

**Merrimack School Board Meeting
Merrimack High School Cafeteria
September 19, 2011**

PUBLIC MEETING MINUTES

PRESENT: Chairman Vaillancourt, Vice Chairman Ortega, Board Members Barnes, Markwell and Thornton, Superintendent Chiafery, Assistant Superintendent McLaughlin, Business Administrator Shevenell and Student Representative Yates were in attendance.

1. Call To Order

Chairman Vaillancourt called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m.

Chairman Vaillancourt led the Pledge of Allegiance.

2. Approval of September 6, 2011 Minutes

Board Member Barnes moved (seconded by Board Member Thornton) to approve the minutes of the September 6, 2011 meeting:

Board Member Barnes requested the following changes to the minutes

- Page 4 of 11, section Consolidation of Special Services/SAU offices, paragraph 2, change “pushed out” to “moved forward”
- Page 4 of 11, paragraph 3, section Consolidation of Special Services/SAU office, Town Center Committee should be changed to Library Building and Marketing Committee.
- Page 4 of 11, paragraph 2, change “because it was voted down...” to “a capital reserve fund to put down a deposit on a building project” was voted down on the town ballot.
- Page 5 of 11, section Technology Infrastructure Upgrade, paragraph 3, should read “ARRA grant”
- Page 7 of 11, section Consideration.... Meetings, paragraph 3, last sentence, replace the words “the board meeting” with “other meetings”
- Page 7 of 11, section Consideration.....Meetings, paragraph 5, should read “Board Member Barnes asked about the flexibility for the 24-hour notice that has to be given if there is a need for a non-public meeting”
- Page 8 of 11, paragraph 2, insert the sentence “Board Member Barnes felt her questions were answered and that she supported using the Town Hall meeting room and waiving the 2-week rule.
- Page 10 of 11, paragraph 1, sentence 2, “She noted.....important” and add “and that the technology importance was noted as an area of improvement by the accreditation board.

Board Member Thornton requested the following changes to the minutes.

- Page 2 of 11, Section 6, add second paragraph to read, “Board Member Thornton commented on how valuable the surveys are to the Safeguard Committee.
- Page 3 of 11, Section Presentation of CIP, paragraph 5, first sentence, change the “middle school” to “Reeds Ferry School”.
- Page 3 of 11, Section Presentation of CIP, paragraph 5, last sentence should read: The existing roof that was previously done at Merrimack Middle School had a 10-15 year warranty.
- Page 3 of 11, Section Asbestos Removal, the sentence should read “Board Member Thornton asked if Business Administrator Shevenell could explain that the removal of asbestos is preventative.”
- Page 10 of 11, paragraph 2, after “extra curricular” add “should be considered, knowing that there are many State and Federal mandates”.

Board Member Markwell requested the following changes to the minutes.

- Page 2 of 11, Section 6, the last word in the last paragraph should read “approval”
- Page 6 of 11, paragraph 7, change “he should...” to “board members should have wide latitude to do that and he will continue to do so”

Vice Chairman Ortega requested the following changes to the minutes.

- Change all the words “sited” to “cited”
- Page 4 of 11, last line should read “Vice Chairman Ortega asked about the difference in capital costs associated with the plan for the next two years.
- Page 6 of 11, last paragraph, change colleges to colleagues
- Page 10 of 11, paragraph 3, the second sentence should read, “Budgets have increased, but the.....gone down in recent years.”

Chairman Vaillancourt requested the following changes to the minutes.

- Page 4 of 11, Section Consolidation....Offices” paragraph 3, ...the project “moved out” should be “moved forward”
- Page 4 of 11, Section Consolidation....Offices, paragraph 3, “a full report on the district website” should be replaced with “a full report on a study regarding the construction of a new consolidated SAU office.”
- Page 5 of 11, second paragraph from the bottom should read “Chairman Vaillancourt asked the board to provide her with input regarding what they would like to include in a charge to the Planning and Building Committee for the study for a high school athletic field.
- Page 6 of 11, paragraph 1, should read that she “has no strong feeling about the policy and go with the consensus of the board” and that had witnessed a committee member using a laptop during the meeting and that she an issue with that.

Board Member Barnes moved (seconded by Board Member Thornton) to approve the minutes of the September 6, 2011 meeting.

The motion passed 5-0-0.

3. Public Participation- Chairman Vaillancourt

There was no public participation.

