

**Merrimack School Board Meeting
Merrimack Town Hall Meeting Room
November 3, 2014
PUBLIC MEETING MINUTES**

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

1. Call To Order

Chairman Ortega called the meeting to order at 7:35 p.m.

Chairman Ortega led the Pledge of Allegiance.

A moment of silence was observed for Merrimack senior, Sean Moran.

2. Approval of the October 20, 2014 minutes

Vice Chair Barnes moved (seconded by Board Member Guagliumi) to approve the minutes of the October 20, 2014 minutes.

Chairman Ortega requested the following changes to the minutes:

- Page 3 of 14, line 101, change the word “for” to “that”.
- Page 3 of 14, line 108, change the word “at” to “that”.
- Page 4 of 14, line 193, move “-The” to the next line as the next bullet
- Page 6 of 14, line 257, add the words “utilizing the existing buildings” to the end of the sentence.
- Page 7 of 14, line 340 should be COPsync911
- Page 7 of 14, line 342, add “s” to the word “shooting”
- Page 9 of 14, line 399, should read, “...immediately be sent into an incident chat room”.
- Page 10 of 14, line 467, should read, “He envisions that there...”
- Page 10 of 14, line 468, add to the end of the sentence “..and that the training period would be the time to address those revisions”.
- Page 11 of 14, line 506, should be “..compilation of the board members’ ”
- Page 11 of 14, line 509, bullet b should be “Status”
- Page 11 of 14, line 528, should read, “The School District Repair Fund had...”
- Page 11 of 14, line 539, change “and” to “an”
- Page 11 of 14, line 542 should read, “...one thing we have to look through the budget cycle and in preparation of the warrant articles, is the plan for reconstituting the Repair Fund...”
- Page 12 of 14, line 552, remove the “s” from “administrations”
- Page 12 of 14, line 582 should read, “...when the bleachers arrived to be installed”.
- Page 12 of 14, line 585 should read, “...breast cancer volleyball fund raiser game

The motion to accept the minutes of the October 20, 2014 meeting as amended passed 5-0-0.

3. Public Participation

There was no public participation.

4. Recognition of a Merrimack High School Teacher

Principal Johnson of Merrimack High School read the letter that he submitted to the New Hampshire Lottery and New Hampshire Speedway in support of educator Jon Van de Car who has been an automotive and welding instructor at Merrimack High School for thirty-five years. As the winner of the “All-Star Educators” contest, Merrimack High School received a two thousand five hundred (\$2,500) donation and another donation of five hundred dollars (\$500) was awarded to the Vocational Program at Merrimack High School. Principal Johnson added that Mr. Van de Car was unaware of the nomination and that over one thousand educators applied for the award.

Mr. Van de Car thanked the town of Merrimack, the school board and the administration for their support of the Alternative High School program. He also thanked Principal Johnson for the nomination and thanked the staff at the high school for all their support over the years. He added that he will retiring soon and hopes the program will continue after he leaves the district.

Board Members Powell and Guagliumi thanked Mr. Van de Car for all the time he has invested in the program.

Chairman Ortega asked Mr. Van de Car about his unique style of teaching.

Mr. Van de Car responded that he follows the curriculum, but not in the traditional way. He added that the grades the students receives are based on what has been learned when they leave the classroom for the last time.

Principal Johnson added that Mr. Van de Car’s teaching is a demonstration of competencies and is intensely personal.

Chairman Ortega congratulated Mr. Van de Car on behalf of the district.

5. Update Regarding the Merrimack High School Track

Business Administrator Shevenell explained that he had viewed the track on many occasions and it had been a tremendous learning experience for him.

Tom Touseau, Maintenance Director, explained that they would not only be talking about the track itself, but also about some improvements that will probably need to be done that will affect the track in the future. He added that there are two options regarding the track. Option 1 is replacing the track as is. Option 2 is replacing the six lane track and adding two more straight-away lanes making it an eight lane track on the front stretch.

Brian Cornish, of Maine Tennis and Track, stated that the high school track was originally installed in 1999. Mr. Cornish is a service provider for the district and a planning expert. Over the years his company has made some minor repairs to the track but it is beginning to show its age. In some cases, safety is an issue with an older track and though there are no safety issues at the moment, he thought there may be some in the next couple of years.

