

**Merrimack School Board Meeting  
August 23, 2010  
Merrimack High School – Cafeteria**

**PUBLIC SESSION MINUTES**

PRESENT: Chairman Vaillancourt, Vice Chairman Thornton, Board members Barnes, and Ortega. Also present were Superintendent Chiafery, Assistant Superintendent McLaughlin, and Business Administrator Shevenell.

**1. Pledge of Allegiance**

Chairman Vaillancourt led the pledge of allegiance.

Chairman Vaillancourt called the meeting to order at 7:31 p.m.

Chairman Vaillancourt announced that Board member Barnes would be attending the meeting late due to a work commitment. She also mentioned that Board member Swonger would not be in attendance and had been excused from the meeting.

**2. Approval of July 19, 2010 Minutes and August 9, 2010 Minutes**

Vice Chair Thornton moved (seconded by Board Member Ortega) to approve the July 19, 2010 minutes.

Chairman Vaillancourt requested the following corrections.

- Page 5 of 10, paragraph two, second sentence, replace the words “middle parking” with “middle school parking”
- Page 5 of 10, paragraph three, second sentence, change the word “report” to “reported”
- Page 6 of 10, paragraph ten, review the tape.
- Page 6 of 10, paragraph eleven, second sentence, change the word “Hickey’s” to “Hickey”
- Page 6 of 10, paragraph thirteen, last sentence, change the word “Work” to “Works”
- Page 8 of 10, paragraph two, first sentence, replace “...consider sharing resources...” to “...consider discussion regarding sharing resources...”
- Page 9 of 10, paragraph two, the sentence should read “Board member Swonger asked when the high school NEASC report would be received”.

The motion passed as amended 2-0-1 with Board member Ortega abstaining.

Board Member Ortega moved (seconded by Vice Chair Thornton) to approve the August 9, 2010 minutes.

Vice Chair Thornton requested the following corrections.

- Page 2 of 6, paragraph two, first sentence, review the tape to identify the school year.
- Page 3 of 6, paragraph three, replace "...asked what for..." with "...asked for..."
- Page 3 of 6, paragraph eleven, replace "...program because..." to "...program mid year because..."
- Page 4 of 6, paragraph four, replace "...and everything should..." with "...and the after school program should..."
- Page 4 of 6, paragraph nine, review the tape for the number of students that attended the after school program.
- Page 4 of 6, paragraph ten should read "Vice Chairman Thornton stated that she favored the trade and the \$200,000 was a surplus that should be going back to the tax payers."

Board Member Ortega requested the following corrections.

- Page 1 of 6, section two, paragraph two, line four, replace "...averaged between..." to "...would result in class sizes between..."
- Page 2 of 6, paragraph thirteen, first sentence, replace "...judgment to pay..." with "...judgment and how to pay..."
- Page 5 of 6, section three, add the following sentence. "Board Member Ortega asked for a more detailed presentation once class sizes were finalized."

The motion passed as amended 2-0-1 with Chairman Vaillancourt abstaining.

Board member Barnes arrived at this time.

### **3. Public Participation**

There was no public participation.

### **4. Consent Agenda**

Assistant Superintendent McLaughlin announced the following teacher resignations and teacher nominations.

#### a) Teacher Resignations

- Susan Hansen, World Language Teacher, Merrimack High School
- Bethanie San Martino, Math Teacher, Merrimack High School
- Erin Crosby, Art Teacher, Reeds Ferry Elementary School

#### b) Teacher Nominations

- Richard Bartlett, Kindergarten Teacher, Reeds Ferry Elementary School
- Mary Beth Donovan-Olsen, Art Teacher, Reeds Ferry Elementary School
- Laraine Fay, Grade 5 Teacher, Masticola Upper Elementary School
- Adam French, Science Teacher, Merrimack High School
- John Mannarini, Math Teacher, Merrimack High School
- Andre` Pare`, World Language Teacher, Merrimack High School

Board member Barnes moved (seconded by Vice Chairman Thornton) to approve the consent agenda.

The motion passed 4-0-0.