4. Acceptance of Gifts/Grants under \$5,000 – Matt Shevenell

- From Target to Merrimack Middle School for \$271.92 for educational supplies

Board Member Barnes moved (seconded by Board Member Markwell) to accept the gift.

The motion passed 5-0-0.

5. Consent Agenda- Dr. Mark McLaughlin

a) Teacher Resignation

Assistant Superintendent McLaughlin announced the following teacher resignation

- Jennifer Hutchinson, Special Education Coordinator, James Masticola Upper Elementary School

b) Approval of Merrimack Middle School's Participation in the NH Youth Tobacco Survey

Board Member Barnes moved (seconded by Board Member Markwell) to approve the Consent Agenda.

The motion passed 5-0-0.

6. New Hampshire State Scholar Initiative Program (SSI) Presentation

Tom Putney gave an overview of the New Hampshire Scholars Program stating that it is a partnership between business and education to strengthen the chances for student success in college and the workplace. The core course of study includes math, science, social studies, language arts, and the study of foreign language.

- Goals included in the Memorandum of Agreement include
 - Recruit and train business leaders to make presentations to grade 8 students
 - Ensure that business leaders present the SSI 8th grade presentation to middle school students
 - Recognize and support students who make the effort to be State Scholars
 - Honor each high school senior who completes the Scholars Core Course of Study
 - Ensure that, at a minimum, Merrimack students complete the SSI Core Course of Study requirements. (for a total of 15.5 credits)

Mr. Pat McGrath gave a PowerPoint presentation explaining the program; why we are in the program, who is part of the program and when the students begin to participate in the program.

Ms. Linda Mandra introduced two students to report on the program.

- Joel Yates, student representative to the school board and high school senior, reported that he found the presenters in all areas to be very interesting and informative.
- Ben Rogers, high school senior, also commented on the presentations. He reported that he took an on-line course to complete his social studies requirement entitled The Diversity in the United States. He found this experience was important in building communication and preparing for college.
- Ms. Mandra reported that another student was not able to attend, but had been to a presentation by educators on teaching. The young lady had thought she wanted to be a teacher, but after the presentations she was so touched that she was convinced that she wants to teach.

Mr. Putney shared with the board that in 2011, 81 seniors took part in the Scholars program or 22% of the class. In 2011, 28% of the students signed up for the program and for the class of 2015 (freshman this year) 141 students (or 42%) have indicated that they want to participate in the New Hampshire Scholars Program.

Board Member Markwell asked how the businesses were recruited.

Mr. Putney responded that the Chamber of Commerce was the source of many businesses participating in the program.

Board Member Markwell asked if the businesses were restricted to Merrimack businesses.

Mr. McGrath responded that the businesses are not restricted to Merrimack. Members of the Advisory Board reach out to other businesses and people they may know. In many instances the local business people had been students in the Merrimack school system.

Superintendent Chiafery commented on the student essays, explaining that through the essays the students directed the committee to know what their special interests are and what they want to do in the future.

Board Member Markwell asked how much time a mentor is required to give to the program.

Mr. McGrath responded that it depends on the individual participant.

Vice Chairman Ortega thanked the participants for their attendance. He asked what it would take for 100% of the high school students to participate in the program.

Mr. Putney responded that to include more students in the program, parents and the community should become involved in the program, as well as getting the word out to the community and challenging the students to become participants.

Mr. McGrath responded that the program is not designed to reach only the top 10% of the students. It is for students who may not think they can go to college or have a successful business career. The program is saying that “You can do it, you have the support.”

Board Member Thornton inquired about working with the middle school students to introduce them to the NH Scholars program.

Mr. Putney explained that eighth grade students are encouraged to participate in the summer essay program to become a part of the program. Members of the Advisory Board also speak to parents at parent/teacher meetings for the grade 8 students.

Chairman Vaillancourt noted that the essay assignment is on line at nhscholars.org.

7. Update on Emergency Management Planning for the School District

Mr. Les Carter gave a brief history of the Emergency Management Plan for the Merrimack School District. The committee has three areas to address – to identify short and long term goals, to establish continued relationships between the school, fire and police departments and to explore initiatives that would provide the public with the emergency planning taking place.

Mr. Carter continued to say that there is a flip chart, Emergency Management Procedures, which is common to all the schools in the district that are in every classroom. The Parent’s Guide to Emergency Management is printed every year.

