

**Merrimack School Board Meeting  
Merrimack Town Hall Meeting Room  
February 4, 2013  
PUBLIC MEETING MINUTES**

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

**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 January 14, 2013 and January 16, 2013 and January 22, 2013 Minutes**

Board Member Barnes moved (seconded by Board Member Schneider) to approve the minutes of the January 14<sup>th</sup>, January 16<sup>th</sup> and January 22<sup>nd</sup> meetings.

January 14, 2013 Budget Workshop Minutes

Board Member Barnes requested the following changes to the minutes:

- Page 2 of 11, paragraph 2, remove the word “Senior” before “Assistant Principal”.
- Page 3 of 11, paragraph 2, first sentence, change “participate in” to “participate at”.
- Page 6 of 11, paragraph 8, 2<sup>nd</sup> sentence, change “It” to “He”.

Board Member Schneider requested the following changes to the minutes:

- Page 5 of 11, paragraph 4 from the bottom, should read, “Board Member Schneider asked Business Administrator Shevenell to provide the Board members with the cost of the four high school teaching positions that were being eliminated prior to the January 16<sup>th</sup> meeting”.
- Page 6 of 11, paragraphs 5 & 6, correct the spelling of LINK to LYNC.

Chairman Ortega requested the following changes to the minutes:

- Page 2 of 11, paragraph 4 from the bottom, first sentence, at the end add, “...awards in that the students would receive certificates instead of medals.”
- Page 3 of 11, change the word “budgeted” to “budget”.
- Page 5 of 11, paragraph 4, second sentence should be “...combined French IV and French V...”
- Page 5 of 11, paragraph 5, last sentence change “roll” to “role”
- Page 6 of 11, paragraph 1, should be “...Nancy Rose who is acting Director of Library/Media and Technology services”.
- Page 8 of 11, change “Signa” to “Cigna”.
- Page 8 of 11, paragraph 5 from the bottom, should be 2014-2015.

January 16, 2013 Budget Workshop Minutes

Vice Chairman Powell requested the following changes to the minutes:

- Page 1 of 5, last paragraph should be “2013-2014 budget”.
- Page 5 of 5, paragraph 1, last sentence should be “due diligence”.

Chairman Ortega requested the following changes to the minutes:

- Page 2 of 5, paragraph 2 from the bottom, last sentence, add “and that we should not defer this project”.
- Page 4 of 5, paragraph 3, first sentence replace “past” with “passed”.
- Page 4 of 5, paragraph 5 from the bottom, second sentence should begin with “However,”
- Page 4 of 5, paragraph 5 from the bottom, last sentence, add the word “also” after “balance”.

#### January 22, 2013 Board Minutes

Vice Chairman Powell requested the following changes to the minutes:

- Page 5 of 18, section 7, second bullet, correct the amount of the reduction to \$218,000.00
- Page 5 of 18, bullet 3, should be “Contracted psychological services added “\$100,000.00”.
- Page 7 of 18, paragraph 4 from the bottom, correct Richard Hastings’s title to “the School District Treasurer”.
- Page 10 of 18, paragraph 1, change the amount to \$67,477.00.

Chairman Ortega requested the following changes to the minutes:

- Page 3 of 18, paragraph 4 from the bottom, change the word “tracks” to “trails”.
- Page 4 of 18, paragraph 8, should read “...actual easement would be discussed and decided at a subsequent meeting”.
- Page 7 of 18, paragraph 2, second sentence, change the word “process” to “revised budgeted schedule this year...”
- Page 7 of 18, Section 8 after paragraph 3, insert, “School Board Member Barnes moved (seconded by Vice Chairman Powell) to authorize the Administration to open an account to allow non-state funds to be deposited for the purpose of paying memberships which may or may not have lobbying in their organizational structure.”
- Page 8 of 18, paragraph 7, should read, “Chairman Ortega stated that he has concerns about this part of the discussion based on the attorney’s rendering”
- Page 8 of 18, replace the attorney’s rendering with: *“Note that unless a non-lapsing fund is properly created and any balance left in this account at the end of the fiscal year could not be spent. This will obviously mean additional work for your business office, opening and closing a separate account each year and making sure that local tax revenue is deposited directly into this account. However, this seems to us to be the easiest way to avoid a violation of RSA:15:5”.*
- Page 12 of 18, paragraph 3 from the bottom, correct the amount of the budget to \$56,700.
- Page 14 of 18, paragraph 5, replace “asked” to “suggested”.

