

**Merrimack School Board Meeting  
Merrimack Town Hall Meeting Room  
September 15, 2014  
PUBLIC MEETING MINUTES**

PRESENT: Chairman Ortega, Vice Chairman Barnes, Board Members Powell, Guagliumi and Schneider, Superintendent Chiafery, Assistant Superintendent McLaughlin, Business Administrator Shevenell and Student Representative Crowley.

**1. Call To Order**

Chairman Ortega called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m.  
Chairman Ortega led the Pledge of Allegiance.

**2. Approval of the September 2, 2014 minutes**

Board Member Powell moved (seconded by Board Member Guagliumi) to approve the minutes of the September 2, 2014 meeting.

Vice Chair Barnes requested the following changes to the minutes:

- Page 4 of 14, line 172, change Catherine Hansberry's name to Catherine Cibotti
- Page 5 of 14, line 217, should read "Bill Byron from HealthTrust".
- Page 9 of 14, line 369, change it to "The track is definitely a priority".
- Page 9 of 14, lines 384-385, should read, "Vice Chair Barnes asked about the Reeds Ferry building compared in age to the Thorntons Ferry building, as there is a gap by a number of years for the roof replacement schedules."
- Page 13 of 14, line 555 change "bleaches" to "bleachers".
- Page 13 of 14, line 589, add Merrimack Middle School Principal Woelflein after Business Administrator Shevenell.

Board Member Schneider requested the following changes to the minutes:

- Page 6 of 14 line 275, change the word "projects" to "repairs".

Board Member Guagliumi requested the following changes to the minutes:

- Page 12 of 14, line 522, should read, "Board Member Guagliumi, for clarity, stated that this would be less of a focus on the Common Core as the total solution but more as aligning specific tools to standards and grade level requirements".

Chairman Ortega requested the following changes to the minutes:

- Page 2 of 14, line 77, change "exiting" to "existing"
- Page 6 of 14, line 243, change "Mr. Kennedy" to "Mr. Greenier".
- Page 6 of 14, line 261, after "reviewed and ultimately approved" add "by the School Board".
- Page 7 of 14, line 290, after "roof replacement plan", add "showing projects six or more years in the future."

The motion to accept the minutes of the September 2, 2014 meeting as amended passed 5-0-0.

### **3. Public Participation**

Ms. Pat Merchant spoke about the upper elementary school being used for voting on September 9, 2014. She gave examples of the lack of security in the building which she believed compromised the safety of the students during that day. She suggested that in the future, there should not be school on voting days.

### **4. Acceptance of Gifts/Grants Under \$5,000**

Business Administrator Shevenell presented the following gift/grant for under \$5,000:

- HealthTrust, Inc. for a gift of one hundred dollars (\$100.00) for the District Wellness Initiatives

Vice Chair Barnes moved (seconded by Board Member Schneider) to accept the gift from HealthTrust, Inc. for one hundred dollars (\$100.00).

The motion passed 5-0-0.

### **5. Consent Agenda**

Assistant Superintendent McLaughlin presented the following item for approval:

- Teacher Nomination
  - Maggie Crouteau, Health Teacher at Merrimack Middle School

Board Member Powell moved (seconded by Board Member Guagliumi) to accept the Consent Agenda as presented.

The motion passed 5-0-0.

### **6. Merrimack Middle School Intersection Development**

Business Administrator Shevenell stated that the area they would be discussing is a seventy-one lot subdivision that is planned for being adjacent to the middle school property on the southerly side of the lot.

Ken Clinton of Meridian Land Services, Inc. stated that he was there on behalf of Old Blood Properties, LLC.

Mr. Clinton referenced the plan for about two hundred acres which have been under consideration for a subdivision for about ten years. He explained that his company was retained to see the final design through to fruition and conclusion. The company met with Business Administrator Shevenell and several other people who were connected to the district, especially those in association with traffic safety. The Administration suggested the company representatives meet with Steve Keach of Keach, Nordstom Associates, who was hired by the district to review the company's work for an expanded design that the district would consider.

Mr. Clinton stated that the primary concern was the busses stopping as they were exiting the school driveway onto Madeline Bennett Lane. He explained the revisions to the area were made to accommodate the busses as well as allowing emergency vehicles passage into the area. The roundabout is a key feature. Flashing standard 20mph school zone signs would be installed on Madeline Bennett Lane and Old Blood Road.

Mr. Clinton continued, stating that hopefully Business Administrator Shevenell and Steve Keach would have some level of support for this design. His company is looking for some level of endorsement from the board.

Chairman Ortega asked about the need for this road. He asked about the requirement for this road to actually be an intersection as opposed to an emergency access only road.

Mr. Clinton responded that requirements were directed to his company by the Planning Board. They wanted to see a road that went all the way through.

Chairman Ortega stated that the proposed road runs through a conservation easement. The agreement of the Conservation Commission would have to be modified on the board's part in order to allow the road to go through.