Mr. Carter continued to explain that recent focus has been on the high school. The procedures found in every school pertain to that school only, and because of the size of the high school, certain procedures must be looked at differently. The protocols are directed to give each school information on where to assemble and how to account for every student and every staff member. There have been lock-down drills in the high school, which are different than police and fire drills. Administrative protocols will contain specific information used to set up command posts and participate with the police and fire departments.

Student Representative Yates commented that he was glad that evacuation procedures were being developed, especially in the high school.

Mr. Carter responded that he was pleased to see some changes in the evacuation plan at the high school, and added that there is still a long way to go.

Mr. Carter added that the high school staff does not have a communication system. He stated that he is in favor of placing two-way radios in the classrooms to aid in emergency communications.

Board Member Barnes noted that the safety of students is as big a priority as educating them. She added that she is pleased that the plan is getting fine-tuned and that there is value in these exercises and the documentation.

Mr. Carter stated that the police and fire department have been in constant communication with the committee. Every student in the high school is familiar with evacuation drills, having experienced them in the Merrimack elementary and middle schools. He added that accounting for people is part of what teachers need to do.

Vice Chairman Ortega noted that in the Emergency Management Procedures document contains the principles behind the procedures, but they are not school or building specific. He questioned how practice on drilling could be done without school/staff protocol.

Mr. Carter responded that some of the schools do have school/staff protocols. For example, a “shelter in place” is not necessarily school specific. However, details such as where students would board busses in case of total evacuation is school specific and is handled by each of the schools separately.

8. Response to Proposed Capital Improvement Plan – Jody Vaillancourt

Chairman Vaillancourt explained that any adjustments to the Capital Improvement Plan, which was approved on August 23, 2011, would be discussed.

Board Member Markwell asked about the possibility of a steel construction for the SPED/SAU building.

Board Member Barnes presented a worksheet with suggestions of adjustments to be made to the Capital Improvement Plan. In addressing several projects that could be moved to different budget years, the bottom lines would be:

- For year 2012-13, the total would be \$1,947,469 instead of \$2,822,486 on the August summary
- For year 2013-14, the total would be \$2,048,008 instead of the \$1,523,281 on the August summary
- For year 2014-15, the total would be \$1,574,444, instead of the \$914,163 on the August summary
- For year 2015-16, the total would be \$736,475, instead of the \$1,046,475 on the August summary
- For year 2016-17, the total would be \$101,494, which is the same on the August summary
- For year 2017-18, the total would be \$1,276,500, which is the same on the August summary

Vice Chairman Ortega asked Business Administrator Shevenell if there will be issues in terms of draining, paving and entrances at the upper elementary school all taking place at the same time over the summer.

Business Administrator Shevenell responded that most of the paving could be done over the summer. For the entrances, plans for the project need to be made and submitted to the fire department before construction can begin. Therefore it is possible that the construction may “bleed” over in the school year.

Vice Chairman Ortega asked if the repairing or replacing the roof at the high school could be combined with the roofing projects at the other schools.

Business Administrator Shevenell answered that it could be done at the same time.

Vice Chairman Ortega noted that the projects discussed (asbestos removal, roofing, paving, etc) are funded based on the Capital Improvement Plan, whereas the SPED/SAU building will be bonded. He suggested that the principal and interest payments of the bond be spread out over the years of the bond as opposed to the lump sum of 1.8 million dollars in any one given year. He asked Business Administrator Shevenell about the amount of those payments.

Business Administrator Shevenell responded that a 10-year bond for the project would probably be around \$200,000 a year, plus or minus.

Board Member Thornton suggested that the proposed paving projects be stretched out over the next four to five years instead of lumping them together so that the \$1,900,000 would not be the bottom line of our budget, which could be a tax problem. She added that spreading them out would mean getting the maximum out of the paving previously done and paid for.

Board Member Thornton asked if contractors for the roofing projects, asbestos removal and paving at the same time would cause there to be a fighting for space in the work environment.

Business Administrator Shevenell responded that there could be a problem and suggested another project be swapped with one of the other projects in order to make it feasible.

Board Member Barnes suggested the asbestos abatement in 2013-14 be swapped with 2014-15 asbestos abatement and that could solve the problem.

Board Member Markwell stated that it would have been helpful if the work sheet by Board Member Barnes had been included in the school board packet that was sent out. He also stated that for him, paving was not a priority, and that technology and the SPED/SAU building would have a higher priority.