Mr. Cornish continued, explaining that when a track is no longer safe, it is because there is a lot of delamination, which means the track surface is no longer stuck or adhered to the asphalt below. In his recent visits, it was noticed that lane one, which is the heaviest used lane, is starting to get pretty rough. Some significant patching was done a few weeks ago to address some safety

concerns. He explained that the site test that was done did not show any major asphalt cracking. Leaving the asphalt and going back on top with a newer system would be very risky. Mr. Cornish recommended laying the asphalt when completing the track. Soil testing, compaction testing, and adequate drainage for the site should all be carefully planned to protect the track.

Mr. John Snell, educator and track coach at Merrimack High School, addressed the needs of the school as far as the different surfaces that are being contemplated.

- In the spring, there are approximately two hundred students from the middle school and the high school that use the track.
- Currently the track has six lanes and was designed that way because of the footprint of the school i.e. they cannot go under the power lines.
- It is one of the fastest tracks in the state because it has “wide curves”.
- In the past fifteen years Merrimack has hosted six Division I meets and they have brought in the biggest gates ever.
- The NCAA-USA Track and Field recommends that schools run eight person finals, which have to be on an eight lane track for sprint distant events. This would enable Merrimack to host even more track meets should the district select that option.

Principal Johnson stated that he walked the track with Vice Chair Barnes and it was obvious that things had fallen into disrepair.

Superintendent Chiafery explained that the purpose of the presentation was to gain information as well as to have a discussion about the track because it is on the CIP but was not going to be addressed until 2015-2016. However upon discussion, observation and reflection, the item surfaced to be looked at more carefully. She would therefore like to hear any questions the board may have because she needs guidance from the board if they would like to have this project included in the budget.

Vice Chair Barnes asked about the cost differential between Option 1 (six lanes) and Option 2 (eight lanes).

Mr. Touseau responded that the engineering cost for Option 1 is two hundred ninety thousand dollars (\$290,000) which includes fixing all the drainage problems which would cost forty-eight thousand dollars (\$48,000). The engineering cost for Option 2 is four hundred twenty-eight thousand dollars (\$428,000) and includes the cost of building a retaining wall and having additional site work done which would cost one hundred fifty-three thousand dollars (\$153,000).

Vice Chair Barnes asked if there would be benefits to the football field with the site work being done.

Mr. Touseau responded that there would not be any benefits for the football field by fixing the track.

Vice Chair Barnes asked about the potential of having more track meets. She specifically asked if we do not have them now because of the condition of the track. She asked when Merrimack held its last meet. She also asked how many potential meets could be held with the new track.

Mr. Snell responded that it was 2011 when Merrimack hosted its last State track meet. He added that right now Merrimack hosts between three and five meets as well as the Merrimack Invitational. The middle school hosts three or four meets per year.

Vice Chair Barnes asked Principal Johnson what kind of revenues can be gained from hosting these meets. She added that sales from the Booster Club go back to support the track program, so additional meets will assist in fund raising.

Principal Johnson could not give specific numbers, but stated that by hosting meets, a lot of revenue is brought into the town.

Mr. Touseau explained that the NHIAA takes in all the gate money, which is used to pay the officials.

Vice Chair Barnes asked about the difference between the six lane oval track and the eight lane straight-a-way track.

Mr. Snell explained that it has to do with the number of participants that get into the finals of the meet. If there is a six lane track, only six students can get into the finals. With an eight lane track and straight-a-way, there could be eight students who get into the finals. In the next few years the scoring charts will be based on eight participants in the finals. We would not be able to host meets that require an eight-place final because we could not provide the scoring opportunities if we have a six lane track.

Board Member Powell asked how many schools in New Hampshire have eight lane tracks.

Mr. Snell responded that both Nashua high schools have eight lane tracks, as do Londonderry, Bedford and Manchester Memorial School.

Board Member Powell asked if the track is done now, are there any issues with doing the field at a later date, as far as damaging the track.

Mr. Cornish responded that even though most projects are done from the inside out, this one will be done from the outside in. The track can be bridged, keeping in mind that a lot of earth work goes into repairing a field. It may be somewhat messy, but it can be done without significantly disturbing the track.

Board Member Powell asked if there is any kind of protection/covering that could be put over the track during the winter.

Mr. Cornish responded that not plowing the track in the winter is how to protect it.

Board Member Powell asked if the bleachers need to be relocated and/or if there is any other work that has to be done when the retaining wall is constructed.

Mr. Touseau responded that the bleachers will remain where they are.

Board Member Powell asked about the time frame of the project from start to finish.

Mr. Cornish replied that it would take the summer, about ten weeks.

Mr. Touseau added that the project, if accepted, needs to be put on Mr. Cornish's calendar as soon as possible so it can be put on his company's calendar.