The motion to accept the minutes passed 4-0-0.

### **3. Public Participation**

There was no public participation.

### **4. Consent Agenda**

Assistant Superintendent McLaughlin presented the following teacher resignation for approval:

- Shefali Kadakia, Technology Education Teacher at Merrimack Middle School

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

The motion passed 4-0-0.

## **5. Parent Involvement Survey (District Summary)**

Mr. John Fabrizio, Director of Special Services, introduce Trish Swonger and Barbara Publicover, members of the Parent Support Group. He explained that the Parent Involvement Survey is a requirement of the U.S. Department of Education and is out of the Office of Special Education. It goes along with the Individuals with Disabilities Act. This is the 5<sup>th</sup> year Merrimack has done the survey. It allows states and districts to measure how parents are receiving Special Education services, i.e. what involvement do they have in improving the child's education and how they are being serviced. There is one survey for students between 3 and 5 years old, and another survey for students 6 to 21 years old.

Ms. Trish Swonger gave the history of the survey. Highlights included:

- The Parent Involvement State Committee began meeting in 2005. They worked and continue to work with Measurements, Inc., to collect, process, and validate the data.
- The survey was designed over a three-year period.
- Merrimack chose the Rausch method, which is a statistically proven method for data collection and measurement to show improvement. This method sets us apart from other districts by the quality of the data and the quality of the tools we use as a measure.
- The Federal Department of Education decided it was a necessary requirement to have a questionnaire because there has been a proven link between parent involvement, especially in Special Education, and the quality of student education and the quality of our schools.
- Every year the committee meets to review how the survey went, and what the glitches are and how we can best, as a state, support the districts in getting their surveys out and getting better responses.
- Merrimack has succeeded by a large amount in the return of surveys. Usually the return numbers are 14% to 16%, but Merrimack returns are 30% or more.
- Merrimack is annually recognized for the forward thinking actions taken to involve the parents and make them aware of the survey.
- The committee will meet in Concord in March.

Ms. Barbara Publicover spoke about the Parent Involvement Committee. Highlights included:

- About four years ago the Administration approached the committee regarding the survey, including what it meant, what the parents thought about it, what could be done to make some of the areas better.
- Throughout the last four years they have had many workshops, including transitioning out of high school, evaluations, and social and emotional workshops that the survey showed parents wanted to hear about.
- Every year when the survey comes out, the committee looks at it to see how parents feel about the services they and their children are receiving.
- If you look at the five-year history there have been some tremendous gains.
- The results of the survey are made public through their website.
- The committee uses the survey to make things better for special education parents and children.

Mr. Fabrizio stated that Merrimack has a high return rate of surveys and exceeded the state target of participation. Amazing gains have been seen in almost every area of the survey from 2008 to 2012. This is a credit to the Parent Involvement Group, David St. Jean (former Director of Special Services) and the great work all the buildings are doing in taking the survey seriously.

Mr. Fabrizio continued by asking “What’s next?” Working with the pre-school population is an area of focus, holding pre-school information days under the direction of Sheila Demers, the Pre-school Coordinator for the district. Hopefully a pre-school support group will be formed. In looking at the survey answers/questions, the results are not as high for the pre-school age children as the 6-21 year olds. There seems to be a disconnect with the pre-school. The survey will determine where the problem areas are.

Vice Chairman Powell asked what the pre-school ages are as well as the “regular” school ages.

Mr. Fabrizio responded that the pre-school group is for ages 3 to 5. The other group is from ages 6 to 21.

Vice Chairman Powell suggested a combined parent support group for all the ages, from pre-school through age 21.

Board Member Barnes stated that a pre-school support group is a great idea because the needs are different for pre-school and ages 6 through 21. She asked for the name of the web site used by the Parent Support Group.