Mr. Clinton responded that he did not have the same understanding that there is a need to modify the provisions that were done in the 2005 Conservation Commission easement, which allowed for the realignment and upgrade of the road.

Vice Chair Barnes asked how Mr. Clinton envisioned the busses parked in the bus staging area ("the shoulder") are going to merge into traffic.

Mr. Clinton responded that the busses would merge into traffic the same way they do now. There is no other traffic mechanism that can be installed to change the problem. There were several different alternatives. This is the best and most suitable location, though it is not entirely perfect.

Vice Chair Barnes stated that there is not a problem now because there are traffic lights that ebb and flow cars and busses into a hybrid environment. She spoke about the "caterpillar effect", which means that when one bus moves and another bus moves, cars do not move, because they cannot merge in between the busses. She continued, stating that when busses are moved from park status into a traffic flow status towards that circle, it could result in a back-up of vehicles.

Mr. Clinton responded that the traffic light at Baboosic Lake Road and Madeline Bennett Lane would not be removed. He added that the traffic for that area during the time of dismissal is not that heavy, so it will probably not be a problem.

Vice Chair Barnes asked what happens to Madeline Bennett Lane when the proposed enhancements go into effect.

Mr. Clinton responded that Madeline Bennett Lane is currently not an accepted public road that is maintained by the town, since it is partly on town land and partly on a right of way that could be construed to either be owned by the town and/or the school district. He added that his company proposed that they would have enough improvements on Madeline Bennett Lane in conjunction with the repair of the sewer lines that would make it a fully acceptable public roadway.

Vice Chair Barnes asked if the maintenance of Madeline Bennett Lane would be the responsibility of the school district.

Mr. Clinton responded that one of the conditions of the subdivision is that Madeline Bennett Lane would be the responsibility of the town. He added that another requirement of this subdivision is that it has to be on public sewerage and that it has to be accepted by the town.

Vice Chair Barnes asked if the cost of all the enhancements, as well as the cost of the flashing lights, would be the financial responsibility of the district.

Mr. Clinton responded that neither the enhancements nor the lights would be a cost to the district.

Vice Chair Barnes asked if Mr. Clinton was asking for the board's endorsement but not the board's permission. She also asked if the board responded with a "no", what would happen to the plan.

Mr. Clinton responded that they are seeking the board's endorsement because some of these improvements affect how the school operates and the school board has the ultimate authority for that. However, within the language of the Easement Deed, it gives the discretion to the Town Engineer.

Board Member Powell asked how the process of the students boarding the busses would change with this new configuration.

Mr. Clinton responded that the boarding of the busses by students would not change.

Board Member Powell asked how much traffic is anticipated going through the intended intersection.

Mr. Clinton responded that they do not have a traffic analysis that gives the number of cars per day. He added that he met with town officials, Tim Thompson and Kyle Fox, and it was determined that such an in-depth review was not necessary.

Mr. Keach responded that everything in the project is designed for the school. The peak hour of operation for the school is going to overlap slightly with a portion of the peak hour of the neighborhood in the morning. During the afternoon peak hour for the school, there is no overlap anticipated because it is in the middle of the afternoon. He added that having a roundabout there will slow traffic down coming into or out of the school.

Board Member Powell asked if the new traffic pattern would lead to people using the subdivision as a cut through.

Mr. Clinton responded that people would be going through a neighborhood that would not save them any time. It would be a “long cut” instead of a “short cut”.

Board Member Powell asked which easement deed Mr. Clinton had previously referred to.

Mr. Clinton responded that it is the Conservation Easement.

Business Administrator Shevenell stated that the board’s legal counsel had said that there is a need to change the language in the easement agreement because it states that certain items, such as utility poles, cannot be installed on the land.

Mr. Clinton responded that all sewer lines and all utilities will be underground.

Board Member Schneider stated that he is concerned about off-hour car racing on the access road. He added that he thought a speed bump would be needed.

Board Member Guagliumi asked if the plan had been brought before the Conservation Commission.

Mr. Clinton responded that they have gone before the Conservation Commission. The overall property is about two hundred acres. Eighty acres will be developed, with the remaining one hundred twenty acres being protected as open space. This open space will be adjacent to other town lands, not just the Conservation Easement. If this intersection is resolved, before the final design they will go back before the Commission.

Vice Chair Barnes asked if there was an expectation of anything being resolved at this meeting, or was the presentation merely fact-finding.

Chairman Ortega explained that tonight’s presentation had been for information. In terms of seeking an endorsement, the board needs to process the information and bring it back as an agenda item at a subsequent meeting. In terms of an endorsement for the seventy homes, they need to process and talk about it at the October 6, 2014 meeting. He added that there is a lot to be considered.

Vice Chair Barnes stated that she thought the October 6<sup>th</sup> meeting is too soon to bring this issue before the board. She added that the impact to the neighbors in that part of town should be considered.