## **5. Planning and Building Committee Update**

Chairman Vaillancourt introduced Rich Hendricks, Chairman of the School Planning and Building Committee, and Gage Perry, Vice Chair of the School Planning and Building Committee.

Committee Chairman Hendricks reported on the charge given to the School Planning and Building Committee over a year and a half ago regarding options in finding new space for the SAU Office and Special Services Administrative Office. The Special Services Administrative Office is the smaller of the two office requirements needing between 2,500 to 3,000 square feet.

Committee Chairman Hendricks stated that two previously discussed options were: 1) possible leasing of property; and 2) purchasing of property. These options were eliminated because they were not cost effective. A third option discussed was use of an existing school facility for either one or both of the new offices. Out of the six schools only the upper elementary school had any possible space.

Committee Chairman Hendricks stated that he met with James Masticola Upper Elementary School Principal McGill and Assistant Principal Morris to look at the facility and listen to any concerns and limitations that might occur if offices were within the confines of a school building. One concern was the flow of individuals coming in and out of the building and into the Special Services Office each day. After two tours of the facility, an associate of Frank P. Marinace Architect, PA looked at the upper elementary school to see if it was structurally sound and code compliant.

Committee Chairman Hendricks stated that the Committee was looking at the first floor of the upper elementary school that faces the playground. Since the school was built in 1953 or 1954 the building is approximately 60 or 70 years old and was once the first Merrimack High School. After looking at various designs of the upper elementary school, the architect wanted to make sure that the school met with all of the building and fire codes.

Committee Chairman Hendricks stated that the special services office would need to be approximately 3,200 square feet and would fit into the upper elementary school. The proposed cost for renovating the existing facility into an office would be an additional \$350,000 to \$400,000.

Mr. Hendricks noted other reasons why it didn't make sense to have the Special Service offices within the confines of a school building included: 1) Buses. The buses line up in front of the upper elementary school for about an hour and a half each day where you cannot enter or leave the parking lot. Scheduling would become an issue for the special services office with students trying to enter the building for testing or with students completing testing and then asked to wait until the buses have departed. The plan indicates that 12 to 14 parking lot spaces would be

allocated for use by the special services office. 2) Fire drills. About ten times a year fire drills are conducted at the upper elementary school where a mandatory evacuation of every person inside is required. There are major concerns with testing sessions being stopped and important phone conversations with the State Education Department being ended abruptly.

3) Playground. The special services office would be next to the playground where balls could bounce off the windows and children could peek in the windows and making faces. In order to accommodate these concerns, an additional cost would incur for the replacement of the old windows with more soundproof and insulated windows. 4) Hallway. The special services office cannot have, at any given time, 650 children walking back and forth through the office.

Therefore, you would need to reroute the children through the fifth grade corridor, causing distractions to those classrooms in addition to the increase of three to four minutes needed to enter and exit the school. 5) Security. An issue with security is how to get people in and out of the special services office without letting them go anywhere else within the Upper Elementary School. In order to secure the area the Committee proposed closing off either one of the stairwells, but was not successful due to a fire code issues.

6) Bathrooms. The two bathrooms that are at the upper elementary school are the originals and not handicap accessible. In order to meet the specifications, the bathrooms would need to be redone. 7) Ventilation. A few years ago Honeywell upgraded part of the ventilation system at the upper elementary school, which did not include the area where the special services office could be located. The special services office is used twelve months of the year and would need heating and air conditioning.

8) Configuration. The current configuration of 3,250 square feet is not the most efficient because it cannot be retrofitted into the upper elementary school. A design that is currently being looked at uses only 2,500 square feet.

Chairman Vaillancourt wanted to clarify that part of the upper elementary school was not done when Honeywell did the ventilation upgrade, specifically the section where the Special Service Office would be located.

Committee Chairman Hendricks agreed.

Committee Chairman Hendricks stated that two proposals were drawn and the chain link fence would need to be moved to allow visitors to enter and exit the Special Service Office. The upper elementary school was a good location because it would take up one corner of the building. The Architect looked at providing security by placing a window on the wall just inside the doorway to the upper elementary school and then placing buzzers on the doors to gain access into the special services office. The Architect also proposed a side entrance next to the boiler room which is at the end of the corridor. A receptionist would buzz you into the special services office, but there is a door to the left that would not be secure and anyone could enter the upper elementary school from there.