Mr. Cornish added that his company plans and helps with the project, but the site work and paving etc. are all contracted out. Those contractors need to know the schedule as soon as possible.

Board Member Schneider asked if it ever becomes a problem when the track has too many patched areas.

Mr. Cornish responded that patching is very common, but it is not a permanent larger-scale correction. He added that at this point safety concerns have to be addressed.

Board Member Schneider asked if the longevity of the material have improved since the track was built in 1999.

Mr. Cornish responded that he did not know if the formula has changed but their methods and techniques continue to improve.

Mr. Touseau asked Mr. Cornish to explain the plan for the new track.

Mr. Cornish responded that his first recommendation was to strip off the track surface and haul it away. Then they would pulverize the asphalt down to a useable gravel which would bring up the entire plane of the track. They would probably add a little gravel on top of the asphalt, recompact it, add new pavement and a new track surface.

Mr. Cornish explained that there are three levels of track surface. The first is $\frac{3}{4}$ inch, which is there now. The next step up is $\frac{1}{2}$ inch, going from a five level system to a seven level system. The third is the colored track, which is not cost effective.

Board Member Schneider asked if there would be an issue with water seeping between the existing track and the repaired areas.

Mr. Cornish responded that when they do their patching they use the same rubber, but a different adhesive that works better in colder temperatures. He added that these track surfaces are designed to accept moisture.

Board Member Schneider asked if the adhesive had been the problem underneath the current track.

Mr. Cornish agreed that the current adhesive had deteriorated significantly over the last couple of years.

Board Member Guagliumi asked if safety issues prevented Merrimack from hosting meets during the last couple of years.

Mr. Snell responded that it had definitely been safety issues that prevented Merrimack from hosting meets. In 2011 they had to move the high jump mat and stop the meet because as the students were preparing to jump, part of the track had lifted up.

Board Member Guagliumi asked if, from a safety point, the track would be ready in the spring.

Mr. Snell responded that with all the patching that has been done, meets could probably be held in Merrimack in the spring.

Mr. Cornish responded that he will come to Merrimack in the spring to make sure the track is safe.

Mr. Touseau added that they rely on the coaching staff to inform them if there is a safety problem with the track. He added that he is pretty sure there may be some issues over the winter, so they will walk the track before any meets are scheduled in the spring.

Board Member Guagliumi asked if the prices quoted include the cost of the asphalt for both Options 1 and 2.

Mr. Cornish responded that the numbers he provided to Mr. Touseau include all asphalt on the runway, long jump, triple jump, pole vaulting and high jump areas.

Board Member Guagliumi asked what should be done to protect the track when people with cleats have to get across the track to play football on the field.

Mr. Cornish responded that there are a number of crossing areas that are protected by a heavy-duty urethane roll-out mat. He added that these mats are so heavy, they are usually put out at the beginning of football season and removed at the end of football season.

Mr. Touseau added that right now there are two crossing areas. When the field is being mowed, the crossing areas are used so the track will not be disturbed.

Mr. Snell added that of the two crossing areas one is for the home team and one is for the visiting team. He stated that the football teams are very good about using the cross over mats.

Board Member Powell asked about the warranty for the new track.

Mr. Cornish responded that California Products provide a five-year warranty on their materials and his company provides a five-year warranty on the workmanship.

Chairman Ortega stated that he felt it was time to address Superintendent Chiafery's question about putting the cost of the new track in the 2015-2016 budget.

Board Member Powell responded that he felt they need the options laid out. He would personally like to see the cost of the new track in the 2015-2016 budget. The need for it has been demonstrated, but his concern is whether or not the track will be all set in the spring, with safety being the biggest issue.

Superintendent Chiafery asked Board Member Powell if he favored Option 1 or Option 2.

Board Member Powell responded that he was undecided, since there is such a large price difference in the two Options.

Vice Chair Barnes stated that she would lean towards Option 2 because of the opportunities it brings to the district. With the eight lane final, there would be more opportunities to host more meets.

Board Member Schneider stated that he would go with the eight lane track because it gives the biggest flexibility. He would like to see the details of what the costs would be. He added that he wanted to know if some piping could be installed under the track to prevent any damage to it when the field is redone.

Mr. Cornish stated that a lot of the drainage is designed for the track with the synthetic turf fields. Those fields are designed to drain straight down at an unbelievable rate.