Mr. Clinton responded that the Zoning Board and Planning Board have required them to notify the abutters about the project. That has happened at least twice. He added that at this point he was hoping to have a recommendation, since he had been working with Steve Keach and Matt Shevenell through the school department to answer any questions that may arise.

Vice Chair Barnes stated that the board has received feedback from some of the abutters, and it is not known if their concerns have been addressed. She felt it is important to consult the district's attorneys to make sure they are doing the right thing for the people. She added that it would be irresponsible for a decision to be made at this point.

Board Member Powell stated that it is vague as to how the easement deed is written. He felt that he did not have enough information to make a decision at this time.

Chairman Ortega stated that Mr. Keach's involvement and review of the plans makes them much more palatable to the board. He added that there is a lot to consider and therefore it is reasonable to take a couple of weeks to review and process all the information. He added that the work that has been done and the presentation were appreciated. He stated that if there are any additional charts and pictures available, the board members would appreciate receiving them prior to their next meeting.

Mr. Clinton asked if, other than the easement question, all questions were answered.

Chairman Ortega responded that there are some questions that still have to be resolved by the board.

Mr. Clinton stated that they would follow up with their attorney on the easement language. He asked if he should attend the October 6, 2014 board meeting.

Chairman Ortega responded that his attendance at the meeting would not be required but would be helpful in case there were any follow-up questions.

Mr. Clinton responded that he would be at the October 6, 2104 board meeting.

## **7. Response from Educators about Smarter Balanced Field Testing**

Assistant Superintendent McLaughlin offered a few words of introduction.

- The original field testing began in the spring of 2012.
- The initiative continued again into the spring of 2014.
- There were three purposes for the Smarter Balanced field test:
  - Quality Assurance: The field test was designed to test over nineteen thousand items.
  - To set a benchmark for achievement standards.
  - To help other participating districts to understand the technology of the Smarter Balanced test.
- Five of the six schools in the district were invited to participate in the field test over a two year period. Thorntons Ferry was not invited to take part.

Marsha McGill, Principal at the James Mastricola Upper elementary School, thanked the board for inviting the participants to share their experiences. She explained that James Mastricola Upper Elementary School (JMUES) was the first and only school to participate in the field test for the first year, 2013.

### **James Mastricola Upper Elementary School, 2013 Testing**

Helen Fitzgerald, Technical Integrator at James Mastricola Upper Elementary School, spoke about the Smarter Balanced testing.

- Nancy Rose facilitated the readiness survey to determine their infrastructure at the school. She also gave them a secured icon on the desktop so students could access Smarter Balanced tests.
- Students in grade six math classes were tested in 2013. There were about three hundred regular and special education students involved in the testing.
- Students were provided with individual access codes. Student desktops were individualized, with no two students having the same desktop.

The students were very comfortable using technology.

Nicole Rheault, Language Arts Coordinator, JMUES, spoke about the testing.

- It was a team effort. One test administrator was on the floor giving help to students when needed. One test administrator monitored the test from a computer terminal. A teacher actively monitored the room.
- Students had to answer each question before they moved on to the next question. Students were able to flag questions so they could go back to them. They could make their best guess, move on to another question and then go back to check their work or spend more time on questions that they were not as confident about.
- Students were asked for feedback concerning computer use. The students revealed that they were comfortable using the technology. The students took the testing very seriously and they were completely focused. They wanted to do their best job and were totally engaged in the process.
- All the staff's/team's concerns, questions and feedback were given to the Smarter Balanced staff.

### **Merrimack High School, 2014 testing**

Mark Merrifield, Technical Integration Coordinator, spoke about the field test at Merrimack High School.

- He was informed that he needed to install a secure web browser on all of the computers that would be used for the testing. He was pleased that the software was installed without a problem. Students were tested in the library, where there are about fifty computers.
- The software the proctors used allowed them to start, stop or pause the test. They could observe the progress of the students. Students logged in with a designated password.
- In the future, he would like to keep in mind the availability of computers and scheduling them with a group larger than in the pilot group. He also suggested that headphones should be available for the audio portion of the test, that training for the proctors on the software is done prior to the testing, and that enough time is given to install the browser everywhere it is needed.

Ron Delude, Math Department Head at Merrimack High School

- Students were asked if they wanted to take the test. Twenty-five students participated in the field test.
- All the Math teachers in the department were the proctors. Every teacher in the department was able to proctor over the two-day test.
- Students had no trouble with using the computers.

### **Merrimack Middle School, 2014 Testing**

Cheryl Smith, Math Coordinator at Merrimack Middle School

- Eighth grade students were selected for the Math testing
- Twenty-two students were randomly selected to take the test during the first week of June.
- Ms. Smith and Leslie Warhola, the eighth grade Guidance Counselor, were the testers.
- The test was administrated over two days. The first day was the non-performance test and the second day was the classroom activity, or the performance test.
- A letter was sent home to the parents about two weeks prior to the testing explaining the pilot and giving them the opportunity to call with any questions.
- A Special Education teacher was able to make necessary accommodations for students.
- Nancy Hobbs, the computer teacher, made sure the software was working. There were no problems with the technology.
- The only problem they had was in verifying the student information on the computer. The biggest concern was how the building would be affected when a larger student population is involved in taking the test when it is implemented.