Committee Chairman Hendricks stated that the architect looked at the reconfigurations and gave the Committee a cost estimate for site work and interior renovations to be \$750,000.

Board member Ortega asked if Committee Chairman Hendricks could explain the cost of this proposal versus building separately. The incremental cost of accommodating the Special Service Office and a new SAU building are approximately \$185.00 per square foot with a total cost of approximately \$481,000, which is marginally less expensive then renovating the existing spaces.

He asked if there were estimates for the new SAU building and for the incremental cost for the Special Services Office.

Committee Chairman Hendricks responded that the Architect's best estimate for a 2,600 square foot building is \$185.00 per square foot (\$110.00 of that amount is for construction costs) that comes out to \$480,000 versus \$232.00 per square foot it would cost to do a complete renovation with all of the upgrades. The proposals were not put out to bid because no contractor would be willing to estimate a cost with a pen and ink drawing.

Board member Ortega asked if the Committee Chairman and the architect considered other options of the configuration. For example, if you flip the lunchroom with the director's office you would not have the students playing next to an office, but the lunchroom instead).

Committee Chairman Hendricks responded that the configuration was a legitimate idea and would be discussed with the architect.

Vice Chair Perry stated that there are some relationship issues with moving offices within the space of the upper elementary school. If you move one office you need to move two and this would cause some major changes.

Board member Barnes wanted to confirm that the new building would cost \$480,000 for the special services office only and that did not include the SAU building.

Committee Chairman Hendricks responded that the cost was based on a new building and that Board member Barnes' statement was correct.

Board member Barnes asked if that included any shared resource areas like lunchrooms, copy rooms or such.

Committee Chairman Hendricks responded in the affirmative.

Board member Barnes asked if the administration felt any positive feelings toward integrating within a school building versus an independent building or vice versa.

Committee Chairman Hendricks stated that the architect wanted the special services office centrally located because you have a better chance of sharing ideas (i.e. when you have lunch together). There was no input from the Administration.

Board member Barnes asked if there was an existing District owned property identified for the special services office or would there be the requirement needed to look at land that is not owned by the District at this time.

Committee Chairman Hendricks stated that the Committee eliminated any off-site locations a while ago and is looking at space owned by the School District to eliminate any cost for land acquisitions.

Chairman Vaillancourt stated that she was surprised to see the additional \$200,000 for the ventilation (heating and air conditioning) upgrades that was not included in the overall general interior renovations. She stated that the upper elementary school and the Mastricola Elementary School share the complex with each school having its own traffic and buses. She stated that if

the reconfiguration is going to cost more money and the school will have issues, she is not sure why the Board would want to reconfigure the existing space at the upper elementary school for the Special Service office at this point. Every year the Administration goes before the Planning Board to discuss the Capital Improvement Plan. Last year the Planning Board discussed the fact that the proposed combined Special Services and SAU offices project should not be on the Capital Improvement Plan because the Planning Board thought that it would cost \$100,000 or more to reconfigure the space at the upper elementary school. She asked if Committee Chairman Hendricks would bring the architect before the Board. She asked if Business Administrator Shevenell had a plan for something like that in the future or was it still in the works.

Business Administrator Shevenell stated that the plan was still in the works and once the plan is presentable it will be brought before the Planning and Building Committee. At that point the plan will be looked at by the architect and then the Planning and Building Committee will come before the Board, but that is still to be determined.

Committee Chairman Hendricks stated that he would like to meet with the Board again in October. He asked if the architect, David St. Jean, Superintendent Chiafery, and Business Administrator Shevenell could attend the October meeting to discuss the conclusion and provide a full presentation to the Board. He stated that the meeting this evening was just a quick update and with all of the problems with the reconfiguration of space at the upper elementary school the Committee did vote unanimously to take this off the options.