Ms. Publicover replied that the website is [www.merrimackpact.com](http://www.merrimackpact.com). She added that information is also on the district website and that minutes of the meetings are available for people to read.

Ms. Swonger added that the survey is online in multiple languages and interpreters are available for those who need them.

Board Member Schneider stated that he thinks the biggest issue is the lack of knowledge about the pre-school Special Services program. It is important for the public to know that the program exists and that there are evaluations and programs for these children. He added that the services provided by Merrimack are outstanding.

Chairman Ortega thanked the group for the comprehensive information. He thanked Ms. Swonger and Ms. Publicover for the work of the Parent Support Group, stating that it is a model for other districts in the state.

## **6. Board Response to Draft Warrant Articles for the 2013 Warrant**

Chairman Ortega explained that at the last board meeting the board looked at a number of Warrant Articles that will be put on the ballot. They recommended a few of them for adoption and deferred a few of them. He added that tonight the remaining Articles would be discussed so the board can put forward the recommended Articles.

Chairman Ortega recused himself from the discussion on Warrant Article 5 because his wife is employed by the Merrimack School District. He turned the position of Chairman over to Vice Chairman Powell.

*Warrant Article #5: Shall the District approve the cost items included in the collective bargaining agreement reached between the School Board and the Merrimack Teachers Association which calls for the following net changes in salaries and benefits at the current staffing levels and further to raise & appropriate the sum of \$768,400 for the current fiscal year, such sum representing the additional cost attributable to the increases in salaries and benefits required by the new agreement over those that we paid at the current staffing levels?*

| <i>Year</i> | <i>Estimated Amount</i> |
|-------------|-------------------------|
| 2013-2014   | \$768,400               |
| 2014-2015   | \$556,000               |
| 2015-2016   | \$460,288               |

Business Administrator Shevenell explained the end result of the deliberations with the Merrimack Teachers Association (MTA). They came up with an idea of changing the plan design in order to save both them (MTA) and the district money. Points made were:

- The contract, which is for three years, includes a 2.99% raise in the first year, a 2.75% increase in the second year, and a 2.75% increase in the third year.
- The contract was built on the contract that was approved two years ago, when the board and the MTA came together to look at the health insurance increase costs and the increasing burden on the district and the members of the MTA.
- The budget amounts for three years would be \$768,400 for 2013-14, \$556,937 for 2014-15 and \$462,288 for 2015-16. These amounts go down each year because of the additional healthcare cost concessions by the teachers.
- The teachers are currently paying 11% of the HMO plan. We used to have them tied to the Point of Service (The Blue Choice plan), which is a more expensive plan, but we got them to agree to just have the benchmark be the HMO plan.
- In 2013-2014 the teachers are going from 11% to 12%. They are giving up a percent in the first year. In 2014-2015 the teachers are going from 12% to 13% and the third year from 13% to 15%.
- In year two the health insurance bill level would be lower by \$105,291 and in year three the health insurance bill would be lower by \$222,000.
- This plan deletes Pay For Performance and reallocates those funds to make an adjustment in the salary column chart. It also allows us to take \$105,291 for district directed initiatives and to assign teachers to a particular role over and above their classroom work. Also, every year the principals of the schools come up with lists of the things that have to be done, and that money is allocated for that specific purpose in the building and in the curriculum.
- The dental plan is being enhanced and is competitive in the area.
- Board Member Barnes and Vice Chairman negotiated the teachers' contract with on behalf of the Board. Board Member Barnes was the lead negotiator.

Board Member Barnes listed the areas that were looked at in comparison to Merrimack. They were Amherst, Auburn (grades K-8), Bedford, Bow, Dresden (Hanover), Exeter, Hollis (K-6), Hollis/Brookline (grades 7-12), Londonderry, Oyster River and Windham. They looked at the average of salaries for this compiled data. She added that Merrimack needs to be competitive with other towns. Merrimack is not in a position to “catch up” with some of the other towns, but she feels that we do have the best educational preparation and experience. She noted that if teachers are paying for more health care, they do not feel like they are getting a raise at all. She felt that we need

to keep our teachers and provide for them as best we can in order to keep competitive, or our teachers will go elsewhere. For these reasons, Board Member Barnes stated that Article 5 is very important. She added that the MTA and the District came to the table with respect, understanding and value of each other's roles in this contract.