### **Mastricola Elementary School, 2014 testing**

Joanne Green, Special Education Coordinator at James Mastricola Elementary School

- The school was selected to test third grade Math and fourth grade Language Arts.
- She was concerned with having the Special Education students well prepared to fit up with the accommodations they needed.
- All students in third and fourth grades were tested. There were about one hundred students from each grade. There were about fifteen students with Individual Education Plans (IEPs).
- They downloaded a manual on the accommodations to see how it compared to the NECAPS. There were three levels of tools for these accommodations:
  - Universal Tools - accommodations for all students, not necessarily those with an IEP.
  - Designated Supports - for students who need a higher level of support. They need to be recommended by a teacher or a team.
  - The Accommodation Section - for IEP and 504 students who need more support.
- Ms. Green and Michelle Romein, former Language Arts Coordinator and present Assistant Principal at James Mastricola Elementary School, went through the students' IEPs and looked at the accommodations they received on NECAPS to align them with the Smarter Balanced tests. Most of the students did not need anything extra.

- The students were not nervous about the use of the computers. The browser was downloaded to a laptop which would be available in the resource room if needed. Only one student needed that accommodation.
- All students wore headphones. None of the students knew if a particular student needed extra support.
- There was tremendous support from the many adults in the room, including the computer teacher, Administrators, a Special Education teacher, a classroom teacher and a guidance counselor.
- Lessons learned: really look at the accommodations ahead of time, have a backup plan, and check to make sure the accommodations were working.

Ms. Romein added that a team was set up early in the process with the Language Arts Coordinator, Special Education Coordinator, the Computer Technology Coordinator and the Guidance Counselor.

- They downloaded a responsibility time line and a field guide time line.
- The staff took the Smarter Balanced practice test.
- Time was set up for students to take the practice test in the computer lab.
- Lessons learned: the Administrator checklist was helpful, as well as using name tags for the students to log themselves on to the computers.

### **Reeds Ferry Elementary School, 2014 testing**

Kathy Hoppa, Guidance Counselor at Reeds Ferry Elementary School, reported that about fifty fourth grade students were tested in math only.

- They found the Smarter Balanced manuals and support guides were very cumbersome and very difficult to use.
- Through trial and error and many practice runs, they were able to work on problem solving.

Carol Lewis, Education Technical Instructor, spoke about the observations of the test itself and the students' interaction with the test.

- Extra computers were set up in the room in case problems arose.
- There were some students who were absent and because of the test design, were able to take the test together in one room on a specific day. iPads were used because of limited access to administrators in addition to having the use of one computer.
- The test was very user-friendly.

Vice Chair Barnes asked for the length of the testing sessions.

Principal McGill responded that in 2013, because the test ran from the general questions into the performance task, the average time was between one hour and forty-five minutes to a little bit over two hours. In looking back, they would probably separate the general questions from the performance tasks and have a break in between.

Vice Chair Barnes asked if there was a lot of analysis about the content of the test.

Principal McGill responded that they did a content analysis of the 2013 test. They spoke with the students regarding their comfort in using technology.

Vice Chair Barnes asked about analysis of the questions themselves especially compared to the questions on NECAPS.

Principal McGill responded that the rigor of the questions was much higher, questions were multi-stepped, there was a lot of writing, a split screen on the computer was sometimes used, and the performance tests required a lot of training one day prior to the test.

Vice Chair Barnes asked if there was a gap between the content of the questions and the curriculum in the classroom.

Principal McGill responded that what they do with children every day is very similar to what is being asked on the test.

Board Member Powell asked Ms. Fitzgerald about the different desktops for different students, specifically if the layout was different.

Ms. Fitzgerald responded that the layout and the questions were entirely different for each student. There were twelve different performance tests. She added that one of the differences with NECAPS was, after the test, the questions were released, whereas for Smarter Balanced no questions were released after the test.

Board Member Powell stated that he was pleased to hear the testing was well received by the students. He asked if the testing will be able to be done with the current technology and the current availability of the computers.

Assistant Superintendent McLaughlin responded that there had been a technology readiness survey which was sent to all the schools in all the districts in the state to assess where the districts are, relative to technology readiness for the test and to help the State determine the degree to which they could rely on the online portion. The technology readiness survey helped to understand what the requirements would be. He stated that we are not far off from meeting those requirements.

Board Member Powell asked if, with the twelve week window for taking the test, disruption in the school schedule would be eliminated.