Chairman Vaillancourt stated that this has been a three phase project. The project came before the Board to discuss leasing, buying and using existing buildings that the School District does not already own. It was discovered that leasing was not an option; that the use of existing space that the School District already had would take a substantial amount of time to study and come up with a product; and that the possibility of a new building would be looked at.

## **6. Budget Committee Spending Questions**

Chairman Vaillancourt introduced Andy Schneider, Chairman of the School Budget Committee, and Bill Cummings, Vice Chairman of the School Budget Committee.

Budget Committee Chairman Schneider noted that two thirds of the Budget Committee members were in attendance in the audience. He stated that a member of the Committee had tendered their resignation. The Committee will meet the week after Labor Day to discuss the process to replace that member.

Budget Committee Chairman Schneider stated that the Committee typically becomes engaged with the budget process after the School Board receives the budget from the administration. He stated that the Budget Committee would like to become engaged a little earlier in the process, around the same time the School Board provides guidance to the administration. He stated that the Budget Committee has decided to offer its own independent guidance to the administration prior to the September time frame. He stated that the Budget Committee had various questions about spending polices with regards to discretionary and non-discretionary spending. The Budget Committee also had questions about how the school district's traditional spending versus what the guidelines might state. He noted that the Budget Committee had submitted a list of questions to Superintendent Chiafery for clarification.

Superintendent Chiafery stated that she would answer the Budget Committee's questions in two parts: 1) Answer questions about the ARRA funds. She stated that ARRA funds were part of President Obama's Administration and new to the School District. She stated that Business Administrator Shevenell would discuss what the School District had done relative to the ARRA funds this far. 2) Discuss any questions that were raised about budget considerations. She stated that the School District has not conversed with the School Board regarding the budget process. She stated that prior to meeting with the Administrative Team, (principals, assistant principals and the directors) she meets with Assistant Superintendent McLaughlin and Business Administrator Shevenell to discuss budget considerations. She explained that budget considerations include contractual obligations and the state minimum standards.

Business Administrator Shevenell explained that the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) funds are an entitlement grant, not a competitive grant. He stated that the Merrimack School District's entitlement from the ARRA funds was just less than one million dollars. He explained that the funds were to be used specifically for special education in grades kindergarten through high school. Approximately \$36,000 was to be used specifically for the special education pre-school program (ages three through five). He stated that the ARRA funds have had a positive impact on all students.

Business Administrator Shevenell stated that he met with Assistant Superintendent McLaughlin and Director of Special Education David St. Jean to devise a spending plan for the ARRA funds. Consideration was given to the logic model, literacy, math, technology, and environment. The intent of the plan was to supplement the budget, not to supplant the budget. The ARRA funds could not be used to pay for items in the operating budget.

Superintendent Chiafery stated that the process was very transparent and very different from anything that was done before. The Department of Education verifies the all ARRA rules and regulations are adhered to. The ARRA grant information will appear online for all to view.

Business Administrator Shevenell stated that grant applications are now submitted electronically using usernames and passwords.

Superintendent Chiafery asked if the summary of the ARRA funds captured what the Budget Committee was seeking.

Committee Vice Chairman Cummings stated that the Budget Committee was concerned about ARRA fund spending with regards to a cliff affect. He asked if ARRA funds created programs that would obligate the district to fund from future operating budgets.

Business Administrator Shevenell responded that the ARRA funds did not fund any new programs. The ARRA funds paid for many training sessions, equipment, notebooks for special educators, computers for the special education classrooms, new software and data systems for special education.

Budget Committee Vice Chairman Cummings asked if the ongoing maintenance of computer systems and software licenses were new or replacements. He added that this would be the type of questions the Budget Committee would be asking throughout the budget process.

Business Administrator Shevenell responded that some equipment was being replaced; however, there were many new pieces of equipment. Each special education coordinator would receive a laptop that would be used during classroom observations. He stated that the new equipment would eventually become part of the computer equipment replacement plan. He stated that the impact of the new laptops to future operating budgets would be some, but not dramatic.