Board Member Barnes stated that the teachers approved the contract this week.

Business Administrator Shevenell noted in last year's contract, or prior to that, we had increased the number of early retirement from seven to ten. This contract went back to seven. He felt that this was a key component to the contract.

Board Member Barnes moved (seconded by Board Member Schneider) to recommend Warrant Article 5.

Board Member Schneider noted that we need to keep the teachers we have and attract other teachers as well. The percentage of increase and the amount we are spending on the overall compensation is adequate for what we need to do and it is important that we do it. Trying to use our money in an optimized fashion is helping and affecting the teachers.

Vice Chairman Powell stated that he appreciated the efforts of the MTA to come to a common ground, as well as the efforts of the Board.

The motion passed 3-0-0.

Warrant Article 6: *Shall the District, if Article 5 is defeated, authorize the School Board to call one special meeting, as its option, to address Article 5 cost items only? (Majority vote required)*

Business Administrator Shevenell explained that Article 6 authorizes the board, if they choose, to go back to negotiations with the MTA if the contract is defeated. In that case, there would be another deliberative session, another meeting and another vote. This would prevent having to go through an appeal to the Superior Court.

Vice Chairman Powell moved (seconded by Board Member Barnes) to recommend Warrant Article 6.

Vice Chairman Powell spoke to the motion, saying that it is standard practice to go back into negotiations if we choose to do that.

The motion passed 4-0-0.

Article 8: *Shall the district see if the Town will vote to authorize, indefinitely until rescinded, to retain year-end unassigned general funds in the amount not to exceed, in any fiscal year, two and one half percent (2.5%) of the current fiscal year's net assessment, in accordance with RSA 198:4-b, II. Such fund balances retained may only be used to reduce the tax rate or for emergencies to be approved by the Department of Education under RSA 32:111.*

Business Administrator Shevenell explained that this article gives the same rights and privileges to school districts that municipalities have. This is a brand new article that the School Administration Association has put on the docket for some time to put districts and communities in a more stable

financial footing to have the correct reserves that they should have in case something happens. It also talks about reducing the tax rate. He added that there is no law that gives towns the authorization to do this, but there is for schools. There is also no law that says it can be used only to reduce taxes or use for emergencies. He added that he thought it would be best not to be the earliest adopter of this Article, and would like to see what the other districts do. Currently 30% to 40% of the school districts are putting this Article on the ballot. He would like to wait a year and look at it again in the next fiscal year.

Superintendent Chiafery stated that she asked New Hampshire School Boards Association Executive Director Tom Comstock and Attorney Christina to survey other districts regarding Article 8. Thirteen districts responded; only two districts (Timberlane and Goffstown) are moving forward with a similar Article. She added that the Article was a good idea, but she would like to wait and see. There are things that have to be answered.

Chairman Ortega moved (seconded by Board Member Schneider) to remove Warrant Article 8 from the ballot.

Chairman Ortega added that there were aspects of the Warrant Article that need to be ironed out.

Vice Chairman Powell agreed that Merrimack should not be the first district to be challenged on this Article. He stated that there are too many unknowns right now. The language needs to be looked at for specific guidelines such as what funds can be used for and what they cannot be used for.

Board Member Schneider stated that, as a former member of the budget committee, they look at the historical trends relating to the return of funds to taxpayers. He added he would like to see the wording tightened up so it is understood what the short and long term impacts are. He questioned the 2.5% of the retained funds as stated in the Article.

Business Administrator Shevenell stated that the Department of Revenue recommended 8% to 17%. The Article suggested 2.5% which is an indication that the district should wait on this Article.

The motion to remove Warrant Article 8 from the ballot passed on a vote of 4-0-0.

Board Member Barnes asked if the Warrant Articles needed to be renumbered after the removal of Article 8 from the ballot.