Assistant Superintendent McLaughlin responded that he was reluctant to speculate at this time because the Leadership Teams in each building are responsible for scheduling the tests. He added that he thinks the district has a very good plan and the disruption would be minimal by the time it is operational in the spring.

Board Member Schneider asked if, based on the students taking the sample test, the students adapted well to the way the questions were asked.

Principal McGill responded that the students worked right through the testing using the applications. They were very comfortable working on the computers

Mr. Delude responded that sections of the test that were not the performance tack, were pretty similar. The students did not seem to struggle with how to answer the questions.

Board Member Schneider asked if some of the tasks were harder to do on the computer than on paper.

Mr. Delude responded that there was not a lot of graphing or visual representation in the performance tests so there was very little difference.

Assistant Superintendent McLaughlin responded that there are two parts to the test. They are the non-performance and the performance tests. The non-performance test is more reminiscent of the NECAPS. He added that there is no need to change the way teaching is done, since teaching for understanding has been done all along.

Board Member Guagliumi asked about parental feedback after the test.

None of the participants had any parental feedback.

Board Member Guagliumi asked about the testing time of twelve weeks and if the problems “switch out” during that extended period of time.

Assistant Superintendent McLaughlin responded that on the non-performance test, which is adaptive, that problem does not exist.

Chairman Ortega asked the panel what their biggest concerns were as a group and how the board could be supportive in terms of addressing those concerns.

Mr. Merrifield responded that scheduling is a great concern. NECAPS were done in the cafeteria, but in this case the testing is done on computers and the library will have to be used. It is not possible to use the computer labs for testing because other students need to access them during the day. He is concerned about closing the library to all other students while the tests are being given.

Principal McGill added that once the 2013 testing was completed, some of the glitches were worked out. She added that 2014 testing went much more smoothly.

## **8. Consideration of New Air Ventilation System for the Cafeteria at Merrimack High School**

Business Administrator Shevenell recounted from the last meeting that Mr. Gage Perry of the Planning and Building Committee came up with a Plate and Frame assembly design for the heating and ventilation system at the high school.

Business Administrator Shevenell explained that the Heat Wheel that is in place now is an energy recovery unit. It does not meet current codes when it is placed in a kitchen area. Honeywell is bringing in an alternative design which will cost around the same amount, which is five hundred thousand dollars (\$500,000.00).

Jim Lucy from Honeywell introduced Bob Marcotte, who is a Mechanical Engineer with Honeywell. Highlights included:

**Existing Conditions**

- The existing rooftop energy recovery unit (with heat recovery wheel) exhausts air from the kitchen hoods, recovers heat from the exhaust air, and supplies fresh air to the cafeteria.
- Current codes do not allow energy recovery units for kitchen hood exhaust applications. Any upgrade to this unit would be required to be compliant with current codes.
- Kitchen hood exhaust duct work is galvanized steel. Current codes require welded carbon steel or stainless steel ductwork.
- The existing rooftop energy recovery unit is old (1977) and is in need of replacement.

**Proposed Solution**

- Remove existing rooftop energy recovery unit and all the ductwork to the exhaust hoods.
- Provide two new rooftop exhaust fans and new welded stainless steel ductwork; one exhaust fan for each of the kitchen hoods. Provide variable frequency drives to control the speed of new exhaust fans in response to the new kitchen hood control system.
- Provide a new rooftop air handling unit to supply ventilation air to the cafeteria and make-up air to the kitchen hoods. Connect the supply ductwork from the new rooftop air handling unit to the existing supply ductwork which serves the cafeteria.
- Provide a kitchen hood control system which will monitor smoke and heat in the kitchen hoods and will control the speed of the kitchen hood exhaust fans in response to the intensity of cooking operations. The kitchen hood control system will also control the amount of outdoor make-up air that the new rooftop air handling unit supplies.
- Provide new DDC controls for the new rooftop air handling unit and upgrade graphics with a new system. Design new rooftop air handling unit in consideration of previous noise issues associated with the existing rooftop energy recovery unit.

Board Member Schneider asked if the fans would run at a slower speed during the evening, or when there is no cooking in the kitchen.

Mr. Marcotte responded that the fans will run at a slower speed when the kitchen area is not being used. He added that Tom Touseau, Director of Maintenance, will have the ability to change the speed of the fans if necessary.

Board Member Schneider asked if there is another heating source for the cafeteria.

Mr. Marcotte responded that this unit does have a heating coil that will take the air and blow it out at room temperature.

Vice Chair Barnes asked if this will realize a savings to the district.

Mr. Marcotte responded that the net impact is going to be an additional energy usage because right now the unit that saves money is running all the time. This is a system that will save energy when the intensity of the cooking operation is reduced. There are no final numbers on that. They need the kitchen staff's feedback on this.

Vice Chair Barnes stated that the cafeteria is not only for eating, it is used for educational purposes as well. She is therefore concerned with the air quality in the cafeteria.