Chairman Vaillancourt explained that Board Member Barnes was asked to put her thoughts about the Capital Improvement Plan into a chart to be discussed at the meeting, as a courtesy to other board members, but was not required.

Student Representative Yates stated that the bus loop at the high school is in deplorable condition and suggested that the paving project become a priority.

Chairman Vaillancourt addressed several concerns about Board Member Barnes’ chart, including needing a good solid plan before going ahead with the front entrance at James Masticola Upper Elementary School construction, the roofing and the construction of a new SPED/SAU building should not be moved up from 2012-2013. She added that the Capital Improvement Plan presented last year had the most level amount of tax impact.

Board Member Barnes stated that she was concerned about the entrance projects put off to another year, but acknowledged that she wants them done correctly.

Vice Chairman Ortega noted that the Capital Improvement Plan is a long-term vision, and probably shouldn't change that much each year. He questioned if the SPED/SAU office was pushed back to where it was, would the district be prepared next year to move forward with the project.

Vice Chairman Ortega moved (seconded by Board Member Barnes) to move the SPED/SAU office building back to where it was in 2013-2014.

Board Member Thornton agreed that the SPED/SAU building should be moved, but asked if we would be ready for this project, since there have been new thoughts about a steel structure.

Business Administrator Shevenell responded that the SPED/SAU building project needs to be reviewed by the Planning and Building Committee. He noted that the committee might want to modify the existing plan.

Chairman Vaillancourt stated that reducing the cost of building the SPED/SAU office would benefit the district as well as the town. However, after all the work the committee has put into research, studies, providing information, and receiving approval from the school board, she would not like to have the design completely changed.

Business Administrator Shevenell responded that there could be certain things that can be done to modify the project to bring the cost down considerably, but the quality could be compromised.

Board Member Thornton noted that the middle school roofing project was completed to be a cost saving effort, but the quality was such that now reroofing it had to be put on the Capital Improvement Plan shortly after it was completed.

The motion passed 5-0-0.

Board Member Barnes moved (seconded by Vice Chairman Ortega) to move the Technology Infrastructure Upgrade from the years 2015-15 to 2012-13.

Board Member Barnes stated that Merrimack needs to be ahead of the curve in technology. Board Member Barnes mentioned, among other things, wireless technology.

Chairman Vaillancourt questioned if the technology infrastructure was moved up would the district be ready to put the plan in place.

Business Administrator Shevenell listed the needs as being a new server for PowerSchool, a new server for BudgetSense, new remote file and print servers at each school and a new centralized back up system. He felt that a plan to put this in place could be done quite easily.

Vice Chairman Ortega questioned the delivery of information to the students not being on the list given by Business Administrator Shevenell. He noted that wireless was absent from his description of technology infrastructure.

Business Administrator Shevenell explained that each student has a portfolio and all their information is saved on the servers, which need to keep going without potential crash. He added that there is an

organizational problem that needs some consulting time and that PowerSchool directly impacts student learning.

Vice Chairman Ortega asked specifically what the \$150,000 would be used for and if it included wireless for the students.

Business Administrator Shevenell responded that the wireless project is in the AARA funds has been initiated. He suggested wireless can be added to the list, but hoped people realized that there are other infrastructure upgrades that are needed.

Board Member Thornton stressed that a definite list of what would be included in the year 2015-16 as far as technology upgrades would be needed.

Business Administrator Shevenell responded that in the past, the technology upgrades had been for classroom computers for students and that servers, switches, etc. have never been budgeted.

Vice Chairman Ortega questioned if the plan were accelerated, would there be proper planning for technology upgrades.

Business Administrator Shevenell responded that if the money were appropriated now, a list could be put together.

Vice Chairman Ortega understands and agrees, and stated further that he was not convinced that there are not more line items that should be included in future years.

Superintendent Chiafery stated that she and Business Administrator Shevenell had put together a visual plan, and now was the time to operationalize it. She added that there is an immediate need to help the overall system. Just as there had been a plan for furniture and capital improvements, there needs to be a plan for this, perhaps needing consultants in the process.

Board Member Thornton agreed that there needs to be a plan. Technology is an ongoing expense and every year there is something new that comes up. She also questioned if this technology upgrade could be put into the operating budget.

Board Member Barnes referred to the roofing projects by stating that a roof needs to be fixed before it leaks, because once it leaks it will cost more money to fix. She stated that she thought the technology system has "leaked" and needs to be fixed by providing sound architecture in which the technology plan will serve everyone well.