Superintendent Chiafery responded that the order of the Articles would change. The Bond Warrant Article would appear first on the Warrant. The Board will decide on February 18<sup>th</sup> which Board member will move and second each of the Articles on the Warrant.

Board Member Schneider asked if the Articles would be ready to discuss at the Budget Committee meeting on February 5<sup>th</sup>.

Superintendent Chiafery responded that she and Business Administrator Shevenell would confer to get all the new votes in place, reorder the Articles and revise the language where appropriate.

## **7. Preparation for School Board's Bond Hearing for Warrant on Consolidation of Special Services/SAU Offices**

Superintendent Chiafery explained that Business Administrator Shevenell asked Attorney Peahl to go over the bond hearing process, as well as the timing. Since there had not been a bond hearing since 2002, they wanted to make sure everything was done properly and legally.

Superintendent Chiafery stated that the Board is the governing body and they schedule the bond hearing. Therefore, the next thing to do is to take a look at the calendar and realize what the parameters are for such a hearing. The last date to hold a hearing for the bond is Tuesday, February 19<sup>th</sup>. A legal notice will be published in the newspapers at least seven days prior to the bond hearing date. She added that the presence of the board members is important at this meeting, as is the presence of Rich Hendricks, the Chairman of the Building and Planning Committee.

It was determined that the bond hearing would be held on Monday, February 18<sup>th</sup> at 6:30 p.m. at Merrimack Town Hall in the Matthew Thornton Room. The snow date will be February 19<sup>th</sup>.

## **8. NH Model Educator Support and Evaluation System**

Assistant Superintendent McLaughlin explained that the district is undertaking an effort to craft a new teacher evaluation system. The district's work is in conjunction with the work done on the state level. His goal in speaking to the board was about the state's effort at crafting a teacher support and evaluation system.

Assistant Superintendent McLaughlin presented New Hampshire's State Model Educator Support and Evaluation System. He explained the nine points in the state task force's work on the initiative:

- Design Team:
  - The NH Phase II Task Force for Effective Teaching included over 40 key education stakeholders, including teachers, principals, superintendents, high education representative and key union and association representative.
  - Supported by the NH Department of Education, the Center for Assessment, Regional Education Laboratory Northeast and Islands and the New England Comprehensive Center.
  - This is a multi-year effort that the state has engaged in.
- Guiding Principles: The State model system development was guided by shared design principles. The primary purpose of the system is to maximize student learning. The following are highlights of some of the principles supporting this primary purpose.
  - High quality teachers are critical for fostering student learning. Therefore, the system is designed to maximize educator development by providing specific feedback and on-going support that can be used to improve teaching quality.
  - Local evaluation systems should be designed collaboratively among teachers, leaders and other key stakeholders such as parents and students as appropriate.
  - The State model system and all local systems shall be based on multiple measures of teaching practices and student outcomes including using multiple years of data when available.
  - The Model system is designed to be internally coherent and complementary to the NH Leader Evaluation system.



- The Model system should be applied by well-trained leaders/evaluators using multiple sources of evidence along with professional judgment to arrive at an overall evaluation for each educator.
- Recommended Requirements: The Task Force recommended that all local educator evaluations include the following limited set of common components for all district systems:
  - Ensuring all educator/leader preparation programs meet the InTASC (Interstate Teacher Assessment Consortium) and the ISLLC (Interstate School Leader’s Licensure Consortium).
  - Having a comprehensive educator evaluation system in place
  - Classifying evaluation results for all educators into four New Hampshire categories of performance using common definitions of performance: Highly Effective, Effective, Needs Improvement, and Ineffective.
  - Incorporating student performance results into the evaluation of all educators, and
  - Evaluating the performance of all educators at least once every three years through a summative evaluation.
- General Evaluation Framework: The State Model System contains five major components, four areas of professional practice and student performance results. Each of the areas should be weighed relatively equally, although local districts have the discretion to adjust the weighting of the domains to reflect local priorities. Each educator evaluation should include:
  - Early self-reflection and goal setting (Merrimack does this)
  - A professional portfolio documenting key aspects of teacher practice (Merrimack has this in place)
  - Observations of practice by educational leaders and potentially peers (partially being done in Merrimack)
  - Student Learning Objectives(SLOs)
  - Student Growth Percentiles (SGPs, where applicable)
  - Shared attribution of at least part of the SLO and/or SGP results depending upon local theories of action around school improvement.
  - In addition to the major components listed above, the Task Force recommends exploring the inclusion of measures of student voice and parent opinions in the evaluation of educators (Merrimack has parents on the committee)
- Standards of Professional Practice: The Model System is based on the four areas of effective teaching described in the Phase I report and further elaborated by the InTASC Model Teaching Standards:
  - Learner and Learning
  - Content Knowledge
  - Instructional Practice
  - Professional Responsibility