Mr. Marcotte responded that the new controls will include a carbon dioxide sensor. When it senses an increase in carbon dioxide the unit will automatically increase the amount of ventilation in that space.

Chairman Ortega wanted to know if the other option, the Plate and Frame assembly, was ever discussed and if the differences were understood.

Business Administrator Shevenell responded that the option of the Plate and Frame assembly was based on putting it in the cafeteria area, which cannot be done now. So it was not comparatively discussed.

Mr. Touseau added that the Plate and Frame assembly was looked into, but it was not compliant.

Mr. Marcotte added that they looked at the option of an Air Ventilator system, but more than a dozen units would be needed based on the number of classrooms.

## **9. Reconsideration of the Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) for 2015-2020**

Chairman Ortega reiterated that Business Administrator Shevenell and Maintenance Director Tom Touseau presented the Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) that had been passed by the district's Planning and Building Committee. He added that it was now time for the board to review and amend and move the CIP forward. The next step would be to go to the Town Planning Board.

Vice Chair Barnes moved (seconded by Board Member Schneider) to reduce the Merrimack High School track and field upgrade for 2016-2017 from one million six hundred eighty-five thousand dollars (\$1,685,000.00) to two hundred thousand dollars (\$200,000.00), which would be the cost of the only the track, which showed an established need according to the Planning and Building Committee report.

Vice Chair Barnes stated that we have a decent field, but not a decent track. She would not want the taxpayers to see a spike in their taxes due to the projects involved.

Board Member Schneider wanted to know. If the two projects are pulled apart, he wanted to know the correct cost of completing the field. He wanted to make sure the board knows all the risks involved, as well as being realistic in the budgeting.

Mr. Touseau stated that it is somewhere around two hundred twenty-five thousand dollars (\$225,000.00) to two hundred fifty thousand dollars (\$250,000.00) because some of the expenses are not determined at this time.

Vice Chair Barnes amended the motion to read: Vice Chair Barnes moved to reduce the Merrimack High School track and field upgrade for 2016-2017 from one million six hundred eighty-five thousand dollars (\$1,685,000.00) to two hundred fifty thousand dollars (\$250,000.00).

Board Member Schneider seconded the amended motion.

Board Member Guagliumi asked if there was any new or additional information on the track and field.

Mr. Touseau responded that the track probably has two more years on it before it becomes unrepairable and has to be replaced. That is the track only. The field itself is still managing and there are no issues with it.

Chairman Ortega stated that when the Planning and Building Committee presented the plan and looked at turf as an option for the field, it wasn't necessarily to address a specific issue with the grass field. It was to increase the availability of the space so the teams could all play in the space.

Vice Chair Barnes stated that she is looking at the responsibility to the tax payers.

Board Member Schneider stated that he is uncomfortable with not addressing the track and field at all in 2016-2017. He suggested that in 2017-2018 and 2018-2019 two of the roofing projects could be put together in one year and the field could be done in the opposite year.

Chairman Ortega stated that there is a wide need for the use of the field. He likes the idea of addressing the track, but does not want to lose sight that there is a need for the field.

Chairman Ortega called for the vote on the motion to amend the 2016-2017 track and field expenditure to be two hundred fifty thousand dollars (\$250,000.00) for the track alone.

The motion passed 4-1-0 with Chairman Ortega in opposition.

Board Member Schneider moved (seconded by Board Member Guagliumi) to put the field project on the CIP for 2017-2018 for one million four hundred thirty-five dollars (\$1,435,000.00) and remove the Thorntons Ferry roof project from 2017-2018 and add it to the JMUES roof project in 2018-2019.

Chairman Ortega asked Mr. Touseau if he was comfortable combining the two roofing projects, Thorntons Ferry Elementary School and James Masticola Upper Elementary School, into the same year.

Mr. Touseau responded that at this point in time, he does not have a problem with that.

Vice Chair Barnes stated that based on the adjustments made so far and if this passes, the CIP figures in the operating budget will be:

2016-2017	\$1,432,112
2017-2018	\$2,142,500
2018-2019	\$1,639,285
2019-2020	\$1,484,140

Chairman Ortega stated if we have a field with a potential life of fifteen plus years, we could plan to pay it off in five years which is one third of its lifetime, there would be an estimated annual cost of approximately three hundred thousand dollars (\$300,000.00) to four hundred thousand dollars (\$400,000.00). That might be a funding option to deal with spikes year after year.

Business Administrator Shevenell responded that was correct.

Board Member Powell agreed that he did not like the spikes year after year. If they brought the high school paving forward, there would only be a three hundred thousand dollar (\$300,000.00) spike and then dip back down as opposed to one half million dollar (\$500,000.00) spike.

Board Member Powell called the question.

Chairman Ortega called for a vote on the motion to move the Thorntons Ferry Elementary School roof in the amount of five hundred seventy-six thousand fifty-five dollars (\$576,055.00) into 2018-2019 with the James Masticola Upper Elementary School roof and place the one million four hundred thirty-five thousand dollars (\$1,435,000.00) for the field upgrade into 2017-2018.