Chairman Vaillancourt stated that it was impossible to use the funds in such a way that the School District would not have to replace something that would have been budgeted anyway without some type of future liability. She stated that the information David St. Jean submitted was true to the logic model. She also noted that the District understands that if personnel were hired with grant money, the cost of the personnel would need to be added to future operating budgets. Training is a one time expense and the School District reaps the benefits by training one person who then trains other personnel. If the Budget Committee would like to obtain a copy of David St. Jean's presentation pertaining to training the personnel and how it would be used within the School District, the Committee should let the Board know.

Committee Vice Chairman Cummings stated that the information would be good as a reference point for the Committee.

Business Administrator Shevenell stated that the first step to building a school district budget is to look at all the School District's contractual obligations and State and Federal regulations and obligations. Contractual obligations include the teacher contract, support staff contract and associated benefits that go along with those collective bargaining agreements such as health insurance, dental insurance, staff development, pay for performance and retirement incentive.

Business Administrator Shevenell reported that the School District has a bonded debt of two and a half million dollars a year, which includes the addition to the high school in 2000 for approximately six million dollars, the middle school bond a few years ago for approximately fifteen million dollars and the additions to the elementary schools in 1997. He stated that the bonded debt was as significant to the budget as salaries, health insurance and other fixed costs. The twelve year energy management contract with Honeywell is similar to the bonded debt. Another contractual obligation is the transportation contract.

Business Shevenell stated that other state and federal regulations include criminal background checks for employees and volunteers, worker's compensation and unemployment compensation insurance, FICA and Medicare, and New Hampshire Retirement System, special educational services including transportation for students with disabilities. He noted that special education is mandated by law and is a large portion of the School District's budget.

Business Administrator Shevenell stated that the school district, fire department, police department, and the Merrimack village district are each required by law to provide a Capital Improvement Plan to the Town of Merrimack Planning Board once a year.

He explained that the budget process begins with a meeting between the Administration and the School District Planning and Building Committee to review the Capital Improvement Plan prior to the plan coming before the School Board. The Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) identifies items costing more than one hundred thousand dollars. The School District's Capital Improvement Plan is submitted to the Town of Merrimack Planning Board. The Planning Board ranks the Capital Improvement Plans from the School District, the Town of Merrimack and the Merrimack Village District into one list.

Superintendent Chiafery asked if that was representative to what the Committee was asking in general form.

Budget Committee Chairman Schneider stated that the Budget Committee members wanted to know if there were spending areas that the School District exceeds state and federal requirements.

Chairman Vaillancourt stated that Superintendent Chiafery had prepared information about minimum standards. She asked if the Budget Committee had any questions about the contractual obligations.

Business Administrator Shevenell stated that information regarding minimum standards would be discussed next.

Superintendent Chiafery stated that there are a number of standards for public school approval. She stated that the School District's goal has always been to make sure that the School District arrives at school approval when it is time to be judged which happens every five years. She noted that Chairman Vaillancourt reported to the community a few weeks ago that all six of the Merrimack schools met School Approval Standards.

Superintendent Chiafery stated that the criteria for minimum standards are specified in the New Hampshire Code of Administrative Rules.

She stated that the minimum standard for class size in kindergarten through grade two is 25:1. The standard also states what school districts and local school boards should strive toward. For example, it suggests that districts strive for a ratio of 20:1 for the primary learners. She stated that the community of Merrimack and the Board (as the representative of the community) has acknowledged the importance of having lower student to teacher ratios at the primary level. Merrimack exceeds the minimum standard for class sizes at the primary level where the students learn to read and write. The kindergarten ratio is 14:1, first grade ratio is 18:1, and second grade ratio is 20:1.

Superintendent Chiafery stated that the minimum standard for class sizes in grades 3 through 5 is 30 students or fewer to one teacher with additional wording that the local school board should strive for 25 or fewer students to one teacher. Merrimack tends to integrate grades 3 through 6 between 23, 25 or 26 students to one teacher which is above the minimum standard. The minimum standard for class sizes at the middle and high school levels is 30 students or fewer to one teacher with the notation to strive for 25 to 30 students and in some high school classes

28 to 30.