The Task Force expects that districts will use existing tools to help specify and measure the various aspects of professional practice, but recommend that all districts map their framework to the four dimensions from the Phase I report.
- Use of Student Performance Results: All teachers, whether in “state tested grades and subjects” or not, will document student academic performance each year using Student Learning Objectives (SLO) in according with the SLO guidelines developed by the Task Force. The Department of Education will produce Student Growth Percentile (SGP) results

documenting the individual student and aggregate growth for students based on state test data. These results, based on NECAP and eventually Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium (SBAC), using the SGP model, may be incorporated into teacher's evaluations either using a shared or individual attribution framework.

- **Coherence:** The State Model is designed to maximize coherence among the various aspects of the system. In particular, the Task Force wants to ensure that the four areas of teaching practice and student performance results are seen as integral parts of the comprehensive system.
- **Frequency of Evaluation:** All teachers should undergo a summative evaluation at least once every three years, while new and/or teachers previously rated ineffective should be evaluated every year. All teachers will receive formative feedback and participate in SLOs and the professional portfolio process each year.
- **Consequences and Supports:** The system has been designed to ensure that teachers with low evaluation ratings receive support in order to improve their teaching performance. If the teaching performance is low for a second year, the educator will be supported by a directed professional growth (improvement) plan that includes targeted mentoring and support. At the same time, teachers with exemplary performance demonstrated by the evaluation ratings may be recognized in ways determined by the local district.

Assistant Superintendent McLaughlin stated that this Model is suggested, and that the district is not required to follow everything. He added that when teachers are well-trained and well-supported the obvious benefit is the students. We are now at a point where the administration has taken on more of the responsibility of the teachers' evaluations, trying to engage in dialogue with teachers to maximize student learning. This is a nexus between teacher practices and student performance.

Assistant Superintendent McLaughlin stated that the State has developed a series of networks. These are Network of Support, Innovation Network, Knowledge Network and Technical Assistance Network.

Vice Chairman Powell was concerned that the state is recommending that we "Ensure (ing) all educator/leader preparation programs meet the InTASC and ISLLC standards as well as the newly approved NH rules for program approval (Ed 505.07)". Specifically, what is "program approval"?

Assistant Superintendent McLaughlin responded that each district is required to have a teacher evaluation model this is locally controlled. That means that it must be internally consistent. We cannot have three schools doing one thing and three schools doing another. He added that there is no rule in the school approval standards that says you must adopt these recommendations specifically, but rather you must have an internally consistent plan.

Chairman Ortega asked about the frequency of evaluations, specifically why they must be done every three years for the "regular" teachers.

Assistant Superintendent McLaughlin replied that it is a minimum recommended protocol. We have to periodically remind ourselves that we are breaking new ground and this is a minimum guideline that we are free to exceed if we choose to do so based upon good and rational reasons for doing it.

Chairman Ortega stated that he is looking forward to speaking with the parent representatives to the committee and sharing their experiences. He added that having student performance results as part of the system is very interesting. He thanked Assistant Superintendent McLaughlin for his presentation.

## 9. NH School Board Delegate Assembly Report

Board Member Barnes provided the Board with a report from the Delegate Assembly held on Saturday, January 12<sup>th</sup>. Highlights included:

### - **Superintendent Evaluation.**

Based on the Department of Education's Rule 303.01(k), school boards shall annually evaluate the Superintendent based on written criteria established by the school board. An informal poll was taken and about half of the districts have had to look for a new Superintendent.