The motion passed 5-0-0.

Board Member Powell moved (seconded by Board Member Schneider) to move the Merrimack High School paving for two hundred twenty-five thousand dollars (\$225,000.00) that is currently in 2017-2018 up one year to 2016-2017 which would change the bottom line of 2016-2017 to one million six hundred fifty-seven thousand dollars (\$1,657,000.00) and the bottom line of 2017-2018 to one million, nine hundred seventeen thousand dollars (\$1,915,000.00) and some change.

Board Member Powell reiterated that would level out the spiking to where there would be about a three hundred thousand dollar (\$300,000.00) difference for 2016-2017 and then back down to a three hundred thousand dollar (\$300,000.00) difference for 2018-2019.

Board Member Schneider stated that the bottom line could go from one million six hundred thousand dollars (\$1,600,000.00) to one million six hundred thousand dollars (\$1,600,000.00) to one million nine hundred thousand dollars (\$1,900,000.00) to one million six hundred thousand dollars (\$1,600,000.00), which makes it smoother.

Chairman Ortega called the question to move the Merrimack High School bus loop paving project from 2017-2018 to 2016-2017.

The motion passed 5 -0-0.

Board Member Schneider moved (seconded by Board Member Guagliumi) to approve the Capital Improvement Plan as amended.

The motion passed 5-0-0.

## **10. Updates to the Special Education Manual**

Mr. Fabrizio, Special Education Director, previously came before the board and spoke about Focused Monitoring for the 2014-2015 school year. One of the things he is required to do is to submit to the State of New Hampshire policies, procedures and forms one month prior to the school visitation. He spoke with Superintendent Chiafery and consulted with Santina Thibedeau, the head of Special Education at the Department of Education, who told him the District Special Education Manual had to be updated. He went over the updates:

- Page 2 includes Mr. Fabrizio's name as well as listing the names of Stacy Conty, Meredith Davine, Lisa Frenette and Sherry Goldberg in their new positions.
- Page 4 identifies the NH rules that were amended as of May 15, 2014
- Page 10 contains the Public Policy and Record Retention
- Page 18 discusses Professional Development
- Page 27 had to do with changes in regulations regarding private insurance
- Page 29 lists low-cost or free legal services through the IEP process
- Page 47 is a chart the State asked to be included in the manual.
- Appendix D which is the NH Special Education Safeguards Handbook was amended in December, 2011.

Board Member Powell moved (seconded by Board Member Guagliumi) to accept the updated Special Education Manual and to waive the two week rule.

The motion passed 5-0-0.

## **11. Update on the Educator Performance and Evaluation Process (EPEC)**

Superintendent Chiafery reported that she is working with the Merrimack Teachers Association in bringing forth their new Educator Evaluation and Performance Model. At the end of 2013-2014 a formal evaluation was done by evaluators at Innovations WestEd. Because of that evaluation, we realized we had to go back to the team that put the model together and have them look at the three or four items that had surfaced whereby the model may have to be modified in

some way. In addition we realized we had had thirty-six evaluators in the district and forty-five teachers that had gone through the system and had given a great deal of insight into the model itself.

It became apparent to her and the Leadership Team that it would be in their best interest at the beginning of this year to insure that they had set up a training mechanism whereby all the professional staff would go through the model and be able to ask clarifying questions and get more insight into the model. Her suggestions for this year are:

- They will continue this year to use the model which has been used over the past thirty years
- From October to January they would insure that all professional staff has a day of formal training with Susan Villani from Innovations WestEd to become more familiar with the model.
- The Evaluation Performance Evaluation Committee would be convened if necessary to look in a formal way at those items that were raised to modify the evaluation mechanism.
- The school board and the Teachers Association would be asked to take a formal vote in February with the idea that they would use the remainder of the year to make the model ready.
- In 2015-2016 the new model would be implemented.

Superintendent Chiafery added that she is very hopeful with all the effort made that they will be ready for the vote and that the vote will move us forward. She stated that this model is so important that she feels we need to market it. She is speaking with faculty members so they understand the intent. So far she has received a very positive response.

Vice Chair Barnes asked if there will be the opportunity to see what the evaluation will look like under the new structure.

Superintendent Chiafery responded that they need to make sure they have a bonafied system in place when doing teacher evaluations. The new system has not been formally adopted.

Board Member Guagliumi asked about change management as well as the new structure.

Superintendent Chiafery responded that much has been learned from the educators who participated in the pilot, especially the amount of time spent in dialogue between the evaluator and the evaluatee. There are other elements that need a closer review; therefore, EPEC is extremely important. We are still doing in depth evaluations, we still have a written mediation plan and she felt strongly that we just could not live in a land of two systems, especially one that is not bonafied. Right now it is about training all three hundred twenty professional staff to understand the model.