Business Administrator Shevenell added that Mr. Touseau had a conversation with Keach-Nordstrom Associates. The higher costs in the CIP includes the improvements in drainage. Option 2 also contains the cost of the retaining wall and the fence. He added that he thinks the district is comfortable from a budgetary standpoint with these numbers.

Board Member Guagliumi stated that she is in support of putting this in the 2015-2016 budget, but is not sure about the two options. If the six lane track is becoming obsolete, she may be in favor of the eight lane straight-away.

Superintendent Chiafery stated that in her meetings with Mr. Touseau and Mr. Cornish, they were trying to do projections for fifteen to seventeen years to see what they would yield.

Chairman Ortega stated that he supports seeing this in the budget. His main concern is the safety of the students, more than the opportunity to host meets. He thinks it will be helpful to give the board more time to research this and understand what the implications are twenty years from now if we still have a six lane track versus an eight lane track. He added that Mr. Touseau tries to maximize the life of all of the assets we have and he has done that with the track. He thanked Mr. Touseau for doing all that he does and that the district appreciates all that he does to keep the board fiscally conservative.

Board Member Schneider asked what the cost would be to put the two lane straight-a-way on the other side of the track so a retaining wall would not be necessary near the bleachers.

Mr. Snell responded that there may be other options out there, but they would probably cost just as much, if not more. He explained that the issue of moving the two extra lanes into the inside of lane one is that complications arise when trying to do events on the oval as well as on the straight-a-way.

Superintendent Chiafery would like to have graphics available and to have all the costs laid out. She asked for any additional information between now and the next meeting on November 17, 2014 so budgetary decisions can be made.

6. First Reading of Policy- Student Use of Information

Assistant Superintendent McLaughlin noted that last year he and Ms. Nancy Rose came before the school board and presented the Teacher Use of Information Technology Policy and tonight they were presenting the Student Use of Information Technology Policy. He stated that both of these policies were modeled on Responsible Use. Both policies recognize that in a 21st century technology environment we have to optimize the use of technology for educational purposes and then guide student behavior to use technology responsibly.

Ms. Rose stated that this policy is aligned with the Employee Policy that was done last year and there is a focus on responsibility regarding the use of Information Technology that is either in or related to school. It allows the district to provide a safe and secure learning environment, which then alludes to the anti-bullying policy, which is of great concern in this time of social media, texting etc. She added that this policy has more of an emphasis on the use of different kinds of web resources.

Assistant Superintendent McLaughlin and Ms. Rose read the Student Use of Information Technology.

Board Member Schneider asked if this policy entails any devices that a student uses for anything that might be construed as part of their school activity.

Assistant Superintendent McLaughlin stated that if we think in terms of the focus on responsible behavior, then it is the behavior that triggers the policy, not necessarily the tool. Any use of the tools that cause behaviors that are damaging would be subject to this policy.

Board Member Schneider asked how this policy can be enforced or supported, and where the line is drawn for the confidentiality of students.

Ms. Rose responded that is why there is a cross-reference to the anti-bullying law, which is that the district seeks to provide a safe and secure environment. So any incidents of bullying that occur outside of the school district that impact the district environment can be addressed by the school district because the district states that it seeks to provide a safe and secure environment. For example, if an incident were to occur on a Saturday with a home cell phone, but it caused disruption on Monday in the school, then that becomes an incident that can be investigated. If they are at school doing something on school grounds that is causing an issue, it is the behavior, not the device that becomes the issue.

Board Member Schneider asked if there are any other behaviors outside the scope of bullying that are not appropriate through social media.

Ms. Rose responded that it is more about responsible use of the technology, no matter where you are and to make it understood that even if you are doing something outside of the school district or outside of the time of the district, if it impacts the school environment, you can be held responsible.

Board Member Guagliumi asked about the appropriateness of purchasing merchandise on line. She would like to see it more defined as well as the use of a thumb drive.

Ms. Rose responded that with the thumb drive, it would be the same as if the students mailed something to themselves. The device is not the problem as much as the intent.

Vice Chair Barnes asked if the policy has been reviewed by an attorney.

Assistant Superintendent McLaughlin responded that an attorney from the New Hampshire School Board Association (NHSBA) has not reviewed this policy but there are a number of legal references on the policy. He added that the Employee Policy had been vetted by the attorney, but as of yet this one has not.

Vice Chair Barnes stated that at the last NHSBA meeting there was discussion on the legal rights to access personal devices of students without something like a court order or warrant. She added that she is in favor and supports the rest of the policy, but there may be challenges with the Cautions to Users item number 2.

Board Member Powell asked about Cautions to Users item number 4, which speaks to the use of Information Technology as a right. He would view it as a privilege.