Chairman Vaillancourt responded that some of the cost of upgrading technology could be put into the operating budget, but that anything over \$100,000 has to be put on the Capital Improvement Plan.

The motion failed 2-3-0 with Board Members Thornton and Markwell and Vice Chairman Ortega in opposition.

Board Member Thornton spoke to the 2012-13 parking lot refiguration at Reeds Ferry. She stated that it would cost \$100,000 to add 35 new parking spaces and perhaps that money could be better used for staffing or for other services for the students.

Board Member Thornton moved (seconded by Board Member Markwell) to reduce the amount for the Reeds Ferry Park Lot Reconfiguration and Lyons Road paving to \$55,000, therefore removing it from the Capital Improvement Plan and putting it into the operating budget.

Superintendent Chiafery stated that the projects had been separated - Reeds Ferry Parking Reconfiguration and Lyons Road paving.

Board Member Thornton commented that the parking lot at Reeds Ferry has been in existence since the 1960's and has been sufficient. Therefore she could not justify spending that amount of money on the reconfiguration plan.

Superintendent Chiafery responded that people, including staff and parents, have complained about the Reeds Ferry parking lot, noting that there is a concern for safety. She questioned what could be done to make it a better situation.

Board Member Barnes stated that guard rails had been constructed around the bus path. The redesign will also improve the line of sight for bus drivers and pedestrians as well alike which is necessary for safety reasons. She suggested widening the bus route path and making sure parallel parking spots do not back up into the bus path would alleviate some of the safety concerns.

Chairman Vaillancourt stated that Reeds Ferry has the worst parking situation of all the schools in the district and is very dangerous, making safety a concern. She added that she would support leaving the \$165,000 where it is in the Capital Improvement Plan so that the safety of the parking lot is addressed in the 2012-13 school year.

Board Member Markwell noted that it is a complex situation. He agrees that Reeds Ferry needs immediate attention and would support leaving \$165,000 in the Capital Improvement Plan.

The motion failed 1-4-0, with Board Members Barnes, Markwell, Vice Chairman Ortega and Chairman Vaillancourt in opposition.

Board Member Markwell moved (seconded by Vice Chairman Ortega) to move the Capital Improvement Plan forward as amended.

The motion passed 5-0-0.

9. Board Members' Input for Planning and Building Committee charge to Address High School Athletic Field Issues

Chairman Vaillancourt explained the process of crafting the charge to address the high school athletic field. Board members present their ideas/comments to the Superintendent who will then craft the charge.

Board Member Barnes stated that she hoped the track and field issues could be "married". One reason was that if they were separated and the track was completed first, when the field work was scheduled, the track would be compromised in order to reach the field.

Chairman Vaillancourt responded that it is important to specifically talk about the physical condition of the field and its repair, maintenance and/or replacement. She added that perhaps at a later date the issue of "marrying" the field and track projects could be discussed.

Vice Chairman Ortega asked for clarification on what field or fields are being discussed.

Superintendent Chiafery responded that the Merrimack High School field is the focus of the discussion because it is in need of repair. In response to Board Member Barnes' idea of "marrying" the track and field projects, she stated that more information would be needed to address the issue. The issue at hand is the field surface.

Chairman Vaillancourt spoke about the possibility of using artificial turf. However, there is no real data or research that has come before the board. She suggested that the Planning and Building Committee research the use of artificial turf and share its finding with the board. Chairman Vaillancourt stated that she had no objection to marrying the two projects, but she didn't necessarily think they had to be done together because she saw the track as being a more urgent need. She asked Business Administrator Shevenell to speak about the lifetime of artificial turf.

Business Administrator Shevenell replied that many schools in New Hampshire have recently installed artificial turf, but there are no statistics as to the lifetime of the materials. He suggested other districts or facilities be examined by the School Building and Planning Committee.

Chairman Vaillancourt discussed the cost of using artificial turf as compared to continue using grass.

Board Member Markwell added that he would be in support of artificial turf if data shows there would be a cost savings. He suggested the board look into charging fees to organizations using the field other than the school district.

Superintendent Chiafery responded that the discussion of fees should stay with the board and not the Planning and Building Committee.

Board Member Markwell suggested that other districts be consulted regarding the performance of artificial turf and their use of fees.

Board Member Barnes noted that the composition of artificial turf has changed over the last 30 years and that a study should be done regarding the life expectancy and the new technologies developed in the material.