Superintendent Chiafery stated that another criteria has to do with the required subjects or courses and what a community chooses to offer up. The elementary level offers the arts, physical education, health, English language arts, reading, mathematics, science, social studies, information and communication technologies which is like library and technology education. The school board and the community, in the past, have supported an exploratory world language course in grades five and six in both Spanish and French, a half year of each. She stated that an enrichment program for students is not required, but the Merrimack School District has chosen to offer Gateway which is a program for the gifted and talented students as well as school wide enrichment.

Superintendent Chiafery reported that minimum standards also apply to terms of services to be rendered such as custodial services, food services, school health service, staff qualifications

Superintendent Chiafery referenced a new law effective July 2009 regarding drop-out prevention and noted that each school system has to determine how it will address drop out prevention. Merrimack School District has chosen to start very young with an intervention that will maintain the learners reading level so the learner does not get too far behind. She noted support from the Merrimack School Board as well as the community.

Superintendent Chiafery referenced the Springboard for Success and the Evening Academy as examples of programs that the Administration has put forward with support from the School Board and Budget Committee that were not required per the minimum requirements, but noted the effort toward drop out prevention.

Superintendent Chiafery stated that each year the School Board and the administration review goals and expenditures in the areas of literacy, mathematics, technology integration, and positive learning environments.

Superintendent Chiafery responded to the Budget Committee's list of questions by stating that playground equipment has always been purchased with funds from the respective parent teacher group. Field trips are generated by the curriculum. The School District provides the transportation. The parents contribute or fundraise for the cost of the admission. She stated that the cost per pupil is based on general classroom supplies such as paper, pencils, crayons, glue sticks, etc. The parent teacher groups have been very supportive by providing supplemental funds.

Budget Committee Chairman Schneider stated that the Budget Committee members were familiar with the school budget; however, this was the first time the budget had been presented with a review of the contractual pieces up front.

Budget Committee Chairman Schneider asked if the cost of field trips and classroom supplies had been funded by sources outside the operating budget and less within the budget over time. He asked if there was a time when there were no outside contributions for field trips and supplies. He clarified that he was asking for a trend over the years, not data.

Chairman Vaillancourt responded that over the past twelve years parent teacher groups have contributed to classroom supplies and playground equipment. She stated that transportation for the curriculum generated field trips have been funded through the operating budget; parents contribute to the cost of admission fees.

Budget Committee Chairman Schneider asked if non-discretionary spending ever became discretionary spending and vice versa. He asked if there were expenditures, when reviewed after time, were deemed not necessary.

Business Administrator Shevenell stated that contractual or mandated obligations are necessary.

Budget Committee Chairman Schneider asked if the cost of the contractual obligations covered one budget year.

Business Administrator Shevenell responded that a contractual obligation could, but not likely, change mid year. For example, the Legislators could change the New Hampshire Retirement System in a way that the School District would not be able to participate at the same level as it is participating now.

Budget Committee Chairman Schneider clarified that expenses that are discretionary versus non-discretionary tend not to change in the middle of a budget year. He stated that budgeted items might change at the beginning of the year. He asked how the school district has addressed mid-year cost increases for a non-discretionary expense, for example the retirement fund increase.

Business Administrator Shevenell responded when an expense is less than the budgeted amount, the extra money would go to surplus funds. If an expense cost more than the budgeted amount, the School District would reduce another line item(s) to make up the difference.

Budget Committee Chairman Schneider asked if the School District was ever blind sided by expenses.

Vice Chairman Thornton responded that the guaranteed maximum rate for healthcare is used during the budget process to avoid being blind sided.

Business Administrator Shevenell explained that the School District uses the guaranteed maximum rate for healthcare for budgeting purposes. If the actual rate for healthcare is less, then the difference is returned to the taxpayers as surplus funds. If the guaranteed maximum rate was not budgeted, there would be potential for a deficit budget that was not expected.

Chairman Vaillancourt stated that the only time she recalled spending more money than was budgeted was to hire staff for the following year.