Ms. Rose responded that they deliberately changed it in the Employee Policy to a right because they want the educators to use it in their work and in their instruction.

Chairman Ortega stated that he thought this was one of cleanest first readings of a policy since he had been involved with the board. On page 2, Code of Conduct/Prohibited Activities, number 3, he asked about the definition of “unauthorized”.

Ms. Rose responded that is somewhat correct. Games tend to be blocked as a rule but occasionally they are asked to open them at a site. It is not that it’s obscene or abusive or criminal, but it is not good for the computers.

Chairman Ortega stated that on page 3 at the bottom, the bullet that refers to “appropriate online behavior, including proper interactions...”, the words “appropriate and proper” are interpretable. He asked how it is envisioned to deal with the grey area of interpretation.

Assistant Superintendent McLaughlin responded that much of this policy is derived from the Employee Use of Information Technology Policy and the issue of “appropriate” and “proper” came up prior to accepting that policy. He added that they struggled with how tightly things are defined. The legal guidance was that the terms “appropriate” and “proper” should not be over-defined.

Ms. Rose added that this policy provides a learning opportunity for the students. It is not a “gotcha” policy where one mistake is the only one you get to make. It is important that starting in kindergarten students learn what “appropriate behavior” means.

7. O’Gara Tennis Court Study

Vice Chair Barnes gave a report on the status of the O’Gara Tennis Courts. Highlights included:

- In light of the last joint meeting with the Town Council (“Council”), Vice Chair Barnes made some phone calls to get some information on the tennis courts.
- There was a professional engineering opinion that the tennis courts did not belong on O’Gara Drive. Neither the school district nor the Town of Merrimack possesses the documentation of this opinion.
- In her opinion, a fresh look at the O’Gara site should be made, including its maintenance, management plan and its future.
- The place to begin is a joint engineering study by Keach, Nordstrom Assoc. based on what the current facilities are built on with the intent to co-sponsor the study with the Council.
- She felt there should be one more joint meeting with the Council in the spring that goes into detail on how we can move forward. By having this discussion in the spring, we can plan for the CIP and for any district responsibility regarding the long term management of the site.

Board Member Powell asked if Vice Chair Barnes was making a motion.

Vice Chair Barnes responded that there have been at least three meetings where they have discussed the tennis courts. She thought it would be appropriate to have a motion to have a joint meeting with the Town Council and have this issue at the top of the agenda. This meeting would be hosted by the district. Both parties would be discussing the 2016-2017 budget because the agreement on the easement is in effect until 2018.

Vice Chair Barnes moved (seconded by Board Member Guagliumi) that a joint meeting with the Town Council be held in the spring, with the focus on what the district can do to better the O'Gara Drive area. The board should engage professional engineers to come up with a long term strategy plan.

Board Member Guagliumi stated that she thought it was a good idea to have a meeting with the Town Council twice a year. She added that it makes sense to partner with the Council on how to move forward on the use of this property and other appropriate items that may affect the community.

Board Member Schneider stated that at the last joint meeting the Council indicated that the Town Manager had gone to the state to talk to them about the tennis courts. Therefore it would behoove the district to not have a joint meeting until the Council hears back from the state.

Vice Chair Barnes responded that if there is a meeting in the spring, and the joint engineering study is approved, we still need a meeting in the spring in order to go forward with budgets in the fall.

Board Member Powell asked when the joint study would take place.

Vice Chair Barnes responded that the study would take place the summer of 2015 so that the district can plan for the CIP starting the fall of 2015.

Board Member Powell noted that money would be needed for the study in this upcoming budget.

Vice Chair Barnes stated that the district budgets for consultants to come in all the time. Her guess is that it would cost about two thousand dollars (\$2,000) based upon some past experiences in the district.

Board Member Powell disagreed, stating that the consolidation site study was just done and that it had to be budgeted for in advance and so something like this has to be earmarked in the budget. He is not in favor of putting any money towards a study in this upcoming budget. He also referred to the fact that the Council went to the state about this and there has been no word about the state's opinion. He added that the district has no say until the easement comes up for renewal. We have basically signed over our rights to that property to the town and the town has to deal with the state and/or Federal government. We cannot dictate what they should be doing with that space and therefore it would be unfeasible for the district to spend any money on a study.

Vice Chair Barnes responded that the goal is not to dictate, but the goal is to communicate and work together towards a mutual beneficial end. This has gone on for three years and there has

been no vision of what a mutual beneficial end would look like. In her opinion, having a partnership and working together with the town is collaboration, not dictation.