Board Member Markwell responded that the current generation of artificial turf should be examined and that different companies and areas should be examined by the School Planning and Building Committee to determine the life expectancy.

Vice Chairman Ortega suggested that all types of surfaces, natural and synthetic, should be examined in order to get the cost benefit analysis. He also asked that Superintendent Chiafery report to the board on the different uses of the high school field beyond the school system and what fees are charged, if any.

Student Representative Yates questioned the striping on the field, since it is used for several sports, including lacrosse, soccer and football.

Board Member Markwell stated that there are stripings available for all sports.

Chairman Vaillancourt stated that the process could move forward and that Superintendent Chiafery will come back with a proposed charge for the School Planning and Building Committee.

10. Board's Budget Message to the Superintendent for 2011-2013

Chairman Vaillancourt read the letter from the board to the budget committee:

For the 2012/13 budget cycle it is the Merrimack School Board's desire that school district administration budget for a quality education for our students while keeping the taxpayer in mind.

The Board has budgetary expectations which include but are limited to, the following:

- We will remain committed to the School District Logic Model. By supporting the long and short term goals and objectives in the Logic Model we have made continuous progress in the areas of literacy, numeracy, technology, school climate and safety.
- We will continue to make data driven decisions. Financial support will be applied only to those programs and tools that have been proven successful by data.
- We will maintain appropriate staffing levels based on enrollments and the needs of our students
- We will continue to prioritize projects contained in our Capital Improvement Plan. We will need to consistently plan ahead for various projects so as not to overburden any one particular budget cycle. We are hopeful that future reductions in bonded debt will assist the district in lessening some of the tax impact of our CIP.
- We will be forward thinking with our support of curriculum and technology. It is the Board's desire that the district continue to look for efficiencies with our use of technology while maintaining our infrastructure in an effort to keep our capabilities as current as possible.
- We will continue to examine co-curricular programs in an effort to streamline our offerings and strive for equality between academic clubs and athletics.
- We will support administration's efforts to create a level funded budget. The trend over the last three years has been one of a decline in growth of gross appropriations with the increase for the 2011/2012 year coming in at ¾ of a percent. Understanding that this may require cuts to staffing and/or programs it is the Board's desire that Administration clearly share the consequences of such actions with the Board and its constituency.

Rising health costs, uncertainties with the NH retirement system, and our state's continuing trend to shift costs to the local level all present substantial financial challenges for the budget of 2012/13. This past budget cycle is a perfect example of the uncertainties that we face with potential loss of revenues and unexpected increases in expenditures. However, the Merrimack School District continues to position itself well to meet these challenges. We will remain prudent with our expenditures without sacrificing the quality of our students' education.

11. Request for New Hampshire School Board Association (NHSBA) Resolutions

Chairman Vaillancourt spoke to the packet received from the NH School Board regarding submitting resolutions. Proposed resolutions are submitted to the NHSBA Board of Directors for review and recommendations. These suggestions then go to the Delegate Assembly for final action. . The deadline for submitting requested resolutions is October 21, 2011. Superintendent Chiafery should be contacted if members are interested in submitting resolutions for review.

Board Member Barnes is the school board representative to the NHSBA.

12. Other

a. Correspondence

There was no correspondence to report.

b. Comments

Board Member Barnes spoke about the Grater Woods Memo of Understanding. The Town Council reviewed the memo and had some concerns. Based on that, there will be continued dialogue and the

committee will meet again this week. Subsequently they will get back to the school board and the Town Council. She will have the next consideration at the October meeting.

Chairman Vaillancourt announced that the new Mandarin teacher helped introduce members of the Chinese exchange program. The new Mandarin teacher was introduced for the first time. Another group from the Merrimack Chamber of Commerce will be going to China at the end of October.

13. New Business

There was no new business.

14. Committee Reports

Board Member Barnes reported that she and Vice Chairman Ortega attended the PERC (Program Evaluation and Review Committee). There are new members to the committee and it is promising to be a very exciting year. They have reviewed the Technology Plan and are going to review the Art and Science curricula. They are still looking for one new member.

15. Public Comments on Agenda Items

Rich Hendricks addressed the board regarding the track/field projects. He questioned who would do the cost analysis of the current track's condition in relevance to its repair or replacement and how soon it might need to be done. He also questioned who would be using the facilities outside of the school system.

16. Manifest

The Board signed the manifest.

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