### - **Maple Street Elementary Magnet School, Rochester, NH**

- The school has a 200 day calendar year
- The school has been in existence for two years
- The students are introduced to foreign language (French) in Pre-K
- The goal is to have higher learning retention with a shorter summer break.
- Selection is done by blind lottery
- If successful, Magnet Middle and High School environments will be considered.

### - **State Retirement Costs:**

The Issues, the Efforts at Reform, What the Future Holds: There are 80,000 participants in New Hampshire; 49,000 are active employees and 31,000 are retirees. The discussion regarding moving to a defined contribution plan focused on the unfunded liability by the existing plan and how it makes it unattainable to make a move at this time.

### - **Greetings by Legislators:**

Greetings were received from State Senator Nancy Stiles, Chair of the Senate Education Committee and Majority Leader of the NH Legislature as well as Steve Shurtleff. No definitive expectations could be shared in the area of education funding due to the newness of the respective membership.

### - **Election of Officers:** Those nominated were elected unanimously

### - **Resolution Adoption:**

- One continuing resolution was removed which encourages moving NECAP testing from fall to spring, based on the state's change of testing to Smarter Balance in 2014.
- Resolution 8, submitted by Strafford regarding testing Special Ed students at Grade level ability was adopted.
- Resolution 9, submitted by Timberlane regarding gambling funding was not proposed by the Delegate Assembly
- Resolution 10, submitted by Newfound regarding Pay/Step Increases, an alternative adoption was adopted.

## 10. Merrimack School District Budget Committee Meeting Schedule

Chairman Ortega presented the Budget Committee Meeting Schedule:

January 29, 2013: The Budget Committee reviewed budgets for the elementary schools, James Mastricola Upper Elementary school, Merrimack Middle School, Merrimack High School and Library/Media Technology, followed by a work session.

February 5, 2013: The Budget Committee will review budgets for Maintenance, Special Education, Food Services, the District Wide Budget followed by a work session and Warrant Article review.

February 7, 2013: As needed/Snow Date

February 12, 2013: Budget Committee will have a work session followed by a Public Hearing at 7:30 p.m. on Final Budget Actions and Recommendations.

February 14, 2013: As needed/Snow Date

February 19, 2013: Last day for committee action.

Board Member Schneider reported that the Budget Committee met on January 29<sup>th</sup>. The observation by the Budget Committee members was that they had the ability to ask questions, attend the meetings and hear the answers, which really helped the flow of the budget process. The Public Hearing for the Budget will be February 12<sup>th</sup>. The Public Hearing for the Bond will be February 18<sup>th</sup>.

## 11. Other

- a) Correspondence:  
There was no correspondence
- b) Comments:  
There were no comments

## 12. New Business:

There was no new business to report.

## 13. Committee Reports

Student Representative Crowley gave an update on events at the high school. She stated that Hollis/Brookline is using Merrimack's Student Congress as a model. She also said that the Congress is writing a constitution, explaining to the students what the Student Congress is about. She added that more tables have been added to the Senior Section as well as trashcans. Finally she reported that the Student Council is working on a Winter Pep Rally. They are also making hearts with the names of every student and staff member to hang in the cafeteria lobby. As an aside, she announced that Merrimack beat Bishop Guertin at Bishop Guertin for the first time in four years.

Vice Chairman Powell spoke about the Teacher Evaluation Committee, which met twice in January. There are four different models that they are looking at and do not want to reinvent the wheel. The group is committed to coming up with an evaluation process that is unique to Merrimack. The next meetings are on February 5<sup>th</sup> and February 9<sup>th</sup>. He added that updates are available on the District website.

**14. Public Comments on Agenda Items**

There were no public comments on agenda items.

**15. Manifest**

The Board signed the manifest.

At 10:00 p.m. Board Schneider moved (seconded by Board Member Barnes) to adjourn the meeting.

The motion passed 5-0-0.