

CONTRACT AGREEMENT

To begin the onboarding process, email this document filled out & signed back to Account Executive

Signature:

Title:

Primary Contact Email:

Date:

Billing Contact Email (for Invoice):

Notes (optional):



RECEIVED

By Marc J. Garofalo, MPA, MCC, MCTC at 9:05 am, Nov 26, 2025