Board Member Powell stated that perhaps dictation was not the correct word. The point he was trying to make was that the district has no say in what is done with that property until the easement comes up for renewal in 2018.

Board Member Schneider stated that we know that something has to be done with the tennis courts, but there are other things around it, such as the skate park and the ice skating rink, that the town does not want to lose. There needs to be a good, frank and open discussion. We need to let the Council follow through with their next step, hear what the results are, and report back to the district.

Vice Chair Barnes stated that there needs to be a meeting in the spring to find out what the Council's intends to do. She added that she felt they should go back to the table with the Council and have a dialogue and start talking about what is best for all parties.

Chairman Ortega stated that he is supportive of meeting more frequently with the Town Council. He gave a summary of some of the details of this situation and his feelings:

- As far as the tennis courts, he stated that we have granted an easement roughly forty years ago to the town. They had a desire to put tennis courts on the property. They applied for and received a grant. With that funding, the town was able to construct the tennis courts on the district's property. That agreement is between the town and the Federal government and the state and it allows for an alternate use.
- The tennis courts have been in disrepair for a long time. The school board looked at the easement agreement and found that the property was not being kept up to the standard. At the school board's request, Chairman Ortega went before the Council. The Council took action. They made the decision to not invest any money or time into the tennis courts. They had an option to look at alternate uses. The Council said that they would pursue that and get back to the school board.
- At the last joint meeting the Council gave an update, stating that the site was visited and they were waiting for guidance from the state.
- He added that he thought the Council had done everything the district had asked them to do to the best of their ability. He believes that the Council expects to hear from the state within six months, so having a joint meeting in March may be a good time to get an update from them.
- He added that the agreement also states that the property be returned to the district in a pristine, useable fashion. In 2018, if there is going to be a turnover of that land, there is nothing that says that another easement agreement could not be struck for the parcel that contains the basketball courts, skate park and ice rink minus the tennis court property.
- To him, a study of the property is really pertinent to the district as it relates to 2018.
- He added that he would support the motion on the basis of making a request to the Council Chair for a meeting in six months' time, roughly in March.

The motion passed 5-0-0.

8. Guaranteed Maximum Insurance Rate for 2015-2016

Business Administrator Shevenell stated that by this time of year, the district receives a Guaranteed Maximum Rate (GMR) for insurance from the HealthTrust in order to build the Operating Budget. It makes up quite a significant percentage of the budget.

Currently we are looking at an overall 4.4% increase in the health insurance line. That is the GMR that will be budgeted for in the 2015-2016 budget. In April we will find out exactly what the rate is. It could be higher, but the hope is it will be lower.

Board Member Schneider asked what the GMR was last year.

Business Administrator Shevenell responded that the GMR last year was pretty close to the 4.4%.

9. Other

a) Correspondence

Vice Chair Barnes reported on receiving an email from a citizen who was looking to have a regular volleyball group use one of the district buildings for their games. She referred the person to the Maintenance Department because it falls under Policy and Procedures.

Board Member Powell reported on receiving an email from a parent regarding the bus stop on Linden Way. He referred her to Business Administrator Shevenell to set up a meeting with the Bus Stop Committee.

b) Comments

There were no comments.

10. New Business

There was no New Business to report.

11. Committee Reports

Vice Chair Barnes reported on the District Parents Group meeting on October 29, 2014. They recapped their fund raisers year-to-date. They discussed future topics for the year including fund raising and making parents aware of the vocational technical programs that are available to all the students.

Vice Chair Barnes reported that the Grater Woods Sub-Committee was scheduled to meet in October, but there was not a quorum.

Board Member Powell reported that the Educator Performance and Evaluation Committee (EPEC) met. The first evaluator training session will be held on November 12, 13 and 14. Also, educator training is expected to begin in December. There were some minimal modifications to the tools and the process that were suggested as part of the spring pilot. Those modifications have been made. A final review of these modifications will occur later in November.

Board Member Schneider reported that the Planning and Building Committee met on October 27, 2014. There was discussion on the NESDEC report and they went over the charge the board had given them. Their next meeting will be on November 10, 2014. He thinks that they are going to request they be put on the agenda for the next board meeting so this report can be addressed.

12. Public Comments on Agenda Items

There were no Public Comments on Agenda Items

13. Manifest

At 9:45 p.m. Vice Chair Barnes moved (seconded by Board Member Guagliumi) to adjourn the meeting.

The motion passed 5-0-0.