Superintendent Chiafery stated that projecting student enrollments was not an exact science. Kindergarten and first grade enrollments are more difficult to project due to variables. She stated that prior to the issuance of staff contracts in April the student enrollments and the number of

staff are reviewed. Recommendations for adjustments would go to the School Board. She noted that equity between and among Masticola Elementary School, Reeds Ferry Elementary School, and Thorntons Ferry Elementary School is very important.

Superintendent Chiafery stated that the Board and the community established a capital reserve fund for special education costs and a capital reserve fund for emergency maintenance. Both are areas that could result in a huge impact to the budget if the capital reserve funds were not in place.

Chairman Vaillancourt stated that the special education capital reserve fund was used to provide special education for a student that needed placement at a higher cost than had been budgeted.

Committee Chairman Schneider stated that the information regarding the budget process was helpful. He asked the Budget Committee to consider the commitment to the contractual obligations during the budget process.

## **7. Summer Learning Opportunities for Students and Staff**

Assistant Superintendent McLaughlin reported that approximately 70-75 elementary school teachers (K-6) participating in a three day training session last week. He stated that training was based around the Collaborative Assessment Project, which was designed to bring the teachers to the next level of continuum instruction. He stated that the principals, assistant principals, teacher leaders and administrators were all in attendance to meet with consultants to discuss the next logical step in the continuum of learning. He stated that the focus has shifted toward the development of rubrics, which has been very successful. He stated that rubrics align the teacher's instruction to central standards and help refine the teacher's practice, enhance the teacher's instructional strategies for literacy, and assist the spokes teacher in informing other teacher's who were not in attendance.

Assistant Superintendent McLaughlin stated that there were a number of events for the students to enjoy over the summer. Approximately 120 students participated in the elementary summer reading program. He stated that the program was an effort to support students whose reading skills are marginal at this point and keep them reading over the summer. He reported that the springboard to success program helps provide a positive experience for approximately 45 students transitioning from the eighth grade into the ninth grade. He reported that summer school was provided to approximately 215 students at the elementary schools, middle school and high school.

## **8. Date for Next Board Meeting**

Superintendent Chiafery stated that the next scheduled Board meeting would fall on Monday, September 6, 2010 which is Labor Day. She recommended that the Board meet on Tuesday, September 7, 2010 at 7:30 p.m. The Board agreed.

**9. Other**

a) Correspondence

There was no correspondence to report.

b) Comments

Chairman Vaillancourt stated that she was not present at the August 9, 2010 meeting and wanted to comment on the agenda item regarding the seventh grade reconfiguration team next year. She wanted to let everyone know that the Board has a plan in place for rolling out a level of detail. She stated that the reconfiguration and schedule change will affect the incoming seventh grade students, their parents and the staff. She stated that information would be shared with those involved and asked if the middle school administration could come to the September 20, 2010 Board meeting.

Superintendent Chiafery stated that she wanted to discuss an issue that was raised at the July 19<sup>th</sup> meeting by Board member Barnes. She stated that Board member Barnes asked about the resurfacing of tennis courts on O’Gara Drive. She stated that she investigated the issue and found that the Town was granted a long term easement to maintain and manage that land in 1988. She also stated that the easement was resigned by the Board of Selectmen in 1993 and extended until 2018. She stated that the School District has documentation to that affect for both the tennis court and the skate board park.

Superintendent Chiafery confirmed that she and Town Manager Hickey were in agreement with the interpretation of the documentation. Town Manager Hickey explained that the tennis net was not put in place at O’Gara Drive because it was his hope that people would choose to play at Wasserman Park.

Board member Barnes thanked Superintendent Chiafery for the update and informed the Board that the tennis courts at Wasserman Park have been resurfaced and they are in pristine shape.

**10. New Business**

There was no new business.

**11. Committee Reports**

There were no committee reports.

**12. Public Comments on Agenda Items**

There were no public comments on agenda items.

**13. Manifest**

The Board signed the manifest.

There was no non-public session.

At 9:11 p.m. Vice Chairman Thornton moved (seconded by Board member Barnes) to adjourn the meeting.

The motion passed 4-0-0.