Board Member Schneider asked who will be taking the vote.

Superintendent Chiafery responded that the vote would be taken in February by the Merrimack Teachers Association and the Merrimack School Board.

Board Member Schneider asked if EPEC is planning on getting back together to look at what has been learned and if the goals set are being accomplished.

Assistant Superintendent McLaughlin stated that the pilot was done in the spring. All the participants were then part of a survey and focus groups. All of the data from that was compiled into a report that is online. The summary of that report was reviewed by EPEC in June. There were no recommendations in the summary, only observations. From those observations EPEC took under consideration which of those observations would be taken for further refinement. There were four or five observations that EPEC decided would be taken under advisement for possible refinement. That process of refinement has already begun because EPEC met last week and began to review those things again and have laid out a timeline for the fall for the actual work on those refinements.

Assistant Superintendent McLaughlin added that there has been a tremendous commitment by the members of the committee. The same group that the board put in place is still operational now.

Chairman Ortega stated that when the pilot evaluation results were shared, he saw more positives than negatives. What we have is a really good starting place. He added that he is quite encouraged by the results.

## **12. Request for New Hampshire School Board Association (NHSBA) Resolutions**

Chairman Ortega received a letter from the NHSBA requesting proposed resolutions be submitted to them by October 24, 2014. The proposed resolutions would then be sent to the Delegate Assembly to be voted on in January. At the October 6<sup>th</sup> school board meeting he will solicit those proposed resolutions. He also announced that Vice Chair Barnes is the School Board's liaison to the NHSBA and she also sits on the NHSBA Executive Board.

## **13. Other**

### **a) Correspondence**

Chairman Ortega announced that a letter was received from the Merrimack High School and Middle School Booster Clubs urging the board to move the track project forward in the CIP and to put it in the operating budget.

### **b) Comments**

Board Member Powell stated how he appreciated Ms. Merchant's comments regarding the use of the upper elementary school during elections. The board is committed to the safety of the students. He added that he is hoping the board will once again meet with the Town Moderator to find a solution to the problems. He added that it may be a consideration to not have school on Election Day.

Vice Chair Barnes stated that she had emailed the SAU office about the voting at the upper elementary school. In the morning students and voters went into the building through the same doors. The board was very clear about what it wanted and that was not part of the plan. She added that pick-up was done as expected and students and voters did not have to mingle. There

needs to be a meeting with the Town Moderator and the Town Council. She felt the board cannot turn its back on the Moderator to take over and run the school building. The board is the governing body and what occurred was unacceptable.

Chairman Ortega stated that there is a joint meeting with the Town Council on October 29, 2014.

Chairman Ortega noted that there were individuals in the audience who are working on their teaching certificates and one of the requirements of their coursework is to attend a school board meeting.

#### **14. New Business**

There was no new business

#### **15. Committee Reports**

Student Representative Crowley reported that the students are excited to start the new school year. She also reported that the high school sports teams swept Bishop Guertin High School last week with a win in boys' soccer, football and volleyball.

Board Member Guagliumi reported that the Budget Committee met on September 9, 2014. They elected a chair, Stan Heinrich, and co-chair, Rick Barnes, of the committee. There were also two candidates who came forward to fill the vacancy on the board. They were Mark Gomes-Casseres and David Ilg. At their next meeting the Budget Committee will be determined which candidate will fill the vacant seat. Also at the next meeting last year's budget will be reviewed.

Board Member Schneider reported that Merrimack Safeguard met on September 11, 2014. It is not yet know if the Merrimack Safeguard grant will be renewed. The prescription Take Back Day will be September 27, 2014. The middle school will be celebrating Red Ribbon Week. There will also be a seminar run on Internet Safety for parents.

Board Member Powell reported that the Healthcare Cost Containment Committee met, but he was not able to attend. He was also not able to attend the Educator Performance and Evaluation Committee meeting. He will get the notes from the meetings and present information at the next board meeting.

Vice Chairman Barnes reported on a program that will be taking place at Merrimack High School on October 21, 2014. This event, which features a speaker on Learning Anxiety, is being supported by the Merrimack School District and the Merrimack Special Education Parent Support Group.

Vice Chairman Barnes also reported that on September 16, 2014 she will be attending the first meeting of the year of the New Hampshire School Board Association.

Chairman Ortega reported that he was contacted by Principal Debbie Woelflein and Principal Ken Johnson who would like to begin the advice and confer process to discuss with the board the employment arrangements under which the administrators work. He will set up a time to meet with them.

**16. Public Comments on Agenda Items**

Paul Wegan of 8 Short Street, Merrimack, spoke about his concerns regarding the new intersection proposal. Mr. Wegan was one of the students attending the meeting to meet the requirements of receiving his teaching certificate.

**17. Manifest**

At 11:00 p.m. Board Member Powell moved (seconded by Board Member Guagliumi) to adjourn the meeting.

The motion passed 5-0-0.